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The Pharaohs of the old kept nations in slavery and object poverty as money, man-power and resource were utilized to build pyramids. The present world is similarly caught up in a maddening arms race that eats up our resources which could otherwise be utilized to build a better world.

"On the face of it, the world is caught up in a highly contradictory situation on the one hand, we have the aggravation of international relations, the growing role of military might and the unbridled arms race, while on the other we have the swelling international drive for disarmament. Meanwhile, the arms race is pursuing its own logic of constant acceleration and seems to be beyond the reach of efforts to halt it and to open the process of disarmament. Hence, the question of whether, at a time when international relations are affected by crises, and when one of the manifestations of this is the arms race, disarmament is an attainable demand or an illusion." (1)

Of primary significance in the global strategy for world peace is the need for meaningful steps towards disarmament, including nuclear disarmament for world peace. Disarmament will reduce the risks of war and enable a significant diversion of
funds to that urgent problems of economic and social development facing Non-Aligned countries.

The second special session of the U.N. General Assembly on Disarmament which started on June 7, 1982 continued its deliberations for five weeks. This five weeks were highly significant weeks showing how serious governments were to take to the path of disarmament, the path to avoid total destruction. The world has spent 66,000 billion dollars since the end of the last war on arms, according to the circulations of U.N. experts, enough perhaps to feed, educate and give shelter to the entire needy people of the world. But today about 600 million people of the world starving, 800 million are illiterate and about 1500 million people are without access to the basic health services. But the richest nations of the West are less and less willing to help the poor. They provide arms to the Third World countries when they need technology for industrial and agricultural development. Today about 75 percent of the arms sold in the world are coming to the Third World. Developing countries have been spending upto 19.5 billion dollars a year on arms. Thus, the arms supply around the world, fed by imperialism, is at the root of the global problems. It is taking the world to the precipice of war and it is also ruining the life of millions of people, both in advance and developing countries.

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI)
points out that the 133 wars and armed conflicts since the end of the Second World War took place in developing countries. Some of these arose from colonial legacy and some were imposed by imperialist machinations. Over the past 35 years there has been considerable structural change in world armament trade. According to SIPRI data from 1970 to 1979, the share of the major Western Countries - the supplies of the main types of weaponry to the developing countries was as follows: U.S.A. 45 percent, France 10 percent, Britain 5 percent, Italy 3 percent, West Germany 2.3 percent and other states 4.2 percent.

The Soviet Union was the first country to take a concrete proposal for a cut of 10 percent in military expenditure of the major countries to divert it for developmental assistance. The U.N. itself has recommended a special fund for developmental from budgetary savings resulting from disarmament measure.

Addressing the opening session of the Foreign Ministers' Meeting of the Non-Aligned coordinating Bureau at Havana on 19 May, 1978, India's Minister for external Affairs warned that if the Non-aligned countries do not resolve their internal differences bilaterally outside powers would intervene and exploit our weakness and extend their spheres of influence all over again." He said the challenging tasks before the Non-Aligned movement was to consolidate its gains and further enhance its effectiveness by talking "Concern and collective initiatives on
major issues of global concreted in the field of detente, disarmament and development." In this context he said that the Non-aligned countries must raise their voices in unison "at the special session of the General Assembly disarmament."

From its inception the movement of Non-alignment has had a clear and unambiguous stand in regard to armament, seeing it as a phenomenon endangering world peace and security and striving, grosso modo, to bring about general and complete disarmament under strict international control. In doing so it has been motivated by the following considerations:

NAM AND PEACE

One of the most important direct and long-term goals of the Non-Aligned movement is to ensure world peace and security. In striking to safeguard world peace and security the Non-Aligned countries are guided, not by pacifist motives and illusions, but by the realization that world peace, meaning peace on all frontiers, is a primary condition for progressive social transformation in national and international proportions. The striving to the end the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, are thus identified with the endeavour to preserve not only world peace and security but all like on our planet.

The competition in the development of increasingly destructive and deadly weapons is giving rise to mounting tension in relations between the great powers and hampering efforts to create an atmosphere and constellation in which it would be possible to solve a number of outstanding problems in the interests of the entire international community.
It is not possible to neglect the economic aspect of disarmament either, considering that the spending of enormous financial resources an armament is, ipso facto, preventing their use for various socially useful purposes, most notably for stepping up the economic progress of the underdeveloped countries.

Nor should one lose sight of the circumstances that the arms race on the world level is influencing in different ways, the accelerated arming of the developing countries at the expense of the satisfaction on the elementary needs of their economic and social development.

The Non-Aligned countries have repeatedly emphasized that their long-run and irreplaceable goal is - general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

The Non-Aligned countries have always found a way of emphasizing in particular the pressing need for nuclear disarmament, because of greater danger to mankind, because the arms race between the great powers and the blocs has, throughout the postwar period, primarily focussed on the development and accumulation of evermore sophisticated and dangerous nuclear weapons.

The Non-Aligned countries recognized the growing danger of chemical and biological means of warfare, a means of mass destruction of people and of the human environment.
The Non-Aligned countries have initiated or endorsed all the agreements hitherto reached in the domain of disarmament, measures which have resulted in a certain restriction of the arms race: The Treaty banning the use of the Antarctic for military purposes. (1961). The Treaty on the peaceful use of space (1967) the Moscow Agreement on a partial ban on nuclear tests (1963) the treaty on nuclear non-proliferation (1968) The Agreement proclaiming Latin America a denuclearized zone (1968) the Treat banning the use of sea bed for military ends (1972) the convention prohibiting bacteiological and toxic weapons (1974) much attention has also been devoted to ensuring the acceptance and enforcement of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, whose real effect is dependent upon its universal acceptance and strict observance, nor has been overlooked that the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, for all its real and possible positive effects, objectively stabilizes and ensures the monopoly of the big powers over the possession of nuclear arms.

The Non-Aligned countries have drawn a clear line between their striving for a ban on nuclear weapons and their plea for free utilitation of nuclear energy for peaceful ends. They have been quick to perceive that their nuclear monopoly serves the great powers not only to ensure their superiority in the military domain, but to establish a sort of technological colonialism which ensures their dominant position in economic development as well, while preventing the non-nuclear countries from using nuclear energy for peace time ends and thereby enhancing their economic lagging. Bearing this in mind, the
Non-aligned countries have insisted that the conditions and mechanisms be established for the free utilization of nuclear energy for the needs of economic development.

The Non-Aligned countries have endeavoured to help restrict the arms race and reinforce international security through the removal of military bases from foreign territory. The Non-aligned countries have attached great significance to the action for denuclearizing certain continents or narrower geographical regions. They greatly contributed towards bringing about the agreement on the denuclearization of Latin America and proclamation of Africa as an atom-free-zone.

The Non-Aligned countries have not neglected the instruments and mechanism of disarmament either. Their capital general stand is that the process of disarmament should evolve under the auspices of the United Nations in the view of the fact that disarmament is a matter of vital interest to the whole international community.

The Non-aligned countries, through their positive attitude to the CSCE, have upheld also the efforts being made on a regional scale in the direction of disarmament in Europe and in the mediterranean and in the context of strivings to reinforce world peace and security. The Non-Aligned countries have called attention to fact that supplying the developing countries with arms, in the form of military assistance countributes to increased tension in the regions of the third world. Military aid most often paves the way for the great powers' infiltration.
while sales of arms to the developing nations slows down their economic and social progress. A reduction of the military budgets of the great powers and restrictions on arms deliveries would help to curb the arms race within the circle of the developing countries.

**NAM AND NEW INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER**

"The Non-Aligned countries have linked disarmament to economic development and, in the final instance, to the establishment of a new international economic order. The huge resources which are being spent on armament, to the tune of over three hundred billion dollars annually, could in large measure be diverted to accelerating the economic development of the under-developed nations and bridging the gulf that separates the developed North from the under-developed South and threatens the stability of the entire international community in the long run. The army of scientists now engaged in the development and manufacture of new weapons and technical-technological instalations for those ends could be re-oriented to investigating those ends could be re-oriented to investigating and producing goods of undreamed of consequence for the general prosperity of mankind". (2)

At the Belgrade Summit (1961) Jawaharlal Nehru said, I believe firmly that the only possible way to solve many of these problems ultimately is complete disarmament, I consider disarmement and absolute necessity for the peace of the world I
think that without disarmament the present difficulties, fears and conflicts will continue. We cannot expect to achieve disarmament suddenly even if this conference wants it. For the present moment, the only thing which we can do is to lay stress on the need to negotiate with a view to getting over these fears and dangers. If that is done, the next and other steps follow."

At the Cairo Summit (1964), the Egyptian President Nasser said, "Total and complete disarmament can, after all, be achieved by following the 'steps which made it possible and paved the wave for it'.

"The arms race is spreading through Asia, Africa and Latin America like an epidemic. The share of the developing countries in total world military spending has increased from nine to sixteen percent in the space of 10 years, and now exceeds 80,000 million dollars a year. While trying to scare everybody with the bogey of the "Soviet threat" and engineering local conflicts, the imperialist powers are egging on the developing countries to increase their military budgets and to import more arms. The danger of imperialist intervention and expanding military establishments in pro-Western states force the peace-loving countries - those of the Non-Aligned movement - to build up their defences so as not to be left unarmed in face of an aggressor. The defence activities of Arab Countries to oppose Israel's expansionist ambitions and the efforts of Angola and Mozambique
Peace is a priceless treasure of mankind and in our time the paramount condition of its existence. Even a part of stockpiles of various weapons which states have in their arsenals is enough to destroy everything living on the planet. The power of just one thermonuclear explosion is dozens of times greater than the total destructive power of all blasts made during all wars in the history of mankind.

Concepts of a "limited nuclear war" has become an official military doctrine of the United States. It is based on the idea of permissibility of unleashing a nuclear conflicts and possibility of scoring a victory in it. Strategists in the United States are planning to strike a "first blow" and to do so from foreign territories which, in their designs, should take upon themselves a retaliatory strike. The Soviet Union believes that it will be impossible to "dose" or keep a nuclear conflict within "admissible" bounds. If a nuclear war breaks out, whether in Europe or any other place, it would inevitably assume a worldwide character. The U.S. intensively developing nuclear armaments. The main supplier of armaments to the world market is the United States. During the past decade the "export of death" from that country grew four fold.

The arms race has a profound impact on all aspects of life in the developing countries. Above all, it limits the possibilities of their progress, perpecuates their backwardness and dooms them to a dependent position in the system of the
international division of labour. Possessing enormous mineral wealth, the developing non-socialist nations of Asia produce just 2.6 percent of the world's industrial output. Militarization is a much heavier burden for developing economies that for advanced ones, for military expenditures in the former case deduct a greater part from the already low share of accumulation. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), the developing countries spent 80 thousand million dollars on war preparations in 1980. At the same time the economic situation in the bulk of developing countries in Asia changed for the worse in the last few years. According to U.N. estimates, four out of each five developing nations could not achieve the planned 3.5 percent growth of per capita output. In Southeast Asia the latter grew just one percent. In these conditions even the poorest Asian countries with per capita annual income under 200 dollars, are spending on military purposes sums equal to allocations for the development of agriculture. Race for arms is contributing to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is precisely those states which take part in regional conflicts – Israel, Pakistan, South Korea and Taiwan, that are about to acquire nuclear arms.

The U.S., according to UN data, a total stock of 150,000–300,000 tons of 90 odd types of chemical poisonous agents contained in three million artillery shells, ruins and bombs stored in 10 bases in America, West Germany and the Pacific. The danger of chemical warfare engulfing the littoral states of
the Indian Ocean and the Gulf region appears more ominous now than ever before with the start of special training for the 82nd division of the US army in using poisonous gases and chemical weapons.

INDIA'S ROLE IN NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

Indian support to world disarmament in the past was largely directed towards the prohibition of the manufacture, stockpiling and experimental explosion of the atomic bomb. There are more than 50,000 nuclear weapons in the stockpiles with the destructive force of about 15,000 mega tons. Their destructiveness can be imagined if one realises that all bombs dropped during the Second World War had the total destructive force of only 3-4 mega tons. It is impossible for human imagination to comprehend the totality of the horror in store for us. All mankind is a hostage to genocide destruction in a thermonuclear holocaust. Scientific studies have revealed the possibility of a global climatic catastrophe and a nuclear winter following a nuclear war. A recent study prepared for the WHO estimates that upto 1.1 billion would die in case of a nuclear war which would not be confined entirely to NATO and Warsaw Pact countries. An additional 1.1 billion people would suffer serious injures. Thus about half of the human population would be killed or seriously injured by the direct efforts of such a war.

The six-Nation Summit on Nuclear Disarmament held in New Delhi on January 28, 1986 contributed a powerful voice to the cause of world peace. It was guided, as it were by the spirit of the world's two foremost crusaders against nuclear proliferation
Jawaharlal Nehru and Indira Gandhi. The six leaders, representing five continents gave a call to save humanity from nuclear catastrophe from the pulpit of the Vidyan Bhavan, New Delhi.

As early as an September 2 1961, Pandit Nehru, while addressing the Non-Aligned conference at Belgrade, pointed out that the world had worried at a stage where was no choice left between negotiation for peace or war. If people refuse to negotiate they must inevitably go to war. "I am amazed that rich and proud, attitudes are taken up by great countries as being too high and to negotiate for peace. I submit that it is not their prestige which is involved in such attitudes but the future of the human race. It is our duty and function to say that they must negotiate".

Speaking in a similar vein at the 38th Session of U.N. General Assembly on September 30, 1983, Mrs. Indira Gandhi said that the relentless search for increasingly barbaric weapon systems was being undertaken in the name of security. India and other Non-Aligned countries were convinced that only general and complete disarmament could provide real and enduring security. Nuclear weapon powers owed it to humanity to renounce use, or threat to use of nuclear weapons in any situation whatever. As first step they should resume negotiations for disarmament and ban the production and testing of all nuclear weapons.

Arms race and international tensions are inseparable
companions over the years there has been a heightening of tension all over the world. All multilateral activity is getting increasingly snarled in bloc rigidities and polemics. There is a spurt in porxy wars and many regions are affected by turmoil directly and indirectly. Therefore, the initiation of a dialogue between the major powers though welcome, does not by itself free smaller and vulnerable states from the competitive attention of the big powers.

Military spending is rapidly nearing the staggering figure of 1000 billion dollars annually. It continues to rise while the world economy hovers between uncertain recovery and a relapse in the deeper recession. This vast military expenditure, apart from causing dissonances in the economies of the leading military powers, has aggravated the problems of global economic recovery and development. Many developing countries face the stark of economic collapse and social upheaval.

The survival of the human race depends on the demilitarisation of the global surface and on keeping outer space free of weapons. We must strengthen the defences of peace in man's inner space as well his mind, soul and spirit. Mahatma Gandhi, who was alive when Hiroshima too place, declared so perceptively: "The bomb will not be destroyed by counter-bombs, even as violence can notably counter-violence."

When the eighteen nation Disarmament was formed in 1962
India was one of the eight Non-Aligned members of the committee. India was one of the pioneers in moving for Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. India urged that those were proliferating nuclear weapons must stop proliferation and those who had not started proliferation should not begin it. In other words what India proposed in 1965 was what is today known as "freeze on nuclear weapons".

INDIA AND NPT: India demonstrated its commitment to nuclear disarmament when it became the only country in the world to carry out a nuclear test to explore the peaceful application of nuclear blast and did not follow it up with production of a nuclear arsenal. Sixteen years after the signing of the NPT the Indian stand that the NPT did not really mean what it sought to persuade the non-nuclear weapon nation to believe has been vindicated. The so-called Non-proliferation Treaty has hurt the interests of the humanity in the following ways:

(1) Unbridled proliferation of nuclear weapons licenced by NPT has led to an unreaasable stigma on nuclear energy and therby hampered the development and application of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

(2) The nuclear weapons in the hands of nuclear weapons powers were legitimised. Through that the doctdrine of deterrence implying the freesing of adversarial relationship between the two blocs was accepted in contravention to the basic principles of Non-Alignment.
(3) A special status of superiority was associated with power and prestige conferred on those powers which possessed nuclear weapons. Thereby these weapons became the currency of international power game.

(4) The treaty was a diversionary move to divert attention away from the galloping quantitative and qualitative proliferation of nuclear weapons powers.

(5) The treaty permitted unlimited horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons within the armed forces of nuclear weapon powers. Hence India's greatest contribution to disarmament campaigns is its relentless struggle against the inequitous and deceitful Non-proliferation Treaty legitimising nuclear weapons.

In December 1978 India moved a resolution in the U.N. General Assembly 33/71B which declared that the use of nuclear weapons would be a violation of the U.N. Charter and a crime against humanity and demanded that the use and threat of use of nuclear disarmament. This resolution was adopted in the General Assembly in 1978, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983 and 1984. It has the support of 126 nations including two nuclear weapon powers, Soviet Union and China. Only 15 nations of the oppose this move to delegitimise the nuclear weapons.

India's role has been to warn the international community of the perils in the nuclear weapons powers persistence in their policies of continuing reliance on more and more
sophisticated armaments in every increasing quantities. India warned about radioactive ful-
or; India warned about the Sham Non-
proliferation Treaty. India warned about the inadequacies of a
detente restricted to Europe only. Now India and other nations are
warning about dangers of an arms race in space. India has not been
content with warnings alone. India has also tried to mobilise
international public opinion in support of measures to contain the
arms race.

Addressing the Third special session of 159-nation General
Assembly of the United Nations at New York on June 9, 1988 Prime
Minister Rajiv Gandhi presented to the peace-treaty world Cogent
Three Stage Action Plan that aims at Progressive elimination of
nuclear weapons over a period of next 22 years i.e. till 2010 A.D.,
culminating into a world that is fully insulated against a nuclear
holocaust that can mean a "mutually assured destruction" in which
none will survive "to tell and no one will left to understand what
went wrong and why."

The Prime Minister opined that the nuclear Non-proliferation
treaty (NPT) which ends in 1995, should be replaced by a new one -
which the negotiations must start in the first stage itself -
giving legal effect to a binding commitment of nuclear weapon
states to destroy all their nuclear arsenals by the year 2010 A.D.,
and restrain all non-nuclear weapon - stages from "crossing the
nuclear weapons threshold.

Shri Rajiv Gandhi discounted the logic that since
consequences of nuclear war were so widely known and understood, nuclear war just could not happen. Neither experience nor logic, he said, could sustain such dangerous complacency. "A madam's fantasy could unleash the end, an accident could trigger a chain reaction which inexorable leads to doom. Indeed the advance of technology has so reduced the time for decisions that, once activated, computer programmed for Armagedden, preempt human intervention ends any hope of survival".

What represented a streak of light in the darkness was that even the mightiest military powers today realized that they could continue their hawkish admissions only at the cost of economic development and expressed his faith that a genuine process of disarmament was bound to promote of all the nations of the world. He was quite hopeful of eliminating of nuclear weapons.

The Non-Aligned and neutral states have consistently taken the position that the development of space weapons and arms race in the outer space, must be prevented at all cost. India constitutes the solitary example of a state which has voluntarily abstained from acquiring nuclear weapons in spite of demonstrated capability to be able to do so. It is consistent with the Indian cultural values and attitudes especially in respect of renunciation and abstention. "The first tangible step towards denuclearisation, therefore, needs to be based on changes in ideas and attitudes by declaring nuclear weapons as
illegitimate and a crime against humanity."(4)

"Above all, it needs to be reemphasized that nuclear weapons are really political weapons, especially for coercive diplomacy at the grand strategic level. The real and viable approach to control the threat and danger emanating from nuclear weapons, therefore, must seek its roots in political measures. This necessitates directing all efforts, at modification and alteration of ideas and attitudes. The weapons do not constitute as much of threat by themselves as the concepts and political strategies for their use do."(5) Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru felt long before the danger and consequences of deadly atomic weapons. He said in his speech given in Lok Sabha on November 27, 1957 - "Our earth has become too small for the new weapons of the atomic age. While man, in the pride of his intellect and knowledge, forces his way in to space and pierces the heavens, the very existence of the human race is threatened. Therefore enough of mass destruction already to put and end to life on earth. Today, America and Russia Possess in abundance, and England also has them, and even the capacity to control them will go outside the range of human power. Nuclear test explosions take place, contaminating air and water and food, as well as directly injuring the present and future generations of mankind" Pandit Nehru's fear was not only fear baseless, we know today the real danger our generation is facing due to the arms race, when no
people, no country, however powerful they might be, are safe from destruction of this competition in weapons of mass destruction which thousands of years of human efforts have built up is being corroded and undermined by fear and hatred, and will progressively wither away if these trends continue. All the peoples of the world have a right to life and progress and the fulfilment of their destiny. They have the right to peace and security.

The arms race imposed on the developing countries is both an exhausting burden and a moral danger to the former. Not reliance on force but peaceful co-existence, not the fanning of conflicts but settlements, not the arms race but disarmament—this is what would be consonant with the vitality important interest of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples. More and more developing countries are beginning to realize that a radical restructuring of the international economic relations is unthinkable without the general struggle for peace, international detente, halting the arms race and ultimately, general and complete disarmament. Suffice it to visualize a world without the crippling burden of military expenditures which swallow up enormous portions of national budgets to realize that disarmament, the age old dream of mankind, is a major instrument for releasing fabulous financial resources from the non-productive sphere to finance the needs of national and soil development. The dream of disarmament is no new, it was in the
minds of men almost as soon as the state came into being. In ancient times the dream of eternal peace and universal disarmament exercised the minds of thinkers, writers and philosophers. Millennia ago the authors of the Bible dreamed of the time when the tribes and peoples of the world would "best their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nations shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more". However, the fulfilment of this noble dream is obstructed by imperialism which, in order to perpetuate its dominance, will stick at nothing, is prepared to go any length, including military intervention, and militarization is vital for imperialism.

"Non-Aligned efforts towards the achievement of disarmament especially, the elimination of nuclear weapons, have not so far met with success, and the arms race continues at an accelerated pace. Existing arsenals of nuclear weapons alone are more than sufficient to destroy all life on earth, and the continuing technological refinements of nuclear weapons are constantly endangering the precarious balance of power. Even the limited arms control measures agreed to by the United States and the Soviet Union are in jeopardy because of the revival of policies of Great Power confrontation"(6).

Indira Gandhi has had expressed concern over the tendency among some countries to endanger world peace "by deliberate
induction of armaments in the name of promoting regional balance and the arming of small nations". The armaments industry in the United States, for instance, flourishes because there are numerous countries ready to buy arms. Pakistan wants arms. Iran wants sophisticated modern weapons and, in fact, all countries want to be militarily equipped. It is the desire of producers of arms to see and the willingness of buyers to buy that keeps the race of arms going. Therefore, the countries participating in the Non-Aligned conferences should reflect on their weakness which make their exploitation possible by big powers. No super power will dare to dump arms on any country if it resists the temptation to accept the offer.

Active Non-Alignment, therefore, should mean much more than finding fault with superpowers; it should mean a more by the Non-Aligned countries to remain united and to eliminate the scope for big powers to interfere in their affairs. "We are determined" Indira Gandhi said, "to pursue goal of reconciliation in our sub-continent". This is a lead for other countries which have yet to resolve their bitter quarrels". (7) But in the two wars that Pakistan forced on India in the mid-sixties and early Seventies, there was large-scale-misuse of American weapons, just as Israel is misusing the American arms in Lebanon. This has already been brought to the notice of President Regan. Such misuse occurred in the Indo-Pak conflicts in the past and the United States was helpless in restraining Pakistan from using the arms against
India. In the U.S. itself there has been much criticism of the policy of arming Pakistan to an unwarranted level, which is inevitably causing much anxiety in India.

Without neglecting the fact the disarmament cannot be a difficult and long term process, in view of the interests and preoccupations of all those who view arms as a means which they can use or misuse for enforcing power politics. We have reason to believe that the initiative of the Non-Aligned Countries, irrespective of its greater or lesser immediate effects, will prove the beginning of serious disarmament talks on the world level in the last decades of the 20th century. Peace is more an effective weapon for survival than their third or fourth generation nuclear arms. And peace can be achieved not by brandishing new weapons but by the talks at the negotiating table. There has to be an end to the arms race.

Jawaharlal Nehru said "Disarmament is problem is by complete disarmament - which is an absolute necessity for the world of the future". (8) He further added - "Essentially, you will never succeed united there is disarmament on a large scale."

MRS. INDIRA GANDHI ON DISARMAMENT

Casper Weinberger, the Pantagon Chief, Samuel Cohen, the father of the American Neutron Bomb and President Reagan are not alone in admiring the weapon which kill people but leave material property intact. Such perverted thinking of designing of mass
destruction — may perhaps of our planet itself — has proved to be infectious. Since the manufacture of Neutron bombs both by U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. has already generated dark clouds of mass deaths and destruction, the establishment of enduring peace in the world, has become a grave concern to the well-wishers of mankind.

In line with U.N. objectives for disarmament, the Non-Aligned assumption behind the idea of disarmament is that if Nations agree to reduce their armed strength that would greatly reduce their fear and mistrust of each others’ tendencies of self-aggrandisement. It will not only enhance the feeling of security in their minds but will also brighten the prospect of world peace. Like Jawaharlal Nehru, Mrs. Indira Gandhi are of the opinion that if leading military powers share colossal funds as a result of disarmament, the same may be made available to the poor and under-developed nations. Really, it will help a great deal in reducing a big gap between the Non-Aligned powers and the economically advanced nations in respect of the standard of living of their respective peoples. If disarmament, says Mrs. Gandhi, is alone in this context, the very idea ambition of the Non-Aligned diplomacy will be achieved. This has been the primary objective of the Non-Aligned diplomacy vis-a-vis its efforts towards disarmament. Mrs. Gandhi was of the opinion that if peace and economic security is given to Non-Aligned countries, many problems of the world will be automatically solved.
Mrs. Gandhi's perspective of disarmament is concerned with the achievement of the following objective. Disarmament is a direct approach to peace. The only direct cause of war admissible in disarmament approach is the existence of armaments. The Non-Aligned diplomacy of Mrs. Gandhi is convinced of this fact that wars are fought for the exploitation of the backward, poor and underdeveloped nations of the world. Mrs. Gandhi was of the view that fear of each others' armaments, whatever type they may be generates tension. When tension mounted between the Soviet Union and the United States after the Second World War, both the countries resorted to increasing to developing and displaying military strength. Today, both have declared to manufacture Neutron bombs. If a serious arms race develops between India and China, or between India and Pakistan, it will be the result rather than the cause of political tension.

Keeping in view the above hypothesis, the Non-Aligned powers are committed to make an end to political rivalry or in more precise terms, the want to make the world tensionless, Mrs. Gandhi emphasized it unlike she was addressing the Fifth Non-Aligned Summit Conference held in Colombo from 16th August 1976 to 19th August 1976. She categorically remarked that "tensionlessness should not be limited to the super powers only. The Third World countries should also have the taste and feeling of tensionlessness."

Mrs. Gandhi's second argument in favour of disarmament is
economic aspects. It would not be exageration to say that economic security is the drive force of the Third World Countries for which they are making efforts for disarmament. Seymour Melman has given the idea of "Peace Race" as a substitute for arms race and he makes a plea for diverting the resources in the direction of world industrialization and international co-operation. (9) Which Mrs. Gandhi is committed to Ariniti Etzioni holds that best way for the United states to win "war" with the Soviet Union is to compete with her successfully in assisting the development programmes of the under developed countries."(10) Thus, the economic argument given by Mrs. Gandhi, rests today on the hope that disarmament can contribute to the general welfare of mankind. The Non-Aligned powers are fully convinced that if the resources on armament is cut down, it will be necessary for their scientific and technological progress. One of the arguments for which Mrs. Gandhi was committed to in support of disarmament is moral. This argument is based upon the belief that war is morally wrong. This argument is concerned not merely with the use of weapons but also with their possession. Most of the Non-Aligned powers have their ethical and normal foundations who inherit from their ancient glory that war is morally wrong, in them India is the Champion of the view, a admirer of "Panchsheel". As Jawaharlal Nehru said, "Let us try to get rid of this fear and base our thoughts and action on what is essentially right and moral, and then gradually the crisis of the spirit will be resolved, the dark clouds that surround us may lift and the way to the evolution of a world order based on freedom
will be clear"(11) Mrs. Gandhi was of the view that even if disarmament is not accepted as a sound theory of causation of war, it has to be accepted at least as an element of the solution of the problem of the war and as a necessary condition of the evolution of a peaceful international order.

Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Indian Prime Minister, who championed the cause of Non-alignment, was the leader of the Non-Aligned countries during his life time. He was, like Mrs. Gandhi, a great imaginative and pacifist thinker and had made ceaseless efforts for nuclear disarmament for which Mrs. Gandhi was struggling till her end of life. Her Non-Aligned outlook was a writ large of Jawaharlal's dream of Non-Alignment, motivated by Indian Culture, glory and tradition, a fact which was also emphasized at New Delhi Conference of March, 1983. Mrs. Gandhi's disarmament diplomacy was a reflection of her long-cherished desire to establish peace in the world. She, as a leader of Non-Aligned movement, was trying her level best for disarmament in the interest of the Third World countries. After Nehru's death, she was committed to manufacture atom bomb, not for war, but for peaceful purposes, that explosion (on 18 May 1974) was conducted with a view to exploring the possibility of the use of nuclear energy in our development programmes. The Government of India has assured the world community in the most univocal terms that India's nuclear research would never be used for manufacturing nuclear weapons. After successful completion of the atomic
blast, Mrs. Gandhi in a press conference, where foreign dignitaries, too, were invited, disclosed to the world that India went nuclear which fulfilled the long-cherished desire of the people of India. She again reiterated the peace-loving policy of India, and we remain deeply committed to the peaceful use of atomic energy." In May, 1972, the then Defence Minister, Sri Jagjivan Ram had informed the Parliament in this regard. He said "Atomic Energy Commission was studying the technology of conducting underground explosion for peaceful purposes." In reply to a question in Rajay Sabha, Mrs. Indira Gandhi had said on November 15, 1973 "The Department of Atomic Energy is constantly reviewing the progress in the technology of underground nuclear explosion both from the theoretical and experimental angles. The economic value of such underground explosion is being studied with respect to available information in various parts of the country. Its possible effects on the environmental and ecological conditions are also being studied. It is only after satisfactory answers to all the problems and available questions of actual underground test for peaceful purposes". Mrs. Gandhi told that the world can breathe peacefully under the blue sky and it can be changed into a heaven only when vested interests are changed to be selflessness and the restriction imposed are withdrawn from the statues of the I.A.E.A.

Mrs. Gandhi's concern for disarmament was in the
interest of the Non-Aligned powers of the world, she was mobilizing world public opinion against nuclear confrontation, in this direction on August 12, 1981, in Nairobi Mrs. Gandhi called upon developed nations to have a deeper understanding of the problem of developing nations and to help them stand on their feet. Mrs. Gandhi asked the super powers to end confrontation and reverse the arms race which was escalating with more and more destructive weapons like neutron bombs and work for total disarmament. She reacted very sharply to the reports of the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. getting ready with neutron bombs. She expressed great concern over it and said, as a leader of the Non-Aligned Movement, India stood for total disarmament and a world without war. She was totally opposed to nuclear war even if there is a war all over the world. Asked about Mrs. Gandhi's nuclear energy programme, she said that India was trying to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Its nuclear programme is modest and it should be viewed in the context of its efforts to develop all energy resources to meet the country's growing needs. She expressed her grave concern that more islands in the Indian ocean were being equipped with nuclear armament, "insensitively" ignoring the U.N. resolutions, declaring the ocean a peace zone. Mrs. Gandhi called for curtailment of armaments, checking the tendencies towards confrontation and reduction of economic disparities in the interest of peace and harmony among the Non-Aligned powers. She declared that India never believed in the
theory of deterrence to frighten opponents, for such a race has no end, she declared that India would not avoid playing a key role in the dialogue between the Super Powers for disarmament. Therefore, Mrs. Gandhi was more ahead on disarmament mission than her father Jawharlal Nehru, who wanted step by step nuclear disarmament. In his comparison, Mrs. Gandhi was in favour of total disarmament which can only establish peace in the world.

NAM AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Indira Gandhi's Address in relation to Non-Aligned countries with the U.N. is very important and quite relevant in this study. She expressed her views by Addressing Plenary Meeting, New York, 26th September 1983 - "The world situation is far more complex than our collective appraisal of it-- Tensions, mistrust and confrontation between the great powers are rising. Even the words in which they address each other are increasingly inflexible, threatening and condemnatory. The very fabric of international peace is under serious stress. The world stands a helpless witness to a major escalating of the nuclear arms race. Against this sombre background, I believe this coming together of statesmen from different parts of the world in a search for peace, disarmament and develeopment is indeed timely and essential."
Smt. Indira Gandhi was very much anxious about world peace, therefore she emphasized "Obviously, disarmament must remain high on the list of priorities of all nations and even individuals who are anxious about the human race and our beautiful planet. of all who consider peace, security and stability indispensable to human survival and progress to higher levels. She was very much concerned about the world tension, created by the big powers, that why she concluded only way to solve this "Our goal is general and complete disarmament, a process which must necessarily begin with nuclear disarmament. At the moment the trend is in the opposite direction expanding existing arsenals. Disarmament cannot make any progress until this process is reversed. The first need is to stop the production of nuclear weapons, then reduce and eventually eliminate them. The Non-Aligned movement has also made some other important proposals involving inter-alia an international convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, which has been endorsed by the General Assembly."

Mrs. Gandhi's view for world peace was quite remarkable and genuine. She expressed, "At the centre of the current crisis lies the inability of the outdated and inequitable international monetary and financial system to deal with the current and future needs of the economy of the world and particularly of the developing countries. The only way out is a
comprehensive reform of the existing system through an international conference on money and finance'. She added "just and equitable international economic order is the very foundation of world peace and tranquility in international relations."

In terms of membership and global spread, the Non-Aligned movement represents today the world's biggest strand in international politics. Comprising about two-thirds members, states of the United Nations system, the Non-aligned States have been playing an increasingly dominant and often a decisive role not only in the General Assembly of the United Nations but also in regional and global peace.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND NAM have reinforced each other in many ways. Their membership has increased in an increasing manner. The major concerns of the United Nations and the NAM have been shared since the seventies in a more pronounced manner, the diction, rhetoric and emphasis of the majority of members has been quite similar. In fact the United Nations has become a principal forum of the NAM, where its members outnumber and can and occasionally did, out-vote other groupings. No other grouping of states have had such an obvious and a decisive impact on the working of the United Nations as the group of
countries comprising the NAM. Both as a group and as individual members, over the years, even when they were in a minority, and some - India, Yugoslavia and Egypt - even prior to the formal establishment of NAM in 1961, influenced the working of the United Nations in many ways, in the preparation of the agenda, the direction of committee work, the form and substance of resolutions, the style and manner of U.N. action and the general trend of collective activities of the U.N. and its many agencies. It is with the sense of pride and identity that NAM has with the U.N., that President Tito, in what was probably his last appearance recognised it as a real support to "the realization of the universality of the U.N. and to the strengthening of its role and importance."

The NAM has thus a structure that provides a form for articulating its demands in the presence of the representatives of the global community and offers its members an institutional format for negotiations on certain issues of concern. It is in the United Nations system that NAM has acquired its international legitimacy and universal recognition as a group, that represents the bulk of humanity as cogegated in the three continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and cluster of islands in the seas and oceans of the world.

NAM represents essentially the struggling millions, improverished, illiterate, afflicted with ill-health and
marginalised by centuries of neglect and exploitation, but uncompromising in the affirmation of their self-respect and the proclamation of their human right to life, liberty and dignity. "NAM originated as an institutional assertion of the expropriated nations and peoples for a fair deal, equality and justice and as a triumphant rallying point of the decolonized for a new world of expanding liberty and rights, and universal peace and property. " Appropriately in the U.N., the main thrust of the NAM members and their group is around issues of liberation vs. settler colonialism; equality of people and race vs. apartheid and racial discrimination; economic development vs neo-colonialism; removal of global poverty vs. energy crisis in the advanced countries; solution of third world debt vs. problems of interest rates in the First World, transfer of technology vs. rights of TNC's disarmament vs. arms race; detente vs. confrontation, global peace vs. cold war; protection of the rights and sovereignty of new and small countries vs. big power domination and varied forms of control. Self-reliant nation building vs. expansion of spheres of influence and unequal alliances". (12)

THE ROLE OF THE NAM GROUP IN THE U.N. FORUMS:

The NAM Group has taken full advantage of the device of the "Emergency special sessions" (ESS) for convning the General
Assembly if the Security Council is paralysed by a big power veto. Interestingly and ironically this is the same device known as the procedure of "uniting for peace", which the United States had sponsored in 1950 as part of the cold war tactics to overcome deadlock in the Security Council "Over issues aggression".

In recent years the NAM has increasingly influenced the preparation of the U.N. agenda and the focus of discussion on major issues in the General Assembly. After the 7th summit of the NAM New Delhi 1983, initiative was taken by the new Chairperson, Indira Gandhi to use the 38th session of the General Assembly as a special meeting - a sort of global summit, focused on crucial problems of development and disarmament, as a "collective manifestation of political will".

But a more decisive impact on the UN Agenda has been made by the NAM, by contributing in the drafting formulation and thrust of what are called the "foundation documents", enunciating basic theoretical concerns by providing the proper historical context, political relevance and normative considerations to several vital issues of global and regional dimensions. NAM has provided much of the "philosophical underpinnings" to several "seminar resolutions" which have become the acceptable doctrinal base and a touchstone for future resolutions and recommendations and are constantly
cited, reaffirmed and reiterated as part of the UN ritual of legitimization of positions and adherance to recognized precedence. Some of these fundation documents include Resolution 1514 adopted in 1960, the Declaration on the Granting of independence to colonial countries and propes (calling for an "end to colonialism in all its manifestation") , the Declaration and programme of Action for the New International Economic order, 1974, the charter of Economic Rights and duties of States 1974. As movement of people in struggle at various levels and in varied forms, depending on the situation and the context, NAM cannot divert itself of the responsibility to respond effectively to the four main challenges the decisive Four D's Decolonization, Development, Disarmament and Democratisation. NAM is not the strategic preserve of any super-power. It remains and has always been, in its essential norms an assertion of independence in foreign policy and a capacity to avoid entanglements in big power politics, and refused to become part of big power military alliances. The credibility of NAM in the United Nations and outside depends on its own coherence, unity of action and capability to improve the quality of life of the teeming millions - among the Blkacks, the Browns, the Yellows and the Whites who are its constituency and human concern with speed, vision and fortitude so as to help a unified world and the United Nations enter the 21st century with triumph and honour.
In her Inaugural Address at the 7th Summit of the NAM in New Delhi, March 1983, Mrs. Indira Gandhi asserted that "The Non-aligned movement is history's biggest peace movement" thereby rightly underlining NAM's proximity to the basic purpose of the United Nations. Today, one of the urgent tasks of the Non-Aligned Movement, especially of its pioneers like India, is to defend the U.N., its universality and representative character against the systematic onslaught and smear campaign to which it has been unfairly subjected by certain powerful counties, interest-groups and tendentious detractors. In a tribute to the United Nations, Jawaharlal Nehru, in what was probably his last major article, published in the New York Journal Foreign Affairs in 1963 wrote, "The United Nations admittedly has numerous shortcomings" Nonetheless, the United Nations is the chief repository of our hope for ever closer and more effective international cooperation for security as well as welfare. It is dedicated to peace - freedom and justice - noble ideals which embody the aspirations of all mankind - and it may lead out of this fear and strife - ridden age into a detailed future when the full potentialities of science and technology could be applied to the well being of all peoples". The need to achieve more completely progress towards general and nuclear disarmament to overcome growing economic disparities in the world and to eliminate the last vestiges of colonialism are issues of
continuing concern among United Nations members.

Many and varied are the threads linking the United Nations with the policy of Non-Alignment. It might be said that these threads are drawing tighter and increasing in complexity with the evolution of the United Nations, the development of Non-Aligned policy and transformations taking place in the broad international frameworks in which that evolution and development are unfolding.

The Non-aligned countries never before were as active in the United Nations, in international life as during the last two decades or so. The Non-aligned countries scored some notable trumps, such as participation in the convensing of the World organisation's second special session on disarmament, work on a resolution to reduce nuclear weapons, and most significantly the Declaration on Non-Interference, as the most outstanding mark of the 36th U.N. General Assembly Session. The Declaration rules that a state, or a group of states, must not, for whatever reasons, interfere with the internal affairs of other states. The document was worked out by several Non-Aligned countries on the basis of a Havana Summit (1979) decision that followed the proposal by Yugoslavia and Guyana. This was initiative for the United Nations to adopt a declaration by which mankind's
largest section should reply to the policy of intervention that, unfortunately, had become a concept of international relations as well as typical general behaviour of big powers and blocs.

The Non-Aligned countries have invariably recognized what the Cairo Summit describes as "The paramount importance of the United Nations". It was also at the Cairo Summit that a call was made for closer consultations among the Non-Aligned countries at the United Nations for concerted action for the achievement of the objectives and implementation of the programme of action outlined by the Non-aligned countries. The Lusaka Summit went a step further, and emphasized the need for maintenance of regular contracts to ensure continuity in the Non-Aligned movement and the implementation of the decisions. It also called for consultation and co-ordination at the United Nations level with a view to appropriate implementation of Summit resolutions. The summits that followed emphasized the same point in stronger terms and provided for more precise institutional arrangements at the United Nations. (UN Document A/34/542).

"The Non-Aligned countries have introduced into the United Nations, not only the question of disarmament, but also the establishment of a more equitable new international economic order. The world organization has now, more than ever before,
turned its efforts towards the solution of problems involving the existence of broad sections of the population from assistance by specialized agencies to the hungry, ailing and to those afflicted by elemental disasters, to concern for the evergrowing number of refugees, of then turned out of their countries by force."(13)

With the growing role and heightened activity of the Non-Aligned countries, the U.N. has gained in strength and prestige which will enable it successfully to fulfill the expectations of peace loving mankind in seeking the paths leading to a free and more secure world based on equality. On mutual respect and on progress for all peoples the world-over. The Non-Aligned have greatly contributed to the development and stabilization of relations in the United Nations through their efforts to ensure respect for its Charter. It is only natural that many countries, and especially the Non-Aligned and other developing countries, wish to see the UN engage in efficient action to halt negative tendencies and pave the way to a speedier settlement of outstanding problems.

"The Non-Aligned countries have moved the most important initiatives in the UN designed to safeguard peace security and to develop international co-operation on a footing of equality. Special merit goes to the Non-Aligned countries for the creation of a platform upholding a fairer and more democratic international political and economic order stressing the need for disarmament and condemning the policy from position of strengt."(14) The
number of initiatives moved by the Non-Aligned countries in the UN keeps increasing. It is worth recalling her that back in 1960, at the Fifteenth Session of the UN General Assembly, Tito, Nasser, Nehru and Soekarno, called upon the great powers to engage in talks and reach agreement so as to put an end to the cold war. The Belgrade Summit conference of the Non-Aligned held in 1961, called upon the blocs and great powers to embark upon a policy of detente. At the Fifth Conference in Colombo, the Non-Aligned countries, at President Tito's initiative, requested the convocation of a special U.N. Session on disarmament which took place in the spring of 1978.

"Viewed as a whole, the Non-Aligned countries have persistently striven for all crucial world problems, to be settled with the framework of the U.N. Although they form a convincing majority in the world organization, they have never abused this. Through their active attitude they have won historical merit for the democratization of the UN. Today the Non-Aligned countries are the most active, most democratic and most numerous part of world organization. They represent a real force fighting for the implementation of the ideas and objective of the UN Charter, for the development of co-operation based on equality among all countries, for transformation of UN into a genuine community of nations."(15) And it is, indeed only this motive force in the UN which can influence the lasting, or more precisely, the definitive elementation of policies conducted from positions of economic and
military strength.

At the Sixth Summit Conference of the Non-aligned in Havana, the faithfulness of the Non-Aligned movement to the principles and aims of the UN Charter was confirmed once again. This conference reiterated that the U.N. today was an in-replaceable instrument of peace, co-operation and increased security in the world. It also stressed that the United Nations, as the most important forum of the international community must be fully engaged in seeking and finding solutions to controversial questions and that it must not be by passed when negotiations involving the world as a whole are conducted.

The Sixth Summit conference further note with satisfaction the growth of the strength and role of the Non-Aligned countries in the UN and reasserted the determination of the NAM to continue working towards the implementation of the principles and objectives of the UN Charter. Note should be made of the fact that the Sixth Conference of the Non-Aligned countries supported the work of the special enlarged Committee for the UN Charter and "the consolidation of the world organization, and called upon the Non-Aligned countries" to coordinate their views so as to achieve a major advance in that committee towards the more rapid completion of the amendments to the Charter, especially those on the right of veto, in order to protect the interest and aspirations of peoples
the world over and contribute in that manner to a fetter adjustment of the UN system to the new realities, on the basis of respect for the sovereignty and equality of all states."(16)

At their Sixth Conference in Havana, the Non Aligned also stressed the need to adjust the structure and re-oriented the policy of the economic and social bodies of the UN with a view to accelerating the creation of a new international economic order. To this end the Non-Aligned called up the Security Council to perform its duties from effectively, to reexamine its modes of work and give though to the steps it could take for its more active and direct inclusion in talks pertaining to the resolution of the most acute international crises. The conference furthermore called upon the permanent members of the Security Council to abstain from the use of their veto power.

At this year's session of the UN General assembly too, the active participation of the Non-Aligned countries was clearly noticeable. In the seat of the world organization the foreign ministers of the Non-Aligned countries agreed to co-ordinate their activities along the lines of the decisions of the Sixth Summit regarding the agenda of the year's session of the General Assembly.

Referring to the United Nations in his speech at the Sixth Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned, President Tito said, "The United Nations is the place where all the crucial problems of the
present-day world should be discussed. It would indeed, be indispensable for the movement of Non-Alignment to urge the General Assembly to consider on a regular basis questions pertaining to the lessening of tension in the world and to take measure to promote this process.... In the struggle for a new international economic order, the forthcoming special session of the UN General Assembly and the adoption of an International Development strategy for the next decade, are of exceptional significance." The Non-Aligned nations, within the United Nations or without, have as their main objectives, independence, peaceful co-existence, world peace and development. Their Voce was decisive in the sharing of detente, it will have to be decisive in development, in the sharing of surpluses. Anything that strengthness peace will be a contribution from New Delhi summit Conference of Non-Aligned nations in 1983, and the main obsption, in this moment of peace, will be the advancement of developing countris."(17)

INDIAN OCEAN PEACE ZONE:

The view of Alfred T. Mahan was that "whoever controls the Indian Ocean, dominates Asia. This ocean is the key to the seven seas. In the 21st century, the destiny of the world will be decided on its waters". The view of Mahan is coming literally correct. The theatre of confrontation between the super Powers from Europe and South-East Asia to West Asia and the Indian Ocean,
which has now become the battle ground of the Super Powers who are determined to establish their Supremacy in that region to protect the routes of their trade and oil supplies and to deter rival Powers from using the sophisticated sea based weapons, and to conduct surveillance. Polaris submarine-launched Ballistic missiles were tested and fired in 1963 and a communication network for submarines carrying these nuclear missiles was established in Australia. In the same year, the United States decided to make her official presence felt in the Indian Ocean in 1964. There were reports in March 1979 that the U.S. was despatching an aircraft carrier led naval task force to the Indian Ocean and the gulf area. In April 1979, the Soviet Union sent an aircraft carrier into the Indian Ocean, shortly after a second US aircraft carrier sailed into the region. By July 1979 President Carter hinted that he would consider a plan to further boost American military presence in the Indian Ocean. While outlining the measures to demonstrate the readiness of the US to safeguard her interests around the globe, President Carter referred in October 1979 to the strengthening of U.S. naval presence in the Indian Ocean. In 1981 Admiral Robert Long stated that the vital interest not only of the United States but also of the Western World as a whole were at stake in the Indian Ocean and asserted that in the near future, the United states and her allies would maintain a military presence in the Indian Ocean region to indicate "the will and resolve of the US to protect
vital interests there".

The US suspects that the Soviet Union is determined to expand her influence and presence in West Asia with a view to providing a corridor for a direct challenge to American defence positions, if allowed to grow unchecked. The Soviet military entry into Afghanistan in December 1979 is cited as a forerunner of similar moves against other states in the region. The Soviet Union is even more vitally interested in this region as it is contiguous to her own land mass. In the event of any serious confrontation, this area could provide launching bases for missile attacks on any impared areas of the Soviet Union. Resurgent Islam in West Asia is also a matter of great concern for the Soviet Union on account of the sizeable and growing Muslim minorities in her own country. The Indian Ocean provides a warm water link between her Eastern and Western Parts. In January 1980, the Soviet Union had two guided missile-cruisers, one modern frigate and three Older destroyer frigate in the Indian Ocean. It was reported that more units were on their way to the Indian Ocean from the Western Pacific Ocean. In 1981 The Soviet Union had 21 ships in the region. She also obtained a foothold in the North-West region near the Red Sea and Gulf outlets. Shhrad installations in Socotra and was building bases on Persian and Dahlak Archipelago, Islands belonging to Ethiopia. The Russians are also trying to get bases in Madagascar and the Maldives. They are hopeful of acquiring Diego Suarez in Norther Madagascar. If they succeed, they will have the
fortification that commands a strategic channel through which super tankers pass carrying oil to Europe. The base will also be valuable for supporting Soviet diplomatic activity in Southern Africa. "With large military force in Afghanistan and use of port and air facilities in Ethiopia and South Yeman and ready access to other parts of the region, the Soviets are developing a substantial presence around the Indian Ocean".

"A revolution in weapon technology, nuclear-powered missile submarines have increased the opportunities for strategic manoeuvres on the sea. The military experts consider Ocean space as an area subserving the goals of strategic deterrence, maintaining a naval presence to assert one's own use of the sea to maintain access to vital resources and of providing surveillance capabilities. That is the reason why the Super powers are trying to that is the reason why the Super Powers are trying to achieve superiority in different oceans of the world" (18)

The military significance of the Indian Ocean has increased after the introduction of SLBM system especially after the perfection of the Polaria A-3 missile with a range of 2500 nautical miles followed by the introduction of Poseidon and the Trident missile. With these developments, the defence perimeter of the Super Powers has moved into the Oceans of the world. That gives added importance to the Indian Ocean.
The Indian Ocean is the third biggest Ocean in the world. It is a vast expanse of water encompassing an area of about 30 million square miles washing the shore of 27 states. It is bordered by the four continents of Africa, Asia, Australia and Antarctica. It stretches from the southern tip of South Africa and Cape of Good Hope. It touches the whole Eastern coast of Africa, the Arabian lands, Iran, India, South-East Asia and Australia.

Indian Ocean is richly endowed by nature. It has a reserve of 8000 billion tonnes nodules containing 7 million tonnes of nickel, 4 billion tonnes of copper, 2.5 billion tones of cobalt and 200 billion tonnes of manganese. It has in its bosom 98 percent of diamond, 2/3 of about 27 littoral states and 17 hinterland states round it. It has a population of about one billion people which is about 25% of human race. Being a non-freezing commercial route, it is a maritime life line for the world trade. Previously, politically half of the Indian Ocean was a British lake, but she lost her control over it, after 1945. When Britain withdrew, American and Russian navies appeared in the Indian Ocean and from that time onwards those navies have been getting stronger and stronger. "The US Administration is strengthening and expanding the military base at Diego Garcia. For this purpose the entire indigenous population of the British colony has been uprooted. The British base at Masirah Island, off Omani Coast, has been placed at the disposal of the US Navy. The
Anglo-US military planners are also seeking naval facilities in the East Coast of Africa."(19)

India which has over 400 small islands in the Indian Ocean area feels that some big powers may forcibly occupy some of the islands and create bases there. The American desire to acquire a foothold in the Indian Ocean is due to the fact its location to the South of the Soviet Union suits her for the placement of her under-water long range missiles. From nowhere else is the Russian heartland more directly threatened by American SLBM than from the Northern reaches of the Indian Ocean. It provides a cover to baffle thermal detection through satellite surveillance, that explains the Anglo-American decision to build a full-fledged naval cum air base in Diego Garcia. Diego Garcia is the largest among 52 island in the Chagos Archipelago in the Indian Ocean. It is 13 miles long and four miles wide. It is almost mid-way between Kanya Kumari and Mauritius. It is at a distance of about 2,400 miles from the Indian shore. When Mauritius got independence in 1968, Britain retained possession of Diego Garcia. Later on Britain gave this island to the US on a 50 year lease. The agreement permitted the US to use the Island for defence purposes. In 1971 the United States started constructing a naval facility in Diego Garcia. In 1974, she signed a pact with the United Kingdom with a view to expand the Island into a regular naval base for her seventh Fleet. In 1974, the American Congress allowed the extension of the runway from
8,000 feet to 12,000 feet. It has now become a base for landing ground forces on the mainland of Africa and Asia. The US is worried about her peaceful shipping to from the states of the Persian Gulf via the Indian Ocean. The threat is from the increased presence of the Soviet Union in the Indian Ocean after the opening Suez Canal on 5th June 1975, and particularly after the military occupation of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union in 1971. The safety in the Indian Ocean is necessary for the United states which depends for nearly 10 to 15 percent of her oil requirements on this area.

The Indian Ocean provides a crucial link between two strategic areas of the Soviet navy and has thus become vital for her trade. The Soviet Union is very much concerned with the developments in the Indian ocean where the US is employing strategic weapon systems. The Soviet Union has to keep a track of the movements of the American navy. After the opening of the Suez Canal for traffic, the Indian Ocean has become a great asset to the Soviet Navy.

Likewise India is also vitally interested in the developments in the Indian Ocean. She has about 6,000 km. coast line facing the Indian Ocean. The security of India is linked up with the developments in the Indian Ocean, with the evolution of a consensus at the United Nations Law of the sea conference in favour of 200 mile economic zone, India has a big task to defend
this national asset. There is enormous potential living and non-living wealth in this area. India also has her growing off-shore exploration programme. The problem of ensuring Indian Sovereignty and effective control over her far-fully territories such as Amdaman and Nicobar Islands and the Lakshadweep Island, has become all the more difficult on account of the growing militarization of the Indian Ocean. The littoral states and the island territories face grave dangers.

The Six-Nation Gulf Co-operation Council has expressed its opposition to the presence of any Super Power in the Indian Ocean and Gulf region. It has called for keeping the entire region free from international conflicts, especially military warships and foreign bases. With the same object, the First Conference of Progressive Parties and Movement of the South-West Indian Ocean was held in April 1978. In that Conference, a proposal was made by Sri S. Ramagoolam, Prime Minister of Mauritius, in which the countries of the Indian Ocean were asked to forge clear ties through regional co-operation and lessen their dependence on the Great Powers.

The Indian Ocean region is currently in the midst of great power rivalry owing to its strategic-nuclear as well as politico-economic dimensions. As a result India is facing deterioration in its strategic environment. "What makes the situation more serious is the conflictual relationship among the regional
powers. The relationship helps to make the great powers exploit local animosities and gain a foothold in the region. The interventionist strategy and coercive diplomacy of the great powers makes the threat of the destabilization of the whole region very real. And India cannot afford to watch it complacently" (20).

Once Jawaharlal Nehru described CENTO and SEATO as encircling alliances. Therefore it is in India's interest to support the development of regional resilience in Southeast Asia which would help keep out the strong extra regional power presence of China, U.S. and USSR. Sri Lanka is the country that took the initiative and worked most actively to formulate the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. Under the leadership of Prime Minister Smt. Bandarnaike, the representative of Sri Lanka, both the United Nations and elsewhere, left no stone unturned to make this idea a concrete issue in current international affairs. Sri Lanka's Permanent Representative in the United Nations addressed a letter to the Secretary-General of UN, suggesting that the "declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace" be included in the agenda of the 26th session of the General Assembly to be held in the 1971. In the succeeding five sessions, the subject was put on the agenda of the General Assembly and resolutions were adopted on each occasion. The General Assembly passed a resolution in 1971 declaring the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. The Preamble expresses the
concern of the littoral and hinterland countries at the signs of an increasing arms race in the area. It also asserts that the establishment of a peace zone in the Indian Ocean could have a beneficial influence on the establishment of permanent and universal peace based on equal rights and justice for all, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The operative or substantive part of the resolution, declares that for all times to come, the Indian Ocean along with the air space over it and the ocean floor under it, is a zone of peace. The resolution is addressed to the Great Powers and urges them to consult the littoral countries with a view to reducing or scalling down their competition, military or otherwise, in the area. It calls for a halt to the "escalation and expansion of their military presence. It categorically demands that the Great Powers should withdraw from all their military bases and installations, remove all nuclear weapons and terminate all manifestations of great Power rivalry in the area."

Even earlier to the resolution of 1971, the Non-Aligned conference held at Cairo in 1964 had condemned the establishment of bases by the big powers in the Indian Ocean and recommended that Non-Aligned countries should close their ports and airfields to ships and aircrafts which were carrying weapons or were equipped for nuclear warfare. The recommendations
incorporated in the Cairo Declaration are also known as the Programme for Peace and International cooperation. So far as the Great Powers were concerned, the goal of checkmating each other resulted in escalating rivalry, the two super powers discussed the possibility of limiting their naval forces in the Indian Ocean. The idea of a balanced Super-Power and Great Power presence in the Indian Ocean was mooted as an alternative. In 1974, the Kenney-Pell Resolution called upon the American President to enter into immediate direct negotiations with the Soviet Union in order to achieve an agreement on limiting the deployment of their respective naval and other military forces in the Indian Ocean and littoral states. It suggested that these negotiations should be conducted either on bilateral level or under the auspices of the newly set up 'ad hoc' committee of the UN on the Indian Ocean. India emphasized the need for regulating and restricting great Power rivalries in the Indian Ocean region so that the detente was not merely regional but universal.

In 1977, President Carter officially proposed to the Soviet Union that the Indian Ocean be completely demilitarized. However, when negotiations started with the Soviet Union, the World demilitarization was deleted and thereafter reference was made only limitation without any mention of demilitarization as the Ultimate objective. In December 1978, a resolution was moved in the General Assembly urging Washington and Moscow to resume without delay talks aimed at withdrawing their military
presence in the Indian Ocean. In December 1979, the main political Committee of the General Assembly voted in favour of a Non-Aligned resolution to convene a conference in Sri Lanka to consider the implementation of the UN Declaration that the Indian Ocean is a Zone of Peace. The Soviet Union also voted in favour of the resolution. On 4 February 1980, the United Nations Committee on the Indian Ocean met with all the five permanent members of the Security Council present. However, no conference was called in 1981 to implement the UN resolution of 1971. In June 1971, Moscow proposed to Washington that the limitation of naval forces be discussed. Washington asked Moscow for clarification and elucidation of the idea. There was no reply. However, it was stated on behalf of the American Government that "We remain interested in any idea that might in the future develop along these lines 'mutual restraints' perhaps in the form of explicit understanding to avoid competition while safeguarding our respect interests in the Indian Ocean".

In spite of Soviet initiatives and American responses, no progress was made. The main reason for this is the lukewarm attitude of both sides to disarmament measure.

Many Americans have made suggestions which constitute alternatives to the peace zone proposal. The view of Elliot Richardson is that the United States should like the Indian Ocean" the view of Howard Wriggins is that the efforts by the
US. to increase her naval force in the Indian Ocean are undesirable, both for the United States and the countries of the Indian Ocean area. To quote him, "The best way to avoid a new arms race in the Indian Ocean would seem to be to negotiate a formal neutralization agreement among the US, the Soviet Union, Britain, France and the littoral States. If a full neutralization of the Indian Ocean should prove unrealizable, a less ambitious agreement might at least limit the members and types of naval vessels each Super Power could introduce here at any given time."

Many members of the American Congress have openly expressed themselves against turning the Indian Ocean into another arena of the Cold War. They have opposed the policies of President Nixon and President Ford to upgrade the Diego Garcia base. The attitude of the Great Powers to the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is a negative one. 'Their attitude has hardened over the years. The super powers are adding to their military strength in the Indian Ocean every year. The question arises what means and methods are available to the advocates of the peace zone proposal to persuade or compel the Great Powers to change their attitude. One suggestion is that all the Afro-Asian countries should join hands and boycott outside powers in certain respects, such as oil. Another suggestion is that there should be a threat from the Indian Ocean littoral countries to withdraw from the Non-proliferation Treaty
(NPT) their continued adherence to the NPT should be made contingent on the great powers acceptance of the peace zone proposal". (21) However, such a step can lead to a lot of trouble for all concerned. It is difficult to expect united action on behalf of all the States of Asia and Africa.

India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi during her last visit to Mauritius rightly emphasised that the Indian Ocean was bristling with problems which portend a big threat to the entire world. That she pledged India's support to the Mauritian claim to the Diego Garcia island and called for continued efforts to keep the Indian Ocean free from outside forces showed how India was spearheading the crucial movement to keep the Indian Ocean zone of peace. Mauritian Prime Minister Aneeroof Jugnauth has already made clear his Government's stand on the Question of demilitarization of the Indian Ocean. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi took another initiative to Non-Aligned nations, particularly the littoral states, in favour of making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

The final document adopted by the Non-aligned co-ordination Bureau ministerial meeting in Havana in June 1982 says that Non-Alignment is the only force capable of turning the world back on to the trace of peace and co-operation. Several world leaders also realize the importance and necessity of Non-Alignment in the present tension-ridden world. At the last Commonwealth
conference held in Melbourne, Australia there was much appreciation of the role being played by the Non-Aligned group in defusing international tension. Greater cohesiveness in the Non-Aligned movement would enable it to play a more effective as well positive role in reducing international tension when a region is either burning or exploding Non-Aligned appeals for peace would be of little avail.

"The idea of making the Indian Ocean the zone of peace requires the withdrawal of the foreign fleet. This is of extreme importance in order to ensure peace and thus stability in that part of the world. This is due to the fact that the presence of the foreign fleet represents constant threat to the interests of the independent countries as well as perpetual danger of the military confrontation of Big Powers."(22)

"Non-Aligned countries must keep up their agitation for turning the Indian Ocean into a region of peace. But it should be realistic enough to realise that the warships of the super powers will not be withdrawn from this area by appeals and exhortations. Unless a detente is established once again between the east and west the Non-Aligned countries in the region will have to remain on the alert, and that calls for the forging of a common front by other littoral powers in this area and the strengthening of their navis, both quantitatively and qualitatively, for their countries self defence."(23)
DETENTE AND WORLD PEACE

In the long run, the future depends on what may be called the three Ds - Detente, Disarmament and Development. To the extent that detente grows, the strains which showed at Belgrade Summit Conference in 1961 among the Non-Aligned will also begin to diminish. Disarmament and development are inter-linked because if the big powers - which incidentally, are both permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and the only members of the most exclusive nuclear weapons club - can be persuaded to disarm they may also feel inclined to divert a part of the money to promoting development and well-being of the Non-aligned nations to the Third World.

"Detente developed out of the recognition on both sides of the Cold War, that the continuance of high tension and the unbridled armament race does not lead to any desirable end, but is fraught with great dangers and might provoke a nuclear world war. It was not a result of a compromise or any other form of agreement or even an acquiescence in modus vivendi 'concerning the divisive issues of the cold war. In fact the detente was possible only as an expression and fear to pursue the cold war controversy and further."(24) It was the reason for its restricted application to the mutual relations between the two blocs. It follows that none of the goals or aspirations promoted by the Non-Aligned countries had been attained by the limited scope of detente or accepted by the two blocs. Still detente was
a welcome and important change in the atmosphere, at least in the first years of the decade of the seventies. It was also significant, giving openly the Non-Aligned countries a major role in the conduct of world affairs. This latter effect of important role played by the Non-Aligned countries in ushering detente on the world scene.

One of the weaknesses and failures of the Cold War policies on both sides was the inability of the blocs to divide among themselves the whole world. The ascent of Non-Alignment in fact caused a visible stagnation of the initial success of the one and other major Powers to widen the circle of states included into the bloc system. Even after 1961 the ranks of the 'Non-Aligned' expanded, as can be seen in counting the number of participants of the Non-Aligned summits. "Furthermore, there were practically no defections from the movement. On the other side, the bloc system were stagnating and the erstwhile ambitions of spreading the systems worldwide had to be given up". (25) Because of this role of the Non-Aligned in the Cold War, and the success registered by the mere expansion of their numbers, détente created unduly high hopes among them. They were further enhanced by the apparent effort of the two major Powers to reach an agreement restricting interferences in disputes in the Third World as a means of avoiding exacerbating the direct confrontation between them. These attitude of the West towards the idea of a new economic order in the world in the early seventies.
In fact, the very idea of the new order matured and was ready as a basic for a dialogue with the North, just at the time when detente opened, at the turn of the decade of the sixties into the decade of the seventies. The significant moves and agreements between the two major Powers on Non-interference in the Third World took place in 1972 and 1973 on the other side, the Algiers Conference convened also in 1973 and there the new economic order was launched. But during the decade of detente the initial momentum of the North-South dialogue diminished and the dialogue came to a stand still. "The reduced tensions, together with the dying down of the dialogues on development, and the general atmosphere of the early years of detente, led to a diminishing of the cohesive forces in both blocs, but also within the movement of the cohesive forces in both blocs, but also within the movement of the Non-Aligned countries. The most perceptible centrifugal movement could be observed in the west, with the European states and Japan pursuing increasingly more independent policies in most cases"(26) This lossening of cohesive forces however was greatly stimulated also by the behaviour of the two leading powers in both blocs. They began to push harder towards bilateral agreements of the type successfully achieved on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The lack of agreement among the western developed countries, though, was certainly the most important obstacle, increasing the burden of negotiations already bogging down under the lack of co-
operation of the West. There was yet another new element on
the world scene, which further contributed to the general
disarray. It was the sudden and drastic increase of the prices
of crude oil. The general malaise was further intensified by
the resumption of increasingly aggressive attempts of the Great
Powers to secure more influence in different areas or
individual countries of the South.

The influence of bloc-inspired influences among the Non-
Aligned countries is much more dangerous in connection with the
problems of development. The original moderation of the Non-
Aligned regarding relations with the developed countries is the
only avenue leading possibly to a new global approach to
problems of development. Without such a new approach, through
confrontation and militancy, economic problems cannot be
solved. "Today's international situation, troubled by many a
crisis, is increasingly characterized by the strained relations
between the big powers. The world seems to be fleeing away
from peace, where as the general circumstances in international
life are causing justified concern among the world community.
Throughout the postwar period, the world has been passing
through the different stages; from cold war to the detente and
to the renewed uncertainty imbued with threats of war in
certain regions. In spite of general awareness of the perils
ensuring from the mounting arms race and the big powers' 
attempt to restore the policy of spheres of interest, the World
Organization, has failed to revive the detente with any real efficiency" (27). It is very true that instead of having some of the perilous hotbeds of crises eliminated there has been an increasingly wide confrontation of the big powers whose role at the U.N. Security Council is especially significant for the preservation of peace. It is the movement of Non-Aligned countries that appears to be the only capable force in this hour to halt the adverse trends in the world. The developing countries have been giving priority to Non-Aligned actions. Knowing that various of the international forums or organization fail in trying to preclude more threats to world peace. Adverse developments in international relations compel the Non-Aligned to one of their most responsible tasks, to act so as to help eliminate all the disturbances that are likely to cause more conflagrations. Peace came from the desire for peace, trust fostered trust - this was the Non-Aligned belief. What Non-Aligned ideology claimed was that peace was a product of the will to peace, and the point about the will to peace was that it was a matter of the approach, and the approach had to be in terms of 'good' moral means. The aim was to introduce morality into the function and conduct of international relations. This was how Non-Alignment sought to reform international relations. As Nehru put it to the 1947 Asian Relations conference "...the point I was trying to bring to your notice is that this might civilization of the West which has done so much to raise human standards somehow occasionally
has some thing which makes it sink to the level of the brute. Perhaps it may be that something of the essential spirit, the old wisdom of Asia, might help to remove the lack in Western Civilization." "Non-Alignment played a role there was room to play but no players to play it, and, because it played it well it was successful"(28) Certainly, Non-alignment as a peace movement played an important role in the 1950s.

To advocate detente and to work for the resolution of international problems by political means or negotiations is one of the essential characteristics of the policy of Non-Alignment. That is how it was at the Belgrade Summit Conference in 1961, and so it is today. Some ten years later, in Georgetown, Guyana, the Non-Aligned countries foreign ministers for the first time took a more comprehensive and meaningful attitude towards detente as a process which the Non-Aligned had encouraged. The Non-Aligned made it clear-cut and resolute demand for the process of detente to be expanded to embrace all parts of the globe without exception. Otherwise there can be no guarantee of peace in the world, no security for the developing countries, the Non-Aligned declared.

Thus they emphasized that an improvement of relations between the big powers must lead to the ultimate removal of crises and confrontations in the whole world. Detente should be attended by the firm obligation to promote international cooperation and strengthen the United Nations. Only then would
it be possible to tackle the fundamental problems of the present-day world, the problems of economic development, disarmament and peace. The danger was clearly indicated of double standard behaviour by the big powers - negotiations on the one side and interference, intervention, subversion and aggression on others.

The Fourth Non-Aligned Conference in Algiers in 1973 confirmed these positions at the highest level. As before, the necessity of detente embracing all problems and regions was stressed again and that peace would be unstable unless the interests of other countries were taken into consideration. To such an elaborated approach to detente, the Non-Aligned foreign ministers meeting in Lima in 1975, added the demand for a democratization of international relations.

Addressing participants in the Helsinki Conference in 1975, President Tito stressed - "The current positive trends in the policy of relaxation of tensions would fall into a crisis very soon if detente were to be reduced to agreement between the blocs rather than increasingly becoming the basis for negotiations of all states based on the principles of respect of independence, sovereignty, equality and non-interference in internal affairs."

At their Fifth Conference in Colombo in 1976, the Non-
Aligned heads of State or government were already critical noting that detente or such as it was contained in the statements of the big powers had not detracted from the intensity of the struggle for expanding and competing spheres of influence waged by the big powers all over the world nor had it extinguished hot beds of crisis. The demand was reiterated for the Non-Aligned countries to play a direct and effective part in the quest for just and equitable solutions to outstanding international problems.

Meeting in Belgrade in 1978, the foreign ministers, of the Non-Aligned countries further enriched the comprehensive Non-aligned stance on detente. They called for a deepening and expansion of the process of detente to cover all areas of international relations in all the regions of the world and to help resolve key international problems with the participation of all states. They emphasized that peace, security and a relaxation of tensions could not rest on a policy of power equilibrium, the division of the world blocs and spheres of influence and the arms race.

At their sixth summit in Havana in 1979, the Non-Aligned countries' heads of states or government enlarged the Non-Aligned concept of detente by demanding that it should be conducive to the removal of hot-beds of tension, and end to aggression, foreign occupation, intervention and interference
as well as to the political and economic exploitation of weaker countries. The declaration adopted by this gathering testifies eloquently to the fact that while supporting detente, the Non-Aligned had, in line with the evolution of the international situation expanded the concept of detente by adding new elements to it which were particularly pronounced at the time.

The crisis and stagnation of detente figured prominently at the Non-Aligned countries' foreign ministers' conference in New Delhi in February 1981. That was when the ministers noted that the crisis in the process of detente constituted a serious threat to peace and stability in the world. They stressed that big power rivalry had been intensified and that the contest continued for spheres of influence, for the perpetuation and escalation of domination exploitation. Reiterating the position adopted by former Non-Aligned gathering on relaxation and detente they pointed out that international security for all countries would only be achieved through efforts geared to changing international economic and political relations as a whole.

"In relation to the process of detente and the easing of tensions in general, the policy and movement of Non-Alignment have consistently been active. Not only have the Non-Aligned responded to the initiatives of others but they have gradually built up the only realistic and most widely acceptable platform
of negotiation and detente. There is every reason for the Non-Aligned to continue to insist on their vision of detente, relaxation and negotiation as well as on the expansion of the process of detente globally. One of the advantages of the Non-Aligned concept of detente is its insistence on the connection and interdependence of crises in international political and economic relations on the indispensibility of detente being universal.

Detente can be a process fortering peace and cooperation on condition that it conduces the elimination of the use of force in international relations. Detente itself is not peace but as a process it will be revived and survive only if it serves as a prelude to a substantial revision of international relations. The Super Powers have been trying to keep detente within the limits of mutual competition and negotiations. That's why detente was not universal all embracing.

While talking about the increased efforts to obtain the diminishing of international tension Tito said. "detente has to be all-embracing, and that it has to spread all parts of the world and to embrace all essential questions of international relations and development. It is here we see the great possibilities and obligations of the policy of the Non-Aligned".

The most significant achievement in Europe in the field of
co-operation and security was obtained at the Helsinki Conference in 1975. The Final Act of the Helsinki Conference represents an actual platform for cooperation and security in Europe. Welcoming the detente between the super powers at the Algiers Summit Conference, Indira Gandhi had stressed to "resist all attempts to so order the world as to suit the interests of a few countries". Understanding the big powers is a good development if it is peace and international justice by any attempt by them to dictate to the rest of the world goes against the principle of equality among nations.

Not easy, but feasible is entire process of building peace in Asia. Although there is no dearth of opponents of the peaceful Asia. The Key idea, of peaceful co-existence, will remain important for the foreseeable future. Although the Cold War is over and the Great Powers are serious about detente international rivalry, the arms race between them the danger of conflict between them continue, and therefore it remains important for the Non-Aligned to promote peaceful co-existence furthermore, the changing internation situation requires that peaceful co-existence be transformed into active co-operation between nations. "In a world that is becoming increasingly independent there is really no alternative except rivalry and conflict to international co-operation in all fields, economic social and political. In promoting international cooperation the Non-aligned will have a role play which will become more
importasnt as the world becomes more interdependent."(30)

Though the US and USSR have shaken hands and linked up in the out space, on earth the edifice of peace still rests on fragile foundations. Besides, some other great powers have come on the international scene trying to throw their weight about, entering into all manner of diplomatic combinations in the pursuit of their own big power objectives. In this context there is a much necessity today, as there was in the days of the cold war, for the Non-Aligned countries to protect and assert their independence and to concert their efforts in order to be able to withstand such pressures and to bring about a greater degree of democratization in international relations.

The continuance of military and naval bases in foreign territories and the resumption of arms supplies to client states in sensitive regions of the world pose danger to peace and the independence of Non-Aligned countries. Thus the classic objective of Non-alignment to preserve national independence in the context of great power military alliances, and rivalries remain relevant. India has been consistently emphasising that this hard core of Non-Alignment cannot be ignored while New Delhi has welcomed and applauded the retreat of military alliances and the forward movement of international detente.

"For us detente is a very broad notion" the Soviet President
Leonid Brezhnev emphasised in his speech in Baku, "Above all it means the general inclination of states and their leaders not to military preparations and hostility to other states, but to peaceful co-operation with them. It means movement communication among countries, among peoples. Conscientious observance of the norms of international law, respect for the sovereignty of every country and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. And, finally, it means the constant striving to promote by practical deeds the curbing of the arms race that has engulfed the entire world, the striving to consolidate security on the basis of the gradual deepening of mutual trust on the principles of justice and reciprocity. This is how we view detente. For this detente we are striving. The point is to ensure a peaceful future mankind."

There is full justification for saying that no one can arrest the process of detente. The peoples of Europe have directly felt its favourable impact in the past decade. The task today is to shift this process to a specific area to begin military detente and this is one of the central tasks. That is how it was worked in the long-term charter the Final Act of Helsinki conference.

The dual character of today's limited detente offers the greatest hope that it will survive despite all the obstacles, limitations and difficulties it is encountering. In all their
actions so far the Non-aligned countries have emphasized the virtues of detente and the need for detente as a permanent, universal and functions course of action. By pointing out that it is not possible to divide the policy of relaxation of tension geographically, the Non-Aligned countries were amongst the first to perceive the dangers which have led to today’s limited detente. "In their efforts to normalize international relations, and to initiate the arduous but absolutely necessary job of improving relations between the main upholders of bloc policies, the Non-aligned countries will endorse detente at all their gatherings as well as at the United Nations, convinced that it offers the only prospect for the peaceful existence the progress of today’s world. The greater the number of states opting for this line the sooner will detente be renewed as a model and a phase of international relations which has so far yielded the most positive results."(32) The progressive forces, are now carrying on the struggle to extend detente to all regions of the world, to eradicate the remaining seats of tension, to secure the dissolution of aggressive grouping and to limit the arms race, to eliminate inequality and discrimination in international economic relations and to liquidate racialism and neo-colonialism. The Non-Alignment movement has an important role to play in the accomplishment of these tasks in the interests of universal peace and social progress.
DETERENCE AND TEST BAN TREATY:

Most of the American Scientists who had been involved in the "atomic bomb project" were convinced that nothing short of the worldwide imposition of strict international control over all future atomic energy developments would succeed in keeping the genie of nuclear weapons use from perverting future national peaceful nuclear power programme into dangerous nuclear weapons programmes. On the other hand there were those who felt that the appropriate approach was to seek a political consensus among all nuclear-capable nations that the future production of nuclear weapons was not an acceptable mode of behaviour. This viewpoint was expressed in the "ban the bomb" movement which had a considerable following in the immediate post war period in England and on the European continent but was not especially widespread in the United States.

The ban-the-bomb movement never gained much following among American scientists and scholars for two reasons. The first stemmed from the conviction that, the genie being out of the battle, there would be no physical possibility of preventing other nations from following in our footsteps, short of actual physical control over the materials needed to construct weapons. This was, admittedly, an entirely technological approach, but it must be borne in mind that the US atomic scientists movement had entirely technological origins, its leaders having had very little, if any experience in the strictly political arena.
"But the second reason for the unpopularity of the ban-the-bomb movement in US. atomic scientists circle stemmed from the widespread — and, unfortunately plausible — conviction that the main impetus for and intellectual under-pinnings of the movement came from groups that were, then commonly referred as "Communist front" i.e. controlled from the Soviet Union"(33)

All in all, the failure of the post war international movement among scientist, scholars and others to eliminate the threat of nuclear weapons can be said to have collapsed. In his book "The Fate of the Earth" Jonathan Schell says, The alternative is to surrender ourselves to absolute and external darkness; darkness in which no nation, no society, no ideology, no civilization will remain; in which never again will a child be born in which never again will human beings appear on the earth, and there will be no one to remember that they ever did”.

It is ironical that despite remarkable achievement in technology humans have come to a point to where they must become extinct unless they learn to get on with their neighbours. This possibility was anticipated in 1955 by none Nobel prize winners along with Albert Einstein and Bertrand Russell when they issued a statement prior to the Big Four Summit meeting in Geneva. "In view of the fact that in any such war, nuclear weapons will certainly be employed, and such weapons threaten the continued
existence of mankind, we urge governments of the the world to
realize and to acknowledge publicly, that their purpose cannot be
furthered by a world war, and we urge them consequently, to find
peaceful means for the settlement of all matters of dispute among
them."

The US has stock-piled 28,500 mega tons of explosive power,
two million times the kind which destroyed Hiroshima. There is
enough to kill every man, woman and child three times over. And
nobody can explain what will be achieved by such over kill,
since in such an event, neither the bombed nor the bomber will
survive to tell it.

Deterrence is rapidly deteriorating from what it used to be
namely maintaining strategic stability due to rapid break through
in nuclear weapons technology. The arms control approach as an
instrument of crisis stability is being eroded by problems of
strategic superiority, uncertainty, vulnerability and the
increasing economic cost of new strategic systems. Hence
questions like "Can Nuclear Deterrence Last out the century"
have become more relevant today. Strategic doctrines like
flexible response, counterfore strategy, Schlesinger doctrine, and
countervailing strategy are the necessary concomitant of new and
more powerful war fighting capabilities to push the world to the
brink of a nuclear war"
The International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation Study Report has highlighted the need to pursue nuclear technology to meet energy requirements of the world and the inescapability of the plutonium economy. The recommendations of the study group refute the thesis of those who are trying to slowdown the development of nuclear energy, especially plutonium-based energy generation. Further development and growth of the economies of the developed countries will need increased energy source materials. In other words, energy will be one of the crucial resources that will be sought after by the Industrialized countries. This competition to ensure energy source materials for one's own consumption may well lead to a confrontation between the two power blocs. If the problem of energy crunch is not solved by the developed nations their own further development is likely to be in jeopardy. This cannot be solved so long as the industrialized world remains divided into two Power Blocs. The competition between them for energy resources may escalate and get out of control some time or other into a nuclear war.

"Non-Aligned Movement is a challenge to the bipolar international system, which has become rigidified over the years through the doctrine of nuclear deterrence and the legitimization of nuclear weapons through the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. (NPT) If Non-Aligned Movement is to fulfill its original role and find solutions for the most urgent and most demanding problems today, the movement should mobilize efforts to lessen the rigidity of the
bipolar alliances and denigrate the role of nuclear weapons in international politics and strip them of their glamour and prestige. Nuclear weapons are being used today as a currency of power (like gold stocks) to hold together alliance system; sizes of nuclear arsenals have become symbols of the bipolar confrontation, and the doctrines of nuclear war and the cartelization of technology have been turned into instruments of hegemony."

If nations and population of half the globe can be held as hostages in line with the doctrines of nuclear war, it tends to have a legitimating impact on other forms of terrorism by other no-nuclear nations, sub national group etc. Holding civilian populations as hostages and killing them in a nuclear strike is a violation of the Hague convention. If nations can violate the Hague convention and indulge in mass terrorism and have them legitimized through the NPT it is no wonder that the holding of diplomats as hostages in violation of the Vienna convention does not produce much reaction, however deplorable the act may be. The present rise in international terrorism is by no means unrelated to the legitimization of terrorism through the doctrine of nuclear war, the NPT, nuclear-weapons free zones, etc.

Non-alignment has to struggle against this and liberate the populations of the industrialized nations from this conditioning.
Once nuclear weapons are stripped of their glamour and prestige, there can be a universal convention branding the use of nuclear weapons as a crime against humanity, which can be subscribed to by all nations of the world. A note written by Lord Louis Mountbatten, a military Commander Surveys the Nuclears Arms Race, clearly brings out the futility of the nuclear arms race and the urgent need to reverse it.

The central objective of the Non-Aligned movement is to bring to bear the pressure of the aspirations of all humanity for orderly progress towards one world on all those who have sought to divide it through power politics based on nuclear arsenals and advanced delivery systems, through economic based upon exploitation, through racial politics based on nuclear arsenals and advanced delivery systems through economic based upon exploitation, through racial politics based upon traditional beliefs: "At the present critical juncture, when the various regressive forces are engaged in an attempt to destroy humanity and its achievements through all manner of divisionness, the NAM must raise its voice to affirm its faith in the oneness of humanity and to resist all divisive and destructive forces."(35)

The second meeting of the group of Non-Aligned coordinating countries for the peaceful use of nuclear energy took place in Buenos Aires from June 30th to July 4th, 1978. Eleven out of the Group's sixteen members attended. This broad attendance
reflects the Non-Aligned and other developing countries' growing interests in this problem. "In view of the fact that some developed countries keep raising the problem of Non-proliferation, the conference pointed out that concern over proliferation should not be used as a pretext for preventing the acquisition of nuclear powers' monopolistic policy of limiting the transfer of these materials and imposing conditions which are in compatible with the sovereignty and independence of the developing countries."(36)

Nuclear deterrence has brought about a two-person-zero sum game all over the world. The gains of one Super Power anywhere in the world are taken to be the loss of the other and one sought to be balanced by the latter through intervention elsewhere. The First Non-Aligned Conference took place at Belgrade in 1961. The most remarkable feature of the Conference was an impassioned speech made by India's Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in which he draw the Assembly's attention to the threat of a nuclear was and pointed out that the main task of the Non-Aligned nations and indeed of all mankind was to struggle to remove this threat and one of the documents adopted was entitled "Danger of war and Appeal for Peace".

Since the signing of the NPT in 1968 there has been a persistent attempt to absorb the Non-Aligned into the bipolar dominant international system and unfortunately this has
succeeded to a significant extent. The basic objective of Non-Alignment is to dissolve the bipolar system and to build up One World. That cannot be achieved if nuclear weapons are legitimized and if the need for overkill nuclear arsenals are accepted. If nuclear weapons are legitimized, the doctrine of deterrence get legitimized and, consequently, the bipolar, international system based on nuclear deterrence to get legitimized. The NPT did exactly that. The NPT was a major blow to Non-Alignment, it was through it that the legitimacy of nuclear weapons, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence and the bipolarity of the world were "sold" to a number of Non-Aligned countries. The NPT was not meant to promote arms limitation among the nuclear-weapons power. 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 a significant scale in the weapon-producing reactors of the Nuclear-weapon powers, leading to further proliferation. Yet the NPT achieved the purpose the sponsors had in view. By UN General Assembly resolution 1653 (XIV) of 1961, the Non-Aligned countries demanded in the true tradition of Non-Alignment the outlawing of nuclear weapons as a crime against humanity. The NPT succeeded in inveigling many of the Non-Aligned countries into accepting the legitimacy
of nuclear arsenals in the hands of the five nuclear-weapons powers.

The Declaration of the Sixth Conference of Heads of States or Government of Non-Aligned countries, held in 1979 emphasized that the most effective safeguards against the use of nuclear weapons is precisely nuclear disarmament and the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. "Due to the policy of force and dominations, and to the assured assumption that more arms ensure greater security, we are witnessing growing stockpiles of nuclear arsenals, and a stalemate in the negotiations on the limitation of nuclear arms. This represents a direct threat to the independence and security of all of us. It is obvious that what we need is effective.

The conclusion of the comprehensive Text Ban Treaty is an obligation arising from the Treaty. This treaty has been for many years the subject of negotiations among the USA, the USSR and Great Britain. However, the three negotiating parties simultaneously continue to carry out nuclear-weapon tests and improve their nuclear-weapon systems. "We believe it is high time to enter into multilateral negotiations on the elaboration of a treaty that could be universally accepted." (38) We are confronted with a selective approach to the horizontal Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The way has been opened for the direct nuclearization of the armed forces of some Non-nuclear Parties to the NPT that are members of the military alliances. This further complicates
the question of security of the Non-nuclear-weapons states, we consider that the only way to guarantee the security of non-nuclear-weapon states from the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and nuclear armament.

THE SIXTH CONFERENCE OF HEADS OF STATE OR GOVERNMENT
OF NON-ALIGNED COUNTRIES MADE THE FOLLOWING ASSESSMENT:

"Concern for Non-proliferation should not be used as a pretext to prevent states from exercising the right to acquire and develop peaceful nuclear technology. The conference expressed its concern over the monopolistic policies of nuclear supplier countries restricting and limiting the transfer of technology and imposing conditions which are incompatible with the Sovereignty and independence of the developing countries. It deplored the pressures and threats against developing countries aimed at preventing them from pursuing their programmes for the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes."

The energy crisis is mostly affecting the developing countries. A growing number of them see a possibility to overcome the present situation in the introduction of nuclear energy into their energy programmes. Every obstruction of the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes is a source of far reaching economic consequences for their countries.
Reaffirming the will of the United Nations member-states expressed in the declaration on the prevention of nuclear catastrophe.

(1) Calls upon all states to multiply efforts to remove the threat of nuclear war and to ensure a safe development of nuclear energy.

(2) Declares that a deliberate destruction of peaceful nuclear facilities even with the conventional weapons is in fact tantamount to an attack involving the use of nuclear weapons, that is to those actions which the U.N. has already defined as the gravest crime against humanity.

(3) Notes that the limitation and cessation of the nuclear arms race will create more favourable conditions for developing international cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

(4) Calls upon all nuclear-weapon states as a first step towards reducing and ultimately eliminating their nuclear assends to agree to simultaneously suspend (freeze) the production and deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles, as well as the production of fissinable materials for the purpose of developing various types of nuclear weapons.

"Nuclear war will be the ultimate catastrophe and any failure to recognize this ultimate truth or to compromise it for
the sake of political expediency, must be recognized as an irresponsible act. Only with the universal recognition, both among peoples and their political leaders, of the nuclear non-use principle, can we hope for survival in the nuclear age.”(39)

NON-ALIGNMENT MOVEMENT AND STRUGGLE AGAINST APARTHEID

Since 1960 when the Soviet Union sponsored in the United Nations, the resolution on decolonization demanding that all colonies be granted independence without any further delay, the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa has started strength. The rise of Non-Aligned movement, besides the socialist world, the defender of the rights of the oppressed South African people, has increased the pressure on the western world for committing themselves, against apartheid. Today the demand for human rights, in Southern Africa is so pressing that even the western world finds it difficult to be openly on the side of racist rulers. Except USA, Germany, UK, France, Israel and Japan, there is no country which so nakedly support apartheid regime in Southern Africa. The credit of this situation goes to the socialist countries, to the Non-Aligned world and the strong forces of peace and solidarity. On one side we have the USSR as supporter of oppressed masses of South Africa and Namibia and on the other the USA, the trusted friend of the resist rulers. The Non-Aligned world is naturally with the Soviet Union on this account.
A minority racist regime committed to the perpetuation or racial discrimination and ruthless exploitation of masses in South Africa, continues to commit crimes against humanity. Report prepared by UN Centre against apartheid mentions the following mechanism of exploitation and discriminations which are in vogue in South Africa.

(a) Under the notorious Group Areas Act, non-whites are compelled to abandon their present lands and premises and move to new and usually inferior reserved areas without compensation or provisional alternative accomodation.

(b) Complete segregation is enforced in public services, such as railways, buses and post offices.

(c) The Supression of Communism Act is being used to suppress democratic movements, especially of the non-whites, for example, those who advocate racial equality or urge opposition to apartheid.

(d) Non-whites are debarred from combat services in the armed forces.

(e) No voting or other political rights whatsoever are enjoyed by non-whites, except in Cape Province, where African and the 'Coloured' inhabitants have a limited franchise.
(f) Africans are confined to reserves and their movements are restrict to certain places after specified hours under certain restrictive laws. The interprovincial movements of non-whites are also restricted.

(g) Non-whites are excluded under the Mines Works Amendment Act of 1926 from certain classes of skilled work and a systematic drive is in progress to replace them, even in the lower grades of the public services by whites.

(h) The education of non-whites and their housing and living conditions are deplorable. Such facilities of this type as are available to non-whites are vastly inferior to those offered to the white population.

"As a result of these obnoxious practices a brutal socio-political system is being evolved under which the non-whites, who constitute 80 percent of the population of the Union of South Africa, will be kept permanently in an inferior state to the white minority. Such a policy challenges all that the United Nations stands for and is a flagrant violation of the basic postulates of the Charter by the United Nations."(40)

The main purpose of these lawless racial laws is the creation and maintenance of large force of cheap labour. Racialism is a sinister device used for the ruthless exploitation of cheap labour in South Africa, where workers have been denied
all political rights and are subjected to grinding exploitation. The unabated oppression of the native masses has enabled the Whites to amass great wealth, but it has brought destitution for the Blacks. While the white minority consisting of 16 percent enjoys a living standard and per capita income level of United States; the Black majority comprising 84 percent live below poverty line and are amongst the world's most poverty-stricken people. Professor Natrass from the University of Natal estimates that overall average white/black annual per capita income ration is 11:1. As a matter of fact, the combination of apartheid and imperialism poses a threat to peace in South Africa. Investment of Transnational Corporation (TNCs) which was 8 per cent of the gross domestic investment, increased to 14 percent between 1970-71 to 1974-75 and reached to 24.5 percent in 1975-76 and gave a new boost to South Africa's exploitation machinery.

Today the United States is the biggest trading partner of South Africa having taken over the Great Britain and F.R.G. In 1980, the U.S. Sold to south Africa machinery chemicals etc. worth US $ 2.4 billion and purchased goods worth over $ 3.3 billion United States oil companies continued to deliver oil to South Africa in contravention of the ban imposed by almost all the oil producing countries. Despite the ban on arms sales to South Africa violating the UN Sanctions on arms. The CIA and South African Intelligence Agency closely collaborate with each
other. South Africa has also acquired a nuclear capability with the active help of FRG, Israel and US. The US Administration allows the recruitment of mercenaries and the publication of 'Soldier of Fortune' in the United States in gross violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution of 1977. The recent decision of IMF to extend a loan of Special Drawing Rights (SDRs) worth US $ 1.1 billion to South Africa has alarmed the whole world. The UN Special Committee on Apartheid has vehemently criticised it as "ill conceived and most regrettable" India denounced the loan as it was designed to further dispossess the African majority of its inalienable rights and deprive it of its citizenship. At the United Nations the Third World diplomats have denounced it by saying "that the money, racist regime in South Africa is getting from the IMF will be used to buttress its policy of Apartheid."

"This help from IMF to Pretoria regime has made the problem of apartheid much more serious and pressing when view against the growing international pressure for the imposition of mandatory economic and other sanctions against South Africa. As in the past, South Africa utilized overseas loans for purchasing sophisticated arms from abroad and to build an indigenous arms industry, the present loan will also be used not for any project for the benefit of the Blacks but for acquiring greater military capabilities to be used against the growing guerilla activities led by ANC and SWAPO" (41) The loans from IMF between 1975-77
enabled South Africa to finance the tremendous increase in her military expenditure.

The apartheid regime backed by transnational capitalist structure and the US is encouraged to defy the UN and World Public Opinion and is becoming more and more intransigent. Apartheid is one of the most challenging problems before the humanity. The liberation of South Africa and elimination of racial discrimination are the challenges before those who believe in having socio-economic equality, human values and new world order based on human dignity and justice, to which India can be called a great lover and admirer. It is not only the task of South African people alone who are faced with the most barbarous and aggressive regime to fight against the monster but is also the most sacred duty of the entire humanity to fight against racism and colour prejudices. For the brave people of South Africa and Namibia who are fighting for the most important and fundamental human rights, namely freedom and equality (Namibia is declared free on 21.3.1990) while this work was in progress) must be helped by all who believe in human values. The racist regime has persistently violated the unanimous resolutions of UNO and blatantly defined the world public opinion.

The racist regime of South Africa which continued getting political, economic and military support by the US, Britain,
France, Germany and now Israel does not hesitate to use violence, wage genocidal wars, commit massacres, torture and execute the opponents of Apartheid in order to remain in power. It is estimated that more than 8 million blackmen and women had been prosecuted under different repressive laws by South African racist regime between 1961-1981. About 1.2 million have been forcibly pushed out of urban areas. The military invasion of Angola and illegal occupation of Namibia, by the racist South Africa's military forces bear witness to the nightmare of terror inflicted upon blacks.

Many efforts have been done in the past to fight the apartheid system, and achieve freedom of oppressed people of South Africa. Many of the anti-apartheid movements in the world came into existence in response to an increasing awareness of the evils of apartheid. As a matter of fact, apartheid is a "Crime against humanity" as declared by the General Assembly of United Nations. The people of almost all countries and particularly of Europe have joined together to combat the collusion of their governments with the racist regime of South Africa and to render all assistance they do to the liberation movement in South Africa.

The anti-apartheid movement backed by USSR and other socialist countries and by Non-aligned movement has become an
effective counter to the propaganda machinery of the South African regime and its supporters. The direct result of this movement is seen in the moral and material assistance to the people of South Africa. The channel of communication established between the black people of Africa and the people of socialist world, the Non-Aligned world has given a big jolt to the practice of apartheid. The USSR and Non-Aligned movement articulate and spread information about the inhuman conditions in South Africa as well as the struggle of the peoples under the colonial and racist domintion. The anti-apartheid groups in almost all the Non-Aligned countdries, socialist countries as well as in the countries of Europe are helping the freedom fighters of South Africa and Namibia with material training and by propagating their cause (with the result Namibia getting freedom on 21.3.90) they bring to limelight the atrocities committed by racist rulers of South Africa with the US backing.

In addition to this, the role of the International Defence and Aid Fund, the World Council of Churches and the World Peace Council are of Vital importance UNO agencies are engaged in valuable work against apartheid for instance UNESCO has made significant educational contribution in the field of racial discrimination. It has published a valuable study entitled "The effects of Apartheid on Educationa, Science, Culture and Information in South Africa." The ILO has also done valuable work on the rights of workers and trade unions in South Africa.
In 1972, the General Assembly invited anti-apartheid organizations to launch coordinated campaign on specific issues as—an end to the torture and ill-treatment of prisoners, to put an end to all military, economic and political collaboration with South Africa, including the cessation of all activities by foreign economic-interests which encourage African regime in its imposition of Apartheid.

The U.N. has set up a UN Educational and Training Programme for South Africa and UN Trust Fund for South Africa for education and humanitarian assistance to victims of Apartheid World Campaign for the release of political prisoners with headquarters in London together with UN and anti-apartheid groups all over the world was instrumental in saving the life of Nelson Mandela (who is free no) and his fellow accused from the death sentence. Unfortunately, many important western powers, though in their declarations they condemn the ideology of Apartheid, they are actively helping the Racist Regime of South Africa in their economic and military efforts. They have paid no heed to the demand of socialist and Non-Aligned countries for the trade and commerce boycott of the Racist Regime. This has encouraged the Racist Regime to adopt oppressive measures against the freedom fighters of South Africa.

INDIA'S STRUGGLE AGAINST APARtheid:

India's contribution to the struggle against apartheid has
been highly praised by the leaders of the freedom movement in South Africa. Nelson Mandela, the outstanding leader of the movement, paid a handsome tribute to India and its leaders in a letter smuggled out of Robben Island prison in 1980 (Now he has been freed in 1990) Great appreciation has also been expressed by African leaders for the role of India since 1946 in promoting international support for the freedom struggle in South Africa, and its many actions and initiatives in solidarity with the oppressed people of the country.

While such expressions of appreciation are most gratifying it must be emphasized that the contribution by the Government and people of India to the freedom movement in South Africa is more than an act of solidarity. It has deep roots in India's own struggle for freedom and dignity. While India was concerned with the treatment of people of Indian origin in South Africa as affront to the dignity and honour of the nation, Nehru saw the issue in the context of even greater oppression of the African majority. India, therefore, took the lead in ensuring United nations consideration of apartheid and promoting solidarity with all oppressed people. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi has said there was a bright prospect of Namibia achieved independence (Namibia got independence on 21.3. 1990, while this work was in progress) but he was pessimistic about the elimination of apartheid in South Africa. He said in the 20th Centdury human rights will become a major issue in almost every part of the globe. But there were "abberations" in South Africa still. Receiving a
cheque of rupees one crore for the African Fund on the occasion of Human Rights Day from the chiefs of the State Bank of India and the Coal India. Rajiv Gandhi expressed the hope that the quadripartite talks on Namibia would be resumed soon and go well. And it went well and because of that got independence. The Africa Fund was set up during the Harare Summit of the Non-Aligned nations. Since then 42 nations including India which contributed Rupees 50 crore pledged $ 413 million.

It is quite appropriate to quote here Mrs. Indira Gandhi’s speech at the India Day Celebrations, New Delhi 25th May, 1974 "We sincerely hope that the racist and facist regimes in South Africa will also have the foresight to realize that they cannot fight the inevitable much longer. Many peoples have been suppressed as also their desires, their aspirations, but we have found that the idea is stronger than any force and the idea of freedom is one such thing which gives tremendous strength to the weakest of people, and it becomes ultimately more powerful than weapons and military strength or any kind of repression."

India has always been wishing that all the countries of the world should respect each other's sovereignty and integrity. So also India desires that the people of South Africa be helped to
throw off the shackles of racial discrimination. For the past ten years or more India has pressed for economic sanctions against South Africa and has laid the basis for great "Boycott South Africa" campaigns for recent years. India has also made modest financial contributions to the International Defence and Aid Fund for South Africa, UN Trust Fund for South Africa, UN Education and Training Programme for South Africa, UN Fund for Namibia, the UN Institute for Namibia and the Special Non-Aligned Fund for Namibia.
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