CHAPTER-5

THIRD WORLD AND ITS ATTITUDE TOWARDS COLONIALISM, NEO-COLONIALISM, ZIONISM, NON-ALIGNMENT & PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

Colonialism was like a cross on which almost every Third World country was nailed and grilled. Barring the Latin section of the Third World, countries of Asia and Africa experienced sometime or other that degrading form of domination known as colonialism. The U.N. lexicon has defined colonialism as Western rule of non-metropolitan areas. In fact colonial problem was essentially Afro-Asian the way Zionism was basically a West-Asian headache. Colonialism was not exported to South America where all the countries except Brazil and Haiti once happened to be Spanish colonies in the sense that the new immigrants soon severed connexions with the mother country and became independent. The new settlers either drove away the native aborigines or got mixed up with them. The new-comers became powerfully dominant in all spheres of life and numerically outrun the local inhabitants. In short, Latin America has the same story like the U.S., once a British colony but broke-off and gradually assimilated diverse heterogeneous groups where the pronounced element is White Anglo Saxon Protestant (WASP) unlike South America's Latin. As a group, the Latin American nations have generally been somewhat less extreme than the Afro-Asian ones. The Latin states have not had quite the same emotional content as that of Asian and African states because of few direct ethnic and cultural ties with the peoples of the dependent territories and also the different colonial experiences and revolutions ...(1) They are the ethnic cousins of the European whites who once colonized the world.

1. The UN & Colonialism: A Tentative Appraisal by Haroua Karan Jacobson in International Organizations Politics & Process edited by Leland M. Goodrich & David A. Key (P. 294)
But resurgent Europe's lurch to the East riddled the Afro-Asian region with political domination and economic exploitation. According to Barbara Ward, the Europeans came primarily to trade but the economic imbalances were not created out of direct exploitation alone. They were more of the unplanned consequences of the aggressive industrialization that the conquerors had imported from Europe. The rough balance between farming and handicrafts in the Asian villages broke down in the face of the 19th Century economic invasion of the European manufacturers. The ancient handicrafts were gradually replaced by factories and the colonies started supplying the raw materials to the great industrial benemoths for their survival. The colonial govts. could not or did not stop that kind of industrialization that ultimately led to polarization. The only Asian country that was spared of this agony was Japan which after its opening in 1854 met the West on its own terms having successfully adopted their techniques. The handful of white Europeans who came and subjugated these burgeoning people with their superior skill and immaculate discipline, kept themselves closeted aloof from the general stream, remained always numerically inferior and ruled with a bludgeon. The divide and rule tactics of the colonial powers created the urge among the enlightened ones to forge unity within each of their nations. The colonial rule had established some semblance of orders in areas that for centuries had been battlegrounds of internecine squabbles and skirmishes.

The colonialists have almost always seen themselves as purveyors of some transcendental moral, spiritual, political or social worth. The colonial experience makes deeply sensitive the relationships between the rich nations and the poor, between the proles and the patricians. The local natives for sometime got dumb founded but gradually with the spread of liberal education, though Western again in origin, the affluent and the progressive section among the native population became aware of the political bondage.
It should be noted that concepts of self-govt. and individual rights were never a part of the Asian or African tradition. The European colonizers gave a "law and order" govt. which was free and developed the attitudes of mind which ultimately drove them out. The Indian National Congress was founded by the Englishman named Alan Octavius Hume. Many of the national leaders of Asia and Africa who led their countries to independence like Nehru, Nkrumah, Kenyatta, Nyerere were all steeped in the Western tradition and culture. They felt attracted towards its political institutions. But they felt jittery about the nature and extent of economic exploitation.

The economic exploitation, became glaring to them and they started rousing the people from stupour. At the outset the colonizers had their fieldday without much obstruction but as the local sentiments and resistance became meaningfully formidable the rulers toughened their attitude and ways. Thus there emerged a battle ground where crusades were launched by the down-trodden, penurious Afro-Asians against the white colonial powers. The colonial rulers virtually turned out to be the Metropolitan Powers who took over from the early colonizers and tried to stage a come back in covert, concealed ways known as neo-colonialism. Little wonder that the countries sharing the common experience stood unified in their attack on colonialism and neo-colonialism and thereby created a propitious atmosphere that threatened them with extinction. The future of colonialism is in limbo as it has found conservative, militant, reactionary, progressive socialist and royalist together. Among the Asian states, those who have alliance with West have often taken a somewhat less demanding stand. Although the Afro-Asian group has generally taken a more anti-colonial position, it has not been solid unit either.

As a matter of fact to many western publicists, Third World means countries of warring nationalisms, some of them struggling on behalf of nations that have never existed as separate entities and may never do so. Third World nations shared a common antipathy to colonization while licking their wound inflicted by their previous masters. They endured many hard knocks of fortune which formed a moral base in a heritage of shared convictions. They suffered an unending hemorrhage of political and economic potency. Thus the accepted division between "pagan" Africa, South of Sahara, and Islamic, Arab-Berber North Africa before 1950s gave way to co-operation. Colonialism gave them a common past of domination and made them products of the same struggle. As a form of domination it -- transcended the political and economic barriers to permeate the defenceless societies, it became a total social system. Political independence was the condition precedent for unfettering the colonial society from foreign economic hegemony. The so-called un-economic "dwarf-states" bore eloquent testimony to the most serious legacy of colonialism in which major resources were owned by transnational conglomerates. Because they inherited "un-viable" economic units after independence from their colonial masters, their common war on hunger and poverty remained un-interrupted. "Between their society of hoes and goats, and the Euro-American world of space rockets and blast furnaces, there is a grand canyon full of bitterness and mutual mistrust. This is the greatest 'alienation' of the twentieth century"... They knew that their common poverty was an historical product, backwardness a result of human deceit. To decry their demand for NIEO (NEW INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER) as something

"ominously close to looting... was a travesty of truth, a flat denial of dues by the un-repentant -- colonizer. True that political domination became an endangered species but economic nihilism would weld the divergent "have-nots". The objective of all ex-colonies was to change the states of economic dependence into one of independence.

This is a core chapter in the sense that the Third world draws its inspiration of unity from the issues discussed here. In the League of Nations colonial powers' influence predominated; in the UN the two leading members, the US and the Soviet Union, were avowedly anti-colonialist and there was a growing number of other members who could be expected to be openly critical of any form of European colonialism...

(2) But in the case of the US it was impaled to the horns of a dilemma; if it were to side with the advocates of change, it would infuriate the colonial powers, several of which were important US allies. The US abstained in the roll-call vote on the GA Resolution 1514 (XV), the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial countries and peoples, because of a direct appeal from British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan to President Dwight

1. Daniel P. Moynihan - According to him the Marxist argument has a superior capacity to induce guilt and America's capacity to absorb guilt is what makes Americans, at times, a bit absurd. If a communist regime were to take over in the Sahara, there would in no time be a shortage of sand. Moynihan never liked the Third World - USSR honeymoon at all. He said, the Third World must feed itself and this will not be done by suggesting that Americans eat too much. There is no nation so poor that it can not afford free speech. Democratic socialism has become less democratic. The ex-US ambassador to India and the UN is an acerbic critic of Third World Socialism and authoritarianism. He called them, "politics of resentment and economics of envy."

2. In an article, the UN expectations and experience by Geoffrey L. Goodwin in the book titled, the Evolving UN - A Prospect for Peace - edited by Kenneth J. Twitcheet - Europa Publications 1971, P. 33.
D. Eisenhower to avoid placing the UK in an awkward position. In a choice between old allies, the UK and Portugal (both NATO members) and the new nations of Africa and Asia the US sought refuge in a kind of neutralism. Its support of the colonial minority ran counter to its much vaunted tradition of anti-colonialism and left the field open for the Soviets. The Soviets are free to identify themselves unambiguously with African liberation movements. Something the US has rarely been able to do because of its close relations with the former colonial rulers. The US foreign policy sought repressive stability in regimes that represented nothing round the world so that American business could accumulate prodigious profits. At times anti-colonialists campaigned against foreign investment which put the US on the defensive.

There is a Third World conviction that the US is impurely promoting its own interests with aid. Few in the Third World believe that the US values humanity more than money. The US in the Third World eyes is a cultural and economic colonialist, the heir to everything hated in the colonial powers—"to quote John Updike, "that fountainhead of obscenity and glut." The newly independent states of Asia and Africa were, therefore, mesmerized by the compulsion to quicken the total end of colonialism in the underdeveloped world. The Soviets declared that all colonial countries "must be granted forthwith complete independence". But the final Afro-Asian draft on Decolonization (Resolution 1514) drew heavily upon the resolutions previously approved by the Afro-Asian conferences at Bandung in 1955, Accra in 1958, and Addis Ababa in 1960 because they represented previously agreed upon phraseology which could be accepted without extensive negotiation... \(^{(1)}\) In the debates on those two

drafts on Decolonization - one prepared by the Soviets and
the other by the Afro-Asians - the Western states tried to
depict the more constructive aspects of colonialism which
received considerable support from Latin America. In fact,
the emotional content of colonialism was much less to the
Latin Americans who had direct ethnic and cultural ties with
the Metropolitan powers. Some Latin American countries paid
more attention to the legal niceties involved in colonial
issues. As a group the Latin American states were somewhat
less extreme than the Afro-Asian fraternity. Since its
support has been virtual requirement for the adoption of
any resolution, this group has frequently served as a
sobering influence on the Third World radicals.

History shifted its gear when the Third World states ulti­
mately sung the funeral dirge of colonialism. With their
unrelenting distaste against colonialism their activities
made the politics of UN a politics of successive approxi­
mation toward goals involving a variable mixture of private
negotiations, public oratory and voting. The circuitous
tactics of these nations in regard to Rhodesia demonstrated
the extent to which the patient application of such tactics
could gradually lead to a desired goal.

Apart from the Cold War, decolonization has in fact been by
far the most significant international development since the
Second World War. Almost a half of the world's population
has seen its international legal status altered within the
decades of the 1950s and 1960s. Membership of the UN has
more than doubled as a result of decolonization. The vast
transformation took place smoothly and peacefully for which
the Third World is entitled to the gratitude of posterity.

Let us start with India - the brightest jewel of the British
Empire where the sun never set.

While trying to trace out the history of colonialism India noted that with the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the European Nations marched eastward. They started to look for lands whose whereabouts they did not know by way of the Pacific, the Atlantic or the Indian Ocean... Some of them went to the Indian side also. A period followed in which European countries established their empires the Portuguese, the Dutch, the French and the English.

But resurgent colonialism, wherever it sought to assert itself in any territory, was meeting with ever-mounting and active discontent, summoning the dependent people to mass action for liberation. The colonial powers had to spill much blood and spend money in what seemed to be futile effort to turn the tide of history. Colonialism was beneficial neither to the colonizer nor the colonized...

India cited statistics of colonialism. On the continent of Africa, the problem was rather different. There was a situation where the UK, which had a home territory of somewhere about 94,000 square miles - less than 1,00,000 square miles - had an empire in Africa of somewhere about 2,250,000 square miles; whereas France, which had a home territory of less than 250,000 square miles, held sway over nearly 4,500,000 square miles; 6,750,000 square miles were colonial areas and, if the Trust Territories, were included it amounted to 8,750,000 square miles. Out of a total population of 191 million people were either subject to colonial rule or were in Trust Territories. Therefore, the vast continent of Africa, which was 130 or 150 times the size of the U.K. was still in part the latter's private domain, the rest being shared by France, Portugal and Spain. Not only was the whole continent retained for the purpose of exploitation, but certain sections of humanity were kept out of it by various devices, indeed even on the basis of apartheid.

India again noted in 1961 that Portugal's was the largest empire; it was the oldest ally of the U.K., a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Portugal owned 1.3 million square miles in the world, the greater part of it in Africa, with small enclaves on the Indian continent, in the Pacific Ocean, South and East in Timor and Macao. Portuguese colonialism did not even have the characteristic of nineteenth century or twentieth century colonial rule. It was characterized by cruelty and repression which had resulted in, according to authoritative estimates,- somewhat over 130,000 refugees fleeing into the Congo. (1)

Conditions in the Congo were not such that anybody would like to go there as if it were a sanatorium, but the conditions in Angola were obviously far worse and therefore refugees were driven into these areas, and they were going at the rate of 10,000 a month or so. These were not reports by political parties but by the International Red Cross, which was taking care of these people. They were mainly children driven from Angolan homes where men and women were forced into the modern slavery of forced labour. The view that was taken by the Portuguese Empire in this connexion was something that was inconsistent with the Charter of the U.N., indicted India.

The places mentioned by India afterwards won freedom from the Portuguese much to Third World's exhilaration. Since Cuban troops took part in the liberation of Angola under the command of the Soviets, Daniel P. Moynihan called them "Gurkhas of the Russian Empire."

Iraq assailed the Colonial Powers because they were the major architects of the policy of the 'balance of power' which was at the root of the dangerous world situation. Colonialism, as a policy of domination and exploitation of the weak by the strong, was not merely confined to the physical occupation of

1. Official Records 1025th Plenary Meeting, Date: 4.10.1961
Page: 246
territories and subjugation of peoples for economic purposes, but it was also a policy of indirect domination and the threat of the use of force, discrimination and corruption. It was quite erroneous to imagine that colonialism was dead. On the contrary, it survived and generated great trouble and danger. The fight against colonialism had been relentlessly carried out for the last few decades in the colonial territories and on the international level. It was condemned by the majority of mankind. Nevertheless, the fight against colonialism was still raging in parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Iraq was frank enough to admit that on colonial questions it was anti-Western. Its position regarding colonialism was definite: It wanted the complete liberation of the colonial territories and of the new States from colonial rule and all the vestiges of the colonial system. This did not imply that it was against everything Western. But it must be pointed out that the West was on the wrong side of a social and political revolution which was sweeping all the under-developed areas of the world. This revolution was in essence a demand by the new nations for equal political rights, equal economic opportunities, and the rule of law. The propelling forces in this great march for liberation from the bondage of past ages were no different from those which carried European society out of the ages of feudalism and serfdom.

In fact, the social revolution which was driving towards the goal of national independence and individual freedom and equality, found in the colonial system the main obstacle and roadblock to its fulfilment. Historically, colonialism was the one-sided rule of the human race by a European minority which imposed itself by force and treachery. The end of colonialism

1. Official Records 1028th Plenary Meeting
Date: 6.10.1961.
Page: 287
meant the promotion of normal relationships between the various races, nations and states, and implied, above all, the termination of Western political, economic and cultural domination over the under-developed countries.

The colonial system of relationships which was based on force and violence developed an ideology of the superiority of Western ideas and institutions. In consequence, and in order to maintain the old relationships, the imperialist ideology was fighting a rearguard battle, and thus violating the principles of the Charter, and creating conditions which threatened the foundations of peace and security in the world.

Neo-colonialism was, therefore, the principal form which the imperialist policy took under existing world conditions which were created by national liberation movements and by the retreat of the capitalist exploitation system in the face of the advancing socialist systems.

In many cases, the colonialists realized that power relations made it imperative to retreat to new positions. But it was evident that as long as the capitalist monopoly system remained as it was, the colonialists could not renounce their super-profits derived from invested capital, the domination and ruling of colonies, the resources of raw materials, cheap labour, markets, spheres of influence and capital investment, nor lose the strategic positions for their military security and otherwise.

For those reasons they sought to change their methods and tactics in order to keep their positions of domination under a new form, that is, neo-colonialism. Thus neo-colonialism was in essence an endeavour to conceal the new division of territorial and economic interests. This was to be achieved, among other things, by slowing down the process of liberation of the colonial peoples, and by maintaining the institutions devised under the colonial system.
In comparison with traditional colonialism, neo-colonialism did not reflect political and economic force and power, but rather the weakness and decline of the imperialist system. It nevertheless struggled to weaken and obstruct the national liberation movements, especially by indirect methods which, however, did not exclude the traditional use of force and violence, the oppression and extermination of people and the invasion of territories. In order to achieve its objectives, neo-colonialism, which appeared in many cases as collective colonialism despite inter-imperialist contradictions and rivalries utilized political, economic and ideological means.

Politically, neo-colonialism with the assistance and support of the reactionary and corrupt social elements tried to divide the national front and to prevent the formation of independent States. Economically, the main objective of neo-colonialism was to prevent the establishment of independence or autonomous national economies by maintaining the fundamental colonial elements of the economic system, such as production of raw materials, maintenance of the feudal and semifeudal agrarian structure and monoculture, obstruction of industrialization, keeping of unfavourable balance between imports and exports. Neo-colonialism hoped to create conditions which would allow it to perpetuate indirectly, and even to restore, the imperialist domination. In fact, neo-colonialism followed methods and tactics which aimed at retarding, and might even falsify, the achievement of the real independence and sovereignty of the new nations.

Iraq recalled that when Britain first established herself in the Arabian Gulf, it was a time of sharp colonial rivalries in this strategic region. Czarist Russia was trying to penetrate the warm waters of the Gulf and build a coaling centre at Kuwait. France was able to conclude a secret agreement with the sultan of Muscat. Germany came with her famous Baghdad railway scheme terminating at Kuwait and threatening British routes to India. But those reasons existed no more. The reason thereafter was oil. (1)

The Middle East contained 69 per cent, more than two thirds, of the proven petroleum reserves of the world, excluding the Soviet Union. Proven reserves are based on "guess estimates". Even then, the industrial West and Japan are totally dependent on Middle East fossil fuel, so much so that the Arabs after the 1973 embargo learnt to use oil as a political as well as economic weapon. According to Iraq, Kuwait itself had the largest reserves of oil in the Middle-east, some 62 billion barrels. Now it is believed that Saudi Arabia possess the greatest oil wealth in the Middle East. This was against 33.5 billion barrels, the estimated U.S. proven world reserves. Kuwait alone had 21 per cent of the proven world reserves of oil; this was more than the combined reserves of both the U.S. and the Soviet, which stood at 17 per cent. The value of these reserves, based on the 1961 ruling price, was estimated at more than $100 billion. The figures given did not include the neutral zone between Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, which had a reserve of 6.5 billion barrels.

In those days according to oil experts the most prolific single oil-field in the world was in Kuwait, which was then the leading producer of crude oil in the Middle East. Its output averaged around 1,900,000 barrels per day. The cost of production of oil in Kuwait was the lowest in the world. This huge interest was owned by the Kuwait oil company, a joint venture of the British Petroleum Company and the Gulf Oil Corporation of the U.S. The total profit to the Company calculated according to what was paid to the Sheikh from 1948 to 1960, amounted to $ 2,8000 million. Then Iraq quoted a statement made by Baroness Summerskill in the House of Lords on 19 July 1961.

The statement stated that the Sheikh received about £150 million from the Kuwait Oil Company and between £30 million and £40 million of this was invested in the London Stock Market.

1. Official Records 1059th Plenary Meeting
   Date: 21.11.1961.
   Page: 734
The Sheik's total holding was then estimated to be at least £300 million - 'and his investments represented between 8 and 10 per cent of all the new money available for investment each year in the U.K. That was Arab economic aid to Britain on a scale far larger than any aid enjoyed by an under-developed country'. This statement should explain the real cause behind Britain's attempt to separate and prolong its domination of Kuwait, under the guise of fake independence. That convenient arrangement would secure to Britain not only her share of oil profits, but also the colossal sums returned to Britain in the form of investments, as was pointed out by Baroness Summerskill. The other point was that by keeping Kuwait a convenient British base as indicated by the exchange of notes dated 19 June 1961, Britain intended to maintain her power and domination in the region, especially after the loss of her military bases in Iraq, following the revolution of 1958. Many Third World countries believed that by supplying arms to the Shah of Iran, the US. tried to create "an island of stability" that could keep a watch on the Persian gulf areas.

Interesting to note in this connexion is the fact the oil-rich Arabs prefer to keep their money in the First World countries and if those Arab reserves are withdrawn at a time, the First World countries would face a tremendous capital shortage. This became more potent after the price hike of oil in 1973. Not only they keep their money in the First World banks but they are interested in buying shares of industrial ventures like the Fiat, (Libya 10%) or Daimler Benz (Kuwait 14%) and real estates in the developed region. In fact as tourists and on the education of their children they spend money there and thus boost the economy of the First World. There are five thousand Saudis studying in the U.S. alone and there is a provision of an $80,000 a year stipend for each of the three thousand Wahabi plus princes ... (1) If a trickle of the petro-wealth was spent, kept or invested in the Third World, much of its economic development would have been ensured.

1. Paul Martin, The Times, reproduced in Delhi Statesman
   Date: 13.3.77
Saudi Arabia stated that the soldier with his armoury, the explorer with his maps and compass, the adventurer with his dreams, the industrialist with his capital, the governor with his golden maxim of "divide and rule", the jailer with his ship and handcuffs and lastly the missionary with his sweet tongue to preach the mission of love, peace and human brotherhoods (1) - all the heroes of colonialism and engineers of imperialism were made to play their roles. It was a thrilling, sensational and exciting drama, real, factual and actual as well. Three continents were involved - Asia, Africa, Latin America. Each and everything was involved - the people and their land, their liberty and their wealth, their markets, their sweat and tears. It was a hair-raising story which, at the end, found a conclusion of relief and comfort. Decolonization was the answer to colonization. The resolution 1514 (XV) was passed by eighty nine votes in favour, with none against and nine abstentions. Of those abstaining, were the U.S., the U.K. and France - the "Three Musketeers" of the free world ... (2). Arabia indicted the US because of its close association with the U.K. and France and its support for Zionism which is considered another version of colonialism in the Third World.

To Ghana formal independence was not enough. Colonialism was turning to new strategies. Instead of sailing against, it sailed with the wind of change, in order to maintain its last stronghold-economic and technological supremacy. In its last throes, it was almost resigned to death, but was at the same time preparing to rise, like a phoenix, from the ashes of its funeral pyre, and to rise, with renewed youth and vigour, to live through a more cunning and, therefore, far more dangerous cycle of neo-colonialism... (3)

1. cf"When the missionaries came we had the land & they had the Bible. They taught us to pray with eyes closed. when we opened eyes, We had the Bible & they had the land". - Jomo Kenyatta.
2. Official Records 1049th Plenary Meeting, Date:8.11.61, Page:593.
3. Official Records 105/nth Plenary Meeting, Date:17.11.61, Page:687
By neo-colonialism, of course, Ghana meant the practice of granting formal independence with the concerned intention of making the liberated country a client-state and controlling it or rather tele-guiding it, effectively by means other than political ones. It was in effect the maintenance of a hegemony through the agency of an interposed government and by means of a complex of economic, ideological and other weapons including the imposition of dubious military agreements. It was out to defend the same interests over the corpses of old-style colonialism; the nature and purpose of both were the same, only the methods were adjusted to modern conditions.

In these circumstances, the struggle against colonialism should be extended to all its forms whether economic or political, so that independence should be achieved quickly, and not merely in a formal sense, but in a true, complete sense. Colonialism must be finally liquidated with the least possible delay; independence was an urgent necessity, but it must not be purely nominal; it must not be a screen behind which the same foreign influences which had been known to overtly colonialist could continue to operate, warned Ghana.

Ethiopia accounted for the motive force of colonialism. The primary motive for the adventure of colonialism had always been the extraction of huge profits from expanding markets, cheap labour, an abundance of mineral resources and primary commodities. (1) To give but a few examples, the monthly salary that was paid to an African worker in Kenya in 1924 was less than what a New York manual worker in 1961 got per working hour. This was so only for an African worker who toiled to enrich his white rulers. Quite recently, in 1947 in Northern Rhodesia, the same principle was consecrated by law, which in effect gave an African miner precisely 28.6 times less wages than a white miner doing exactly the same kind of job. It was therefore quite an undeniable fact that the consequence of colonialism was exploitation, primarily of an economic nature.

1. Official Records 1058th Plenary Meeting Date: 20.11.61 Page: 725
The debates on colonialism took place in the year 1961 when Congo was groaning under the neo-colonial pressure. It was facing disintegration. So the debates soon turned into neo-colonial harangues.

To Mali neo-colonialism was no myth. Neo-colonialism might be defined as "the granting of a show of independence to a colonial or Trust Territory while the newly independent country was paralysed by means of economic and military agreements." (1)

Mali drew a complete picture of neo-colonialism in all its forms, it mentioned economic plans, such as the Constantine Plan and others, which mobilized considerable resources for official objectives regarded as unattainable; the securing of land for settlement; transfers of population; the violent destruction of working communities, together with their techniques and social order; population pressure, a vicious circle leading to the acme of under-development; miscalculations, wilful or otherwise, on the part of technocrats accustomed to think of economic development in capitalistic terms; and refusal to develop agriculture because colonialism wished to prepare a new arm for use against the peasant revolution, a socio-economic arm which was to "break" the peasantry (constituting 80 per cent of the indigenous population) by famine, over-population, exodus, the destruction of the traditional environment itself, and finally the creation of a "Lumpen proletariat" incapable, in most cases, of producing enough for its own subsistence. Elsewhere, neo-colonialism preferred indefinitely to subsidize poverty, indefinitely to remedy the agricultural deficit by gifts of cereals which would have to be increased as the deficit worsened, rather than to solve the agrarian

problem by the revolutionary mobilization of the under­employed rural masses. Neo-colonialism was also characterized by the co-existence, in the same nation, of a collectivist and authoritarian agrarian economy with an industrial economy subject to the capitalist rules of the game, which brought profit to an "elite set apart from the masses"; by the rapid growth of production for export, accompanied by stagnation or contraction in production for internal consumption, by the dislocation of the national economy, and the increase of its dependence on foreign markets. Such was the picture of neo­colonialism painted by Mali.

It saw colonialism and neo-colonialism as Siamese twins. Short of the complete and final liberation of the countries under colonial domination there could be no well-being, no possibility of economic and social development or indeed of any kind of development. That was why Mali held that on the general problem of eradicating colonialism no neutral position, no compromise was possible. One was either for or against colonialism. This radical attitude was shared among others by Tanganyika - a fellow African nation.

Tanganyika demanded that the end of colonialism must come quickly. Those who were free had absolutely no right to sit comfortably and counsel patience to those who did not yet enjoy their freedom. This was a matter of the greatest urgency, for it was an intrinsic part of the development of the human spirit. The word "neo-colonialism" meant the replacement of political domination by economic domination. (1)

Tanganyika assured that its opposition to colonialism was total, and not confined by space or time. No compromise, come what may.

According to Senegal, the course of decolonization concerned three interrelated fields: the political, the military and the economic. (1) Political decolonization meant the recognition of the right of peoples still under colonial domination to independence and self-determination. This principle had become a rule of international law which was binding on all. Senegal found it regrettable that some powers deliberately closed their eyes to this obligation. It thought in particular of Portugal, whose Government continued to commit revolting crimes in the various territories placed under its administration. To say that Angola or Guinea were Portuguese provinces was simply naivete or more likely stupidity, if not outright cynicism. On the basis of that monstrous idea, the Portuguese Government in defiance of all the resolutions adopted by the U.N., was engaged in an unprecedented repression of the peoples of those Territories, with a hysteria which verged on beastility. Senegal decided to break off diplomatic relations with Portugal and to grant asylum to the nationalists of so-called Portuguese Guinea who were prevented by the cruel oppression from campaigning in their own country, by normal democratic means, for the attainment of independence and dignity. It explicitly proposed that the U.N. should expel Portugal and South Africa - the two branded International pariahs. The Third World turned off its venomous taps to Portugal when Angola and Goa were liberated. But S. Africa was still going strong.

The same: Senegal urged the non-aligned nations to take critical look at themselves. Many of them caught the sickness of the former colonizers the spirit of intolerance and the desire for conquest. Senegal alleged that those who railed the loudest against colonialism were those who claimed the right to annex a brother state, on racial, historical or on even unreasonable grounds. (2)
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Cameroon lashed out at People's Republic of China. It alleged that the moral and material aid received from Beijing China by the rebellious group of the Union des populations du Cameroon (UPC), whose subversive aims were well-known, demonstrated that Beijing China's intentions and aims with regard to that country were far from peaceful, and that, on the contrary, they tended to foment and maintain within its borders, a permanent state of disorder and instability. This murderous activity, carried on and directed from Beijing, constituted beyond all question, an infringement of its national sovereignty, interference in its Republic's domestic affairs and a constant threat to international peace and security. On that ground it opposed Red China's admission also to the UN.

Every day at about 9 P.M. the People's Republic of China broadcast from Beijing a programme beamed on Cameroon, containing incitement to open revolt against its institutions and Government. Guerrilla weapons, many pamphlets and other propaganda materials were being seized which enabled it to establish, without the shadow of a doubt, that the Beijing Government was responsible for leading and equipping the localized "underground" groups still existing in Cameroon. Many young Cameroonians, attracted and led into China under false pretexts, received psychological and military training there for the sole purpose, after their return to the country of engaging in subversive agitation and serving as leaders and rank-and-file in a possible general rebellion. This was neo-colonialism, Chinese style.

As the policy of "apartheid" formed a part of colonialism, the debates then got around the dirty policy of S. Africa. To Ceylon the philosophy of "apartheid", seemed a perversion of Christianity rather than its apotheosis. Those theories
contained the seeds of a gigantic racial war in the not-far-distant future. Shootings at Sharpeville and Langa in the spring of 1960 might be compared to other historical incidents which had proved to be turning points of government policy, such as the Armenian massacres in Turkey in the nineteenth Century and the incidents at Amritsar of Jalianwala Bagh in India in the twentieth century. (1)

The Government of Ceylon had always considered "apartheid" as a part of colonialism. The U.N. was dedicated to the liquidation of colonialism which therefore fell outside the purview of Article-2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

In the Assembly debates on apartheid Ghana spoke once again. It expressed its heart-felt odium against the International pariah, South Africa. It was convinced that the only solution of the problem created by "apartheid" was to ostracise South Africa from the community of civilized nations. Ghanian delegation therefore urged that all States should implement resolution 1598 (XV) adopted at the second part of the fifteenth session at the earliest opportunity and act on the appeal issued by the Second Conference of Independent African States held at Addis Ababa in June 1960 to break off diplomatic relations with South Africa, to close their ports to all vessels flying its flag, to enact legislation prohibiting their ships from entering its ports, to boycott its goods, to refuse landing and passage facilities to all its aircraft and to interrupt air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication with it. (2) But with the blessings of the First World, S. Africa survived those "sanctions".

According to Dahomey, the policy of "apartheid" constituted a threat to international peace and the U.N. was in duty bound to act in time to prevent further catastrophes. The U.N. must
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take the action which the situation demanded, for the policy of "apartheid" constituted a real international threat. Quite apart from the unjust treatment meted out to the Bantu majority, the policy had repercussions on the future of other States. (1)

Libya considered that it was time for the Assembly to adopt positive measures against the South African Government, since all conciliatory proposals had proved of no avail. The South African Government must be given no further opportunities. The time for action had come. (2)

Syria believed that sooner or later, however, their self-confidence was bound to be shaken, for South Africa was becoming increasingly isolated from the rest of the international community. (3)

Tunisia observed that before the Second World War the Nationalist leaders of Africa and Asia had not anticipated that their cause would triumph within their own life-times. Since then, however, they had succeeded not only in leading their peoples to independence, but also in proving to the world by the economic and cultural strides which their countries had made under their leadership, that the effect of colonialism had been simply to hamper development. Just as the peoples of the colonies had been able to overthrow what had appeared to be the firmly entrenched power of their rulers, so the people of South Africa would find in themselves the strength to break their chains. When that revolt of slaves occurred it was likely to be accompanied by almost unprecedented violence, for which the champions of "apartheid" would have to accept responsibility. (4)

Ethiopia was so disgusted and outraged that it felt to appeal to the conscience of the South African Government was a pure waste of time. The Prime Minister of that Government himself had said that nothing would persuade him to abandon the policy of "apartheid". For fifteen years the South African Government had flouted the Charter. (1)

That the Latin thinking was flavoured with moderation was evident from the restrain that Brazil counselled in the debates. It opined that the proposal to impose sanctions was not realistic. It should not be forgotten that, apart from the legal aspect of the Assembly's competence to call for sanctions, its injunctions were only recommendations. It was very doubtful whether those recommendations would be followed by all countries particularly those which maintained active trading relations with South Africa and might perhaps be unwilling to sacrifice vital interests. An ineffective and incomplete boycott could only damage the prestige of the U.N. The only practical course which the U.N. could follow was to throw all its weight into an effort to encourage the liberals of South Africa and bring home to the South African Government the unanimity of world opinion. (2) S. Africa still defied world opinion successfully with blessings from many First World countries.

Speaking again India did not feel, however, that it was proper for the G.A. to call upon States to take action which should or could be taken in exercise of their own sovereign rights. The Assembly could only appeal to individual States and urge them to take such action in the exercise of their constitutional rights and in consideration of their treaty and other obligations. In that way full freedom would be left to each sovereign State to decide what action it should take in pursuance of the aims of the Assembly's resolution. (3)

Against the mounting criticism for its apartheid policy, S. Africa tried to defend it by saying that the white population of S. Africa was a permanent one whose ancestors had come to the country more than three hundred years ago. They were not "colonists", as was so often erroneously alleged. They could not return to the countries of their forefathers. They were strangers in those countries, just as the Roosevelts, the Eisenhowers, the Diefenbakers and the Vanderbilts were strangers in the countries of their forebears...\(^{(1)}\)

Secondly, the Bantu, or black, peoples of S. Africa were not the original inhabitants of the country. Their ancestors moved southwards from East and Central Africa and crossed the Limpopo River at about the same time as the original Dutch settlers arrived at the Cape. At that time the only inhabitants of the Southern end of Africa were nomadic groups of Hottentots and Bushmen. The Bantu living in S. Africa, therefore, had no greater claim to the southern end of the African continent than the white population.

Thirdly, S. Africa was a highly developed and industrialized country - the most highly industrialized country on the continent of Africa. This was accomplished against tremendous odds with considerable sacrifices, and by the initiative of S. Africans of European descent. By providing the necessary labour, non-Whites contributed their share to the development of the country.

Fourthly, the White population of S. Africa was being told by African countries and by some of the Asian countries, and also by the delegations of certain Western countries, that what had been built up over three centuries by their forebears and by successive generations of White S. Africans, must be placed under the control of the non-White majority. That would be the logical consequence of the demand for full political equality in the same State.

\(^{(1)}\) Official Records 1033rd Plenary Meeting, Date: 11.10.1961. Page: 392
It asked would the U.S. of America, Canada, the Latin American countries - all countries whose respective early histories of colonization were similar to that of South Africa - be prepared, if their relative proportions of White to non-White populations were the same as in S. Africa, to hand over the control of their countries to Negro or to Indian majorities? Few know that the word apartheid was in fact an abbreviated form of "aparate outwikkeling", which meant separate development, with emphasis on the word "development", concluded S. Africa. In fact the Whites wanted to be considered as Whites with a permanent stake in Africa.

It should be noted that a group of settlers revolted and independence was granted to S. Africa by Britain in 1910. Thereafter, the settler-regime consolidated itself. But in case of Rhodesia, the privilege and dominion enjoyed by the white minority dates back to 1890 - the arrival of English diamond millionaire Cecil Rhodes and the British pioneers who took the White man's burden to Southern Africa and founded the colony. It bore the name of Sir Cecil Rhodes who was knighted afterwards.

The problem in S. Africa as well as in Rhodesia is not the expulsion of the White settlers, the Afrikaners(1) but one of majority rule. In a country where the Whites are outnumbered by 22 to one, man for man, the Rhodesian army ranked among the word's finest fighting units. But to flush out the guerrillas was almost an impossible task. The principal proprietors and policy makers of the continent's white power bastions, fledgling Ian Smith and Vorster, did not seem amenable to reason and propriety for sometime. Between white obduracy and black tenacity there seemed to be little room for reason. Ian Smith illegally declared Rhodesia independent in 1965 to avoid majority rule.

1. Verkrampte (literally, cramped or narrow minded) Afrikaners - a proud, stubborn calvinist people with an imperious sense of their divine mission to lead Africa out of darkness.
As the First World shrugged off its responsibility, the guerrilla war that started in 1963 caused a lot of bloodletting. In October 1976 Mugabe formed an alliance with Nkomo whose smaller Soviet-armed Zimbabwe People's Revolutionary Army (ZIPRA) and the Patriotic Front stepped up its guerrilla forays. Moscow already buckled in a kind of red belt of influence across the middle of Africa by supplying arms and supporting the wars of liberation. That the new, Carter administration was serious about transfer of power and alive to the grave situation was evident from the repeal of the Byrd amendment which permitted the U.S. to buy chrome and other strategic materials against U.N. sanctions and also the repeated emphasis put on the observance of Human Rights by the White House, Ian Smith's regime caved in soon. The two guerrilla leaders met with representatives of the biracial Muzorewa Govt., which was a stop-gap caretaker govt., for an all-parties peace conference at London's Lancaster House in December 1979. Chaired by the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Carrington, the 15-week talks produced majority constitution, a ceasefire accord and a transitional plan that temporarily returned the country to British colonial rule. In the election that took place in March 1980, Mugabe's Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) swept up 57 seats out of 80 seats reserved for the blacks in the 100 member House of Assembly. Rhodesia took the new name of Zimbabwe. Thus a black-rulled Zimbabwe became a reality. With the country's main agricultural, mining and manufacturing industries freed from the shackles of international sanctions imposed after the unilateral declaration of independence, economists expect a steady rise in the gross domestic product and a boom in exports. It could be the larder, the power-house and the bank of Central Africa.

Sooner or later, the odd ball of the dreadful 19th Century paradigm, S. Africa, is bound to bow down to the imperatives of indiscretion. The Third World geared its diplomatic machinery

1. Time Date: 17th March 1980.
to put all kinds of pressure and helped build world public opinion. The public opinion in the western democracies too felt outraged at the asinine effrontery of the minuscule white regime. Today's meaningful attitude of some of the First World Countries was to a great extent the result and reflection of the mood of the millions who thought keeping Ian Smith and Vorester in power was tantamount to putting the clock back and thus holding the inevitable. Mugaba's victory, according to press reports, caused concern among the Whites of S. Africa. After the Zimbabwe election, S. African Prime Minister Pieter Botha told his National Party followers that some apartheid laws - such as those banning interracial marriage and sex could be relaxed in order to defuse mounting pressures for social and political change. But his promised reforms fell far short of Black African demands for one-man, one-vote equality. The Zimbabwe election also hardened Botha's stand on Namibia (S. West Africa). Mugabe's victory left white-ruled S. Africa more isolated than ever behind a ring of less than friendly black states; consequently, there now seems to be little chance that the Pretoria will agree to internationally supervised elections in Namibia. Instead, S. Africa backed parties in the huge territory may be tempted to go ahead with their own version of unilateral independence. If that happens Nambibia might become a new International outcast, and the theatre for an increasingly bloody civil war.

There was no discordant note in the Third World chorus because there was complete aggregation of interests among its members. Because of interest aggregation the G.A. passed the De-colonization resolution and much of the Third World now stands decolonized, at least politically. In their attempt at decolonization, the Third World was always supported by the Second for currying favour with the new Afro-Asian states which reduced its minority position in the G.A. and pressed its case against the western powers during the Cold War. One of the oldest Portuguese colony, Angola was liberated by joint Soviet-Cuba participation. Because of unflinching unity and monolithic
stand on colonialism the Third World was able to play an effective role in easing tension and ridding the World of an obnoxious paradigm.

Interesting to note in this connexion is the fact that no angry diatribe is directed against the British (crown) colony of Hongkong where the British, the Chinese and the local inhabitants enjoy the benefits of untramelled capitalism with an ideologically clear conscience. Hongkong is a major hard currency earner for China where Beijing could do business peacefully, profitably and without political embarrassment or objectionable local controls. Red China knows that it could not possibly permit a laissez-faire economy to continue under its own jurisdiction if Hongkong returns to China. The British lease is scheduled to expire in 1997. Since as a colony, it serves better the interests of the parties concerned its continuation as such is welcome. Free trade, free enterprise and free monetary exchange did away with customs duty, purchase tax of VAT. It has become a leading commercial, banking and communication centre on the eastern rim of the Pacific - a kind of "commercial laboratory" where socialism comes to terms with a vibrant consumption-oriented, profit-conscious society - a Chinese colony instead where the British are no better than the eunuchs at the Persian court.

ZIONISM:

Zionism, according to Encyclopaedia Britannica, is a Jewish nationalist movement that has had as its goal the creation and support of a Jewish national state in Palestine, the ancient homeland of the Jews, which is called in Hebrew "Eretz Yisrael" (the land of Israel)... Though Zionism originated in eastern and central Europe in the latter part of the 19th Century, it is in many ways a continuation of the ancient and deep-felt nationalist attachment of the Jews and of the Jewish religion to Palestine, the promised land where... Some Arabs might judge the Lord's injunction to Moses in "Deuteronomy"(1:7) as an early example of Zionist expansionism: "turn you, and make your journey, and go to the hill country of the Amorites (a mountain tribe that lived among the Canaanites) & unto all the places right there unto as far as the great river Euphrates".
one of the hills of ancient Jerusalem was called Zion. This attachment to Zion inspired the Jews throughout the middle ages and found its expression in many important parts of their liturgy. In fact, one cannot separate parent from child, the Jews from Zion. Judaism too is not merely a nationality, or a race, or a culture, or a religion, but an inextricable mixture of all these.

The interest in a return of the Jews to Palestine was kept alive in the first part of the 19th Century more by Christian millenarians, especially in Great Britain, than by Jews themselves. Among the few Jews pleading then for a Jewish settlement or state was the American Mordecai Manuel Noah (1785-1851), who in 1813 became US Consul in Tunis and later high Sheriff and surveyor of the port of New York. In 1825 he acquired Grand Island in the Niagara river and invited the Jews of the whole world to create a Jewish state, Aravat, there. More important but not more successful were the attempts by Lord Shaftesbury, Sir Laurence Oliphant and others in Great Britain to create a Jewish state in Palestine. Some political writers thought of a Jewish state in the Holy Land as a means of assuring the overland route to India. Others were inspired by religious or mystic ideas.

Whereas in Western Europe the Jews became in the 19th Century an integral part of the nations whose citizens they were and fully adopted their language and culture, the Jews in eastern Europe, then identical with the Russian Empire, lived as a separate community with their own language, Yiddish, their own civilization and their own economic structure. A very small trickle of Jewish Youth from Russia went to Palestine and founded there the first agricultural settlements. Though these early settlements were able to survive only with the help of Baron Edmond de Rothschild of Paris, they laid

1. 1878 Founding of Petach Tikva (Gate of Hope), a pioneer village of Jewish immigrants from Russia.
2. 1882 First Aliyah (wave of immigration) of Jews from Russia and East Europe to Palestine started.
the foundations of practical Jewish colonization in Palestine.

A new impetus was given to Zionism by Theodore Herzl, an Austrian journalist. Herzl had no living ties with Jewish and Hebrew traditional values. He never desired the rebirth of Hebrew as the Jewish national language. In his novel \textit{Alitneuland} (1902) he depicted the future Jewish life in Palestine in terms of life as he had known it among the liberal assimilated central European Jews. In this novel, his testament to the movement, he rejected all narrow nationalism and demanded above all brotherly consideration for, and closest co-operation with, the Palestinian natives in a common homeland.

Herzl moulded Zionism into a political movement of world wide significance. The centre of the movement was established in Vienna, where Herzl published the official weekly, \textit{Die Welt} ("The World"). In 1903, the British government offered an area of 6000 sq.mi. to the Zionist organization in the uninhibited highlands of Uganda. This offer led to violent controversy and even a split in Zionist ranks. A minority under the leadership of Israel Zangwill was willing to accept the offer. Members of this minority founded in 1905 the Jewish Territorial organization with the aim of finding an autonomous territory for those Jews who could not or did not wish to remain in the countries in which they lived. The majority of the Zionists, most of them from Russia, insisted on Palestine as the only field of activity for Zionism, and the Seventh Zionist Congress in 1905 rejected any colonization outside Palestine and its neighbouring countries.

The growth of Jewish settlement in Palestine was due to the "practical" Zionists, who were opposed by the "political" Zionists who insisted on the granting of a Charter as an essential pre-requisites for colonization. With the growing strength of the Young Turk nationalist movement in Turkey
especially after 1908, the prospects of obtaining a Charter dimmed considerably. But in spite of small financial means, urban development and agricultural settlement among the Jews in Palestine made steady progress. The situation changed with the outbreak of World War I. Zionist work in Palestine came to a standstill. Turkey and Britain were at war. An opportunity offered itself for "political" Zionism to reassert itself and to combine the old British sympathies for Zionism with the opportunities of political warfare. As a result the centre of the Zionist movement shifted from Germany, Turkey's ally, to London. In the wake of the Russian Revolution of November 1917 and of the consequent civil war with its pogroms perpetrated by the white armies and because of the intensified nationalism of the various succession states of post World War I Europe, great misery spread among eastern European Jews. From then on the financial and economic strength of Zionism came from Jews in the U.S., the masses of its adherents from 1920 to 1938 came from Poland.

The British Governments hoped that a declaration in favour of Zionism would help to rally Jewish opinion, especially in the U.S., to the side of the Allies, and that the settlement in Palestine of a Jewish population attached to Britain by ties of sentiment and interest might help to protect the approaches to Suez Canal and the road to India. The Balfour Declaration fell short of the expectations of the Zionists, who had asked for the reconstitution of Palestine as "the Jewish national home. Instead, the Balfour Declaration envisaged only the establishment "in" Palestine of "a" national home for the Jewish people.

In the years after 1920 Zionism increasingly concentrated upon building up Jewish urban and rural settlements in Palestine, perfecting autonomous organizations there and solidifying and intensifying Jewish cultural life and Hebrew education. But Jewish immigration into Palestine remained relatively small until the rise and spread of Hitlerism in Europe.
From the beginning the Arabs in Palestine bitterly resisted Zionism and the British policy supporting it. Several times they rose in revolt, especially in 1929 and in 1936-9 claiming the right of national self-determination; as they represented the large majority of the inhabitants, and demanding the preservation of Palestine as an Arab homeland. Therein they were supported by all the other Arabs. The British repressed the Arab rising for independence, but recognized the genuine character of Arab nationalism and Arab fears.

To S. Arabia colonialism was the sine qua non for Zionism. As such it traced the genesis of Zionist movement. In his inaugural speech at the Zionist Congress held in London in 1900, Theodore Herzl, the father of Zionism, said: "English, with her eyes roaming over all the seas, will understand us and our aims." He was addressing his words to England, at that time the greatest of the imperialist countries.

On 18 May 1901, Herzl, in his first interview with the Ottoman Sultan, offered £1,600,000 to secure a charter for Jewish colonization in Palestine. The Sultan, a sovereign of great integrity, rejected the offer and refused the bribe.

On 27 October 1902, the same Herzl interviewed the British Colonial Secretary, Joseph Chamberlain, asking him to allow Jewish colonization in Cyprus. Not in Palestine this time, but in Cyprus - just because the whole idea was one of imperialism anywhere. But the British Minister refused the idea. The next day Herzl met with Lord Lansdowne, the Foreign Secretary and proposed Jewish colonization in the Sinai peninsula. Herzl went to Cairo to negotiate with Lord Cromer, but the Egyptian Government rejected this scheme completely.
On 8 February 1920, referring to the future success of Zionism, Mr. Churchill - the greatest, or the last, architect of the British Empire said the following:

"If, in our lifetime, be created, by the banks of the Jordan a Jewish State, under the protection of the British Crown, which might comprise three or four millions of Jews, an event will have occurred which would be especially in harmony with the truest interests of the British Empire."

To the U.S., Zionism was explained as a movement of development to drain marshes, to irrigate the desert and to bring progress to the whole area. And, these were the very same arguments of colonialism in its march in Africa and in Asia...

To Great Britain, the Zionist movement was advocated a movement "to defend the Suez Canal and the route to India."

The Zionist movement explained its motives, once to France, once to the U.S., once to the U.K., once to Germany and, lastly, to the Soviet Union. Thus Zionism moved from one lap into another as an imperialist movement. It appealed to all. But it was the British who, on 2 November 1917, in an attempt to gain the support of Zionism in its war effort of the First World War, communicated to whom? To Rothschild, one of the greatest pillars of colonization - declaration to facilitate Jewish colonization in the Holy Land. Immediately after the First World War, against the will of the native people and at the point of British bayonets, Jewish Colonization started.

Zionism established two institutions, known as the Keren Kayemit and Keren Baysod, to finance colonization, just like many financing institutions in Algeria established by France, and just like many financing institutions in the Congo established by the Belgians. The result, as testified by

Sir John Simpson, the official expert of the U.K. was that many thousands and thousands of native peasants became landless. They became landless as a result of this Jewish colonization.

But what was amazing was that such a movement of imperialism should have its headquarters in the U.S.? The greatest and the first to rebel against colonialism and imperialism, the U.S. with its glorious record of anti-colonialism, Zionism was housed and financed in the U.S. The U.S. seemed to be stock-market for Zionist bonds and the like. Whether they liked it or not, this was imperialism on behalf of the U.S.\(1\)

Syria affirmed that the Arabs were convinced that Zionism was one phase of aggressive Western imperialism. The Zionists were brought to Palestine to be used by the Colonial Powers against the Arabs. Western colonialism wanted to have a bridgehead in Palestine. Arab fears and apprehensions were amply justified by the British favouring of the Zionists in Palestine and by Zionist arrogance and dispossession of the poor Arabs of Palestine of their lands...\(2\) The Arabs their pride stung by the creation of Israel and convinced from the beginning that Israel was occupying their national territories, had refused to accept the very existence of the Jewish state.

There was nothing inevitable about the need to create a Jewish state. In religious terms, "Zion" traditionally was not an earthly realm but the Kingdom of God and the "return" would be through divine intervention, not the setting up of a secular state. Some Jews felt that their people's destiny was not to

---
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become a small state among other states in the Middle East but to seek opportunities - and make contributions - in other cultures the world over. Hitler did much to resolve that debate and to seal through horror the belief that Jews must have a country where they would never, under any circumstances, be outsiders. Thus, Israel was born in an extraordinary confluence of prophecy and politics.

Truman supported the UN plan for partition of Palestine in 1947. He announced recognition of Israel eleven minutes after its formation and promptly received Israel's first President, Chaim Weizmann, in Washington...

The terrible irony of the Middle Eastern tragedy is that the early Zionists actively wished peace and co-existence with their Moslem neighbours. They never wanted the Arabs to pay the price for the creation of a Jewish state. As early as 1924, for instance, David Ben Gurion declared, "we have no right to deprive a single Arab child, even if through such deprivation we shall realize our aims"...(2) In later years, as hostility between Israeli and Palestinian heightened, Ben Gurion was to remark "If I were a young Arab, I might also be one of the fedayeen".

In spite of vitriolic Third World verbiage against Zionism, the state of Israel is a fait accompli. Survival is the Jewish sacrament. Even the secular-minded are compelled to regard Jewish survival through millenniums of repeated exodus and holocaust as one of history's miracles. Israel is that miracle's latest and perhaps most remarkable incarnation. For the Jews of the World, the founding of Israel - those steeped in biblical faith prefer to speak of its "restoration"-

1. Time March 10, 1975
2. Time April 30, 1973
was something of a miracle. Let no one forget, the incredible war of 1948 in which the forces of one tiny nation defeated six invading Arab armies. Let no one forget the Six-Day War, when the Egyptians literally abandoned their shoes as they tried to get back across Suez Canal, leaving their armoured corps in a smoldering heap in the Mitla Pass. Israel today exists in a state of euphoria. And why not? Militarily it has never been so stronger. Economically, it has never been more prosperous. Statistically, its achievements are virtually unparalleled in history. At the time of proclamation of the State of Israel, at Beersheba, there were a couple of huts and some Arab Bedouins, the best place in the world to get murdered. In the 1970s, there was a university and that was achievement. After centuries of wandering in the Diaspora, the people of the covenant had returned to their promised land. No longer did the passover toast, "Next year in Jerusalem", represent an impossible dream. It was reality where life seemed to be a permanent revolution.

A nation, surrounded by implacably inimical Arab states whose populations outnumber it 42 times, has not only survived more than a quarter-century of strife and war, but grown and prospered beyond its founders' wildest dreams...(1)

Pitted against this formidable adversary are the Arabs of whom the late General De Gaulle of France once said,"Did you ever see an Arab building a Dam?" True that the petro-wealth has made them the "money people" and in the era of energy politics Arab oil would put meaningful pressure on the US - Israel's unswerving supporter - to change its policy towards Israel. Contrary to late Saudi King Faisal's aphorism that "oil and politics do not mix" - the Arab oil embargo on the US and the Netherlands for their pronounced pro Israeli stance just after

1. Zionist Writer Ze'ev Jabotinsky once remarked in the 1920s, "we won't really be a country until we have Jewish Policemen and Jewish prostitutes". Today Israel has both.
the Yom Kippur War of 1973 drove a chilling wedge of recession and compelled them to compromise. The Egyptians and — Syrians fought well in the war, destroying the myth of inevitable Israeli victory. Arab nations were finally able to form a common front, destroying the myth of inevitable Arab disunity. The diminution of the Cold War made Israel's role as a bastion of US influence in the Middle East seem less vital to US interests. Belatedly, the Arabs discovered public relations and began to cultivate US opinion.

US imports of Arab oil would be likely to climb to 50% by 1980. In addition to US energy dependence on the Middle Eastern Oil moguls, their mammoth deposits in the leading American banks made the US more vulnerable to pressures from the oil-rich depositors. In any disagreement with US policy, a bloc of OPEC nations could quickly withdraw its deposits, possibly leading to a dangerous disruption in the foreign exchange market, or slap an oil embargo again. In any case the US could no longer soft-pedal Israeli violations or down play the Arab interests as oil as a political as well as economic weapon gave the Arab an increasing leverage in Washington. From a Jewish point of view, the sentiment in favour of Israel in the US seemed to be counteracted by declining guilt over the Holocaust and an increased sympathy for the Palestinians. The world seemed to be turning against Jews and willing to sacrifice them up. In the wake of the 1973 oil embargo there were proposals for a US - Israeli military pact lest Tel Aviv was dropped from the US allies' list the way Taiwan was deserted to make room for Beijing China. That the US credibility to its allies was not sacrosanct or taken for granted was proved when it coaxed Beijing and gave it a permanent seat at the SC - the seat which was traditionally reserved for Taiwan and which it had denied over the decades to Beijing... (1) Another American turnabout can not be ruled out completely.

1. Soviet Premier Aleksei Kosygin once asked LBJ, Glassboro, N.J. in 1967, "I don't understand you Americans backing Israel. There are 80 million Arabs (the Premier was a little off: at the time the population of Arab countries was 110 million) and only 3 million Israelis. It does not make sense. Why do it". Replied Johnson: "Because it is right." - Time March 10, 1975
Partly because of their continued insistence on security through territory, the Israelis suddenly seemed intransigent to many people. They seemed to have tapped emotional springs of agony and sympathy for Israel a little too much. The nations of Western Europe appeared willing to bargain away Israel's security in return for access to Arabian oil in the wake of Arab oil squeeze in 1973. The US could hardly allow Western Europe and Japan to go down the drain and deepen recession at home in order to support Israel. After all American participation in Israel's fate has been mainly vicarious. Thus contrary to King Faisal's claim that oil and politics do not mix, the newfound oil weapon can be used profitably by the Arabs to force the industrial countries to sign on the dotted lines and shore up their own deficiencies.

But then again the Arabs have to face the first generation of deliverence, the Hebrew children who did not know what anti-semitism was, the sabras... They are tanned, cheeky and free - the diametrical opposite of the Diaspora child who was pale, white and frightened. A typical sabra is tough, proud and unemotional. He is ashamed to be ashamed, afraid to be afraid. The Israeli born Jew is also a bit weary of hearing about the sufferings of the Diaspora, if not openly scornful of the Diaspora Jew's passive acceptance of his fate. As a group, the Sabras tend to dismiss or be uninterested in grand visions of Zionism; yet they are jealous about the fate of their homeland. They tend to be more tolerant and respectful toward the Arabs of Israel than their parents are. Everybody knows that the only way Israel can be ousted from the territories once held by the Arabs is by force... The only way to solve the

1. The Sabras take their name from the sweet - centered prickly-skinned fruit that thrives in Israel's desert lands. These native born Israelis account for half of the population.

2. Jews lay a 4000 year claim on Palestine against Arabs' 1300 Yrs. Moslem Arabs seized Palestine from the Christian Byzantine Empire in the 7th Century A.D.
Middle East muddle is for the Palestinian people to be incorporated into a state of their own - either federated with Jordan or a separate state between Jordan and Israel. That would relegate the Hashemite King to an emir and Jordan to a kind of political "has been".

The State of Israel was foisted on Arab territories and since the new state could flex its military muscle on the bounty of the European Jews and Yankee largesse, the Third World wrath is directed not only against Zionism but also against its promoters. The Zionists are usurpers who displaced poor Arabs now wandering as Palestinians across the Arab hearland. As Zionism is dubbed as another version of colonialism, the issue draws prompt denunciation and odium of other Third World states. To the Arabs as well as well as the Third World, Zionism means colonial expansion. Israel was carved out of Arab land. To the Jews, Israel holds out the last chance of their survival. A kind of "adversary partnership", some sort of accommodation, would give good political dividends - rhetorics of support - to everybody.

During the time of the British mandate in Palestine, Arab leaders would never sit at the negotiating table with their Zionist counterparts. After the creation of Israel in 1948, the boycott was even more through. At the Arab Israeli Lausanne conference of 1949, the two sides stayed in separate hotels, never saw one another, and communicated only through couriers. When Lebanon's Charles Malik was President of the GA, he once strayed into the Israeli pavilion at an international fair and drank a champagne toast. He was photographed in the act and was savagely attacked throughout the Arab world. (1) The Arabs in fact tried to consign Israel to a kind of ghetto-existence of international isolation. (2) Israel was maddened by isolation and the fear of an imposed peace. The psychological gulf separated Israelis and Arabs since the creation of the Jewish State.

2. Henry Kissinger.
Time honoured Arab Israeli blood feud took a dramatic turn when Egypt's Anwar Sadat...\(^{(1)}\) descended to the promised land in the winter of 1977 like a messenger from Allah on a magic carpet. Prophet Mohammed made a covenant with the Jews of Medina 1355 years ago. Sadat's pilgrimage reconciled Jacob with his brother Esau, who fathered the Edomites, said to be forebears of today's Arabs and brought the prospect of a negotiated settlement within the realm of hope. The Middle East, of course, is strewn with the ruins of old hopes for peace. But Sadat this time forged a tight alliance with Saudi Arabia - a country considered as a vital source of US energy supplies. To the Arab radicals, Sadat is a traitor and his peace-offensive no better than a political thuggery. Saudi Arabia, with its oil wealth and its links to both moderates and rejectionists, remains crucial to any permanent peace in Middle East. Henry Kissinger's "shuttle diplomacy" laid stress on step-by-step solution or theory of gradualism to shore up Arab morale and humiliation. Sadat also believes, to start with, a Palestinian entity should receive such "symbols of sovereignty" as a flag and the right to issue its own passports. For the first time, Egypt would have non-Arab allies in the region. Un-official alliance of Egypt, Israel, and Iran might link three countries with complementary economic assets: Egyptian manpower, Israeli technology and Iranian oil wealth. The political basis for such a partnership would be common opposition to extension of Soviet or leftist power in the Middle East. Such a surreal drama would draw the background actors - the US and Saudi Arabia - the countries who have a political and economic investment in Middle East stability.

The emerging American blacks are gradually supporting the cause of the Palestinians. So there is a constant pressure at home and abroad to soften the American policy. If the USA is to reckon with the Third World friendship, it must toe the Palestinians line. The Settlement of the Palestinians would resolve the Zionism issue once and for all.

1. Declared Man of the Year, 1977, by Time Magazine.
Non-alignment is a policy of national interest—foreign policies of nations who are not in an alliance with either the Communist or Western bloc.

It prospered in the post-war background of nationalism, anti-colonialism and desperate problems of economic—underdevelopment. A highly developed sense of nationalism honed the independence movements of the newly created states of Asia and Africa even in the absence of a common language and culture. As a matter of fact cultural ties, education, law and administration of Afro-Asian states, and even personal sentiments of their leaders were predominantly western. Once decolonized the nations seemed preoccupied with the threats to their independence in the garb of neo-colonialism. The new nations did not attain that stage of stability or efficiency in administration which could insulate them against new forms of interference. To them both sides in the Cold War were suspect. The non-aligned countries thus tried to play one side off against the other in order to obtain increased supplies of aid and also protect themselves against the designs of the rival powers.

Non-alignment as a policy seemed to have matured beyond ideology. Cold War equations in the early 1950s needed a political surgery badly and non-alignment seemed to have provided just that. It emerged from the tight Cold War groupings when many of the Third World states felt impelled to strike a balance between the two rival blocs. Seeds of non-alignment, an awareness of forming a third force, the necessity of wielding the collective influence of small nations could be traced in the early years of the UN. Many of them considered themselves no better than foothills or piedmounts of power round the Great Powers. Some of them—Pakistan, Iran, Turkey, Philippines—cringed in terror at the sight of the military muscle of the Super Powers and joined the regional pacts as reluctant actors. According to
Michael Breecher, their real interest was two-fold, a negative-positive compound. First was the spectre of war between the Super Powers. Second was the desire for capital and technical assistance.

The valiants, the evangelists of true grit, stayed back and launched what became known as non-alignment. Those who did not take their cue from the Super Powers and remained beyond the pale of military alliances, felt alienated and that awful sense of alienation was turned into a profitable movement that showed the world that the concept of peaceful co-existence was a more pragmatic approach to the cold war realities than armed confrontation. The ideas of positive peace were sold to a world that was groaning under an awful pressure of armaments and atomic proliferation. When — ideological semantics could not be held to an artful minimum, when armament race was carried to such indiscreet lengths that humanity wobbled on the verge of an apocalypse, non-alignment invaded the world scene as epiphanic blasts of flash powder. If non-alignment can be described as poor nation's art of survival, detente between the Super Powers is in effect an euphemism of peaceful co-existence. In a sense detente and SALT (Strategic Arms Limitation Talks) are latter day Super Power versions of peaceful co-existence and disarmament.

That the need for a third force was felt in the early days of the UN was evident from the Assembly Speeches of Philippines, Liberia, Colombia and Syria in 1948-49 much before the Bandung Conference of 1955. Initially it meant equi-distance from the Super Powers.

Philippines realized that the small nations, for their part, could help to avert war by pooling their strength and wielding their collective influence as a third force dedicated to the cause of peace. Less involved than the great Powers in the

1. The New States of Asia, Michael Brecher,
snares of the grim struggle for the political and economic mastery of the world, the small nations were in a better position to represent the true will and the real interests of mankind. The Philippine delegation called upon the small nations to close their ranks and present a solid front against any attempt to undermine the peace...(1)

The Liberian representative was sure that he expressed the feelings of all small nations when he said that they watched with fear and anxiety the political struggle among the great powers for control of the universe. They could not refrain from a certain feeling of nervousness when they observed the division of the world into two blocs: one side, the forces of Communism and on the other the forces of democracy. They did not want to be involved in that deadly struggle for world domination. Hence Liberia wanted a policy of non-alignment...(2)

But at that point of time there was no official policy or movement labelled as non-alignment.

Mr. URDANETA-ARBELAEZ (COLOMBIA) declared that when the spokesmen of the smaller nations appeared on the rostrum before the Assembly, from where their voices could be heard throughout the world, they were imbued only with an ardent desire to tell the truth as they saw it, and fully determined to speak the truth with courage and frankness...(3)

Syria argued that if the US and the USSR had been left in isolation, and if the small States had taken a neutral attitude, treating each problem separately and judging what was right and what was wrong without condoning the purpose and intentions of the two great States, their attitudes would have altered.
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and their obstinacy would have given place to a spirit of compromise. Syria asked why should not the small States, therefore agree among themselves to form a third camp and hold the balance in their hands. That camp would in fact be the camp of peace, for the small States had no ambitions, they harboured no ill-will toward anyone, nor had they any imperialistic design... (1) It should be noted that the word "bloc" was skilfully avoided. The non-aligned nations preferred to be called as a Third force or a camp instead. All they wanted was to protect the weak against the ambitions of the strong and to establish justice, right and peace, with malice toward none and with goodwill for all.

Uruguay remarked that if disagreements and disputes existed among the great Powers and if a deadlock was reached in negotiations to ensure peace, the many small countries distributed through the world could obviously, if united, play a decisive part in keeping up a steady movement on the road towards that more lasting peace which was so much desired and hoped for by all. (2) A sense of identity was in the process of being forged in 1954.

Syria spoke again in 1955. It did not forget, however, that the handful of independent States was no longer a handful. A new phenomenon was emerging. A number of States came to the UN with a free mind and independent judgement. Particular mention might be made of the African-Asian States. They were not a third bloc, nor did they wish to be. They were an expression of independent thinking. They approached international problems on their merits, and on their merits only. As a matter of fact, in Africa and Asia they differed in creeds, cultures and races. But their common ground had always been peace through freedom. They came

---
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to the UN with their wounds still fresh. They were awakening - they were rising in moral and material strength. They were to form a kind of third force in bi-polar politics.

India declared that it did not belong to the great Power blocs. They were referred to sometimes as "neutralists", "neutrals", "uncommitted areas", and this and that and the other. It stood pledged to carry out the principles and purposes of the Charter. It thought it was in their interests and in the interests of the world. It believed the policies that it followed—namely, respecting the sovereignty and integrity of other countries, not being predetermined in their relations and, what was more, pursuing what might be called the path of collective peace and not relying on armed groupings—were consistent with the purposes of the UN.

Peru equated the small States with the Members of the chorus in a Greek tragedy, impotently watching the approach of destiny with all its tragedy and infamy. But this was not enough. They were unwilling to be mute and impotent witnesses to a tragedy, because they too would be destroyed in such a tragedy. As in the Greek play, all the figures on the stage would be destroyed. This seemed to have been overlooked by those who should realize most of all that a spark ignited anywhere in the world could cause a universal conflagration.

Nepalese Government believed in maintaining peace and friendship with all nations and in a policy of non-alignment with any one of the international power blocs. It did not want to commit itself beforehand to support one bloc or the other in the event of difference or war between them. This, however, did not mean that it was shirking responsibility or sitting on the fence. It merely wished to retain its independence of
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judgement even as a small nation. Of course, when there was a choice between good and evil, or right and wrong, it certainly knew what to choose, and its history was in itself a proof of its capacity of judgement in such a situation. It believed in assessing every international issue on its merits, without consideration of anybody's fear or favour. (1)

To Nepal the policy of non-alignment was nothing but a recognition of existing international realities and had nothing to do with the concept of neutralism which was often ridiculed in interested quarters and which implied a lack of response to basic questions of international life. Therefore, the policy of non-alignment did not, mean that it was neutral on many international questions, and neutral towards different ideologies that prevailed in the world. It meant that it decided each issue on its own merits, and did not commit itself beforehand to the position of either of the two Power blocs by joining either group of military alliances in the form of military pacts. (2)

Pakistan (3) felt that the smaller countries were in a position to play a very constructive role in moderating the policies of the great Powers. They were in a position, collectively, to exercise great moral influence on the larger Powers towards the settlement of their differences and the reduction of tensions among them, in the spirit of the purposes and principles of the Charter. However, if the smaller countries were divided amongst themselves, not only would their influence be ineffective, but they would risk losing their independence and freedom in the maelstrom of big-Power rivalries.
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Pakistan believed that any classification or grouping would be arbitrary. Any attempt at arriving at such a classification, for instance into "non-committed", "non-aligned" or "neutral" States and "committed", "aligned" states, would run counter to the sovereign equality of Member States, would be mischievous, would set in motion strains and stresses which might threaten the very existence of the Organization and would, in any case, seriously discount its effectiveness. In short Pakistan admitted the role of small nations but at the same time did not favour any kind of label. Without becoming a member of the non-aligned group, it joined the military alliances.

Senegal's desire to be independent of the two blocs was expressed by the different countries in formulas which must be carefully scrutinized. Some spoke of "positive neutralism", others of "non-commitment" and still others of non-alignment". What was important, of course, was not the formula but the reality of its independence; it must therefore avoid using ambiguous terms which were open to criticism. When it spoke of positive neutralism, it must first remember that it was impossible to be neutral. The course which it chose was not a neutral one; it was political attitude, a specific and positive action, in regard to the problem of peace.

Guinea said that non-alignment could not be another negative attitude with regard to questionable interests, for it would then serve only to aggravate the harmful effects of the cold war. Its attitude towards different problems was determined solely in the light of the high objectives it had set itself.
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Lebanon liked to remind the Assembly that the search for a definition of non-alignment was a rather delicate matter when it was taken up in Cairo. Non-alignment was as hard to define as aggression, or even law, and jurists and diplomats who had exercised their vast wits for dozens of years were not able to agree on definitions of those terms. However, it was quite willing to adopt the excellent definition of non-alignment given by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal.\(^1\)

Iraq noted that the world was no longer governed by the big Powers, and therefore it was the right and duty of the non-aligned nations to intervene effectively in world affairs, particularly with regard to those policies of the great Powers which affected the present and future destiny of the rest of the world.\(^2\)

Tunisia observed that the small countries, free from any commitment to one or other bloc and poorly equipped with destructive means and weapons, nevertheless represented a tremendous moral force; they were particularly well qualified to give sincere expression to the profound anxiety of the universal conscience racked and tormented by the tragic prospects of human destiny. They were in a position to make this voice heard and to bridge the gulf between the two great antagonistic blocs. They had no desire to constitute a third force, nor lay down the framework or to dictate the terms for the settlement of this or that problem, but it was their duty to keep reminding the great Powers that the values of civilization were the common heritage of all mankind and that no effort must be spared to safeguard these values and to set up an international order governed before all by the rules of law and morality.\(^3\)
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UAR(1) remarked that alignment and non-alignment grew, in fact, together after having been born almost on the same day. Besides being two parallel growths, they represented two parallel departures, a real departure by the members of the two blocs from the precept of unanimity between the permanent members of the SC, and an apparent departure by the non-aligned countries from the precept that all members of the UN must be aligned formally as allies, through the Charter, in safeguarding world peace and security, and in realizing the purposes which they had agreed to serve.

It was obvious that non-alignment, as intended, referred only to antagonistic blocs, and was a counter-balance to their disagreements which seriously endangered world peace and security. It was not intended to be a passive attitude of indifference to what was going on in the world, or a mere protest against the upsurge of antagonistic blocs whose cold war quarrels and rivalries shook the foundations of peace.

Cypriot non-alignment was the source of its freedom of judgement and independence of approach to world problems, allowing its stand to be determined by what was right and just in each case. Its non-commitment to any bloc became its commitment, and a strong commitment, to moral principle.(2)

Non-alignment in a nut-shell was a home spun doctrine especially made for the smaller and weaker nations. It was immune from the polemical snafus of the cold war. It was thus repugnant to both the camps. To the capitalists, Nehru and Tito were not neutral but aids and allies of communist imperialism in fact and in effect, if not in diplomatic verbiage.(3) In the communist world the non-aligned nations were known as "running dogs of imperialism".

1. Official Records 1034th Plenary Meeting; Date : 11.10.61  
Page : 411
2. Official Records 1039th Plenary Meeting; Date : 18.10.61  
Page : 484
3. AF1-CIO President, George Meany in 1955.
But in essence, with Nkrumah, they were marching neither right nor left, but forward. To the non-aligned poor cold war conflict was a fundamentally inhuman, perversely blind and a parochical obsession.

PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

Linchpin of the non-alignment credo seemed to live and exist side by side with the powerful neighbours in this little planet called earth. Such a living together presupposed an atmosphere of peace because with the first sign of hostility these hapless countries might be the most unfortunate casualties. The small nations were scared out of their skins at the prospect of the military muscle flexing of the great Powers. A growing sense of helplessness prodded them to preach peaceful co-existence, a system that ensured a chance of survival for all the heterogenous elements, assortments of nations rich and poor as well as big and small. That common helplessness and fear syndrome bound them together to propagate the gospel of peace and kept them away from bloc rivalry.

Senegal in the sixteenth session of the G.A. 1961, tried to explain what it meant by peaceful co-existence. In order to drive its point home it quoted Shepilov, minister for foreign affairs and a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, who had defined peaceful co-existence as a struggle — a political, economic and ideological struggle. In Senegalian view peaceful co-existence should be free of any taint of cold war. Then it quoted a Yogoslav Ambassador to France who had said that peaceful co-existence between states of different political systems implied an atmosphere of mutual tolerance and understanding. In a complex world with marked differences in political, social and economic conditions there ought to be an ever greater variety in the forms of political and economic organization for stability and useful collaboration in International relations. Having retained the spirit and method of socialism Senegal interpreted peaceful co-existence not only in terms of complete disarmament but also of renunciation of

ideological conflict. Understanding and tolerance were not mere moral concepts. They were positive factors of peace.

Then again it recited a Khruschevite definition of peaceful co-existence that in its simplest form peaceful co-existence meant renunciation of war as a means for settling matters in dispute. It also meant renouncing interference in the internal affairs of other countries for the purpose of changing their regime or mode of life or for any other motive whatsoever. In order better to satisfy the needs of mankind peaceful co-existence could be transformed into peaceful rivalry. Senegal concluded declaring that under-developed countries comprised two thirds of mankind and represented a stake for the imperialist regimes. But because they represented a stake they could, if they wished, bring great weight to bear in world affairs. The Great Powers were to be judged not by their words but by their deeds... (1)

Uruguay felt that for small nations, indeed, world peace was a singularly precious thing. Peace was the precondition of their survival. Other nations might venture forth on the stormy seas of war, for small nation there was no choice. In the family of nations the clamour of the small nations, regardless of the military power behind them, was the expression of the general will, the will of the people which according to a wise saying was the will of God. When the only alternative to negotiation, talks and meetings was total war, the choice did not appear difficult... (2)

Peru never conceived of peaceful co-existence merely in the negative sense that no state of war was declared. It considered peaceful co-existence was incompatible with psychological warfare, hostile propaganda, support of subversive movements or attempts
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to foster directly or indirectly, the difficulties which other peoples might encounter in the process of their development. Co-existence, if it was to be termed peaceful, called for understanding, sympathy and a mental outlook which found expression in frank and loyal co-operation of every kind and in renunciation of all claims to political supremacy.\(^{(1)}\)

To Indonesia peaceful co-existence and negotiations required mutual respect and reciprocal treatment on a basis of equality. That belief was in commensurate with Indonesia's philosophy of life as embodied in its State ideology, the Pantja sila or Five Principles: namely, first belief in God, second, humanity; third, nationalism; fourth, democracy; and fifth, social justice. Panch Sheel became a household word in the mid 1950s.\(^{(2)}\)

Non-aligned nations staked their lot beyond the Super Power periphery and were remunerated. To start with they stayed equidistant from the Super Powers but in course of time drew close of equal proximity. In any case their interests were served in the jig-saw puzzle game. The committed ones soon found alignment unpaying and military imponderables gradually receding in the background. Moreover in military imbroglies the gangman stood as a mute spectator counselling restraint. When Turkey and Greece, both members of the NATO fought over Cyprus, the US could do nothing more than suspend military and economic aid. But both sides resented US action. Similarly, the cod-war between Iceland and the UK could not be averted by regionalism. These shortcomings were pointers to the counterproductive nature of military alignments. The common ground on which the elaborate edifice of commitment was raised soon gave way to the inveterate vital interests of individual states. The bogey of communism could not pull back break-away France to NATO. The over-kill proportion of nuclear deterrents taught the Big Powers to live peacefully. As for the countries of the Third
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World who were once partners in defence, they were no better than the country cousins of the Big Powers. Pakistan and Iran are the two disillusioned nations knocking at the non-aligned door. No wonder they wanted to unstring themselves from the military mesh. All these factors together accounted for the swelling of the non-aligned ranks. In a sense the Third World was indeed like a company. It had 'a product' - non-alignment and peaceful co-existence - which it shared with its customers - mostly world's weaker nations.

Thus non-alignment and peaceful co-existence helped an alliance-weary world bid riddance of frequent Super Power sabre-rattling and ease tension. Some of the Third World countries' flirtation with both the worlds, depending on the nature of issues, made the Big Powers realize that faiths and sides could be swapped without guilt and there was basically nothing wrong in emulating peaceful co-existence at least for a change. The Third World then, by its integrated stand on non-alignment and peaceful co-existence, has enabled these norms of peace, if peace norms they are, to march on to victory. In fact today in a world faced with nuclear menace real peace would emerge if all states in the world accept these two peace norms - Non-alignment and Peaceful co-existence.