CHAPTER TWO

ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT
Non-Aligned is a post-second world war concept. Its roots go back to the period of the first phase of the national liberation struggles of the colonial peoples, immediately after the second World War.¹ The Non-Aligned was born in the context of the cold war, and out of the disintegration of the traditional colonial system. The policy of the Non-Aligned can be traced in the outlook and foreign policy orientation of the newly independent Afro-Asian States, which, in the post-second World War era, decided to steer clear of the cold war and retain their hard-won freedom by upholding an active and independent foreign policy.

The policy of Non-Aligned has been in operation for over four decades and is being practised today by about 108 countries.² The concept of Non-Aligned emerged in the late 1940's and has firmly established itself since the

The policy of Non-Alignment today includes over two-thirds majority of the membership of the United Nations, and the Non-Aligned nations constitute a majority of the human race.

The termination of World War II witnessed certain basic changes in the international milieu, which resulted in qualitative changes in the nature of the international political system. Most obvious of the effects was the rise of a bipolar power constellation, with the two Super Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, threatening to demarcate the world into two rival spheres of influence. This power configuration, which came to be termed as cold war, lasted for more than three decades following the end of the Second World War.

To the intensification of the cold war ran parallel yet another world phenomenon, which perhaps proved to be instrumental in the birth of the Non-Alignment. This was the process of decolonization which made rapid strides following World War II, resulting in the liquidation of colonial empires and the consequent emergence of a number of independent states on the world map.

With the escalation of the cold war, the Super Powers began jostling against each other, taking advantage of the internal weaknesses of free countries. Their interference in the affairs of the new states caused sharp deterioration in international relations. The United States tried to exploit the fear of communist expansion in these states while the Soviet Union tried to keep as many of them out of the sphere of the American influence as possible. In other words, it has yielded place to a new kind of imperialism with advantages of the past without the opprobrium of its manifestations.

The United States donned the mantle of UK, France, Holland and all other imperialists of the yore. Apart from its desire to control the supply of strategic raw material and oil and secure its markets, the United States' strategy has been emphasised on East-West issues and de-emphasised on various regional or local problems to have a strategic consensus between the United States and the other lands threatened by the Soviet Union and heavy reliance on arms sales abroad to cement their consensus.

It was during such a state of world politics these newly independent countries challenged the right of the developed nations to monopolize decision-making and refused to join "bloc politics" and pursued a policy of Non-Alignment, which was essentially an expression of their individual identity and their overwhelming desire to be independent of any foreign influence. Instead of flowing someone else's guideline, they wanted to judge each issue in world affairs on its merits from their own respective national perspectives.

Non-Alignment is the desire and ability of an independent country, or more accurately, of a country that truly feels itself to be independent, to follow an independent policy in foreign affairs, it is the desire and ability to make up its own mind, to take its own decisions or not to take them, after judging each issue separately and honestly on its own merits.

It was Jawaharlal Nehru who contributed the concept of Non-Alignment to the vocabulary of international relations. Non-Alignment, as Nehru conceived it, is best defined as not entering into military alliances with any country, and in

particular with any country of either the Western or the Communist bloc. The second essential of Non-Alignment, according to Nehru, is acting according to our best judgement, an independent approach to foreign policy, not being tied down to any particular line of action because of membership of a cold war bloc. And the third essential is an attempt to maintain friendly relations with all countries, whether belonging to military blocs or not.¹

All the three aspects are so important for a proper comprehension of Non-Alignment that it would be useful to quote Jawaharlal Nehru on what he meant by Non-Alignment. He said in the Lok Sabha on 9 December, 1958: "... When we say our policy is one of Non-Alignment, obviously, it means Non-Alignment with military blocs. You cannot have a negative policy. The policy is a positive one, a definite one, and I hope, a dynamic one, but insofar as the military blocs today and the cold war are concerned, we do not align ourselves with either bloc. That in itself is not a policy; it is only part of policy... one has to lay stress on the fact that we are not parties to the cold war and we are not members of, or attached to, any military bloc. The policy itself can only be a policy of acting according to our best

judgement, and furthering the principal objectives and ideals that we have.... Broadly Non-Alignment means not tying yourself off with blocs of nations or with a nation. It means trying to view things, as far as possible, not from the military point of view, though that has to come in sometimes, but independently, and trying to maintain friendly relations with all countries".¹

To have a clear picture of Non-Alignment, perhaps it would also be useful to indicate what, in Nehru's view, it is not. Non-Alignment does not mean neutrality. Neutrality has little meaning as a policy except in times of war. In a sense it is true that if we take into account the cold war between the two blocs, India might be said to be neutral insofar as it has decided that it would not join either bloc. The term "neutrality" may, however, connote that the country which adopts such a policy has no positive opinions on the issues which divide the blocs.² This certainly is not true so far as India is concerned, and the term "neutrality" is, therefore, inapplicable to India's policy. On significant world issues, especially insofar as they relate to war and peace, India has spoken clearly and with conviction. To cite a few instances, it condemned the British and French invasion of Suez as a "naked aggression" (1956); and it


condemned, albeit belatedly, Soviet interference in Hungary (1956) and it had earlier considered the North Korean troops merching into South Korea as "aggression".¹

Non-Alignment is to be distinguished from neutrality. In the words of Jawaharlal Nehru before the United States Congress in 1955: "Where freedom is menaced or Justice threatened or where aggression takes place, we cannot be and shall not be neutral".² The representative of India declared in the UN General Assembly: "We are not neutral in regard to peace, we are not neutral in regard to dominance of imperial and other countries, we are not neutral in regard to economic and social problems that will arise".³

The concept of Non-Alignment does not and cannot include the concept of equidistance.⁴ As Nehru understood it, Non-Alignment did not mean that the Non-Aligned countries should be equidistant the opposing military and political camps; rather it meant Non-Alignment with bloc policy, i.e.,


with a policy contradicting the interests of young independent states. As Indira Gandhi later explained: "It is untenable to interpret Non-Alignment as equidistance from the Super Powers. On the contrary, Non-Alignment is something very positive. It means taking every chance to improve the outlook of peace and to adopt a clear stand on matters on which we have strong convictions. Take racialism and colonialism. Did not the so-called democratic West take obstructive positions on decolonization and apartheid? Even now, looking at the support given to South Africa and Israel, its record does not shine. The Soviet Union's consistent stand on such matters has brought us closer together. The question is not of our voting with the Soviet Union so much as the Soviet Union voting with the countries of Asia and Africa, and supporting freedom movements and struggle against colonialism".

Several phrases like, "positive policy for peace", "positive neutrality", "non-engaged", "keeping aloof from blocs", "independent policy", "friendly relations with all", etc., are commonly used to denote Non-Alignment. The term


"Non-Alignment" became popular during 1950's when it was first used in the United Nations by the then Indian representative there, V.K. Krishna Menon.¹ The Egyptian President Nasser preferred the term "Positive Neutralism". The Burmese Premier U Nu said: "this policy has been called neutralism in cold war". The western socialists were in favour of using the terms neutrality or neutralism rather than "Non-Alignment".²

Many writers have persisted in maintaining that Non-Alignment is merely a synonym for neutralism or neutrality. Neutrality involved abstention from all conflicts, whereas Non-Alignment only involves abstention from the cold war. Non-Alignment has not implied neutrality in the anti-colonial struggle nor in conflicts between the developing and the developed nations. Indeed a claim has often been made that Non-Alignment may involve active participation in cold war disputes provided that each issue is decided "on its merits"; rather than by regular support of a bloc leader.³ The distinctions between Non-Alignment and neutralism may be summed up by the difference between an activist and an isolationist approach.

Non-Alignment has often been defined as an independent foreign policy.\(^1\) It is an expression in the international field of the independent spirit and the independent judgement of a nation. It reflects a country's own perception of its national and international interests and its own view of the world, looking at the world, as Jawaharlal Nehru used to say, through one's own eyes and not through the eyes of others.

Nehru's credit was that in elaborating the doctrine of Non-Alignment, he took into consideration not only the interests of his own country but also those of all countries which gained their independence.\(^2\) He feared that without a correct foreign policy orientation the young national states would again become easy prey to the imperialist states in their neo-colonialist designs. Nehru saw the concept of Non-Alignment as a means of bringing the emerged countries together and creating a united front of struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism.

To some Non-Alignment means a negative attitude to world affairs. To be very clear in their attitude, some Non-Aligned countries have sought to their policy positive neutralism, dynamic neutralism etc. Many countries have even

---

suggested the abandoned of the term in favour of a new name which would express positive attitude and objectives.\textsuperscript{1} Probably this was the reason why Nehru did not approve of the term Non-Alignment in the beginning.\textsuperscript{2} Later, it was he who defined the term and gave it currency. Still, the Non-Aligned countries are not agreed on the connotation and denotation of the term. There have been a number of differences on the emphasis, meaning and implications of Non-Alignment, for like alignment, Non-Alignment is no longer monolithic.

Non-Alignment is not the only or the most satisfactory term by which the policy or attitude it denotes is represented. Even Jawaharlal Nehru, who coined the term Non-Alignment, was not quite happy with it because of its apparently negative connotation. Non-commitment, non-involvement, neutrality, neutralism, positive neutrality, positive neutralism, dynamic neutrality, independent and active policy, peaceful active co-existence are some of the terms used to denote the idea of Non-Alignment.\textsuperscript{3}

However, because of the single reason that Belgrade and Cairo Summit Conferences regarded the term "Non-Alignment"

\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
as the most authoritative term for the policy which all the members claimed to follow, it came to be accepted. It is indeed true that the basis of the concept of Non-Alignment was made evident by the pronouncements of its founding fathers and thereafter summarized and crystalized by the Cairo Preparatory Conference held in 1961 to discuss the first ever Summit of the Non-Aligned countries.

The term "independent-policy" was more frequently employed during the period 1946-50; the term "peace-area-approach" was preferred during the period 1950-58 and the term Non-Alignment came into vogue after 1958; but it was maintained that change in terminology does not reflect any change in policy.

The term "Non-Alignment" as used by the statesmen of various Non-Aligned countries, inspite of different implications, always refers to an active policy. For instance, in his more important speeches on foreign policy in 1950's, Jawaharlal Nehru stressed the active quality of Non-Alignment.

Neutrality and other terms signify primarily a country's status of non-participation in hostilities when other countries are at war. Yet in international law a neutral state also has certain duties and claims certain rights. This conception is however of recent date.

Non-Alignment is not the neutrality of a non-belligerent country during a general war, though many seem to take such a view. It is not the neutrality of the Swiss or Austrian band guaranteed by other nations by a treaty.¹ That is to say, Non-Alignment was not established on a treaty of a group of nations; on the other hand, it is a movement. Non-Alignment is not only a policy to be followed in order to promote peace and prosperity. It does not disapprove of friendship or cooperation of countries for the sake of development, peace and understanding. But it is against bloc alignments.

Non-Alignment and Non-Aligned countries do not represent a third bloc against the two existing blocs (the United States and the Soviet Union). Such an idea runs counter to the basis of the policy of Non-Alignment. Jawaharlal Nehru describing the idea of a third bloc or third power said, "If it meant a third area which did not want war, which worked

for peace, and which believed in cooperation, I would have no objection to it.¹

Non-Aligned countries are not at all following isolationist policies. On the other hand they are playing an active role in major world conflicts and international policies. Non-Aligned countries are determined to play a dominant role in the event of great world conflicts. They do not want to keep aloof. At times there are instances wherein they played a role even beyond their capacity.² Prince Norodom Sihanouk told the Belgrade Conference that Non-Alignment represented a dynamic form of international life, not an unhealthy and passive intervention.

Non-Aligned countries are equally interested in themselves as they are in the aligned countries. This can be proved by the statement of Jawaharlal Nehru: He said "It is certainly true that our instructions to our delegates have always been, to consider each question first in terms of India's interests and secondly on its merits. I mean to say if it did not affect India, naturally, on its merit, and not merely to do something or give a vote just to please this power or that power....."³

It is said from the very beginning that Non-Alignment is not just a policy of a country but one of those things that the world requires; otherwise world remains divided into two camps, opposed to each other. There must be something an area of peace, not territorially, but politically, diplomatically, morally etc.

The philosophy of Non-Alignment includes Nehru's Panchasheela, Tito's Peaceful Coexistence and Nasser's Arab Nationalism. When they first came to power Nehru, Tito and Nasser, founders of the Non-Alignment did not consider that their countries would lead a new Movement in the Third World. Therefore, it is essential to discuss how India, Yugoslavia and Egypt became Non-Aligned countries and formed a group under the following circumstances.

INDIA: NON-ALIGNMENT

The Indian concept of Non-Alignment as the main pillar of its foreign policy deserves a deep probe, if only because among the Non-Aligned countries that were under colonial rule, India was the first to gain her independence. Nehru, the Indian Prime Minister who laid down the very foundation of India's foreign policy, has been considered a pioneer in


the evolution of the concept of Non-Alignment in the Post-
Second World War era.

Jawaharlal Nehru writing clearly in his book "The
Discovery of India" about India's role to be played after
independence in world affairs insisted that India could not
play secondary fiddle in the international arena. As he
wrote that "India, constituted as she is, cannot play a
secondary part in the world. She will either count for a
great deal or not count at all. No middle position
attracted me. Nor I do think any immediate position
feasible".¹ These lines explicitly point out how Nehru's
mind was working on the shaping of India's future foreign
policy, i.e., the concept of Non-Alignment. It reflects
that it should have its own independent policy in regard to
establishing relations with countries of the world.

As early as 1946 Jawaharlal Nehru, as Vice-President
of the Interim Government, held a press conference on 2
September and proclaimed that India's foreign policy was
based on Non-Alignment. He made a proclamation again
repeating it in a broadcast on 7 September. He visioned
that "Non-Alignment would be the basis of foreign policy of
many states in Asia, Africa and Latin America".²

1. Nehru, Jawaharlal, The Discovery of India, Segnet Press,
Calcutta, 1946, p.36.
2. Sengupta, Jyoti, Non-Alignment - Search for a Destina-
tion, Naya Prakash, Calcutta, 1979, p.7.
wanted that India would keep away from all power blocs but at the same time have friendship with both the Great Powers—the USA and the USSR—to avoid war and to work for peace. Nehru's Non-Alignment was active pursuit which would be possible because India would not be a partner in any bloc and at the same time would be friendly to all.

Nehru began to build Asian unity only after India became independent. There were obvious reasons for this. Among the many factors listed by Nehru which go to make the Asian countries unite together, apart from geography, were: firstly, the experience of colonial domination by Europe; secondly, the process of "finding oneself" after their coming together; thirdly, the fear that freedom may be lost to Europe once again; and fourthly, the common economic needs.¹

Since India was the first among the Asian countries to cast off its colonial bondage, it took lead in giving a call for forging the unity of the people of the continent, for developing solidarity with Africa, for helping newly independent countries in revolving foreign policies within the framework of Non-Alignment, for building zones of peace, and for establishing friendship.²

1. Jawaharlal Nehru: India's Foreign Policy, Selected Speeches 1946-61, p.261.
In the early fifties, the international situation sharply deteriorating, the cold war had begun and aggressive military alliances were being created: in April 1949 NATO, in September 1951 ANZUS Pact, and in September 1954 SEATO. The Warsaw Treaty Organisation came into being in 1955.¹

Of the greatest importance for the further evolution of the Non-Alignment principles were the between India and China talks in April 1954, India's attempt to project her moral approach became a sustained propaganda offensive with the Five Principles or Panchasheela offered as a solution to the world's problems. They were first launched in a trade and communications agreement for Tibet, between India and China. The preamble said that the two countries have resolved to enter into the present agreement based on the following principles:

1. Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty;
2. Mutual non-aggression;
3. Mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs;
4. Equality and mutual benefit; and
5. Peaceful co-existence.²

2. "India-China Agreement on Tibet", April 29, 1954, given in Foreign Policy of India, Texts of Documents, Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi, various editions.
The Panchasheela was able to receive the explicit endorsement of the Soviet Union, only one month after the Warsaw Pact had been signed.\(^1\) Within three years, 18 countries from all parts of the world, with the exception of the major Western Powers, had endorsed the Panchasheela in Joint Communiques and joint statements with various Indian leaders. The Panchasheela was also incorporated in the Ten Principles enunciated at Bandung Conference of 1955 and after a cursory and acrimonious discussion in the last three days of the session were partially endorsed in a United Nations' resolution in December 1957.\(^2\)

To maintain that India's simple moralistic approach has not made a useful contribution to international affairs is not to deny that India's actual role in many specific issues has been extremely valuable. In the early 1950's India's warnings on the consequences of American troops entering North Korea, her assistance in achieving a Korean armistice, her contribution to the Geneva Settlement on Indo-China and her persistent lobbying in the UN for progress in disarmament talks are but the highlights of India's early foreign policy that consistently matched well in practice with the later development of the ideology of

---

1. Ibid., India-USSR Joint Declaration of June 23, 1955.
2. UN Official Record, 12th Session, Plenary, p.624; First Committee, pp.399-449.
Non-Alignment. But actually Panchasheela was only a tool of Indian diplomacy and not the basis of policy.

The policy of Non-Alignment believes in the principle of peaceful co-existence and Panchasheela. In other words Panchasheela or Five Principles are the essential pillars of Non-Alignment.¹

YUGOSLAVIA AND NON-ALIGNMENT

The three founders of Non-Alignment were very different from each other in their perspectives on the world. For instance Yugoslavia, unlike the Afro-Asian Non-Aligned States, was an ally of one of the parties of the cold war before becoming Non-Aligned.² Tito was the leader of a country that had in 1948 successfully survived a confrontation with one of the Great Powers and has ever since felt the need to guard against possible intervention by the Soviet Union.³ Yugoslavia's determination to adopt an uncommitted stand in world affairs sprang from two sources: Tito's refusal to allow Yugoslavia to become a satellite of the Soviet Union, and his strong urge to see Yugoslavia play an independent and constructive role in world affairs.


Yugoslavia's foreign policy strategy resulted from her peculiar relationship with the Soviet Union. Tito was determined to resist the strict ideological conformity sought to be imposed on Yugoslavia by Soviet Union. Tito's adamant attitude resulted in his expulsion from the Cominform in June 1948 and at end of the year Yugoslavia began to assert her right to have a limited co-existence with the West without jeopardizing her separate identity.

In 1950, both Edward Kardelj, the Foreign Minister of Yugoslavia and Tito declared that, having severed their relations with the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia had no intention of joining any other camp. At the fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly it was asserted that "The policy of Yugoslavia cannot accept the assumption that mankind must today choose between the domination of one Great Power or another. We consider that there is another path, the difficult but necessary path of democratic struggle for a world of free and equal nations. For democratic relations among nations against foreign interference in the domestic affairs of the people and for the all-round peaceful cooperation of nations on the basis of equality".2

1. Lyon, Peter, Neutralism, Oxford University Press, Bombay, 1964; p.130.

The Korean crisis of 1950 had made Yugoslavia realize that as the Soviet Union had been guilty of oppressive policies towards her East European allies, so also the Korean crisis proved that the United States was interested in exploiting the crisis to her advantage in containing communism. This made her reject Western overtures and assert that "We should rather go hurry and barefooted than sacrifice our independence". ¹

In 1953, Tito concluded an agreement with Greece and Turkey, which came to be known as the Balkan Pact, for mutual cooperation and military and civil aid when attacked by any adversary.

Tito's visit to South Asia in 1954 marked the beginning of an effective rapprochement between Tito and Nehru, the two pioneers of the Non-Alignment. Paying tribute to the newly-emerging Asian countries in the world, Tito asserted that "People who have suffered bitter trials in the past and who have achieved their independence at the cost of heavy sacrifices and efforts are best able to understand one another today, irrespective of the races they may belong to, and irrespective of their numerical strength and the size of the countries". ²

---

In the joint communiqué issued at the end, the two heads of states noted the similarity of the historical development and socio-economic condition of the states as well as the fact that both had gained independence by way of strong popular liberation movements. They proclaimed their adherence to Non-Alignment which both felt was an active, positive and constructive policy.

In 1955, Yugoslavia further widened her foreign policy base when Tito had his first meeting with Nasser of Egypt, which was in February of that year, and then attended the Bandung Conference of the Afro-Asian states in the same year. At Bandung, President Tito observed that it was impressive that the Conference was attended by twenty-nine states with different social systems which were represented by a number of different races, political ideologies and religious beliefs, and that they found ways and means to examine outstanding problems in a constructive manner and formulate common attitudes as a manifestation of the viability of the principles of active peaceful co-existence.1

Major changes occurred in the Soviet Union after the death of Stalin leading to a rapprochement between Tito and Khrushchev. The Balkan Treaty was soon forgotten. Tito

became a communist ideologue arguing for Khrushchev's new policy of co-existence.\(^1\) But the Soviet-Yugoslav detente, their relations fluctuated dramatically. Khrushchev's was opposed to any influence of Titoism in the Soviet camp. The Hungarian crisis of 1956 dramatically increased the threat perceptions of Yugoslavia leading to a significant increase in defence spending. Tito was very cautious in his remarks about the Hungarian situation so as not to irk Khrushchev. Yugoslavian delegate in the UN argued that a debate on the Hungarian situation would only aggravate the situation and his country was not in favour of it. Thus until 1961 the key concept of Yugoslavia's foreign policy was 'Peace and active co-existence'. In 1961 it was simple to weld 'co-existence' together with the ideas of other leaders so that it formed a part of Non-Alignment.\(^2\)

**EGYPT: NON-ALIGNMENT**

The origin of the Egyptian Non-Alignment can be traced in long-standing Egyptian national interests. Though independence had been officially granted to Egypt by the British in 1922, after her being under British control since 1882, it was not before 1936 that Egypt was allowed some amount of independence in formulating her foreign policy. However, with the condition that Britain would retain her right to have a permanent military base in the Suez canal

zone. Immediately after the Second World War, Egypt's struggle was directed towards freeing herself of what remained of the British control over her. It was only in 1954 that Egypt succeeded in making Britain agree to withdraw from the Suez Canal Zone.¹

The creation of the State of Israel in 1948 gave the Arab League a common enemy and added an immediate lasting sore to Egyptian and Arab world hatred of Great Power policies. The humiliation suffered by the Arabs at the Israeli hands in Palestine wars was a potent factor making for the creation of an Arab collective security pact of 1950 and paving the way for an eventual overthrow of monarchy in Egypt.²

After the fall of monarchy, and assumption of power by Nasser, Egypt's attitude seemed to be that all Arabs and all true nationalists in Afro-Asia are neutralists.

Egypt's interests according to Nasser's conception, lay in three circles, the first widening into the second and beyond into the third: the 'Arab Circle' the 'African Continent Circle' and the 'Islamic Circle' - with Egypt in the Centre.³ Throughout the 1950's the First Circle of the

---

³ Ibid., p.31.
world continued to be of prime importance for Egypt. There was a series of crises to absorb Egypt's attention. Egypt vigorously opposed the Baghdad Pact, which attempted to bring Arab states into military alliance with the West.

In 1955, on being refused aid by the United States after the attack by Osrael on Gaza, Egypt turned to the Eastern Europe for help. In 1956 saw the culmination of the Egyptian nationalism, and a determination to follow an independent policy, when, again on United States' refusal to finance the construction of the Aswan Dam, Nasser announced the nationalisation of the Suez Canal, with the result that she suffered the tripartite invasion.

In 1960 friendship with Nkrumah and the Congo crisis led Nasser to play an active role in the African Second Circle. Nasser never paid serious attention to the Islamic Circle and indeed when Saudi Arabia and Iran took the lead, in late 1965 and early 1966, in promoting international Moslem political cooperation, Nasser was even antagonistic to the idea, fearing that it would be a conservative force.


2. Nasser's attack went as far as to claim that the conference was designed as an 'Islamic Pact' to replace the Baghdad Pact and place the Arab Moslem Countries under Anglo-Saxon influence', Keesings Contemporary Archives, 1965-66, p.22661.
Professor Mazrui characterised Non-Alignment as Egypt's Fourth Circle.¹

Arab Nationalism is the origin of Egypt's interest in Non-Alignment. Robert Stephens referred to Nasser as the most powerful symbol of radical Pan-Arab Nationalism; with its aspiration for complete independence from foreign power and he further said that "To mobilise the Arabs behind Non-Alignment meant also exposing Arab causes more actively over Palestine and the remaining Western imperial footholds in the Arab world as well as resisting attempted communist penetration".²

On the diplomatic front Nasser tried to improve relations with other Afro-Asian unaligned countries, beginning with a visit to Belgrade. Nasser also attended the Bandung Conference and got the Chinese support against Israel. The nationalization of the Suez Canal, the Suez war and its aftermath showed what a wide sympathy and wide support a neutralist state could secure in repelling the imperialist domination. The Soviet Union and China quickly showed that any neutralist state at loggerheads with the Western Powers could rely on their support and there began a

period of close Egyptian - Sino-Soviet accord. The USA on the other hand criticised the Anglo-French and Israeli invasion of Suez. Subsequently Egypt abstained on all the ten UN General Assembly resolutions criticising Soviet Aggression on Hungary.

The personal contacts between President Nasser, Tito and Prime Minister Nehru culminated in the 1956 Brioni meet. The Union of Egypt and Syria in 1958 as the United Arab Republic gave Nasser a free hand to manoeuvre between East and West, as the Union rounded the ascendancy of Egypt in the Middle Eastern affairs. Further since mid 1950 Nasser also began to cultivate relations with fellow neutralist states. Inspite of the defection of Syria from the U.A.R. in 1961, every Arab Government whatever its political colouring had to take serious stock of what its relations with Nasser ought to be. He enjoyed good relations with both USA and USSR and he had been instrumental with Tito in arranging the Belgrade Conference of the Non-Aligned in 1961. Thus the policy of positive neutralism (Non-Alignment), which demanded vehement opposition to all cold war alliances and promotion of radical Arab Nationalism, was instrumental in enhancing the diplomatic status of Egypt and thereby preserving its national security.

In a sense, the Asian Relations Conference held in Delhi in 1947, the Conference on Indonesia held in Delhi in 1949, the Five-Power Colombo Conference of 1954, and the Bandung Conference of 1955 were forerunners of the Belgrade Conference of Non-Aligned Nations.¹ These Asian and Asian-African gatherings were not merely regional or narrowly nationalistic conclaves. They represented the urges and aspirations of the suppressed peoples of the newly emerging nations for freedom, independence, peace, equality, cooperation and a just international order. The idea of Non-Alignment, the first coherent outline of which was presented by Jawaharlal Nehru in 1946 gradually evolved through these conferences.

The first Asian Relations Conference, held in New Delhi in March 1947, was attended by twenty-eight countries. For the first time in history, the countries of Asia came together on one platform, speaking a common language of anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism along with Soviet Central Asian Republics and started a new socialist way of life. According to Nehru, who was the originator of the idea of the Asian Relations Conference, there were two objectives in convening such a Conference: (1) to understand Asia's problems, social, economic and political; and (2) to promote cooperation among the people of Asia.²

The Conference reaffirmed that Asia, long held in colonial servitude, had arrived on the scene and could no longer be browbeaten and held back from advance. Nehru said "For too long we of Asia have been petitioners in western courts and chancellories. That story must now belong to the past. We propose to stand on our own feet and to cooperate with all others who are prepared to cooperate with us. We do not intend to be the playthings of others". The conference stressed the need for Asian unity. The first Asian Relation Conference, a prelude to the Bandung Conference, was thus an event of historic significance.

Jawaharlal Nehru again took the lead in organising another conference of Asian countries in New Delhi, in 1949. The immediate issue was the need to come to the rescue, politically, of Indonesia in its continuing struggle to preserve its freedom against the Dutch attempt to reassert their colonial rule in that country. Only twenty countries participated in it. Nehru described the Dutch actions in Indonesia as "the most naked and unabashed aggression". The conference again discussed the forms of Asian unity needed to fight against colonialism.

The Conference adopted three resolutions: the first criticised the Dutch action and urged for the UN action; the second urged the representatives of the participant nations in the UN to consult among themselves on the issue, and the third asked the participating governments to consult each other for exploring the ways and means of establishing a suitable machinery for promoting cooperation within the framework of the United Nations. The outcome of this conference was seen in the fact that the Dutch colonialists were forced to withdraw from Indonesia and that country was declared independent on January 1, 1950.

Non-Alignment is a coalition of a variety of governments which share certain broad international objectives. These governments coalesce on certain occasions to obtain specific objectives. Speaking at the Columbia University in 1949, Nehru explained the basic objectives of Non-Alignment as follows: "the pursuit of peace, not through alignment with any major power or group of power but through an independent approach to each controversial or disputed issue, the liberation of subject peoples, the maintenance of freedom, both national and individual, the elimination of racial discrimination and the elimination of want, disease


and ignorance which afflict the greater part of the world's population".1

The years between 1950 and 1954 were the formative years of the Non-Alignment. In the United Nations a group of Arab and Asian nations came into being whose member states were mostly ruled by reactionary regimes and where the national revolution had not yet taken place. On some questions such as the Korean war, the liberation of Tunisia and Morocco, racial discrimination in South Africa etc., they united in opposition to the Western Powers. When Ethiopia and Liberia and later Tunisia and Morocco entered the Arab Asian group it became the Afro-Asian group.

The years of 1954 and 1955 were decisive ones in the evolution of Non-Alignment, Chou-En-Lai and Nehru were the first statesmen to formulate the Five Principles of Panchasheela. The 1954 Geneva Conference on Indo-China demonstrated the important role of the Non-Aligned countries. In the United Nations the Afro-Asian group unanimously advocated peace and disarmament.2

The Conference of the Five Prime Ministers of Ceylon, Burma, India, Indonesia and Pakistan - known as Five Colombo Powers - was held in the Ceylonese capital on April 15, 1954.

The Conference had on its agenda the Indo-China situation, the question of hydrogen bomb, the question of Tunisia and Morocco, and the question of communism in general. The Conference did reveal that Pakistan was not ready to accept the Indian stand against acting in terms of communism versus anti-communism in relation to the issues of international politics, especially those of Asia, but it proved of a great use in voicing the Asian concern over the aggravation of military pacts in Indo-China. The Conference approved the idea of an all Asian-African Summit hosted by Indonesia in 1955. It became the birth-point of the Bandung Conference ultimately culminating in the origin of the Third World.

The Prime Ministers of the Five Colombo Powers met at Bogar in Indonesia on December 28, 1954 and decided to convene the Asian-African Conference under the joint partnership of the five countries. The main purposes of the conference were set out in the joint communique. They were: to promote goodwill and cooperation among the nations of Asia and Africa; to consider social, economic and cultural problems and the problems of special interest to Asian and African peoples; and finally, to view the position of Asia and Africa in the world and the contribution they could make.


2. Dr. Roy, Gandhiji, The Non-Aligned Diplomacy of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Janaki Prakashan, Delhi, 1983, p.84.
to the promotion of world peace and cooperation.¹

The Inter-continental Conference of the so called coloured peoples which was held at Bandung on April 18, 1955, and was attended by twenty-nine Asian and African countries, was yet another milestone in the evolution of Non-Alignment. The Conference denounced racism and called for the elimination of all vestiges of racism in Asian and African countries. The key document of the Bandung Conference was the "Declaration on the Promotion of World Peace and Cooperation".² The Conference unanimously reiterated the inalienable right of all nations to self-determination and freedom to choose their own political and economic systems, their own way of life in conformity with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

The Ten Principles of the Bandung Declaration were in essence the elaboration of the Five Principles of Pancha-sheela and of the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.³ The Bandung Declaration was a historic document, it meant the reaffirmation by more than half of the world's population of its desire to live in peace and good neighbourly relations with one another, to practise

peaceful co-existence and to live by the Charter of the United Nations.

The Bandung Conference was held in April 1955 and the first Non-Aligned Summit was held in 1961. In the intervening years, Non-Alignment was gradually crystallizing itself into a significant world peace. The Brioni meeting between Nasser, Nehru and Tito, the triumvirate of Non-Alignment in its infancy, representing informally indeed the aspirations of the new and non-bloc nations of the three continents of Asia, Africa and Europe was of considerable important to the articulation of the fundamentals of Non-Alignment.¹ At the Brioni Conference of 1956, the three pioneers of the Non-Alignment reaffirmed the Ten Principles of Bandung, and their discussions covered all those issues, including world peace through collective security, peaceful co-existence, disarmament, peaceful use of atomic energy, economic development of the underdeveloped part of the world and the specific problems of the Middle East, Central Europe, Far East, Algeria etc. which had become the highlights of discussions of the Non-Aligned Conferences since 1961.²

The main object of the Non-Alignment is peace and prosperity of all human kind. Jawaharlal Nehru said in the US Congress on October 13, 1949 that the objectives of our

Foreign policy were the preservation of world peace and enlargement of human freedom.\textsuperscript{1} Freedom is essential for every country. There can be no existence of any country in the world community without freedom. As Nehru said "Independence is as vital as the breath we take to sustain life".\textsuperscript{2} He further said, "Peace and freedom have become indivisible and the world cannot continue for long partly free and partly subject. In this atomic age peace has also become a test of human survival".\textsuperscript{3} Peace is necessary for developing countries. In lack of peace the nations cannot progress in any sphere. Nehru said, "Peace is essential for the entire world. It is more so for the countries of Asia and Africa, who are on the path of progress after long years of dependence and stagnation".\textsuperscript{4} Only a world free from conflict and tensions can devote its energies and resources towards the economic and social betterment of its people. None can expect any progress against a nuclear arms race or pillaging up of lethal weapons.

Non-Alignment has steadily developed into a major force in international affairs. It is today a voice to be reckoned with. The process has been helped by the emergence

\textsuperscript{1} Jawaharlal Nehru: India's Foreign Policy, Selected Speeches, September 1946-April 1961, Government of India, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Publications Division, 1961, p.591.

\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., p.599.

\textsuperscript{3} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., p.500.
of a larger number of countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America as independent nations. The crystallisation and evolution of the concept of Non-Alignment was perhaps the greatest and most significant contribution in the field of international affairs by leaders like Nehru, Tito and Nasser.

Non-Alignment, strictly speaking, represents not only one aspect of policy; but has other positive aims also. Among them are the promotion of freedom from colonial rule, racial equality, peace and international cooperation. In a way Non-Alignment has become a summary description of this policy of friendship towards all nations, uncompromised by adherence to any military pact. Non-Alignment is a distinct political philosophy, doctrine, or ideological world-view, a view of contemporary world events distinct from the system of conceptions which are characteristic of the policies and spheres of interest.

The aims of the Non-Alignment are:

1. Respect for the right of people's to self-determination; the fight against imperialism and the liquidation of colonialism and neo-colonialism.

2. Respect for territorial sovereignty and integrity of states; non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of states.

3. An end to radial discrimination and apartheid.

4. General and total disarmament; banning nuclear tests; dealing with the problem of foreign military basis.

5. Promotion of peaceful co-existence among nations with different political and social systems.


7. Study of problems concerning uneven economic development and improvement of economic and technical cooperation.¹

The aim of the Non-Aligned countries is not so much to command military or economic power as to be in a position to influence the Super Powers. They realise that the question of war and peace primarily rests with the Super Powers. Non-Aligned countries do not represent judicial impartiality in world affairs, and they do not seek to be umpires in the game. They do seek to judge impartially every question or situation on its merits. But they are not impartial after the judgement has been made; for, inevitably they do side with one or the other.² In the same way they cannot claim that they are the sole protectors of international peace.

Non-Alignment is a new type of foreign policy, basically designed to preserve national independence and

ensure economic development in conditions of peace, while endeavouring to alter the existing international relations in the political and economic spheres and pursuing constantly a new type of relations in the international community on the principles of peaceful co-existence and active cooperation.¹

The Cairo preparatory conference which was held in June 1961, attended by Twenty-one states as full members and Brazil as an observer. The conference evolved the criteria for deciding which countries should be invited to the First Summit Conference in Belgrade in 1961. The Committee laid down the following criteria:

1. The country should have adopted an independent policy based on the co-existence of states with different political and social systems and on Non-Alignment or should be showing a trend in favour of such a policy,

2. the country concerned should be consistently supporting the movements for national independence,

3. the country should not be a member of a multilateral military alliance concluded in the context of Great Power conflicts,

4. if a country has a bilateral military agreement with a great power, or is a member of a regional defence pact,

the agreement or pact should not be one deliberately concluded in the context of Great Power conflicts,

5. if it has conceded military bases to a foreign power, the concession should not have been in the context of Great Power conflicts.¹

The first Summit Conference of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned countries was held in Belgrade, Yugoslavia during September 1-6, 1961 and was attended by 25 Afro-Asian states. 3 Latin American countries were present as observers. It was the product of three factors: the close relation between Yugoslavia, Egypt and India; the dramatic impact of the African states on world affairs in 1960 and a sudden increase in tension after hopes had been raised of an easing in the cold war.²

The Belgrade Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned states was primarily concerned with broad political issues like anti-imperialism, anti-racialism, the threat of war, aggression and intervention, foreign military bases, national self-determination, disarmament, and peaceful co-existence. The Conference concentrated particularly on world peace and security. The participants stated that world peace and stability depended to a very large extent on

the relations between the two Super Powers, who were therefore urged, as a matter of principle, to negotiate the solution of their disputes. The Conference marked a turning point in unanimously adopting an "Appeal for Peace", which "appealed to the President of the United States of America and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR to make most immediate and direct approaches to each other to avert the imminent conflict and establish peace".

The Belgrade Summit Conference was not, of course, altogether devoid of economic content. But the economic resolutions were relatively low in priority as well as significance, and were of a preliminary and exploratory nature. Thus the participants merely said that "efforts should be made to remove the economic imbalances inherited from colonialism and imperialism" and to promote international economic and technical cooperation.1

Belgrade Summit Conference was a milestone in the evolution of Non-Alignment. It provided for a diplomatic method of consultation among the Non-Aligned countries in order to evolve a common policy on key issues. It had succeeded in enlarging the membership of the UN. Disarmament

Committee in 1962, and tried for convening a world disarmament conference by General Assembly resolution passed by 1965.\textsuperscript{1}. Though the Belgrade Conference was mainly political in nature, it laid the foundation for economic cooperation which led to the Cairo Economic Conference in 1962 and the first UNCTAD gathering in 1964.

In Second Non-Aligned Summit Conference was held at Cairo, Egypt, during October 5-10, 1964, attended by 47 countries. And in addition, there were observers from 9 Latin American states, the League of Arab States, and the Organisation of African Unity. The Cairo Summit was not fundamentally different from the Belgrade Conference, as it was primarily concerned with global political issues. Out of the eleven main resolutions of the Conference in the final declaration, only one dealt with economic issues.

The Conference declared that imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism constituted a basic source of international tension and conflict because they endangered world-peace and security. It deplored that the declaration of the United Nations on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples had not been implemented everywhere and called for the unconditional, complete and

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} Subba Rao, T.V., \textit{Op.cit.}, p.104.
\end{itemize}
final abolition of colonialism.¹ The Belgrade Conference had dealt with major problems of world peace in general terms; the Cairo Declaration went into more detailed and specific issues and new items such as nuclear-free zones and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons were added to the comprehensive resolution on disarmament. Imperialism and colonialism were given more importance at Cairo than peaceful co-existence.

The Cairo Conference also remained in substance a fundamentally political movement. There was, however, the beginning of a new consciousness regarding the structural aspects of international economic relations. It welcomed UNCTAD-I as the result of the Belgrade Summit, recommended an upward revision of the targets of the UN Development Decade, and called for closer economic cooperation among the developing countries and the consolidation of the efforts of the "Group of 77" which had worked unitedly at UNCTAD-I in Geneva in the previous year.²

During the six years between 1964 and 1970 major changes were witnessed in the international set up. To keep out of the rivalries of big power politics, more and more newly independent nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America

¹. The Documents of the "Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, Cairo, October 6-10, 1964", Published as the DGNC 1961-1979, New Delhi, 1981, p.20.
². Ibid., p.28.
opted for Non-Alignment as their foreign policy. Inevitably there was a gap of six years between the second and third Conferences. A few months before the Cairo Conference, Nehru, one of the founding fathers of the Non-Alignment had passed away.\(^1\) China exploded its first nuclear weapon in October 1964 shortly after the Cairo Summit. In 1965, President Sukarno who was the host to the first Afro-Asian Conference at Bandung in 1955 was overthrown. Nasser, another important leader of the Non-Aligned world, got involved in war, first with Yemen and then with Israel.

President Tito started working for the third Conference in 1968. He approached India with a proposal for the third conference. India wanted the conference to be deferred till the international scene cleared somewhat in order to have a proper assessment of the world situation. Other nations also did not show much enthusiasm for the proposal. 1968 had seen the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union. As Yugoslavia suspected that the Russians had put pressure upon India and Egypt to have the summit postponed, the idea was deferred till 1970.

In the years since the Cairo Conference, major changes came about in the relations between the Super Powers and their policy towards the rest of the world. This changed relationship had a marked effect on the position of the independent countries and simultaneously on the place and

---

tasks of the policy of Non-Alignment. The immediate danger of a conflict between the Super Powers had given way to welcome signs of a growing detente between the power blocs. A Treaty of Non-Proliferation of nuclear weapons, worked out jointly by them in 1968, was considered an encouraging example of their understanding and goodwill. However, this growing detente did not contribute to the security of the small or medium-sized developing countries or prevent the outbreak of local wars. War continued in the Middle East and in Vietnam and was lately extended to Cambodia. However, against the background of abortive peace talks in Paris, the threat of actual war had somewhat diminished. The continued Israeli occupation of the territories of three Non-Aligned countries of West Asia was considered a violation of the UN principles, a challenges to Non-Alignment and a grave threat to peace. Another development of concern to the Non-Aligned nations was the continued oppression of the African peoples in Southern Africa by the racist and colonial minority regimes.

In Europe, the stagnation of the past years seemed at last to be breaking up. It is true that attempts by the Warsaw pact and NATO powers to reduce tensions by proposals for a European Security Conference and force-reductions met with little success and the Soviet Union clamped down on Czechoslovakia casting a heavy shadow; but soon events started moving in a more hopeful direction. A Treaty on the
remuneration of the use of force, designed to provide a basis for better relations, was signed in Moscow, on August 12, 1970, between the Soviet Union and the German Federal Republic. This was a welcome step towards closer East-West understanding and reduction of tension.¹

The Third Non-Aligned Conference caught up with the events and formulated the new tasks for the immediate and long-term activity of the Non-Aligned countries in the changed relationship and the new balance of forces in the world. As a result of these considerations at the consultative meeting held at Belgrade in July 1969 and the ministerial level meeting at New York in September 1969, a firm decision was taken to convene the third conference of the Non-Aligned nations in 1970.

The Third Non-Aligned Summit Conference was held in Lusaka, Zambia during September 8-10, 1970 and was attended by 53 countries and 3 observers. The Lusaka Summit Conference marked an important stage in the evolution of Non-Alignment, insofar as international economic questions relating to the basic structure of the international system assumed major significance at this conference.

The old political issues were not ignored. General resolutions were adopted on de-colonization, disarmament, the United Nations and the role of the Non-Aligned countries. The Conference expressed its concern over the danger of local wars and noted that detente which had replaced the cold war had not lessened these dangers. It also called attention to the dangerous situations and crises in the Middle East and the South-East Asia.

The Lusaka Summit Conference expressed deep concern over the widening economic gap between the developed and the developing countries which constituted a threat to international peace and security and the fact that the technological revolution was becoming a monopoly of the rich, and the developing countries were being deprived of their rights to effectively participate in international progress on the basis of equality. In a special resolution adopted on "Declaration on Non-Alignment and Economic Progress" the participants reviewed the lack of progress in the implementation of policies and objectives of Non-Aligned countries by the international community. It expressed a hope that the Second UN Development Decade would lead to structural changes in the world economic system. As regards their own strategy, the participants resolved to increase their economic cooperation and integration at the sub-regional and inter-regional levels, to further the unity and integrity of the "Group of 77" at all levels, including the convening of
a ministerial meeting to prepare for UNCTAD-III.¹

The prominence given to economic problems at the Lusaka Conference led to certain interpretations to the effect that these problems had now become the main preoccupation of the Non-Alignment policy, and questions relating to the safe-guarding of peace, opposition to bloc policies, arms race and other questions had diminished in importance, the cold war having given way to the relaxation of tension between the Super Powers. These interpretations in fact were aimed at bringing about certain changes in the political orientation and rules of the policy of Non-Alignment.

The Lusaka Conference emphasised the significance of international economic problems, including the problems of development and the need for self-reliance. It was, in fact, only echoing the contradiction in the development of world economy and the aggravation of international economic relations between the developed and the developing countries, and indicating that the Non-Aligned had to turn their attention and activity to the problems of their own development and to those of the developing countries.² At

¹. The Documents of the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, Lusaka, September 8-10, 1970, Published as the DGNC 1961-1979, New Delhi, pp.45-60.

the Lusaka Summit, the Non-Aligned countries pledged themselves to actively cultivate the spirit of self-reliance.

In the beginning of the 1960's the policy of Non-Alignment was mainly concerned with peace and security; in the middle of the decade anti-colonialism had priority, while at the end of the decade economic development was the main concern. In the course of its rapid development in international politics Non-Alignment became a movement and had changed its character and content.

The essence of Non-Alignment is the exercise of independent judgement in foreign policy and international relations. The stand of the individual countries is determined naturally by their respective national interest. In this context, the Non-Alignment may be called a "Non-Alignment Policy". The collective stand of the Non-Aligned countries on concrete international issues is called the Non-Aligned Movement. The term "Movement" cannot be precisely dated, but it started gaining currency from the time of the Non-Aligned Foreign Ministers' Conference in George Town in 1972.¹ In this conference a large number of countries participated and Non-Alignment assumed the dimensions of a Movement.

Non-Alignment is more a movement than an organisation. While organised action is essential, it is a movement that

it can withstand the domineering force of the blocs and the Super Powers and exercise influence on the minds of people everywhere, including in the camps of the aligned. "Non-Aligned countries", as President Tito said, "are fighting for the broad interests of mankind as a whole, and not for some narrow goals of their own".¹ In the long run the validity of the movement will rest on this rationale.

As a movement Non-Alignment champions the cause of a New World Order, which is committed to dynamic goals of human betterment.² It stands for peace, for freedom, for independence, for sovereign equality of all nations, for mutual respect and benefit. It implies an attitude of objectivity based on the perception of larger world interests rather than on the narrow and limited interests of one power or a group of powers. It is a collective movement which seeks to strengthen the process of peace and co-existence. The member states pursue the policy of anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, anti-racism and anti-apartheid.

Since its inception and through the process of its objectives, the Non-Aligned Movement has proceeded from the

1. Ibid., p.19.
objectives of the struggle for national independence, peace and social progress and has been defined more and more thoroughly.

The principles guiding the Movement's action in solving international issues, unite the Movement on the basis of its common objectives. The defined principles have proved to be correct and conform to the reality of life, international law and the trends of our time and are all aimed at ensuring first and foremost the respect and full implementation of the fundamental rights of all nations and human beings eliminating oppression, injustice and all sources of conflicts and war, safeguarding world peace.¹

The Fourth Conference of the Non-Aligned countries was opened in Algiers, Algeria, during September 5-9, 1973. It was attended by over half of the countries of the world, representing the majority of the world population. It was attended in an international situation that differed essentially from the situation in which the preceding conferences were held. An armistice had been announced in Laos. A new independent state, Bangladesh, had emerged. The Conference noted all this with satisfaction.

The most significant aspect of the Algiers Conference was the fact that the Non-Aligned countries, though they welcomed to a detente between the Soviet Union and the US on the one hand and between the US and China on the other, asserted that universal peace and security cannot be ensured without extending the scope of detente to cover all parts of the world.¹

In the Algiers Conference, the old political resolutions were generally repeated. But there was greater criticism of the US' role in Vietnam and Cambodia, and of American neo-colonialism in Latin America. The participants also gave vigorous support to the Arab peoples in general and against Israel in particular.

The emerging economic dimension of the collective Non-Aligned Movement added a special significance to the Algiers Conference. The participants took note of the deteriorating condition of the developing countries vis-a-vis the developed ones in the international context since the Lusaka Conference, with special reference to the United Nations international development strategy, the Third UNCTAD, the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, preparations for multilateral trade negotiations,

reform of the monetary system, and the important conference of the Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned nations in Georgetown.¹

The Algiers Summit launched the Non-Aligned countries on a path of asserting that spirit of self-reliance through their collective bargaining strength based upon the right of permanent sovereignty and national resources and economic activities, the development of producers' association and the proclamation in the United Nations of the New International Economic Order.

The Lusaka Conference demanded change in the international economic relations. Hence a shift in the political economic paradigm of the movement was fully evidenced in 1973. An appeal was made for the establishment of a "New International Economic Order". The Declaration and Programme of Action for the Establishment of the New International Economic Order was subsequently adopted at the Sixth Special Session of the UN General Assembly in 1974.²

Thus, between Lusaka and Algiers, the Movement had transformed and got converted into a highly organised


2. See A/Res.3201(S.VI), 1 May 1974, declaring the establishment of a New International Economic Order and A/Res. 3202 (S.VI) 1 May, 1974, adopting a Programme of Action for the establishment of a New International Economic Order.
international pressure group for the reorganisation of the international economic system. The transformation showed some other distinctive features: firstly, the change in the level of attention given to economic issues of developing countries; secondly, the shift from mere reform of international economic relation towards a radical change in the international economic order; thirdly, the formation of a semi-permanent organisational institution to handle economic issues, and the drastic change in the agenda of the international order, giving priority to economic issues of under-development.

When the Fifth Non-Aligned Summit Conference was held in August 16-19, 1976 in Colombo, Sri Lanka, the number of participants increased to 86 countries 21 observers and 7 guest delegations. Its membership represented not only all continents but a diversity of economic, social and political systems. The increasing adherence to the Non-Aligned Movement is due undoubtedly to a growing appreciation of its efficacy.¹ The Colombo Conference again reaffirmed all the chief principles and goals of the policy of Non-Alignment as well as all the lasting components of the political orientation of the Movement, adopted established and confirmed at the Summit Conferences in Belgrade, Cairo, Lusaka and Algiers.

The Colombo Summit Conference was an important landmark in the evolution of the Non-Aligned Movement for a variety of reasons. For one thing, it was the first Summit Conference that was held in the continent of Asia, the original home of Non-Alignment. Secondly, it gave greater prominence, than before, to African and Latin American issues. Thirdly, in a resolution on "the use of veto" the Colombo Summit called for the abolition of the Veto system and the amendment of the UN Charter accordingly.

All previous Non-Aligned Conferences had pledged loyalty and dedication to the United Nations. But the Colombo Summit for the first time called for a radical amendment of the UN Charter to ensure the political equality of nations.

The most significant feature of the Colombo Conference was the developing trend of the pre-occupation of Non-Aligned states with international economic issues. The participants reaffirmed that the struggle for political independence and the exercise of their sovereignty could not be dissociated from the struggle for the attainment of economic emancipation. The Conference observed that the New International Economic Order they conceived would be based on equality, sovereignty, interdependence, common interest and cooperation among all states, and would be aimed at bringing about in the international economic relations an
equilibrium based on justice, mutual cooperation and human dignity.

The Sixth Summit Conference of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned countries at Havana, Cuba, from 3-9 September, 1979, was held in a Latin American state for the first time. By this year, the family of Non-Aligned countries expanded considerably to 95 countries. Besides, there were 12 observers and 8 countries with guest status. Thus, two-thirds of the countries in the world and more than two-thirds of the entire world population attended the Summit.

The Sixth Summit of Non-Aligned heads opened with the backdrop of fear of disintegration based on ideological conflicts between members.¹ The Havana Summit found the environment full of tension and the Non-Aligned community at cross-roads. The Summit witnessed the emergence of two dangerous divisive trends. The first such trend became apparent when radical countries like Vietnam and Cuba advocated that they should join their, "natural ally" the Socialist camp.

As against this view countries like Zaire and Singapore advocated that they should join the Western camp. Fortunately, under the pressure and influence of India and

¹ Asian Recorder, October 8-14, 1979, pp.15115-15119.
Yugoslavia the Conference accepted the continuance of the independent nature of the Non-Aligned Movement as the best way of pursuing the desired goals and objectives. The second harmful trend was evidenced in the demand of some Arab countries for the expulsion of Egypt from the Non-Aligned Movement as a punishment for the Camp David Accord, it had signed with Israel. Finally the Conference decided to keep the issue of the expulsion of Egypt in abeyance and in its place condemned both Egypt and Israel for the unilateral accord that they had signed. Another jolt to the Non-Aligned Movement was the withdrawal of Burma.

In the final declaration, however, both radicals and moderates became successful. Soviet bias was lessened, US was condemned more than once, for its attitude to West Asia, Cuba etc.

The Havana Conference expressed opposition to the division of the world community into antagonistic military alliances and blocs, condemning the Super Powers' hegemonistic politics, reaffirming its support for the UN General Assembly Resolution 2832 on the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. The declaration at the end of the Conference reaffirmed the inalienable right of all states to have programmes for the peaceful uses of

nuclear energy and economic and social development in conformity with their priorities, interests and needs.

The Non-Aligned Movement in the early 1980's focussed attention on five basic problems. Firstly, the problem of averting a new world war, and ensuring world peace; secondly, the struggle for restructuring international economic relations; thirdly, the complete eradication of colonialism, fourthly, the settlement of conflicts among the developing countries - participants in the Movement; fifthly, the establishment of a line towards democratising international relations as a whole.

The Seventh Summit Conference of Non-Aligned countries was due to be held in Baghdad, Iraq in 1982, but Iran-Iraq war prevented the holding of the Summit as scheduled. A decision to hold the Summit Conference at New Delhi was taken in August 1982. The Seventh Summit of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned countries took place in New Delhi during March 7-12, 1983, and was attended by 101 full members of the Non-Aligned Movement and 15 observers with 9 nations and 17 organisations as guests.

The New Delhi Summit emphasized the necessity of disarmament as the key to the preservation of international peace and security and as a first step demanded highest priority for nuclear disarmament. The conference considered that the greatest peril facing the world today was the
threat to the survival of mankind from a nuclear war. The New Delhi Summit appealed to the Great Powers to halt the arma race and adopt urgent, practical measures for the prevention of a nuclear war; favoured the creation of nuclear free zones in different parts of the world. The Non-Aligned countries condemned the US aid and support to Israel. It voiced with the solidarity of SWAPO.¹

The highlight of the seventh Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement was the emphasis on a three-pronged strategy mapped at Lusaka, Algiers, Colombo and Havana - North-South Cooperation, individual and collective self-reliance, South-South Cooperation to bring about structural changes in the international economic order and building the countervailing power to break the North-South deadlock for global negotiations.

The New Delhi Summit transformed the movement into a global one.² It took a global view of the current economic crisis. The new strategy of the Non-Aligned Movement was to establish a New International Economic Order with a view to reforming the unjust and undemocratic Brettonwoods institutions, for the Non-Aligned countries perceive that

---


the real threat to the independence of the developing countries comes not merely from the military but the economic power of the Super Powers as well.

The Eighth Summit of the Heads of state or Government of the Non-Aligned countries took place at Harare, Zimbabwe during September 1-7, 1986 and was attended by 101 members, 10 observers, and 11 states invited as guests. The holding of the Eighth Summit on the 1st September 1986 was an event of special importance as it marked the Silver Jubilee of the Non-Aligned Movement. The agenda was similar to that of the previous Summit at New Delhi, but priority was rightly given to the two most agonising questions of our time, namely, the white racist minority rule in South Africa and Israel's illegal occupation of the whole of Palestine.

Harare Summit called for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa. The aim of these stiff measures to be applied by the international community is punitive in nature, compelling Pretoria to abandon the obnoxious system of apartheid - a crime against humanity.

The most important achievement of this conference was the leaders of the Non-Aligned countries decided on a package of measures to help frontline African states in their struggle.

against apartheid and the establishment of the nine nation "AFRICA FUND" (Action For Resisting Invasion, Colonialism and Apartheid Fund) under the Chairmanship of India to undertake suitable projects in this subject.

The Summit adopted an appeal to the President Reagan of USA and the Soviet Leader Mr. Gorbachev, for a permanent moratorium on nuclear tests. This appeal expressed the Non-Aligned countries' profound concern over the stepping-up of the nuclear arms race and their assessment was that, "never before has humanity been as close to self-destruction". It urged the two Super Powers and other states possessing nuclear weapons to continue a dialogue with a view to putting an end to the arms race and reaching agreements on disarmament, including an agreement on preventing an arms race in space, and condemned US aggression against Libya.

The Summit demonstrated unanimous concern at the lack of economic cooperation among its members. It was a welcome development, therefore, that a permanent South-South Commission would be set up to extend and enhance such cooperation. This Conference included two new additions: a Commission for North-South Dialogue; which is stranded presently and a move to drop trade and services from the new round of trade negotiations with the GATT which was due to

open in Uruguay from 15 September 1986.¹

The holding of the Ninth Non-Aligned Summit Conference in Belgrade in the first week of September 1989, is significant because it completed a circle of nine such conferences. Yugoslavia played the host to the first Conference held in Belgrade twenty eight years ago in 1961. The first had a modest number of members - twenty five - and three observers; the ninth had over four times - as many as 102 and a large number of guests and observers. Significantly, the Summit was attended by representatives of six of the seven members of the Warsaw Pact, Five members of NATO and two of ANZUS.

In its twenty eight year history, the Movement has been primarily Afro-Asian with increased membership from the Carribeean and Latin America in the last decade. Only three members were from Europe: Yugoslavia, Malta and Cyprus. But Yugoslavia enjoys a special place as a socialist country led for decades by a charismatic leader of a national liberation movement, Tito.² It now appeared that Non-Alignment could become an attractive alternative for a number of Eastern European countries looking for a movement that represented a non-bloc, independent force in world politics.

1. Kumar, Satish (Ed), Year Book on India's Foreign Policy 1985-86, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 1988, p.106.
The first Summit Conference was held in a crisis situation in which the world faced the threat of a nuclear holocaust; the ninth came off in the midst of a new detente between the two power blocs and in an international political environment in which most of the problems and disputes of the previous decade had been resolved or were in the process of being resolved. The Soviet Union had withdrawn its forces from Afghanistan, Cuban forces had returned from Angola, the Vietnamese forces in Cambodia were in the process of being withdrawn and there was a cease-fire in the war between Iran and Iraq.

At the outset of the Ninth Summit, Yugoslavia attempted to establish its own priorities for the next three years. It prepared a draft declaration calling for 'Modernisation' internally and the exploitation of a unique window of opportunity in world politics, that of improved relations between the Super Powers. Many members reacted negatively to the term "Modernisation" as it implied that the movement was backward. The term was associated with the views of Euro-American social scientists who conceived of developing countries as backward and in need of modernizing.


The Belgrade Summit considered the detente between the USA and the USSR "a window of opportunity for the international community". Hence, a lower priority for the political questions and a higher one for the economic ones. The Declaration observed, "A detente devoid of economic content is unlikely to endure". It also sought a "balanced" economic and technological development of the entire international community "through efforts aimed at the broadest possible democratization of international relations". In the changed and changing political environment, the Declaration asserted "Our basic interests and the need to enhance the effectiveness of the movement demand that we play an active and direct role in the management of world affairs".¹

The two major developments in the economic sphere were a constructive proposal to activate the North-South Dialogue for mutual economic cooperation and the approval of the Indian proposal for a Plant Protection Fund. On economic cooperation among the developing countries, the conference reiterated that mutual economic cooperation was a lasting commitment of the Non-Aligned and other developing countries and a key element in the strategy of collective self-reliance.

¹ Dr. Srivastava, Govind Narain (Ed), NAM In International Relations Ninth NAM Summit Selected Documents, Indian Institute For Non-Aligned Studies, New Delhi, 1989, pp.97-103.
In the Belgrade Summit Conference the Non-Aligned Movement reaffirmed the continuing validity and relevance of Non-Alignment as an additional foreign policy choice. It thereby rejected the view of some critics of the policy of Non-Alignment that the new detente between the two Super Powers and the power blocs had rendered the policy outdated and that the beneficial fallout of the new detente was limited to political matters only.

The policy of Non-Alignment was born in the context of the cold war, representing the hopes and aspirations of the majority of human kind. The essence of Non-Alignment is the exercise of an independent judgement or freedom of action in foreign policy and international relations. More than three decades have passed since the Non-Aligned Movement became a distinct international orientation, evolved and shaped by the foreign policy practised by the newly independent states of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The main aim of the Non-Aligned Movement is preservation of world peace and the building up of the world without war. The Non-Aligned countries struggled against colonialism, imperialism, neo-colonialism, racial discrimination, apartheid and all forms of interference, threat and use of force against the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of any country and supported national liberation movements, the struggle for general and complete disarmament, the eradication of economic inequality and the
promotion of effective economic cooperation between developed and developing countries, to create a new world order based on justice and peace and for the strengthening of the role and effectiveness of the UN, for the right of all people and countries to have international relations on the basis of equality and their own free choice. The Non-Aligned Movement today, envelops two thirds of the world community. It has become a powerful factor in the struggle for world peace and security. The relevance of Non-Aligned Movement is much more today than it was earlier.

The first Belgrade Summit Conference (1961) was called for strengthening world peace and avoiding world war. A programme of Peace and International Cooperation was adopted at the Cairo Summit Conference which bestowed greater attention on anti-colonialism. The concept of self-reliance received fresh impetus at the Lusaka Summit. The Algiers Summit appealed for the establishment of a New International Economic Order. The Colombo Summit Conference called for a radical amendment of the UN Charter and took some important initiatives in the field of international economic relations.

The Havana Summit witnessed dangerous divisive trends among the members of the Non-Aligned Movement. The New Delhi Summit gave top priority to disarmament and stressed North-South and South-South Cooperation. The Harare Summit
established a nine nation "AFRICA Fund" and appealed to Super Powers for a permanent moratorium on nuclear tests. In the dramatical changes that took place in the international political atmosphere, between the 1961 Belgrade Summit Conference and the 1989 Belgrade Summit Conference, the ninth Non-Aligned Conference (Belgrade Summit), focussed attention on economic and environmental issues. Therefore, it can be said that the Non-Alignment has grown from a policy to a movement and shifted its focus from world peace and security to economic and environmental issues between 1961 and 1989. And in all these Conferences, it may be said, that it was India which took the lead along with other founder members, i.e., Yugoslavia and Egypt, for the growth of the Non-Aligned Movement.