CHAPTER THREE

INDIA AND NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT
The pioneering role of India in the emergence of the policy of Non-Alignment has been universally recognised.\(^\text{1}\) India was the first largest new state to adopt Non-Alignment and the development of Non-Alignment was mostly in the hands of India. The study of Non-Alignment would be incomplete unless one studies the evolution of the Indian Non-Alignment as its prototype.

Non-Alignment was a natural evolution of India's foreign policy as enunciated by Jawaharlal Nehru.\(^\text{2}\) It was founded of India's long cherished values and ideals of peace, tolerance of co-existence and non-violence, which form the bedrock of the ancient Indian wisdom and lie deep in India's civilization. These ideals constitute the moral


force of India's Non-Alignment. But her espousal of Non-Alignment was not based on moralistic consideration alone. It was equally predicated on India's assessment that this way was the only way for safeguarding and consolidating India's national independence and freedom of action in international affairs.

The diversity of the Indian society is both its strength and its weakness, and this became clear during the long political struggle for independence from the British rule. When the Indian National Congress was founded in 1885, the people of India were able to give vent to their aspirations and demand their rightful place in the modern world. In 1885 itself, at the first session, Congress condemned the annexation of Upper Burma by the British.

In 1892 the Congress objected to "the military activity going on beyond the natural lines of the defence of India, in pursuance of the imperial policy of Great Britain in its relations with some of the great powers of Europe." A resolution of 1904 shows the first manifestation of its aversion to foreign entanglements by asserting that an expedition to Tibet was "but part of a general forward policy ... threatens to involve India in foreign entanglements". During the 1st World War Indian National
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Congress showed an independent outlook on foreign issues.

Meanwhile India, though a colony, attained some sort of international personality by virtue of its original membership in the League of Nations in 1919. It was a signatory for San Francisco Conference in 1945 and an original member of the United Nations Charter. However, Indians had no control over external affairs until the formation of the interim Government in 1946.

Since 1921 the All India Congress Committee (AICC) began to take increasing interest in India's relations with its neighbours and to make pronouncements on the elements of the foreign policy of an independent India. In 1925, a significant change occurred when a separate foreign department was established by AICC with Nehru as head. This helped Nehru to a large extent to gain experience in external affairs. Nehru claimed that the foundations of Indian foreign policy were laid down at the Madras Session of the Congress in 1927, when the use of Indian troops in China, Mesopotamia and Persia was deplored and fraternal greetings were sent to the peoples of Egypt, Iraq, Palestine and Syria, who were fighting against imperialism.


In 1928 the Indian National Congress passed a resolution that the struggle of the Indian people for freedom was part of the world-wide struggle against imperialism. In the latter half of the thirties, the Congress pledged its support to the struggle of the Palestinian Arabs against Zionists and British colonialists.¹ In 1939 it proclaimed the desire of the Indian people to steer clear of the war between imperialism and facism, to both of which they were opposed, and thus to preserve peace and freedom for India.

The particular stage in human progress, then, was a global struggle between forces of nationalism and imperialism. That struggle acquired epic proportions in India under the unique and non-violent leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, who instilled in Indians the discipline of self-reliance and the assurance of self-confidence which they would need in conditions of political freedom.

The lessons learnt from the Indian struggle were that freedom should be won through a national effort; liberation from colonial rule should be unconditional; removal of racial discrimination was a universal goal; world peace was essential for safeguarding national independence and security; and the other side of the coin of national freedom

was Non-Alignment with the military alliances of Great Powers.

This Indian trend to keep aloof from the power games of European states was a natural byproduct of the main struggle for independence from the imperial rule of Great Britain.\footnote{Jaipal, Rikhi, \textit{Op.cit.}, p.9.} India refused to align itself even with enemies of Britain in the hope of furthering its own nationalist aims, because it had always been its policy to stand on its own feet and do its own fighting, and it never had any intention of being the plaything of others.

The origin of the concept of Non-Alignment can be traced to the broadcast made by Jawaharlal Nehru, Vice-President of the Interim Government, on the 7th September, 1946, giving an outline of India's foreign policy, Nehru said: "We propose, as far as possible, to keep away from the power politics of groups, aligned against one another, which have led in the past to world wars and which may again lead to disasters on an even vaster scale.... The world, inspite of its rivalries and hatreds and inner conflicts, moves inevitably towards closer cooperation and building up of a world commonwealth. It is for this one world that free India will work, a world in which there is
the free cooperation of free peoples, and no class or group exploits another."\(^1\)

These words are the first manifestation of the newly independent Indian attitude in international affairs. Being the sole founder of the Indian foreign policy, Nehru showed great predictability, ability and strategy in bringing it up.

Addressing a Press Conference on 26 September, 1946, as a member of the Interim Government incharge of external affairs, he said: "In the sphere of foreign affairs India will follow an independent policy, keeping away from the power policies of groups aligned against one other".\(^2\) Later, on December 13, 1946, he observed "We approach the world in the friendly way. We want to make friends with all countries. Non-Alignment does not mean an indifference to international affairs; it means an independent foreign policy".\(^3\)

In the forty-eight years (i.e., 1946-1993) since its first articulation in a cohesive form by Jawaharlal Nehru -

a man who was not only one of the pioneers of the Non-Aligned Movement but also the first Foreign Minister of the second most populous land, a hero of the world's epic freedom-struggle and a vibrant advocate of Afro-Asian solidarity and world peace - Non-Alignment has passed through various stages of refinement and clarity. From an impulse to an idea, from an idea to a policy and from a policy to a movement, Non-Alignment today has become one of the most dominant trends in international relations and politics.

A policy of Non-Alignment with power blocs, it was thought, would give India the freedom needed for her social and economic development.\(^1\) India would also be able to determine its foreign policy independent of external commitments only if it remained unattached to any bloc. It would also be free to express its opinion on the merits of each question.

Non-Alignment was adopted as an instrument, or a means of foreign policy by its founders like India to enable themselves to realise the full meaning and content to their newly achieved political independence.\(^2\) Anxious to protect and promote their national interests through socio-economic development of all sections of their population, they are interested in the maintenance of international peace as a


pre-requisite to the achievement of this objective and opposed to cold war, bloc politics and power politics as injurious to their national objectives.

There may be several reasons for India adopting and continuing the policy of Non-Alignment.¹ They are: The geo-strategic location of the country did not permit it to align with any one nation but to play independently its role in the world in favour of peace. The two leading Communist Powers are on or near India's border, China's international boundary touching it, and the Soviet Union's border being only some twenty miles from it. A military alliance with either bloc is ruled out by this factor. The impact of any war between the two blocs will immediately make itself felt on India.

Secondly, India's need of getting economic assistance from as many sources as possible also rendered the adoption of an independent foreign policy desirable. India's abysmal poverty made rapid economic development an imperative of her domestic as well as foreign policy, and made it necessary to link the broad orientation and strategy of foreign policy closely with those of domestic economic policy. As Nehru said as early as on the 4th December 1947 "Ultimately,
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foreign policy is the outcome of economic policies and until India has properly evolved her economic policy, her foreign policy will be rather vague, rather inchoate, and will be groping.¹

When the British left India, the state of Indian economy was far from happy. In fact the Second World War had hampered the economy of every country. Further, the problems of partition had aggravated the situation for India. Consequently, India has been left with an arrested economy, a low standard of living, a high rate of population growth, stagnant agriculture, the lack of heavy industry and inadequate supply of capital.² For constructive economic development dependence on foreign aid became inescapable for the country. This economic objective could best be achieved by the adoption of Non-Alinement, which could tap several sources in both the spheres of influence, without being subservient to any big power. Nehru perceived this logical connection between Non-Alinement and foreign aid. He said "... We want the help of other countries, we are going to have it and we are going to see it too in a large measure. Even in accepting economic help or in getting political help


it is not a wise policy to put all our eggs in one basket".  

Thus India's foreign policy was conditioned mainly to overcome its poverty by long-term and large-scale development programmes India thus became the major recipient of aid from both Russia and USA.

Thirdly, India was naturally anxious to preserve its newly-won independence in framing her policies, both domestic and foreign, and, as Nehru repeatedly stated, there was always a fear that by aligning oneself, with any one of the powers, one surrendered the freedom to choose and gave up the policy which he would normally pursue.  It was also determined to rally all anti-imperialist and anti-racist forces against the western domination. India's support to freedom struggles in Afro-Asia and her staunch opposition to the racism and apartheid practised in South Africa can be understood in this light. By championing the right of self-determination of the colonies and dependencies, India's Non-Alignment chose to unleash the process of eastern westphalia. This process led towards the birth of sovereign independent states, which could actively participate in shaping the world order.


Fourthly, as a newly independent country, India felt, like any other country in a similar situation, the emotional as well as practical need to retain and exercise independent judgement in world affairs - and that essentially is what Non-Alignment stands for - without being tied to the apron-strings of another country.¹ It meant taking a stand on the merits of a case, ad hoc, not mechanically siding with one bloc or the other.

Finally, there was the impact of India's ancient past and the freedom movement with all its emphasis on non-violence on the formulation of the country's foreign policy. As to its origin, Jawaharlal Nehru observed "I have not originated it. It is a policy inherent in the circumstances of India, inherent in the past thinking of India, inherent in the conditioning of the Indian mind during our struggle for freedom and inherent in the circumstances of the world today".²

In his interview with Michael Brecher Nehru observed that ideological urges would have influence over individuals and could become the common thinking of the people at large. If it is so, any policy of the government must comprise with

it, otherwise it cannot go very far.\textsuperscript{1} Some of the Indian scholars trace back to the religions and traditions of ancient India. According to Mahadevan "Indian foreign policy has its foundations in India's culture and traditions, in her religio-philosophical ideology in her immediate remote past".\textsuperscript{2}

India's Non-Alignment was inherent in her capacity to assimilate the different branches of philosophy propounded by outstanding rulers like Ashoka, Raja Raja Chola and Akbar, and great religious philosophers like Sankaracharya, Guru Nanak, and Kabir.\textsuperscript{3} The Gandhian approach of achieving freedom through Non-Violence and Truth had also something to do with the concept of world peace through Non-Alignment.

Nehru noted that the independence of India was a preface to the independence of all the colonial countries of Asia and Africa. In order to champion the cause of independence, even before the attainment of independence by India, he had organised an Asian Relations Conference on 23 March, 1947,\textsuperscript{4} which provided in shaping the Non-Alignment
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policy according to Nehru's perception. As Nehru rightly observed - while countering the argument of his critics that it was he who was instrumental in India's choice of Non-Alignment - his presence as one of the India's leaders at that point of time was only accidental and national and international circumstances had not given a choice to India at that point of time but to opt for Non-Alignment.  

India's policy of Non-Alignment was dictated by her economic and security interests. India being economically retarded and militarily weak after independence needed all her resources for constructive work and could not afford to enter the arms race with other countries or have its weight felt in the international forums. In fact, peace was essential to the very existence of India. Hence, by assuming a Non-Aligned posture India tried to steer clear of power-blocs and pursue the path of peace and cooperation with all which enabled it to obtain aid from all possible sources.

In such a policy she found the triple coincidence of serving India's own interests, the interests of world peace and finding a moral justification in a policy of peace, which is not easy to find in mere neutralism. Thus peace


is to be maintained not through a system of alliances with
the two power blocs but through an independent approach or
the policy of Non-Alignment.

India eschewed power politics in her policy and
adopted the method of peaceful persuasion or influence
politics. Nehru also avoided joining the military alliances
in order to remain out of the sphere of the power politics
of the great powers. As Nehru explained "Our general policy
is to avoid entanglement in power politics and not to join
any group of powers as against any other group. The two
leading groups today are the Russian bloc and the
Anglo-American bloc. We must be friendly to both and yet
not join either".¹

Thus India tried to keep out of the entanglements of
cold war diplomacy and followed its own independent path.

Two diplomatic events in 1949 i.e., India's
recognition of Communist China, and Nehru's visit to USA to
clear the doubts regarding the western propaganda against
the policy of Non-Alignment reinforced India's pursuit of an
independent Non-Aligned foreign policy.

¹ Jawaharlal Nehru, India's Foreign Policy: Selected
This shows that Non-Alignment does not mean a "middle of the road policy" of "hedging and avoiding the pitfalls" or "sitting on the fence". It is a positive, constructive policy deliberately aiming at something and trying to avoid hostility with other countries as far as possible. Moreover, India never hesitated to fulfil its obligations to the world community and took several constructive initiatives for world peace and international cooperation, sought to strengthen the United Nations, championed the freedom of nations and equality of races and highlighted the desirability of international cooperation for the economic advancement of the industrially underdeveloped countries. Besides this positive role, India did not wish to interfere in international affairs except when India's interests are directly threatened.

India's contribution to the world politics has almost literally added a new dimension to the world political scene; with the spreading of Non-Alignment through most of the newly independent states, the world became tripolar rather than bipolar. The operational phase of the Non-Alignment as a policy began with a bang when "the Korean war transformed Indian Non-Alignment from a verbal assertion into a

global posture which served as an effective instrument of power".¹

On the Korean question, India's initiative in the UN and outside was taken as a non-partisan basis in order to defuse the situation, that there was increasing recognition of the relevance of rudimentary Non-Aligned as a moderating factor in international relations. India's amended version of the 13-power draft resolution on the Korean situation was adopted by the UN General Assembly in December 1950, leading to negotiations in 1951 and armistice in July 1953.² India proved its ability to assume the role of a mediator and an impartial arbitrator, and India's initiative on Indonesia and then on Indo-China, particularly during the Geneva Conference, underlined the global significance of Non-Aligned power, which was recognised as such by the power-blocs, especially the Soviet Union.

Non-Alignment is sometimes misconceived as "Panchasheela," identifying India's foreign policy with it. "Panchasheela" only reflects the basic principles which India or for that matter any other country, desires to observe in its relations with other countries and does not


reflect the Non-Alignment in toto. The provisions of "Panchasheela" are well recognised for international conduct and are incorporated in the United Nations' Charter.¹ Nehru propounded the five principles or "Panchasheela" as the norms of international behaviour.

"Panchasheela" stands for "peaceful settlement of disputes and non-interference"² in the internal affairs of other countries. In the words of Nehru, it means that "there may be different ways of progress, possibly different outlooks, but that, broadly, the ultimate objective may the same".³ Hence, the essence of "Panchasheela" is that "we welcome friendship and association with all and the flow of thought and ideas of all kinds, but we reserve the right to choose our own path".⁴ These principles were to govern India's relations not only with China but with other countries as well.

"Panchasheela" is not the brain-child of Nehru. Its principles have been incorporated in the United Nations
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Charter and recognised by the civilized world. But he gave an impetus to it. In its essential sense "Panchasheela" can be traced in Articles 1 and 2 and the preamble of the United Nations' Charter.¹

The Bandung Conference of 1955, was dominated by these types of overtones and the declaration incorporated these principles. At the Bandung Conference Jawaharlal Nehru touched the moral fibre of Non-Alignment when he said, with a righteous indignation, that "it was an intolerable humiliation for an Afro-Asian country to degrade itself as a camp-follower of one of the other side". In the concluding speech he said "We want to be friends with Europe and America and cooperate with them, but they are in the habit of thinking that their quarrels are world quarrels, and that therefore the world must follow them this way or that. Why should we be dragged into their quarrels and wars?... I hope we shall keep away".²

The newly-freed countries' deep concern for the future of the world was evidenced in the declaration on the promotion of world-peace and cooperation adopted at the Bandung Conference.

Nehru's contribution was that during the Bandung Conference he insisted on correct expression being given to

anti-colonial aspirations preventing some delegates from leading the Conference away from the actual problem of how to abolish colonialism. The Conference fully expressed the determination to end colonialism. Secondly, it was unquestionable as a consequence of the Bandung Conference that the ideas of Non-Aligned struck roots among most of the "Third World" countries. Speaking at the concluding session of the Bandung Conference on April 24, 1955 Nehru said ".... We cannot exercise any decisive influence on the world. But, there is no doubt that our influence will grow. It is growing in fact, and we do exercise some influence even today.... I am sure that the Conference has left its powerful impress on the minds of all those who are here. I am sure that it has left an impress on the minds of the world".¹

The Bandung Conference was the high water-mark of Nehru's success in the sphere of foreign relations.² After Bandung all Asian and African countries, achieving political independence and emerging on the international scene, opted for Non-Aligned.

Jawaharlal Nehru, Colonial Nasser and Marshall Tito, the trio of Non-Alignment met at Brioni, off Croastian coast, on 18 and 19 July, 1956 and laid the foundation for an exclusive club of Non-Alignment. The Brioni Conference linked states in the three continents more clearly than other international gatherings of the mid 1950's, marked those years as the "high point of Indian Non-Alignment diplomacy."¹ From India's point of view the Brioni Conference was more meaningful than the earlier Bandung gathering: it was a conclave of three Non-Aligned nations with a similarity of approach on international issues, though for different reasons.

Events that followed the Brioni meet reinforced the tripartite accord established at that time: the growing threat of nuclear war, the attack on Suez, American intervention in the Middle East and later in Cuba, the Berlin crisis and the hostility of China towards India and Yugoslavia brought reaffirmation of the validity of Non-Alignment and the common interest of the three states in staving off the menacing moves by the Great Powers.²
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It is true that while India pioneered the concept of Non-Aligned and used it as its foreign policy framework even in its embryonic fora for over a decade in the fifties, even without formally using the term Non-Alignment, it was left to Yugoslavia's Tito and Egypt's Nasser to take the final initiative in the sixties for the formal launching of the policy of Non-Alignment and for persuading Jawaharlal Nehru to recognise the necessity of establishing a forum and an organisation to build a firm solidarity of the Non-Aligned countries.1

Nehru's hesitation to have a formal structure of the Non-Alignment, was mainly due to his fear that it might become, on the one hand, too large and amorphous a group for meaningful and concerted political action, and on the other, too bureaucratic in its orientation and thereby lose its political slant.2 Nehru was temperamentally opposed to forming separate blocs, groups and factions in politics, either national or international. Hence his continuous word of caution against building a third bloc that tended to divide and fragment the nations.

Almost a decade and a half after its original and rudimentary enunciation by India, the concept of

Non-Alignment finally acquired a clarity and a specificity which was evident from the address of Jawharlal Nehru at the first Non-Aligned Summit Conference in Belgrade during 1-6 September, 1961. He said "We call ourselves Non-Aligned countries. The word 'Non-Aligned' may be differently interpreted, but basically it was coined and used with the meaning of being Non-Aligned with the Great Power blocs of the world".¹

Nehru sought to emphasize the increasing danger of nuclear war and the primacy of peace and peaceful co-existence as the basic challenge of the time. He warned that "If war comes, all is doomed" and underlined "the desirability of peace for ensuring welfare (even) in domestic spheres".²

In Belgrade Conference, India explained several implications of the policy of Non-Alignment.³ She pursueded the participants of the Conference to start with a clear outstanding that even the alignment of Non-Aligned countries on political lines could amount to a constraint on the freedom of thinking and judgement which would mean the very negation of the philosophy of Non-Alignment. At the
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Conference, India put a check on the tendency to condemn other countries. She deprecated the partisan approach in favour of one cold war antagonist against the other. India resolved to give top priority to world peace and attached special urgency to it. She stressed the need of peace-oriented cooperation among Non-Aligned powers.

The idea of a special, forceful plea for peace was not only Nehru's; Tito and Nasser before him had voiced identical fears. But Nehru's voice was the strongest and many people in the world had become accustomed to listening to him. His staff, headed by Krishna Menon, "managed to obtain a special section in the conference declaration devoted solely to the need for peace". 1

India's policy of Non-Alignment faced a serious crisis in the Sino-Indian War in 1962. 2 The border dispute that erupted between China and India led to the Sino-Indian war. During the course of the war, India had to seek US military assistance which prompted critics of Nehru's government to question India's status as a Non-Aligned state. Furthermore, the government faced severe criticism for its inability to protect India's security concerns and vital national interests.

At the conclusion of the war with China the foreign relations of India appeared gloomy. Many people hoped that, it will bring about a different strategy from Non-Alignment. However, these doubts were cleared when Nehru clung to the principle of Non-Alignment. He observed "we are not going to give up our principles because of this present difficulty which has more effectively met by our continuing that policy".1

Nehru said, if we abandon Non-Alignment it would mean a "terrible moral failure".2

The conflict and the defeat of Indian armed forces at the hands of the Chinese and the subsequent acceptance of military assistance from the US brought to question the policy of India's Non-Alignment.3 India asked for large-scale military assistance for the first time. This request, seemed apparently inconsistent with Non-Alignment. However, Non-Alignment, in Nehru's words, was a vehicle of serving India's national interest. Especially when the security interests of India were threatened, the apparatus of Non-Alignment provided room for seeking military assistance from either of the Super Powers to repel an aggression.

The US' willingness to provide prompt military assistance to India strengthened India's position vis-a-vis China. The US sought to tilt India's Non-Alignment towards the West through military assistance and, thereby, worked towards establishing order and stability in the sub-continent.

The fact that India was able to procure military aid from both the blocs was evidence of her ability to preserve Non-Alignment; it also opened up a new vista for India's policy of Non-Alignment.¹ This new vista refers to the acceptance of military aid without compromising the essentials of Non-Alignment. But a section of public opinion believed that the acceptance of military aid would ultimately lead to the abandonment of Non-Alignment and countries like China and Pakistan accused India of having surrendered Non-Alignment.

Upto 1962 the Indian position was that foreign aid was acceptable as long as it was only economic.² But India thought that military aid would cut cross the essence of Non-Alignment. This assumption placed a constraint on Non-Alignment. The Chinese aggression threw it over-board and revealed the dynamic character of India's Non-Alignment. Even while accepting military aid India would not think of

permitting any foreign bases to be established or any foreign troops to be stationed on her territory. There was a time when critics were opposed to India taking economic aid for her planning because that, in their view, would amount to the violation of Non-Alignment.

But such objections were brushed aside and economic aid was accommodated in Non-Alignment.¹ Foreign aid is after all foreign aid, be it military or economic. The acceptance of any of them does not necessarily imply a surrender of Non-Alignment, unless it impairs the independence of the receiving country. In fact, the purpose for which India sought and accepted military aid was the preservation of national independence and territorial integrity which was essential to Non-Alignment. Thus it is rightly said that military aid itself was accepted in the service of Non-Alignment. Viewed thus India's acceptance of military aid has to be taken not as an aberration but as a stage in the growth of Non-Alignment.

The Cairo Summit was darkened by a painful void. Nehru was not there. As unrelenting warrior of Non-Alignment, Nehru, who had adopted it as India's base for foreign policy even before the country attained legal and full independence, was no more. He died on 27 May 1964. There was no change

in his adherence to the principles of Non-Alignment during his life-time.

Nehru's successor, Lal Bahadur Shastri who led the Indian team to the Cairo Summit Conference, also adhered to the basic principles on Non-Alignment. During his visit to London in December 1964, he affirmed that there would be no deviation from Nehru's policy of Non-Alignment. In his short span Shastri tried to improve relations with neighbouring countries. He faced an aggression from Pakistan in 1965. This time India defeated Pakistan and his stature went up. This conflict resulted in the Tashkent agreement between Pakistan and India, which facilitated bilateral improvement schemes. However Shastri passed away without putting it to test.

Successor to Shastri, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, brought a new impetus to Non-Alignment. She moulded Non-Alignment as economic and political rather than ideological in its impulse. Within short span of time she was able to bring back India's influence to the forefront of Non-Alignment. She reemphasised the Non-Alignment policy of India and warned the other member countries against the neo-colonial attitude of big powers.

At the Non-Aligned Summit Conference, 1970 held at Lusaka, she vehemently observed "The big powers have never

accepted the validity of Non-Alignment. Neither colonialism nor racialism have vanguished. The old comes back in new guise. There are subtle intrigues to undermine our self-confidence and how dissensions and mutual distrust among us. Powerful vested interests, domestic and foreign are combining to create new structure of neo-colonialism. These dangers can be combated by our being united in our adherence to the basic tenets of Non-Alignment."¹

After China's invasion in 1962, and its anti-Indian postures in the 1965 Indo-Pak conflict, the American tilt towards Pakistan and against India in 1969-71, and the support given by the Soviet Union to India's stand on Kashmir, Goa and the Sino-Indian conflict, it became clear as to who were India's reliable friends in the world. The situation on the sub-continent was explosive. Bangladesh was in the throes of a struggle for freedom from the yoke of West Pakistan's military dictatorship.² India was flooded with millions of refugees from Bangladesh, fleeing from the atrocities of Yahyakhan's soldiers. India's economic, administrative, and social structure in the states neighbouring Bangladesh were severely strained.

On top of it all, Yahya Khan deliberately incited border incidents against India in the East, and tried to


provoke it into a conflict in order to divert the attention of his own people and the outside world from his troubles in Bangladesh.¹ India tried its best to impress on Yahya Khan, through his western friends and allies, the need to reach a direct political settlement with the already elected leaders of East Pakistan, especially, Sheikh Mujib. But Yahya Khan did not agree. He thought China and the USA would come to his rescue and he would be able to suppress the Bangladeshis. This situation provided the opportune moment to India for signing the Indo-Soviet treaty on 9 August, 1971. The conventional Non-Alignment of the 50's and 60's, thus came to be replaced, as Mrs. Gandhi called it, by a phase of "dynamic Non-Alignment".²

The conclusion of the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation was an outstanding event in the history of the relations between the Soviet Union and the republic of India.³ It was also a big international event. It may be said without any exaggeration that the close friendship between the Soviet Union and India is one of the main pillars of peace on the Asian continent and one of the

cornerstones, in the edifice of international peace, for it is a friendship between two large states with an important and active part in world affairs.

Mrs. Indira Gandhi declared that the country remained "Non-Aligned" despite the Indo-Soviet Treaty and observed "The act will strengthen by further promoting friendship between the two nations. But there is no change in our policy of Non-Alignment". ¹

The first part of Article IV of the Indo-Soviet Treaty of 1971 provides that the republic of India respects the peace-loving policy of the USSR aimed at strengthening friendship and cooperation with all nations. Under the second part of the Article IV, the USSR respects India's policy of Non-Alignment and reaffirms that this policy continues to be an international factor, the maintenance of universal peace and international security and in the lessening of tensions in the world.²

The efficacy of the Indo-Soviet treaty was doubted and criticised by several jurists, publicists and statesmen.³

The critics were of the view that the treaty had put a seal on the premise of Non-Alignment. Some felt that the treaty had given advantage to USSR and it had gained control over India. Some others viewed it as a part of a 'Brezhnev Plan'. These criticisms emanated mainly from the Western sector of the globe, which could not stomach the growing influence of Russia in the Indian sub-continent.

Some Indians also maintained that India had lost the policy of Non-Alignment after the signing of the treaty. But Mrs. Gandhi asserted "The treaty does not compromise our Non-Aligned position. The word Non-Alignment has been misinterpreted, that is why such doubts arise. The national interests of Non-Aligned countries have to be safeguarded from threats of military advanturism. Security must be achieved in a manner which eschews hegemony or confrontation and ensure lasting peace. This is precisely what the treaty does. (And) the Soviet Union has extended unreserved respect and support to our policy of Non-Alignment. This has been incorporated in the treaty itself". ¹

It goes without saying that the Indo-Soviet treaty was an absolute necessity at the time when it was signed.² India


had been humbled by China in 1962. China threatened to attack India in 1965 during the war between India and Pakistan in 1965 and again in 1971 at the time of the crisis in East Pakistan. The attitude of the Nixon administration was not of neutrality. The United States made it clear to India that in the event of a war between India and Pakistan, India should not rely upon any help from the United States.

Under the circumstances, there was no other option for the leaders of India but to enter into an agreement with the Soviet Union. This clearly shows that India did a right thing in having a treaty with the Soviet Union to protect her national interest. That is why it can be said that India has not deviated from its policy of Non-Alignment.

Ending 30 years of Congress rule, the Janata Party led by Morarji Desai came to power in March 1977. Atal Behari Vajpayee, a former Jana Sangh leader and a strong critic of several aspects of India's Non-Alignment and nuclear policy, took over as Minister for External Affairs. However, both he and Prime Minister Morarji Desai took the earliest opportunity to declare their commitment to India's traditional policy of Non-Alignment on 24 March. Morarji Desai, emphatically declared at a press conference in New

Delhi, that "the foreign policy of Non-Alignment is there for India".¹ In his first broadcast to the nation on 4 April, 1977, he spoke that "The only way to deserve and ensure peace is to follow the path of genuine Non-Alignment without fear or favour, affection or ill-will".²

· On the 7th April 1977, in his address at the meeting of the co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned countries in New Delhi, Vajpayee declared "In the realm of foreign policy we stand for friendship with all neighbours and other nations of the world on the basis of equality and reciprocity and will follow a path of genuine Non-Alignment".³

The Janata Party's manifesto and certain statements of its leaders used the word 'proper' and 'genuine' before 'Non-Alignment; it was expected that the new government while retaining the Non-Aligned status of India in the international community would nevertheless bring some changes in the style of its management of foreign relations. However, the term has been clarified more than once, though not emphatically by both Morarji Desai and Vajpayee.

· On the question of Non-Alignment being "proper" or "genuine", in his address to the Royal Commonwealth Society,

---

1. Indian Express, March 25, 1977.
3. Times of India, April 8, 1977.
London on June 10th 1977, Vajpayee observed "The Janata Party had said that in the international field it will pursue a genuinely Non-Aligned policy. One can very well ask: why is Janata Party so emphatic about genuine Non-Alignment? My humble submission is that India should not only remain Non-Aligned but must also appear to be so. If anything we may say or do gives rise to the feeling that we have learned towards a particular bloc and have surrendered our sovereign right of judging issues on their merit and it will be a deviation from the straight but different path of Non-Alignment. (The) Janata Government would never allow this to happen".¹

They qualified not only Non-Alignment but also co-existence with the term "genuine". The essence of genuine Non-Alignment lies in the refusal to sacrifice a principle for the sake of convenience by submitting itself to the needs of the day.

Qualifying Non-Alignment with adjectives like "genuine" or "even-handed" raised much confusion, controversy and criticism. Under these circumstances, Vajpayee explained the meaning of "genuine" or "proper" Non-Alignment, and said "When we decided to use the adjective

Vajpayee interpreted "genuine" or "even handed" Non-Alignment as refusal "to play the game of power politics, alternatively threatening or placating one power against another", Foreign Affairs Record, June 1977, p.105.
"genuine", we had two things in mind. Firstly, the entire Non-Alignment has to be developed on the basis of fundamental principles which have guided the movements since its inception. Secondly, the basic philosophy of the movement is that all international issues should be judged on merit. The concept of neutrality has to be a positive one. The policy must be pursued in such a manner that the countries of the world should feel that India is really Non-Aligned. We not only have to be Non-Aligned, but, we must also appear to be Non-Aligned. For that we have to avoid too much dependence on any big power. This would require economic stability, military strength and they will to preserve independence of judgement.\(^1\)

The fact that the Janata Party did not intend deviating from the basic principles of Non-Alignment was evident from its election manifesto. Partly because Non-Alignment permitted a government a differentiated approach to the management of its foreign relations and partly on account of its own structure, Non-Alignment seemed to be a logical choice of foreign policy to the Janata leadership. Consisting of the erstwhile Jana Sangh and BLD wings, on the one hand, and the socialists and young Turks of the Congress, on the other, Non-Alignment offered to Janata Party a middle-of-the-line policy.

---

Some countries, at the Havana Summit Conference, like Cuba and Vietnam, desired to join the Socialist Camp. And countries like Singapore and Zaire wanted to join the Western camp. When the divergent stances of the above countries threatened to vitiate the relations among them, India played a leading role to avert disruption of the Non-Aligned Movement.1 After 28 months of the Janata Party's rule, Mrs. Indira Gandhi recaptured power in January 1980 and appointed P.V. Narasimha Rao as the External Affairs Minister.

The Soviet intervention in Afghanistan in December 1979 and India's decision to abstain in the UN General Assembly voting on the subject in January 1980 - when more than 103 nations voted for the resolution condemning the Soviet Union and calling for withdrawal of its troops from Afghanistan - resulted in a serious setback to India's Non-Aligned policy.2 Although India tried to project its policy as being not pro-Soviet by calling for the withdrawal of both intervention (by USSR) and interference (by the West, Pakistan and China), it needs to be conceded that India's Afghan policy resulted in a serious impairing of its Non-Aligned position.

It was perhaps a realisation of these foreign policy lapses that made Mrs. Gandhi feel the need for correcting the imbalances in India's Non-Alignment during the years that followed. Guided by such an objective, Mrs. Gandhi initiated measures to strike an æqui-proximus position vis-a-vis both the Super Powers. But clearly Mrs. Indira Gandhi was keen to impress upon the American leadership that India was in favour of an upgradation of its relationship with the United States. Her visit to the USA in the Summer of 1982, which she described as a 'voyage of discovery' resulted, to a great extent, in clearing the American misgivings about India and paved the way for an upswing in the technological and economic relationship between the two countries.

The Seventh Summit Conference of Non-Aligned countries took place in New Delhi during 7-13 March, 1983 and India was the chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement at a particularly difficult time in international relations. Tensions were on the increase as the world feared that it was on the verge of a new and more dangerous stage in the nuclear arms race. There were no prospects of a dialogue opening between the major nuclear-weapon states. There was a hardening of their positions which made the possibility of solutions in troubled areas such as Southern Africa, the

1. Ibid., pp.95-96.

Middle East, and Central America even more remote. The 
global dialogue on economic issues remained stalemated. The 
relevance of Non-Alignment itself was being questioned and 
attempts made to weaken the cohesion of the Non-Aligned 
Movement by promoting bloc-oriented policies. The Seventh 
Summit reinforced the dynamic role of the Non-Aligned 
Movement as a bulwark of peace, disarmament and development.

From Belgrade to New Delhi, the Non-Aligned Movement 
has taken twenty-two years and with every successive summit, 
the Movement crossed new hurdles. And every summit has been 
historic because step by step this Movement of the newly 
independent countries - the former colonies and 
semi-colonies of the imperialist powers - has been turning a 
new leaf. But the New Delhi Summit marked a significantly 
new turning point in the history of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The important aspect of the Summit was that it not 
only reaffirmed "the principles and the ideas" for which the 
Movement had always stood but also made the Movement 
concrete and specific. In this sense, the significant 
outcome of the Summit was that in the evolution of this 
Movement new perceptions were introduced and the Movement 
began to affect almost every sphere of international 
relations.¹ That nearly two-thirds of the members of the 
United Nations should have taken a clear stand on key issues

facing humanity - how to avert a nuclear war to bring about disarmament, promote democratisation of international relations on the basis of equality, and, above all to build a New International Economic Order through global negotiations - shows that correlation of the forces in the UN has not only changed but that it is the Non-Aligned Movement that has taken the banner of strengthening this international body.

The Seventh Non-Aligned Summit Conference under the chairmanship of India took a stand on the crucial issue of peace. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi in her inaugural speech at the Summit making a fervent appeal to the "nuclear-weapon powers", called upon them "to give up the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in any circumstances, suspend all nuclear tests; and resume disarmament negotiations with determination to reach an agreement"\(^1\) and described "the Non-Aligned Movement as history's biggest peace Movement".\(^2\)

The conference emphasized that while nuclear disarmament had the highest priority, efforts should be made to conclude without further delay a treaty banning chemical weapons. Conventional disarmament must also be pursued within the context of progress towards general and complete

---

disarmament. The Conference declared once again that the outer space should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes.¹

The main objectives and conclusions of the conference were set forth in its main documents - the Political Declaration, the New Delhi Message and the Economic Declaration.

The Summit Conference appealed to the Great Powers to halt the arms race and adopt urgent and practical measures for the prevention of nuclear war "which threatens not only the well-being of humanity in our times but the future generations as well"² and to stop further production and deployment of nuclear weapons and recognise the need for enlightened multilateralism and interdependence of the developed and developing countries as well as the necessity of finding global solutions to economic crises, concerning balance-of-payments unequal exchange and debt-problems of developing countries.

The Conference also proposed "the immediate convening of an international conference on money and finance for

development, with universal participation, and a comprehensive restructuring of the international monetary and financial system. On the urgent political problems of the Palestinian people, Namibia, South Africa, Central America and other areas it called for "a sincere effort on the part of the countries of the world to resolve them in accordance with the principles of peace and justice, independence and equality", expressing the commitment of the Non-Aligned Movement "to pressing these and other critical issues at the (forthcoming) thirty-eighth session of the United Nations' General Assembly".¹

Another outstanding contribution made by the New Delhi Summit was in regard to international economic relations. It referred to the increasing gap between the developing and the industrialised countries as a serious problem and source of instability, jeopardizing world peace and security. The summit also emphasized the necessity of restructuring the world economy by establishing a New International Economic Order. A comprehensive action programme for economic cooperation among the Non-Aligned and the developing countries was worked out at this Conference.

India's chairmanship of the Movement lasted for about three and a half years - March 1983 to August 1986. During this period many initiatives were taken in different areas

of the Non-Aligned activity. On the brutal assassination of Mrs. Indira Gandhi on 31st October, 1984, the mantle of the leadership of the Non-Aligned Movement fell on the shoulders of the young Prime Minister Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. Under his dynamic leadership, the Non-Aligned Movement took significant initiatives in all spheres. It strove to achieve its fundamental objectives in the fields of peace, disarmament and development. It carried forward the relentless struggle for the emancipation of the oppressed people of South Africa and the independence of Namibia. And it continued to give high priority to the resolution of the question of Palestine, which was at the core of the Middle East problem.

During the period of India's chairmanship, the struggle for peace and nuclear disarmament remained one of the basic priorities of the Non-Aligned Movement. At the thirty-eighth United Nations' General Assembly on 27 September 1983, the chairperson of the Non-Aligned Movement, Mrs. Gandhi made a strong plea for peace and disarmament. Mrs. Gandhi stressed that only general and complete disarmament could provide real and enduring security. She urged the nuclear powers to resume negotiations for nuclear arms control and disarmament, and called for a ban on the production and testing of all nuclear weapons.

The chairperson joined in a major global initiative in the field of nuclear disarmament. Mrs. Gandhi and five other world leaders, viz., from Argentina, Greece, Sweden, Mexico and Tanzania, issued a joint appeal, on 22 May 1984 to the five nuclear-weapon powers to halt "all testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems to be immediately followed by substantial reductions in nuclear forces". ¹ For the first time, six nations from five continents came together in such a cause.

This disarmament initiative was vigorously pursued by Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi, who hosted the Six Nation Summit on Nuclear Disarmament in New Delhi in January 28, 1985. ² The New Delhi Declaration called upon the nuclear powers as well as the people, parliaments and governments of all nations of the world to take urgent steps towards a total ban on the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. The declaration also called for a comprehensive test ban treaty, prevention of any arms race in the outer space, and strengthening of the UN system to ensure the urgently needed transfer of substantial resources from the arms race to social and economic development.

A few months later, at the end of 1985, the six leaders sent appeals to the US and the USSR suggesting the suspension of all nuclear tests for a period of 12 months.¹ They also offered their good offices in order to facilitate the establishment of effective verification arrangement. In March 1986, the six leaders, sent another message to President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev, urged them not to authorise any nuclear tests before the next Summit Meeting and renewed their offer to assist in verifying the halt in nuclear testing.

The six leaders met again in Ixpata, Mexico, to renew their call for nuclear disarmament. The Mexico Declaration emphasised the crucial importance of the immediate suspension of nuclear tests, followed by negotiations leading to a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. They also made a concrete offer of assistance to achieve adequate verification arrangements in connection with a moratorium or ban on nuclear-weapon tests.² The Delhi Declaration of 1985, and the Mexico Declaration of 1986 received widespread support from the international community including the public in the nuclear-weapon states themselves.

2. Ibid., p.173.
As chairman of the Movement India made continuous efforts for the implementation of the strategies adopted by the Seventh Summit Conference for global economic recovery through a restructuring of the international economic system to remove the existing inequalities and imbalances and the reactivation of the global dialogue on economic issues.

At the invitation of the chairperson of the Non-Aligned Movement during the thirty-eighth session of the United Nations' General Assembly, Twenty-four Heads of State or Government met in New York in two informal get-togethers during September 27-29, 1983. The participants represented different ideologies, regions, and economic systems. They examined in detail the proposals of the Seventh Summit, especially those about the international monetary and financial systems. The gathering was able to demonstrate its collective commitment to reduce international tensions and promote economic development. The meeting gave to the leaders from the developing as well as developed countries an opportunity to understand each other's point of view about major global problems.

In May 1984, Smt. Indira Gandhi sent personal emissaries to the countries participating in the Summit of the Seven Industrialized countries in London, calling upon

them to take a more constructive attitude towards the problems facing the Non-Aligned and developing countries. On her assassination the concern of the Non-Aligned Movement was once again highlighted in a special communication from the new chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement Rajiv Gandhi to the Prime Minister of Japan on the eve of the Tokyo Summit of Industrialized countries.\(^1\) Thus he sought to keep open the channels of communication between the developed and the developing countries.

The Non-Aligned countries made sustained efforts to provide impetus to the Action Programme for Economic Cooperation according to the guidelines prepared at the Seventh Summit Conference.

The chairperson sent India's External Affairs Minister as a representative of the Movement to participate in the Ministerial Meeting of the Group of 77 in Buenos Aires in April 1983 and explain the initiatives taken by the Non-Aligned countries to promote South-South Cooperation.\(^2\) The Non-Aligned Movement was also represented at the second, third, fourth and fifth meetings of the Intergovernmental Follow-up and Co-ordination Committee (IFCC-II, III, IV and V) at Tunis (September 1983), Cartagena (1984), Jakarta (August 1985) and Cairo (August 1986) with a view to

---


facilitating co-ordination and harmonization of the Caracas Programme of Action of the Group of 77 and the Action Programme for Economic Cooperation of the Non-Aligned Countries.

The Fifth Meeting of the Co-ordinating Countries of the Action Programme for Economic Cooperation of Non-Aligned countries was held in New Delhi from 7-11 April, 1986.¹ The meeting devised a special institutional innovation in the field of the economic activity of the Movement. It suggested that in order to pay greater attention to economic problems which the Non-Aligned countries were facing, a separate high-level committee may be set up. Consequently, the proposal to constitute a Standing Ministerial Committee for Economic Cooperation, was established by the Eighth Summit Conference.

On the question of Namibia also the Movement has kept up its momentum under India's chairmanship in a very large way.² After the Seventh Summit, an International Conference in support of the Namibian people for Independence was held in Paris in April 1983, sixteen Non-Aligned countries took part in it and supported the Namibian people. In the Security Council meeting in May the same year, the Non-Aligned countries repeated their position.

The Non-Aligned Movement's Coordinating Bureau met in New Delhi in October 1983 to be informed of the latest developments at the SWAPO and held another meeting the very next month before the UN General Assembly session. Mrs. Gandhi received a high-level delegation of the UN Council on Namibia in May 1984. Later on Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi called an Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the co-ordinating Bureau on the question of Namibia in Delhi from 19-21 April, 1985, and adopting a comprehensive declaration on Namibia and a plan of Action of the Movement.\(^1\) In June 1985 the UN Security Council held a meeting on the Namibian question in response to the call of the Delhi Bureau meeting and Resolution 566 (1985) was finally adopted on Namibia.

The question of Palestine had been in the forefront of the Non-Aligned Activity. During India's chairmanship of the Movement the Non-Aligned Committee of Eight on Palestine, which had been constituted by the Seventh Summit, was kept active.\(^2\) The first meeting was convened in New Delhi in October, 1983. The meeting stressed the need for urgent action to find just and durable peace in the Middle East on the basis of the guidelines contained in the Geneva Declaration on Palestine and in the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestine rights adopted at the


In November 1983, India, the Chairman of the Movement convened a ministerial meeting of the Committee of Eight to consider the worsening situation in the region. It deputed a four-member Non-Aligned Ministerial Group of the Foreign Ministers of Cuba, India, Yugoslavia and Senegal to go to the Arab countries and study the situation in the Middle East.¹ This group, after a visit, reported that different factions within the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) had offered to work for honouring and safeguarding the cease fire. The PLO leaders also told the group that they would work for unity.

The Committee of Eight of the Non-Aligned Countries worked actively in the UN and secured the passage of an important resolution 38/58c through the General Assembly. It called for the convening of an International Peace Conference on West Asia and requested the Secretary General to begin the preparatory work in this regard. Thereafter the Non-Aligned countries continued their efforts.

The Committee of Eight also met in April, May and September 1985 to hear Yasser Arafat, the PLO chairman, on the then prevailing situation and to consider other related

matters. In October 1985 the meeting of the Non-Aligned countries was held at the UN headquarters to condemn Israel for its barbaric, cold-blooded and totally unjustified attack on Tunisia and expressed deep distress at the heavy loss of life among Tunisian and Palestinian civilians, offered to support the Government and people of Tunisia and the PLO against Israel's aggression.

On the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian people, on 29 November, 1985, the then chairman of the Movement, Rajiv Gandhi, sent a message in which he stressed that "a permanent and durable peace in the Middle East will not be possible till the people of Palestine secure a state of their own in their national homeland". 2

The Iran-Iraq crisis has also been the focus of India's attention as chairman of the Movement. The chairman sent several messages to the leaders of both the countries urging them to bring about an immediate end to the conflict. Special Indian emissaries visited the two countries to secure peace between them. The chairman of the Movement also received envoys from both Iran and Iraq several times. In March, 1985 Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi appealed to the

1. Asian Recorder, June 4-10, 1985, p.18347.
Presidents of Iran and Iraq for the cessation of attacks on the civilian population.

At the initiative of the Non-Aligned member countries in the Security Council, a resolution was passed on February 4, 1986 unanimously deploiring the continuation of this conflict and appealing for an immediate ceasefire, termination of all hostilities and adoption of follow-up measures like withdrawal of troops, exchange of prisoners etc.¹

On 18 February, 1986, the chairman of the Movement states that,² India had consistently endeavoured, through many initiatives, to bring about an end to the said conflict and to promote a peaceful settlement in the interests of both the countries as well as for stability and peace in the region.

'AFRICA Fund' (Action for Resisting Invasion, Colonialism and Apartheid) was established in 1986 at Harare Summit Conference under the chairmanship of India with nine member fund committee to put an end to the policy of apartheid. A Summit meeting of the AFRICA Fund was held in January 1987 under the chairmanship of Rajiv Gandhi, Prime Minister of India. He declared "The AFRICA Fund was

established at Harare to go to the help of all those who are victims of the apartheid regime - the people of South Africa, the people of Namibia and the people of the Frontline states. It is a Fund meant to assist those whose struggle is our struggle. It is a Fund to finish apartheid. It is a Fund to forestall bloodshed. It is a Fund for peace. It is a Fund for the triumph of the human spirit."¹

The leaders who assembled at the AFRICA Fund Summit issued an appeal to the world,² expressing grave concern at the sharp deterioration of the situation in South Africa arising out of the unabated practice of the pernicious system of apartheid by the recist Pretoria regime and called upon all nations of the world, international financial and other organisations, non-governmental organisations and individuals to contribute generously to the AFRICA Fund.

India was the first country to announce a pledge of Rs.500 million over a period of three years. This amount was to be utilised for sending essential supplies urgently required in the region and for setting up projects with Indian machinery and equipment supported by managerial and technical assistance inputs from India.

The Summit adopted a plan of Action for the Fund.\(^1\) This plan sets out specific projects and measures to be undertaken by the Fund to achieve its objectives. The areas covered included the establishment of strategic relief reserves to relieve the shortage of essential commodities, strengthen transport and communication system in the Frontline states, and assist the liberation movements in South Africa and Namibia.

Following the Summit, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, as chairman of the AFRICA Fund addressed personal letters to all countries, Non-Aligned and others alike, as well as to the Secretary-General of the UN, the Secretary-General of Commonwealth and the President of the European Economic Commission. In appealing to the conscience of all human kind, he sought support for the AFRICA Fund for a Crusade against apartheid.

The response was an overwhelming reiteration of opposition to apartheid. The setting up of the AFRICA Fund was widely welcomed. By September 1987, the Fund had received pledges and contribution amounting to the equivalent of over US $240 million.

Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, chairman of the AFRICA Fund, presented a report at the inaugural session of the Ninth Non-Aligned Summit on 4th September 1989 at Belgrade and said that the Fund was an earnest of Non-Aligned Movement's Commitment to stand by the people of South Africa.

as destiny carries them to a famous victory. He said further that "the Fund was perhaps the first concrete manifestation of a united effort based essentially on effective South-South Cooperation. Almost 80 per cent of the contributions were from the developing countries - nations hard-pressed for resources and trying desperately to cope with their own problems of development".¹

Rajiv Gandhi said that since the AFRICA Fund was created at the Harare Summit, the Southern Africa had witnessed important changes. The process of Namibia's independence was gathering momentum within South Africa: there were stirrings of change and indications that at least some sections of the white community had begun to realise the need for fundamental political reform leading to the dismantling of apartheid. He said that when the Southern Africa was face-to-face with one of the most crucial moments of its history, "it is important that ... we carry forward the struggle against invasion, colonialism and apartheid with renewed vigour". He added that "there must be no wavering at the moment, when the people of Southern Africa urgently needed Non-Aligned Movement's support and assistance."²

The Summit decided that the three-year-old AFRICA Fund should continue its activities with India as chairman since the objective of total eradication of apartheid and colonialism in the Southern Africa was still to be achieved. It was also agreed that Zambia, Vice-Chairman of the nine-member Fund Committee, would continue to be in the same office.

India's Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi proposed that an $18 billion-a-year international environmental fund be created, highlighting the growing concern of the Non-Aligned Movement over global pollution. He criticised the industrialised countries for the depletion of the ozone layer, global warming, dumping of hazardous wastes and deforestation but noted, nevertheless that the developed states do "acknowledge these facts and own their responsibility".1

India's Role in the initiation of the policy of Non-Alignment under the leadership of Nehru and later in the evolution of the Non-Aligned Movement is widely recognised. Its role in evolving the policy and Movement of Non-Alignment has been second to none. India's position has been staunch in this Movement on account of various reasons. Its history, geography, size, economic growth and leadership

1. NAM's Role in Furthering the Cause of a New World Order, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi, September 1989, pp.23-25.
have always been somewhat special. There is no doubt that India has been a pillar of strength to the Movement. Practically all major gatherings of the Non-Aligned countries, particularly during the Summits from Belgrade to Belgrade, the various member countries have looked towards India for guidance in reaching compromise solutions to difficult problems in the face of differences of opinion.

India's foreign policy has been mainly based on the policy of Non-Alignment. Under the dynamic leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru, Lal Bahadur Shastri, Mrs. Gandhi, Morarji Desai and Rajiv Gandhi, India has enhanced its prestige in the international arena through its policy of Non-Alignment.

Practically and the Indian Prime Ministers as heads of delegations to the Non-Aligned Summit Conferences have contributed in giving new directions to the Non-Alignment policy in the changing international circumstances. India's sober and balanced contribution was widely recognised when it was requested to host the Seventh Summit Conference in New Delhi within a short period. During three and a half years of India's chairmanship, many initiatives were taken in different issues of the Non-Aligned activity.

Regarding the interests of international community especially those of the Non-Aligned, developing countries, India should leave no stone unturned to carry forward the policy and principles, enunciated and initiated by Nehru. He had envisioned and worked for an international order
which was based on peace, justice and harmony, Non-Alignment was his instrument to achieve these objectives. Nehru made it clear that the essence of Non-Alignment was the belief that each country had not only the right to be free but also the right to decide its own policy and way of life.

Mrs. Gandhi, one of the successors of Nehru, gave a new dimension to the Non-Aligned Movement. Rajiv Gandhi, the young and dynamic Prime Minister of India, who succeeded Mrs. Gandhi convened a Six Nation Summit on Nuclear Disarmament in 1985. He was elected chairman of the AFRICA Fund established at Harare and his role was praised by all nations. He also suggested the establishment of a Planet Protection Fund under the aegis of UN and this proposal was approved by the Belgrade Summit Conference.

Mrs. Gandhi and later Rajiv Gandhi tried to promote constant interaction within the Non-Aligned Movement with a view to evolving a consensus and strengthen cohesion and unity. Agreements were arrived at through wide consultations approaching differences in perception with a sense of realism. The emphasis all along had been on bridging differences and promoting consensus. India's non-confrontationist approach and its successful efforts to keep the
authentic principles of the Movement substantially intact, were widely recognised and appreciated. Thus, India has contributed a lot to the growth of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Apart from India's contribution to the Non-Aligned Movement, it is also essential to study different Non-Aligned countries contribution at different Non-Aligned Summit Conferences to Non-Aligned Movement to have a comprehensive understanding about it. Therefore, an attempt is made in the succeeding chapter to examine the programmes and policies of the Non-Aligned Movement from Belgrade to Belgrade.