CHAPTER - II

GENESIS AND GROWTH OF NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT
Non-Alignment 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. The policy of Non-Alignment has been in operation for over four decades and is practised today by 108 countries of the world. The concept of Non-Alignment was put into practice in the late 1940s and has firmly established itself since the Belgrade Conference of 1961.

While delineating the different implications of the policy of Non-Alignment, late Prime Minister Nehru observed:

"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 in so far 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.... 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... independently and trying to maintain friendly relations with all countries.\textsuperscript{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 terms 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 in so far as it decided not to join either bloc. The term 'neutrality', however, connotes that the country which adopts such a policy has no positive opinions on the issues which divide the blocs. This certainly is not true as far as India is concerned, and the term "neutrality" is, therefore, inapplicable to India's policy. On significant world issues especially in so far 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 the Suez Crisis (Egypt) as a "naked aggression" (1956); and it condemned, albeit belatedly, Soviet interference in Hungary (1956); and it had earlier considered the North Korean troops marching into South Korea as an "aggression."\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1} Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches, September 1957-April 1963, Government of India, Ministry of Publication Division, Delhi, 1964, p. 381.

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" itself came into being during fifties when it was used for the first time in the UN by its Indian representative V.K. Krishna Menon. The Egyptian President Nasser preferred the term "Positive neutralism". The Burmese premier UNU said: "this policy has been called neutralism in cold war". The western socialists were in favour of using the term neutrality or neutralism rather than "Non-Alignment".

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 involves abstention from the cold war. Non-Alignment has not implied neutrality in the anti-colonial struggle or in the conflicts between the developing and developed nations. Indeed, the claim has

often been made that Non-Alignment may involves active participation in Cold War disputes provided that each issue is decided 'on its merits', rather than by regular support of a bloc leader. The distinction between Non-Alignment and neutrality may be summed up by the differences between the activist approach and that of the isolationist.

Non-Alignment has often been defined as an independent foreign policy.\(^1\) It is an expression, of the independent spirit and judgement of a nation. It reflects a country's own perception of 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.

To some, Non-Alignment is a negative policy or attitude, some Non-Aligned countries have sought to call their policy positive neutralism, dynamic neutralism, etc. Many countries have even suggested that the term should be abandoned in favour of a new name which would express the positive attitude and objectives.\(^2\) Probably this was the reason why Nehru did not approve of the term Non-Alignment in the beginning. Later, it was he who defined the term and


gave it currency.\textsuperscript{1} Still, the Non-Aligned countries are not agreed on the absolute connotation and denotation of the term. There have been a number of differences on the emphasis, meaning and implications of Non-Alignment. Today one can talk of various types of Non-Alignment, for, like alignment, Non-alignment is no longer monolithic.

Non-Alignment is not the only most satisfactory term by which the policy or attitude it denotes is represented. Even Jawaharlal Nehru, who probably 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 words used to denote the idea of Non-Alignment.\textsuperscript{2}

However, since the Belgrade and the Cairo Summit conferences accepted the term Non-Alignment as the most authoritative and commonly accepted term for a policy which all the members claimed to follow, it can be accepted\textsuperscript{3}. It is true that the basis of the concept of Non-Alignment was

\hspace{1cm}


made evident by the pronouncements of its founding fathers and there after 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 more into vague after 1958,¹ but a change in terminology does not reflect any change in policy.

"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 the 1950s, Jawaharlal Nehru stressed the active quality of Non-Alignment.² 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 of neutral state also has certain duties and claims certain rights. This conception is however of recent date. Until as late as two hundred years ago the term had different meanings.

Non-Alignment is not neutrality of a non-belligerent country during a general war. Many countries seem to take the view that Non-Alignment means neutrality at the time of general war. It is not correct. The present Non-Alignment is not neutrality of the Swiss or Austrian brand, guaranteed by other nations by a treaty. 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.\(^1\) Almost all Non-Aligned countries probably agreed with Jawaharlal Nehru, when he said "Where freedom is menaced or justice is threatened, or where aggression takes place, we cannot and shall not be neutral."\(^2\)

Non-Alignment was from the beginning defined as non-entanglement in the confrontation of two big power blocs. This did not mean acceptance of neutral or equidistance approach. It imposed from the very beginning active involvement, in diffusing or overcoming world conflicts, global or local. It is generally irrelevant to identify the rights and wrongs but to qualify the offence and try to reduce the consequences or further complications.\(^3\) Principled Non-Aligned approach has always

---


been to take a stand according to the merit of the case and not to depend on the parties involved. There is no justification to change this approach in any way.

This reality was very clearly expressed by Nehru in a statement at a press conference at UN Correspondents' association, in New York in 1960:

"When independence came, we naturally thought more or less following that policy, which was in our minds, in the international sphere. By and large we have tried to follow it. It was, therefore, a continuation of the previous ten or twenty years of thinking and resolution. Our present policy has, thus, grown out of ourselves; it has not been thrust upon us by anybody. It is not a question of balancing between groups or blocs of nations which have arisen. That kind of sitting on the fence or balancing has not occurred to us at all. We are adopting a positive policy which we think is right."¹

It is significant that those states which consider themselves neutral are not inclined to do so among the Non-Aligned countries. Switzerland and Austria are not Non-Aligned countries. There is a significant distinction, as

Nehru already pointed earlier, between Non-Alignment and neutrality.

Non-Alignment, as Nehru conceived it, is best defined as not entering into military alliance with any country, of either the western or the communist bloc. The second essential of Non-Alignment is acting according to our best judgement, and independent approach to foreign policy not being tied down to any particular line of action because of membership of a cold war bloc. A third essential is an attempt to maintain friendly relations with all countries, whether belonging to military blocs or not.¹

Non-Aligned countries do not represent a third bloc against the existing blocs (the USA and the USSR). Such an idea runs counter to the basis of the policy of Non-Alignment. Describing the idea of a third bloc or a third power Jawaharlal Nehru said, "if it meant a third area, which did not want war, which worked for peace and which believed in co-operation, I would have no objection to it."²

Non-Aligned countries do not at all follow isolationist policies. On the other hand they play an active role in major conflicts and international politics. They are determined to play a dominant role in the event of great

world conflicts. They do not want to keep aloof. Norodom Sihanouk declared at the Belgrade Conference that Non-Alignment represented a dynamic form of international life, not an unhealthy and passive intervention.

Non-Aligned countries are as much interested in themselves as they are in the aligned countries. This can be proved by the statement of 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, in its merit, and not merely to do something or give a vote just to please this power or that power...."

It is said from the beginning that Non-Alignment is not just a policy of a country but one of those things that the world requires. Otherwise the 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 ideology of Non-Alignment emerged out of the foreign policies of the governments that first formed the

alliance. In particular Tito's concern with peaceful co-existence, Nehru's moralistic attack on the great powers with the Panchasheela, and Nasser's Arab Nationalism combined to produce the Philosophy of Non-Alignment.¹

Non-Alignment is a global social movement, a coalition of a variety of Governments which share certain broad international objectives. These Governments coalesce on certain occasions to obtain specific objectives.² Non-Alignment is more a movement than an organisation, and while organised action is essential, it is movement that can withstand the domineering forces of the blocs and the super powers and exercise influence on the minds of people everywhere, including the camps of the Aligned. "Non-Aligned countries", as president Tito said, "are fighting for the broadest interest of making as a whole, and not for some narrow goals of their own."³ In the long run the validity of the movement will rest on this rationale. Non-Alignment alone can provide the framework of an international movement against the new arms race, the fresh tensions between the two power blocs, and the consequent increasing interventionism in the Non-Aligned World.

As a movement Non-Alignment champions the cause of a New World order, which is committed to dynamic goals of human betterment. It stands for peace, freedom, independence, sovereign equality of all nations, mutual respect and mutual benefit. It implies an attitude of objectivity based on the perception of larger world interests rather than on the narrow and limited ones 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-racialism and anti-apartheid.

The main object of the whole movement is peace and prosperity of all human kind. Only a world free from conflict and tension 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 piling up of lethal weapons. Non-Aligned Movement 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 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

The policy and movement of Non-Alignment cannot have a part in the struggle to democratize international relations or prove attractive to other countries, movements and parties, if it does not itself set an example of democratic practice in all areas and modes of its action.¹ Non-Alignment has to be preserved as a factor of peace and stability, as a pillar of self-reliance for developing countries.

Non-Alignment strictly speaking, represents not merely one aspect of policy; but it has other positive aims also.² These aims are: 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 characteristics of the politics and spheres of interest. The aims of the Non-Alignment are:

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

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

3. An end to racial discrimination and apartheid.

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

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.² 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. In the same way they cannot claim that they are the sole protectors of international peace.

Non-Alignment stands for national independence and freedom.\(^1\) It also stands for peace and the avoidance of confrontation. It aims at keeping away from military alliances. It means equality among nations and the democratization of international relations, economic and political. It wants global cooperation for development on the basis of mutual benefit. It is a strategy for the recognition and preservation of world peace.

With the escalation of the Cold War, the Super Powers began jostling each other, taking advantage of the internal weaknesses of the free countries. Their interference in the affairs of the new states caused sharp deterioration in international relations.\(^2\) Impelled by internal and external factors, some countries developed a tendency to keep themselves aloof from the cold war. Non-Alignment came into existence as a result of the spontaneous

1. Dhawan, S.K., Selected Thoughts of Indira Gandhi: A Book of Quotes, Mittal Publications, Delhi, 1985, p. 221.

desire of some of the countries who became independent after the World War - II.

The need for Non-Alignment increased with the increase in the number of small and middle sized countries which refused to join the power blocs and subordinate to them their own foreign policies.¹ The attitude of these countries was well described by Krishna Menon when he said, "We would not go back to the West with its colonialism and there was no question of our going to the Soviet, we did not even know them much. And with our alliances after our independence we desired not to get involved in foreign entanglements."²

In a sense the Asian Relations Conference held in Delhi in 1946, the Conference on Indonesia held in Delhi in 1949, the Five-Power Colombo Conference of 1954, and the Bandung Conference of 1955 were fore-runners of the Belgrade Conference of Non-Aligned Nations.³ These Asian and Asian-African gatherings were not merely regional or narrowly nationalistic conclaves. They represented the movement of history and the urges and aspirations of millions of suppressed people and of 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.

If the Belgrade Conference of 1961 was the first organised and formal gathering of Non-Aligned countries, the joint statement issued by Nehru and Tito in Delhi in 1954 was the first and formal proclamation to the world by Yugoslavia and India together that they had adopted a policy of Non-Alignment. That was a turning point which marked the transformation of the policy of Non-Alignment into the greatest and the most vital International Movement.

A meeting of representatives of 22 countries took place in Cairo in June 1961 and this conference evolved the Criteria\(^1\) for deciding the states to be invited to the first Summit Conference in Belgrade in September, 1961.

1. The committee laid down the following criteria:

(i) The country to be invited should have adopted an independent policy based on the co-existence of States with different systems and on Non-Alignment or show a trend in favour of such a policy.
(ii) It should have consistently supported the movements for national independence.
(iii) It should not be a member of any multi-lateral military alliance concluded in the context of great power conflicts.
(iv) If it has a bilateral 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 conflict.
(v) If it has conceded military bases to a foreign power, the concession should not have been made in the context of great power conflict.
In the course of the visit to Yugoslavia, President Nasser, President Tito and Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru met at Brioni on 18-19 July and discussed matters of mutual interest. They noticed with satisfaction that the policies pursued by their countries had contributed to a certain extent, towards the lessening of international tensions and to the development of healthy relations among the countries.

They felt that the principles of peaceful coexistence had been recognised. It was their opinion that as long as the conflicts and tensions continued, peace cannot be established.¹ They expressed that progress towards disarmament was essential for lessening fears and conflicts and they were deeply interested in international cooperation in promoting efforts to quicken the development of developing countries.

The three statesmen recognised the importance of international economic and financial cooperation; normal flow and extension of international trade. They considered the problem of the Far-East, Palestine and Algeria.² They supported all efforts towards finding a just and peaceful

settlement and acting in accordance with the basic principles of united Nations charter.

The Belgrade Summit Conference (1961) may be taken as the real beginning of the Non-Alignment in that it heralded a period of continued expansion of the movement and of its growing influence on world affairs as an independent non-bloc factor.

The first conference of the Heads of the States or Governments of Non-Aligned countries took place in Belgrade from 1st to 6th September, 1961. It was attended by delegations from 25 Asian and African States with 3 Latin American countries as observers. Thus the idea of Non-Alignment crossed the expansion of the Atlantic and Pacific. In the declaration passed unanimously at the Belgrade Summit Conference, it was noted that the struggle for peace against colonialism, and racism was the principal orientation of Non-Alignment.

The conference considered it essential that the Non-Aligned countries should participate in solving outstanding international issues concerning peace and security in the world as none of them can remain unaffected by or indifferent to them. It also felt that a further expansion of Non-Aligned area of the world constitutes the only possible and indispensable alternative to the policy of total division of the world into blocs and intensification
of cold war policies. It provided encouragement and support to all people fighting for their independence and equality. The participants in the Conference were convinced that the emergence of newly-liberated countries would further assist in narrowing of the area of bloc antagonisms and thus encourage all tendencies aimed at strengthening peace and promoting peaceful cooperation among independent and equal nations.

The participants solemnly reaffirmed their support to the "Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and people", adopted at the 15th session of the UN General Assembly and recommended the immediate unconditional, total and final abolition of colonialism and resolved to make a concerted effort to put an end to all types of neo-colonialism and imperialist domination in all its forms and manifestations.

The participants demanded the immediate termination of all colonial occupation and the restoration of the territorial integrity to the rightful people in countries in which it had been violated in Asia, Africa and


2. Ibid.
Latin America as well as the withdrawal of foreign forces from their national soil. They resolutely condemned the policy of apartheid practised by the Union of South Africa and demanded its immediate abandonment. They further stated that the policy of racial discrimination anywhere in the world constitutes a grave violation of the charter of the UN and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The second conference of Non-Aligned countries was held in Cairo from 5th to 10th, October, 1964. The number of participants increased to 47 which was more than double the number of the first conference. In addition, there were observers from 9 Latin American States, the League of Arab States, and the Organisation of African Unity. At the opening of the Conference the President of the United Arab Republic (UAR) Nasser noted the contribution made by Non-Aligned countries to the struggle of the people against colonialism, for peace and removal of tension from international relations.\(^1\)

The Heads of States or Governments of the Non-Aligned countries declared that imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism constitute a basic source of international tension and conflict because they endanger world peace and

\(^1\) The Documents of the "Second Conference of Heads of States or Government of Non-Aligned countries, Cairo, October 5-10, 1964", Published as DGNC 1961-79, New Delhi, 1981, p. 19.
security. The participants in the conference deplored that the declaration of the UN on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples had not been implemented everywhere and called for the immediate unconditional, complete and final abolition of colonialism. The conference condemned all colonialist, neo-colonialist and imperialist policies followed in various parts of the world.

The conference solemnly reaffirmed the right of peoples to self-determination and to make their own destiny. It also denounced the attitude of those powers which opposed the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination. It declared that racial discrimination - particularly its most odious manifestation, apartheid - constitutes a violation of Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of the principle of the equality of peoples.¹

Accordingly, the participants suggested that all governments still persisting in the practice of racial discrimination should be completely ostracized until they abandoned their unjust and inhuman policies. In particular the governments and peoples represented at this conference decided that they would not tolerate much longer the presence of the Republic of South Africa in the comity of Nations. The inhuman racial policies of South Africa constituted a threat to international peace and security.

¹. Ibid, p.20.
They felt that all countries interested in peace must, therefore, do everything in their power to ensure liberty and fundamental freedoms to the people of South Africa.¹

The consultative meeting of special representatives of Non-Aligned countries which was held in Belgrade in 1969 reaffirmed the dedication of their states to the policy of Non-Alignment as expressed in the declaration of the Belgrade and the Cairo conferences. These principles continue to be valid in the conditions of the present day world and the policy of Non-Alignment has asserted itself as a significant and lasting factor in international relations.²

The next conference of Non-Aligned countries was held in Lusaka in September 8-10, 1970. During the nine years that passed between the Belgrade and the Lusaka Summit Conferences the membership of the Non-Aligned countries nearly tripled. This was not only due to the emergence of new independent countries but also to the anti-imperialist orientation of Non-Alignment and its positive role in international relations.

1. Ibid, p.22.
The conference while asserting 'what is needed is not redefinition of Non-Alignment but a re dedication by all the Non-Aligned countries to its central aims and objectives,' declared that the following continue to be the basic aims of Non-Alignment.¹ They are, the pursuit of world peace and peaceful co-existence by strengthening the role of Non-Alignment within the UN, so that it will be a more effective obstacle against all forms of aggressive action and the threat or use of force against colonialism and racism which are a negation of human equality and dignity, the settlement of disputes by peaceful means; the ending of the arms race followed by universal disarmament, opposition to great power military bases and foreign troops on the soil of other nations in the context of great-power conflicts and colonial and racist suppression, the universality of and strengthening of the efficiency of the UN; and the struggle for economic and mutual cooperation on the basis of equality and mutual benefit.²

The Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned countries reaffirmed their support to the Arab people and called for the full restoration of the rights of the Arab


people of Palestine in their usurped homeland and reaffirmed their support in their struggle for national liberation and against colonialism and racism.

The conference expressed full support for the solidarity with the oppressed people of South Africa struggling for freedom and human rights and fighting against colonialism and racial discrimination and called upon all countries especially the Non-Aligned to extend their moral and material assistance to them through the liberation committee of the OAU.¹

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 interests. In this context, Non-Alignment may be called a "Non-Alignment Policy". The collective stand of Non-Aligned countries on concrete international issues is called 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 Georgetown in 1972,² when a large number of countries participated.

1. The Documents of the 'Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, Lusaka, Sep. 8-10-1970", Published as the DGNC 1961-1979, New Delhi, pp. 45-60.
The fourth conference of Non-Aligned countries was opened in Algiers from 5th to 9th September, 1973. It was attended by over half of the countries of the world, representing the majority of the world population. It was held in the context of international situation that differed essentially from those of the preceding conferences. The imperialist aggression on Vietnam had been halted. An armistice had been announced in Laos. A new independent state Bangladesh, had emerged. The Conference noted all these developments with satisfaction.

The most significant aspect of the Algiers Conference was the fact that the Non-Aligned countries, though they welcomed the new developments leading 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.

It was pointed out that peace is indivisible and that it cannot be ensured merely by changing the area of confrontation from one place to another. Detente would be meaningless unless it took into consideration the need for peace and harmony in all parts of the world. It was also stressed that the major problems of the world like disarmament and arms control as also exploitation of the
common heritage of mankind must be solved not merely by the Super Powers alone but by taking into confidence all the Non-Aligned nations.¹

The conference reaffirmed the determination of the Non-Aligned countries to strictly observe the principles of sovereign equality and territorial integrity of all states, to refrain from the threat or use of force, and to settle their disputes by peaceful means, in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter, and they call upon all states to do the same.² It gave firm support to and expressed solidarity with the Palestinian people in their difficult trials and great sacrifices in order to regain their dignity and national identity. It upheld the action programme adopted at the international conference in Oslo in support of the victims of the colonialism and apartheid in South Africa, and called for its effective implementation.

The conference supported the admission to the UN of the people's Republic of Bangladesh, as a full and sovereign member of the family of the Non-Aligned countries. In this connection, it noted the fact that the agreements that were concluded on 23 August, 1973 in New Delhi opened


the way to solve the humanitarian problems in anticipation of the establishment of lasting peace in the subcontinent of Southern Asia. In order to ensure continuity and effectiveness of the policy of Non-Alignment which has been vindicated by recent events in the international situation, the Conference resolved to reinforce their action and to coordinate their efforts still closer.

The Great changes which were then taking place at the political, economic and technological levels in a world which was becoming better organised, the urgency and acuteness of problems of emancipation and of development and the need for a true peace were all factors which motivated the Non-Aligned Movement to cooperation in order to create a new basis for their solidarity and to guarantee their participation in solving the main international problems.

The fifth conference was held in Colombo in from 16 to 19, August 1976 in the context of an international situation characterised by an intensification of the struggle of the world for their political and economic independence and for peace and progress and for international political and economic order based on the principles of self-determination, justice, equality and peaceful co-existence between peoples and nations of the world.¹ The Conference noted with gratification that since

the policy of Non-Aligned Movement had been first advanced more than two decades ago, it had demonstrated its growing impact on the developing international situation and that the Non-Aligned Movement had played a constructive and progressively effective role in world affairs. Non-Aligned Movement had proved to be one of the most dynamic factors in promoting the genuine independence of countries and peoples and in creating conditions more conducive to peace, justice, equality and international cooperation in the world.

The Non-Aligned countries which met in Belgrade, Cairo, Lusaka and Algiers Summit conferences, by their concerted actions, made a major contribution towards a positive transformation of international relations and promotion of world peace.¹ The Fourth Summit Conference constituted an important landmark in the development of the Non-Aligned Movement, reinforced its unity and solidarity in efforts to promote international peace and security giving new impulses to the struggle of people of Asia, Africa and Latin America and other forces against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, apartheid, racism and other forms of alien domination. Since the Fourth Summit Conference the principles have been reaffirmed, and the programmes adopted at the time have been vindicated by facts.

¹ Ibid., p.235.
At the Fifth Summit Conference the number of participants increased to 86 and 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 undoubtedly due to a growing appreciation of its efficacy. The Conference considered it imperative that its members exercise unceasing vigilance to preserve intact the essential character, maintain an intense sense of fidelity to its principles and policy and show full respect for its decisions as the best safeguard against any threat to the integrity and solidarity of the movement.

Non-Aligned Movement is determined to establish a new and equitable international economic, social and political order. It is a vital force in the struggle against imperialism in all its forms and manifestations, and all other forms of foreign domination. It upholds the right of all peoples to freedom and self-determination of countries and to preserve their own independent strategy for development and participation in the international problems. It strengthens resistance to the politics of pressure and domination from all quarters.¹

Non-Aligned Movement has always held that the world conflict is not inevitable. It affirmed that newly

independent countries have an important role to play in easing tensions and safeguarding international peace. It rejected the view that international peace can be based on a balance of power blocs and military alliances with great powers. It consistently has upheld the principle of international cooperation as the basis to secure world order and has, opposed the notion that confrontation can be the only course for the countries. The Non-Aligned Movement's unfettering support for the principles of true independence and of international cooperation transcending the divisions imposed by power blocs has resulted in the acceptance of these principles and has begun to command increasing respect from the rest of the world.

The solidarity of the Non-Aligned Movement and the growing cooperation among the members constitute an essential contribution to the evolution of a New International Order founded on national independence and international co-operation based on equality, mutual trust and justice.¹

The Conference affirmed that the policy of Non-Alignment had established itself as an independent and vital force for the creation of new and just systems of political and economic relations providing for the solution of major international problems. As a result of recent developments,

¹. Ibid., p. 190.
importance of ensuring the genuine and complete independence of countries as distinct from merely formal sovereignty has been enhanced. The problem of inequal relations between countries, often amounting to domination, continues to be a disturbing phenomenon even negating the hard won freedom of some countries. Today, one of the principal tests of Non-Aligned countries remains the combating of inequal relations and domination arising from neocolonialism.

Later on Summit Conferences were held at Havana in September 3, 1979, at Delhi in March 7-12, 1983, at Harare in September 1-7, 1986, at Belgrade in September 4-7, 1989, and at Jakarta in September 1-8, 1993. Different emphases were given to the policy of Non-Alignment at different stages. At the beginning of the 1960s 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 the very character and content Non-Aligned Movement came to be changed. From a primarily political strategy, followed by the new states individually and collectively, it has transformed itself fundamentally into a collective economic movement of the Third World Countries and spearheaded the demand and the struggle for a New International Economic Order based on equality and justice.

The Belgrade Summit Conference was not, of course, altogether devoid of economic content. But the economic resolutions were relatively low in priority and significance as well as of a preliminary and exploratory nature. Thus the participants merely stated that efforts should be made to remove the economic imbalance inherited from colonialism and imperialism through accelerated economic development of the developing states, rather than an economic confrontation with the industrialised states. They recommended the establishment of the United Nations Capital Development Fund. They further agreed to demand just terms of trade for the economically less developed countries and in particular constructive efforts to eliminate the excessive fluctuations in primary commodity trade and the restrictive measures and practices which adversely affect the trade and revenues of the newly developing countries. All developing countries were invited to promote economic cooperation and exchange among themselves. Finally, with regard to foreign aid, the participants demanded the freedom of recipient states to determine the use of economic and technical assistance which they received and to draw up their own plans and assign priorities in accordance with their needs.¹

¹ The Documents of the "First Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, Belgrade, September 1-6, 1961", Published as DGNC 1961-1979, New Delhi, 1981, pp.3-7.
The Second Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Cairo in 1964 discussed the economic development and cooperation and recommended a programme of action to provide access to primary products from developing countries to the markets of industrial countries on an equitable basis and to manufactured goods from developing countries on a preferential basis. It welcomed the UN Conference on Trade and Development-I (UNCTAD) which it considered to be the result of Belgrade Summit Conference, recommended an upward revision of the targets of the United Nations Development Decade and called for a New International Division of Labour. Apart from calling for closer economic cooperation among the developing countries and the consolidation of the efforts of the Group of 77, which had worked unitedly at United Nations Conference on Trade and Development-I in Geneva, it declared for the first time that it was the duty of all countries to contribute to the rapid evolution of a new and just economic order.¹

The Lusaka Summit Conference held in 1970 marked an important stage in the evolution of the content in so far as international economic questions relating to the basic structure of the international system are concerned. It noted the lack of progress made in the implementation of the

¹ The Documents of the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, Cairo, October 5-10, 1964", Published as DGNC 1961-1979, New Delhi, 1981, pp. 20-29.
global economic policies and objectives of the Non-Aligned Movement by the international community. It observed that the rapidly widening gulf between the developing and developed states constituted a threat to international peace and security. It noted the decline in the developing countries', share in the world export trade from one-third in 1950 to one-sixth in 1969, the decrease in the financial flows from the developed to the developing in terms of percentage of Gross National Product (GNP), and the increase in the financial flows from the latter to the former. It declared that "the poverty of developing countries and their economic dependence on those in affluent circumstances constitute, structural weakness in the present world economic order". It stressed the urgent need for preventing technological colonialism.¹

The conference expressed the hope that the Second United Nations Development Decade would lead to structural changes in the world economic system. It pleaded for a massive transfer of investment from armaments to development projects on a global basis. It urged the United Nations to employ international machinery to bring about a rapid transformation of the world economic system, particularly in the field of trade, finance and technology, so that economic

domination yields to economic cooperation and economic strength is used for the benefit of the world and to adopt a programme of international action for utilisation of men and materials, science and technology. It demanded that the net financial transfers from the developed to the developing countries should constitute at least one per cent of the Gross National Product of each developed state, and that 75 per cent of the funds should come from official sources. A demand was also made for restraining the alarming increase in freight rates for eliminating discriminatory and restrictive elements. As regards their own strategy, the participants resolved to increase their economic cooperation and integration at the sub-regional and inter-regional levels; to accelerate the conclusion of commodity agreements among themselves, to strengthen the United Nations; to further the unity and solidarity of the group of 77 at all the levels; including the convening of ministerial meetings to prepare for the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development-III\(^1\).

The Algiers Conference of 1973 continued this trend. But it was again the emerging economic dimension of the collective Non-Aligned Movement which added a special significant to Conference. The participants took note of the deteriorating condition of the developing countries

1. Ibid.
vis-a-vis the developed ones in the international context since the Lusaka Conference with special reference to the United Nations International Development Strategy and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development III. The growing economic gap between the two worlds was noted with statistical data, and it was unanimously stated that the international strategy of development had failed. The Heads of State or Government also made the radical declaration that the economic aid had been misused so far, wiping out the aspirations of the developing countries. They observed that the international monetary system worked out at Bretton Woods had served only the interests of some developed countries and demanded its radical restructuring.¹

As regards the multi-national corporations, they denounced before the world public the inadmissible practices of multi-national companies, which encroach upon the sovereignty of developing countries and violate the principles of non-interference and the right of countries to self-determination, which are the basic conditions of political, economic and social progress. The conference requested the United Nations to adopt a "Charter of the Economic Rights and Duties of Countries" at the 28th session of the General Assembly on a priority basis. It pleaded for

greater cooperation between the developing and the developed countries in the economic and technological spheres, but declared the sovereign rights of the developing countries over all their natural resources.¹

On their own part, the participants resolved to increase economic cooperation among themselves and to coordinate their policies against the multi-national countries. An "Action Programme for Economic Cooperation" was adopted at the Conference with this end in view. The cooperative action programme included such items as the establishment of communication channels, relations between the advanced and the developing countries, international monetary and fiscal system, transfer of technology, primary products, environment and cooperation with the socialist countries. The last item, introduced for the first time at a Non-Aligned Summit Conference, envisaged wide ranging cooperation between the Non-Aligned and the Socialist countries including the setting up of joint committees for mutual economic cooperation and development. In particular it was observed that the socialist countries should in their development plans make a provision for the needs and export possibilities of Non-Aligned countries.²

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid.
The Colombo Summit Conference of 1976 was another important landmark in the evolution of Non-Aligned since its main thrust was on the developing trend of the preoccupation of Non-Aligned Movement with international economic issues. The Economic Declaration stated that the widening gap between the developed and the developing countries was one of the most threatening sources of tensions and conflicts and that the existing system cannot ensure the promotion of the development of the developing countries and hasten the eradication of poverty, hunger, sickness, illiteracy and also the social scourges engendered by centuries of domination and exploitation.¹

The conference declared that nothing short of a complete restructuring of international economic relations through the establishment of the "New International Economic Order (NIEO)" will place the developing countries in a position to achieve an acceptable level of development. The New International Economic Order must include, it said:

1. Fundamental restructuring of international trade, with special reference to the terms of trade,
2. fundamental restructuring of world production on the basis of New International Division of Labour,
3. radical overhauling of the existing international monetary managements,

4. adequate transfer of resources on an assured, continuous and predictable basis,

5. urgent and adequate solution to the problem of external debt, particularly of the least developed and the most seriously affected nations for the development of their agriculture, and

6. free access to sea for land-locked countries.¹

The conference welcomed the unity of the Non-Aligned countries at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development-IV and in the General Assembly of the United Nations with regard to global economic issues. It adopted a detailed and itemized 'Action Programme for Economic Cooperation among the Non-Aligned Countries' themselves as well as with the other developing countries.² The Summit Conferences which were held later on also emphasised the economic aspect.

The importance given to economic affairs at Non-Aligned meetings does not imply the acceptance of the view that the political aspects of international affairs should be left to be decided by the rich and powerful countries only, while the poor and weak should mainly concern themselves with economic affairs. It does not diminish the importance of the political ones.


². Ibid., pp. 213-222.
Therefore, the Non-Aligned Movement reflects the hopes, desires and aspirations of millions of human beings who have been denied the right of self-determination and freedom. They have suffered from colonialism, imperialism, neo-colonialism and racialism and have struggled generation after generation to emancipate themselves from colonial rule, foreign domination, tyranny, humiliation, poverty and ignorance. The Movement renewed their pledge to continue their struggle until they attained a world, based on justice and freedom and established international political and economic order governed by peace, independence, equality, and cooperation against all obstacles and forces. The Non-Aligned countries have not been following isolationist policies, but they have been playing an active role in major international conflicts.

The main aim of the Non-Aligned Movement is welfare of mankind. The Non-Aligned countries give encouragement and support to all peoples fighting for their independence and equality. They have appealed to all peoples of the world to participate in their efforts to free the world from war, the policy of force, bloc politics, military bases, pacts, inequalities, oppression, injustice, poverty, and protection of environment and to create a new order based on peaceful co-existence, mutual cooperation and friendship, an order in which all people may determine their own future, attain
their political sovereignty and promote their own free economic and social development.

The Non-Aligned Movement has been in the pursuit of world peace and peaceful co-existence by strengthening the role of Non-Alignment within the UN, so that it will be a more effective obstacle against all forms of aggressive actions. As a universal movement directed towards democratisation of international relations, it has been successful in making its small and middle countries realise their aspirations. It has assumed a new dimension by transforming itself into a general movement for peace and for the settlement of various problems of the countries of the world.

Non-Alignment, with its dynamic principles can be set as a universal concept, or rather as an anti-bloc alternative to preserve international peace, prosperity and goodwill among the states. It may be suggested that Non-Aligned Policy is one of the better policies of the present day world in achieving disarmament, world peace, the right of self-determination, equality among the peoples and a world free from colonialism, imperialism and racialism.

Non-Aligned Movement has succeeded in putting an end to colonialism, imperialism and racialism. The end of the cold war, the collapse of the Soviet Union, the disappearance of the Soviet bloc, the emergence of the USA as the
sole Super Power, have led some critics to argue that in the changing world scenario, Non-Alignment has become outmoded and irrelevant. But today Non-Aligned Movement is essential to the world community in general and to the Third World countries in particular. It can play a very active role in the revival of meaningful North-South Dialogue, and intensified South-South cooperation, protection of environment, complete disarmament, eradication of poverty, hunger, malnutrition, illiteracy, drug trafficking, neo-colonialism, global terrorism. It can help in the effective functioning of the UNO, which is very much the need of the world. Therefore, Non-Alignment is more relevant today than it was in the yester years.