CHAPTER I

EMERGENCE OF NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT
With Renaissance, Europe entered the age of Science and reason. The great scientific achievements in natural science changed the terms of western philosophical and ideological discourse. Scientific research was translated into technological inventions and innovations resulting into large scale industrialisation. The total impact of science and technology and industrial progress was the development of a variety of critiques of religion on one hand and the rise and development of secular ideologies viz, socialism, democracy, humanism etc on the other. Socialism as a political movement flourished throughout the 19th century and its classic expression was formulated in the writings of Marx and Engles et al. While the liberal democracy was integrated with capitalism in France, Germany, Great Britain, Socialist model came to dominate the policy, economy and society of USSR under the leadership of Lenin, the watershed being October, 1917 revolution. After the second world war, two power blocs crystallised in the northern hemisphere of the globe, the NATO bloc led by United States of America with commitment to individual freedom, liberalism and free enterprise
and Warsaw pact countries led by Union of Soviet Socialist Republicsunderlining the significance of distributive justice and central planning. Thus the end of the Second World War saw the emergence of the bipolar international system leading to Cold War between the two blocs.

The origin and emergence of non-aligned movement must be traced against this backdrop. The newly emerging South Asian, West Asian, North and Central African independent nation-states in fifties and sixties of this century faced a bipolar international system within which they were supposed to exercise their foreign policy options. However, the newly emerging nations questioned the moral validity, political soundness and economic wisdom of this bipolar framework. Morally the bipolar system was unjustifiable as it led to respective theoretical justifications of war and an explicit abandonment of the ethic of peace. The system could not lead to stable political nation-states, as it rested on assumptions of inter-state interference, cut-throat competition and mutual
acrimony. Economically, it foreclosed the option of free international trade and aid and stressed the respective ideologies of free market and planned development instead of a healthy pragmatism so necessary for a buoyant growth both in productive and distributive terms. Above all these considerations, the newly emerging nation-states did not want to compromise with their hard won sovereignty by aligning themselves either with capitalist liberalism or socialist totalitarianism.

The Bandung Conference of Asian and African countries may be considered a watershed in the development of NAM. It was held in 1955 at Bandung in Indonesia in which 29 countries participated. The idea of covering a Summit Conference of Asian and African countries was first proposed by the then President of Indonesia Sukarno back in 1953. The idea was to give a United Struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism.

The Non-aligned Movement is a product of the contemporary epoch. Like all social and political
movements, it resulted from the previous course of historical development and a series of major world events, which is why a correct understanding of the essence of non-alignment and its ideological sources necessitates a historical approach to this international phenomenon.

The emergence of non-alignment in international politics is the most remarkable development of the post-second world war. "No principle of foreign policy in the second half of the twentieth century has had a greater impact on relations between small countries and big powers than non-alignment." The end of World War Two inaugurated a new pattern of relationship in world politics envisaging the division of world into two power blocs each headed by the Soviet Union and the United States of America. The period also envisaged the process of decolonisation which led many countries in Asia and Africa to independence. Both the

super power embarked on a mission to win the newly independent states to their respective folds. This super power rivalry triggered the imagination of certain states who were determined not to join either bloc and preserve an independent policy in their relations with other countries:

This approach was given various expressions like, 'non-commitment', 'non-involvement', 'neutrality or neutralism'.

Jawaharlal Nehru is credited with giving Expression to Non-Alignment in 1946.\(^2\) He elaborated this concept by saying that:

"We propose as for as possible, to keep away from the power politics of groups, aligned against one another which have led in the past to two world wars and which may again lead to disasters on an even vaster scale".\(^3\) India emerged as an independent nation-state immediately after second world war. It is also a significant date in so far as an all out revolution starts against colonial powers. The

---


emergence of India as independent sovereign
country in 1947, envisaged the "beginning
of the anti-colonial revolution in the post-
war world and also marked the emergence of
non-alignment at the world state". 4

First, not all countries became free at once with
dozens of them remaining colonies or semi-colonies for
a long time. For them a protracted struggle for liber-
tion still lay ahead. Second, formal independence - the
establishment of a national government, and the adoption
of one's own flag and anthem did not guarantee full and
genuine political and economic independence, which
still had to be won. Third, the newly free states were
in one way or the other tied to the aggressive policies
of the former colonial and other imperialist powers.
Far from being equal in their relations with the latter,
they were, in addition, isolated in international
affairs. To put an end to this situation it was
necessary for them to map out an effective foreign
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policy and to implement it through joint efforts. Such were their objective interests and tasks.

To break with their colonial past the newly free countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America tended to choose a political course that would ensure real independence from the former colonial and other imperialist powers and at the same time promote close alliance with anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist forces, including, of course, the socialist community. Some newly free states, however, were prevented from embarking on this path owing to certain circumstances: the continued economic dependence on the west, close link with the world capitalist economy and as yet insignificant ties with the socialist world and its economic system. Consequently these countries sought an alternative path in the area of international politics. It was the path of positive neutralism or non-alignment, with active development of mutual cooperation and solidarity.\(^5\)

---

In 1945, with the rout of Axis powers, the prospect for the attainment of independence by the peoples of the East improved. It became necessary to work out concepts of Afro-Asian unity and outline an independent foreign policy for the future sovereign states. At the constituent United Nations Conference held in San Francisco representatives of several Asian and African countries proposed to the unofficial Indian delegation that Nehru should develop the idea of Afro-Asian unity and solidarity, which he undertook to do.

The idea of non-alignment was first formulated by Jawaharlal Nehru. As Vice-Premier of India's Interim government, he outlined the basic principles of the country's foreign policy in his speech over the Indian radio on September 7, 1946, and said that India would remain outside groupings and military political blocs of States, trying at the same time to maintain friendly relations with all the countries. In December, 1947,

---
Nehru who was at that time the Prime Minister of independent India reiterated and expounded that foreign policy principle in his address to the Indian Constituent Assembly. According to Indian scholars, he devised the doctrine of non-alignment primarily to preserve and promote India's national interests and only later commended it to other Afro-Asian nations as a second guideline for international behaviour.  

The concept of non-alignment is an amalgam of positive and negative implications. The negative element has been over emphasised by the western scholars. Thus, Ehrenfels, observed, "Non-Alginment by its very term is a negative concept. In this it resembles the idea of non-resistance, non-violence and nirvana". However, this negative conception has been frequently repudiated by the advocates of
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Non-Alignment. V.K. Krishna Menon observed, "Non-alignment in a sense is an ugly word. It is negative but becomes positive when you use it in the way we do". In 1958 Nehru observed, "when we say our policy is one of non-alignment, obviously we mean non-alignment with military blocs. It is not a negative policy. It is a positive one and I hope a dynamic one". There is no static comprehensive meaning of non-alignment. The proponents of non-alignment themselves were not clear about the meaning of term non-alignment and they were not certain about the nomenclature of the term as well. Several phrases like, "Positive Policy for Peace", "Positive Neutrality", "non-engaged", are commonly used to denote non-alignment. The term "non-alignment itself came into being during 1953-54 when it was firstly used in the United Nations by V.K. Krishna Menon, by which time its objective goals and meaning were already in the air. Nasser and other Arab leaders preferred the term "Positive Neutralism". Nehru however, was not happy with this term. He preferred

such terms like "Keeping aloof from blocs", "independent policy", "friendly relations with all", and "Positive initiative for peace".  

The Prime Minister of Burma UNU said: "this policy has been called Neutralism in Cold War, perhaps that is the right name for it. Even the large section of western scholars were reluctant to use the term "Non-alignment". Most of them preferred the term neutrality or neutralism. The term "non-alignment" was unanimously adopted at Belgrade Conference in 1961.

The term "non-alignment" is in vogue since the early 1950s and the non-aligned movement has never cared to define authoritatively, comprehensively and precisely the concept of non-alignment even after nine Summits and numerous other inter-governmental Conferences for the last three decades.

No effort has ever been made to define "non-alignment". Even the Summit Conference held at Belgrade

in 1961 did not discuss this aspect. The fourth
Summit Conference held in Algiers in 1973 did provide
an occasion when a Libyan proposal raised the issue
for a new definition as stricter interpretation of
the concept of non-alignment. The lack of consensus
led to the exclusion of this issue from the agenda
of the Conference.

During the non-aligned Summit held at Havana
in September 1979 the Burmese delegation proposed the
dissolution of the movement and called for the estab-
lishment of a committee to define the movement's
principles. Burma's proposal went unheeded. Besides
various endeavours have been made to define non-
alignment within and without the non-aligned Conference.
But no authoritative statement of the policy or a
definition of the concept by the collective wisdom
of the movement itself has emerged so far. 11

The pioneers of the movement - Tito, Nehru
and Nasser made various statements on non-alignment,
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most of which centred round only on particular or transient elements or aspects of the policy reflecting their respective standpoints. Even a survey of the declaration and joint communiques issued by the Summits and Ministerial Conferences of the movement from Belgrade 1961 to Belgrade 1989 does not provide any authentic, comprehensive and self-contained definition of non-alignment.

The Declaration issued after the first Summit (Belgrade 1961) did not try to define non-alignment but envisaged that the Conference "do not wish to form a new bloc and can not be a bloc". The Declaration issued after the second Summit Conference (Cairo, 1954) was also silent on it and envisaged that the pursuit of the "policy of active peaceful co-existence" was essential in the wake of the existence of military blocs, Great power alliances and pacts arising therefrom has accentuated the cold-

The subsequent Summit Conferences even went on adding new appendages without defining the concept of non-alignment. The Algerian Summit envisaged a scheme of "international security". The communique of the preparatory meeting for the Lusaka Conference of non-aligned states issued at Dar-es-Salaam in April 1970 reaffirmed the will of the non-aligned countries to adhere to the "principles and criteria of non-alignment as expressed at the non-aligned Conference of Belgrade and Cairo. Even the Lusaka Conference (September 1970) noted that what is needed is not a redefinition of non-alignment but rededication by all non-aligned nations to its central aims and objectives. The Algiers Summit 1973 referred to only unspecified aims, principles and practices of non-alignment. The emphasis of the Colombo Summit (August 1976) was on exercising increasing vigilance by its members to preserve intact the essential character of non-alignment, maintain unswerving fidelity to its principles and policies. The Havana Declaration (1979) also echoed the previous thinking leaving the definition part untouched. Thus it became abundantly clear that the non-aligned movement has failed to
provide for an authentic, comprehensive definition, the absence of which has become a source of conceptual as well as international weakness and a major cause of the wide gap between theory of non-alignment and the practice of non-aligned states, individually and collectively. However, Leo Mates has defended the virtue of non-alignment for not going in far a single authorised definition of Non-Alignment. He holds:

"It is not unreasonable to say that there are many definitions of non-alignment as there are non-aligned countries and even possibly more. In a certain sense it can be said that the policy of non-alignment has permanently been undergoing definition, re-examination and criticism while resisting arbitrary assessment. All this is understandable since the movement of the non-aligned countries is something new in international relations not only because of the form of cooperation among a large number of generally dissimilar countries."

Nehru, Tito, Nas jointly referred to as movement. Their outstanding cited by Sekou Toure, P when he spoke on behalf countries in Havana. Dr scholar, believes that "there have always been work, consistency, contribution and reputation".  

Nehru was the first to propose the Pancha-Shila principles as political and legal foundation for the concept of non-alignment. He also had an important role to play in the evolution of the non-alignment policy as the newly free countries' active peace loving course on the world scene, which presupposed their most active influence on the solution of global problems. He was among the main organisers of the Bandung Conference.  
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It was under the influence of Indian delegation that the Conferences attached priority importance in their resolutions to the urgent problems of ensuring peace, disarmament and preventing war. Elaborating on the essence of the policy of non-alignment, Nehru wrote: "we will not attach ourselves to any particular group of states". He added that this policy "has nothing to do with neutrality, passiveness or anything else". 16

Yugoslavia's policy of non-alignment began taking shape in 1950s when the country faced with direct imperialist pressure felt the need for such a foreign policy that would guarantee the diversification and extension of its political support of Asian, African and Latin American countries. Its espousal of the non-alignment principles found expression in particular, in the final communiques issued after Tito's visit.

to India. (December 22, 1954), which said, among other things: "The President of Republic of Yugoslavia and the Prime Minister of India state that the policy of non-alignment with blocs, adopted and pursued by their governments, is neither 'neutrality' nor 'neutralism' and therefore does not spell passiveness, as is sometime claimed but constitutes an active positive and constructive policy aiming at collective peace which is the only possible foundation for collective security". 17

Tito suggested that the geographical boundaries of the non-aligned movement should be extended. In late 1959, he visited Indonesia, Burma, India, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Sudan, Egypt and Syria, holding talks and discussing the problem of convening a Conference of Heads of State and Government of all non-aligned countries. 18
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Speaking about Egypt it is worth mentioning that its road towards the non-alignment movement was an arduous one. After the second world war that formally independent state was in fact subordinate to Great Britain its former metropolitan country. It was not until July 1952 that the Patriotic-minded officers of the Egyptian army led by Gamel Abdel Nasser came to power, overthrowing King Farouk's regime and initiating in this way the Egyptian (July) Revolution. Egypt undertook an agrarian reform and in October 1954 Great Britain had to sign an agreement on withdrawing its troops from the Suez Canal Zone. The Nasser government refuted western bids and undertook a major foreign policy act by deciding to nationalize the Suez Canal, among whose Shareholders were Britain and France. These two imperialist powers, supported by the U.S., responded to the just actions by the Nasser government by trying to bring pressure to bear on Egypt. Having failed, Britain and France made a deal with Israel and attempted an invasion of Egypt in late October-early November 1956.  

The Soviet Union and all peace-loving forces denounced the aggressors and supported Egypt. The struggle mounted by the Egyptian people and the resolute political support given by the Soviet Union forced the aggressors to back down for the time being, though the enemy did not relinquish the attempts to thwart the democratic aspirations of the Nasser government.

Indonesia also had a notable role to play at the early stage of evolution of the non-aligned movement. In President Sukarno's time the country emerged on the international political scene, proclaiming anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism and hosted the Bandung Conference. President Sukarno actively participated in the preparations for and the holding of the first Conference of Heads of State of Government in Belgrade. However, already at that time, considerable differences became manifest in the positions of Indonesia and India. During the 1962 Sino-Indian conflict Indonesia adopted a neutral stand. President Sukarno did not support the initiative made by Tito and Nasser to hold the second Conference of the non-aligned countries and insisted on
holding another Conference of the Bandung type, that is, with the participants restricted only to the Afro-Asian region and in disregard of the non-alignment principles. 20

The concept of non-alignment did not evolve suddenly. Its growth has been the result of experience of newly independent states. The edifice of non-alignment has been built during last three decades, "a process in which the profession and practices of the non-aligned states and the Summit Conferences from Belgrade to Havana, through collective articulation of the ideas and ideals of the movement, have played a significant role". 21

It was also in 1954 that a meeting at Columbo between India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Burma and Sri Lanka

20. Socialist Thought and Practice, Belgrade, 1979, No.9, p. 11.

decided to call a full meeting of the Afro-Asian States. At Bandung, the meeting of the foreign ministers of all independent Afro-Asian States, except South Korea, Taiwan, South Africa and Israel, endorsed the concept of Punch-Shila. Equally important in this context is the joint statement issued by Jawaharlal Nehru and Marshal Josip Broz Tito in New Delhi in 1954. It was the first declaration to the world that India and Yugoslavia had pursued and adopted a policy of non-alignment.

The expression "non-alignment" was first used by Krishna Menon in 1950. So far the different liberation movements in previously colonised countries had fought separately. For the first time the different detachments of this world wide struggle against imperialism were beginning to come together for joint action. The process had been initiated by the Asian Relations Conference held in New Delhi, on the initiative of India in
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1947. The joint actions in the UN prepared the ground for the second major steps in the direction of formulating the basic principles of non-alignment. This was the India-China Joint Communiqué in 1954, enunciating the Panch Shila or the five principles:

1. mutual respect for each other's territorial sovereignty;

2. non-aggression;

3. non-interference in each other's internal affairs;

4. equality and mutual beneficial relations;

5. Peaceful co-existence.

Non-Alignment is a political concept giving expression to the struggle of the countries liberated from the political domination of imperialism to break their continued economic dependence, to build an independent national economy, the true foundation of political sovereignty. This process of transition is taking place today under conditions of a global
crisis, expressed in terms of threat of nuclear war, in pursuit of global domination by a single imperialist power, USA which perceives it as the only way for the survival of the system of international financial monopoly.

Mrs. Indira Gandhi in her keynote address at the New Delhi Summit of non-aligned countries defined the concept of non-alignment in the following unambiguous words:

The evolution of non-alignment was not the result of any preconceived idea or prior consultations among these countries but it was facilitated owing to certain common experiences, ideals and aspirations which these countries shared in varying degrees. President Sukarno's address to the Belgrade Conference in 1961 aptly summed this up as follows:

"There was no prior consultation agreement between us before we adopted our respective policies of non-alignment. We each reached at this policy inspired by common ideals promoted by similar circumstances upurned on by like experiences. There were no attempts at compromise to make our policies identical. But not one of us, I think, will deny that we did inspire each other. The experiences of one country in discovering that a policy of non-alignment is the best guarantee for safeguarding our national and international
positions have doubtedly helped others to come to similar conclusion."

The non-aligned countries had the common experience of having been under the colonial yoke for centuries. The resources of these colonial countries were exploited by the imperial powers for furthering their influence. After attaining the independence those countries had realized the perils of being party to bloc politics. It was this interest that prompted them to keep away from bloc politics. The countries pursued the policy of non-alignment in order to give fuller meaning and content to their newly attained political independence. The former Prime Minister of Jamaica, Michael Manley, emphasizing the same fact, says that "the non-aligned movement did begin simply because there were blocs. It opposed bloc power configurations because there were involved limitations imposed by the world political environment.
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By the end of the Second World War South America had 24 states and 20 relatively small colonial territories located for the most part on Islands in the Caribbean. The majority of Latin American countries attained political independence as early as in the beginning of the past century and had covered a considerable road of capitalist development. Their process was largely checked by their financial and economic dependence on US monopolies and consequently their political dependence on the US.  

To give an unbiased assessment of any phenomenon in life, especially in international affairs, one should have a clear idea not only of the phenomenon itself, but also of its origin of what preceded it and what happened later. This fully applies to the non-aligned movement which has its own history but has been unfolding against the background of international developments.

The origin of this new phenomenon of the system of international relations can be traced to the revolutionary change caused in the system by the October socialist revolution in Russia. The revolution marked the beginning of the end of the international relations which prevailed in world before 1917. The next major change in international relations occurred after World War Second, when the Socialist Community emerged and demonstrated the possibility of equality, fraternal, cooperation and comradely mutual assistance among free people. 27

Between 1947 and 1954 the term "neutrality" was in vogue. It denoted the behaviour of non-aligned countries. But neutrality and non-alignment are not synonymous. During the early post-war years

the term non-alignment was identified with neutrality and western scholars and statesmen were obsessed with this term. However, the "non-alignment" and "neutrality" are two different terms. Frequently both the terms were used in the past interchangeably. Neutrality or Neutralism should be used to describe the general historical phenomenon of uncommitted nations in the world system, dominated by western powers before world war second. Some writings have focussed attention on the relationship between non-alignment and power politics. Non-Alignment has been labelled as a policy based on neutrality and idealism, on the one hand, and on the other hand it has been described as an exercise of power politics. Power politics is beyond the scope of our present study. However, to clarify the distinction between non-alignment and power politics, it seems sufficient to quote George Schwarzemberger. He defines power politics as signifying a type of

relations between states in which patterns of behaviour are predominant; armaments, isolationism, power diplomacy, power economics, regional or universal imperialism, alliances, balance of power and war. Power politics may be defined as a system of international relations in which groups consider themselves to be ultimate ends.\textsuperscript{29}

According to Prof. K.P. Misra, non-alignment rejects this variety of politics and attempts to highlight an organic link between the constituents of the international community. It rejects not only power politics but also the view held by Hans Morgenthau and others that all politics is a struggle for power. Thus non-alignment is devoid of all such ambiguities and is rather a substitute for power politics in international relations.\textsuperscript{30}

"Despite the fact that the non-aligned are not neutral states and are not comparable to the small states

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
of the nineteenth century, many writers have persisted in maintaining that non-alignment is merely a synonym for neutralism". 31 Peter Lyon maintains a minor difference in the neutral states of the past which were bound by an accepted set of legal rights and obligations whereas contemporary 'neutralist' states are not recognised in internal law. Lyon's analysis is inadequate as it admits only one of many differences between neutrality and non-alignment. Even majority of essays in Martin's book Neutralism and Non-Alignment envisage no difference between these two concepts. 32

The second type of neutral state is that of four neutral European countries, viz. Austria, Finland, Switzerland and Sweden. These countries have maintained a status of neutrality during the war and they are pursuing their foreign policy in such a manner which would help them remain neutral.

in an eventuality of war in the future. Non-Alignment is not neutrality of non-belligerent nation during a general war, it is not 'neutrality' of the Swiss or the Austrian brand, guaranteed by other nations by treaty.\textsuperscript{33}

The concept of non-alignment did not originate from neutrality or neutralism as most of the western scholars have endeavoured to prove it.

The doctrine of non-alignment took shape in the complex conditions of the cold war, when in 1949 NATO who formed, and then in 1955 the countries of the socialist community, in response to the threat to their security on the path of NATO set up the Warsa Treaty organisation, the defence alliance to the European Socialist States. But unlike the imperialist powers, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries did not have military political blocs in Asia, Africa

and Latin America. Therefore, when the newly free nations were faced with the question of whether to join or not to join any of the existing blocs, they could have in mind only imperialist groupings. That is why from the outset non-alignment in fact meant refraining from joining military blocs like SEATO, the Baghdad Pact (CENTO) ASPAC, ANZUS and so on. It would be wrong, however, to say that non-alignment took shape under the impact of external factors alone. It was also domestic socio-political and economic factors that led above all to their determination to put an end to the remnants of foreign domination and gain complete freedom and independence, get rid of their age-old backwardness and poverty, wipe out the illiteracy and downtroddenness of the population, raise their living standards, eliminate the survivals of feudalism and semi-feudal bondage, and recognize society on new, democratic principles.\(^\text{34}\)

Non-alignment in Nehru's view did not mean the non-aligned nations had to be an 'equal distance'

---

from each of the two military political camps confronting each other. Non-Alignment according to Nehru meant refraining from joining blocs and from pursuing a bloc oriented policy, i.e. a policy that ran counter to the interests of the newly free countries. Indira Gandhi subsequently explained:

"It is untenable to interpret non-alignment as equidistance from the super powers. On the contrary non-alignment is something very positive".  

Jawaharlal Nehru regarded non-alignment as an effective instrument in the hands of the newly free nations, with the help of which they could pursue an independent foreign policy. Addressing the Indian Parliament Jawaharlal Nehru condemned SEATO, set up in 1954, and warned the western governments that they were pushing the world in the wrong direction. He said:

"It is obvious that our participation in Manila Conference would have meant our basic policy of non-alignment".  


Jawaharlal Nehru, made a major contribution to the Unity of Asian States. At his initiative the first Asian Relations Conference was convened in March 1947 in Delhi attended by representatives of 27 countries opening the Conference, Nehru said:

"Perhaps one of the notable consequences of the European domination of Asia has been the isolation of the countries of Asia from one another. As that domination goes the walls that surrounded us fall down and we look at one another again and meet as old friends long parted... But in order to have one world, we must also, in Asia, think of the countries of Asia cooperating together for the larger ideal". 36

The Bandung Conference was organised for the defence of the rights of Afro-Asian nations, an important instrument in their struggle against the imperialist yoke, for free and independent development. It enable the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America to come

onto the international scene as an organised force in the struggle against colonialism and imperialism. A characteristic of the international cooperation of the Afro-Asian States was that they did not try to set up a bloc of their own. This, they believed, would only have led to an aggravation of international tension and to a heightening of the Cold War. The Afro-Asian leaders were striving to unite the newly independent countries in a broad front of struggle against imperialism and colonialism, for the consolidation of political sovereignty and the achievement of full economic independence, for the creation of favourable conditions for their independent development along the path of peace, democracy and progress.

The Bandung Conference endorsed the five principles of peaceful co-existence and complemented them with new provisions. Its declaration on the promotion of world peace and cooperation emphasized once again that all nations should practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours and develop friendly relations or cooperation on the basis of following principles.
1. Respect for fundamental rights and for the purpose and principles of the charter of the United Nations;

2. Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations;

3. Recognition of the equality of all races and of the equality of all nations; large and small;

4. Abstention from intervention of interference in the internal affairs of another country;

5. Respect for each nation to defend itself singly or collectively, in conformity with the charter of the United Nations;

6. (a) Abstention from the use of agreements of collective defence to serve the particular interests of any of the big powers;

   (b) Abstention by any country from exerting pressures on other countries;

7. Refraining from acts or threats of aggression or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any country;
8. Settlement of all internal disputes by peaceful means of the parties' own choice in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations;

9. Promotion of mutual interests and cooperation;

10. Respect for justice and international obligations.

The Bandung Conference was of truly historic significance both for the countries which participated in it and for other peace-loving and freedom-loving nations of the world. The principles and the spirit of Bandung have served a useful purpose in the subsequent development of international relations and remains relevant today. Hence the continued interests in the first Asian-African Conference whose anniversary was celebrated all over the world.

The movement which served so well at times failed to prevent Iran-Iraq war which continued unabated for more than eight years. Again today the NAM finds itself helpless in the face of the Gulf crisis unable to resolve a dispute between two of its members. This has somehow been the history of NAM, even though its members form a majority of the UN members, because nations in dispute do not want to give anyone the right to mediate and have at times, invited super power's intervention.

*****
****
***