CHAPTER IV

SUPER POWERS AND THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT
The rise and development of non-alignment in fifties and early sixties was a challenge to very validity and credibility of bipolar international politics. It challenged the political usefulness and moral authority of blocs led by USA and USSR in the name of individual freedom and social justice, respectively. Although, NAM comprised mostly of third world countries with little industrialisation and no technological sophistication and therefore, no standing in international trade and finance, yet it provided a way out of either/or of Capitalism Vs Communism. This challenge to the political assumptions and ideological postulates of bipolar international system was not taken kindly by ideologues of Cold War years in post World War II era. They hurled grave charges against the very raison d'être of NAM, the gravest being that of John Foster Dulles castigating the movement as immoral.

It must be said that the reaction of USSR led bloc was moderate. They did not agree with the ideological assumptions or diplomatic strategies of
NAM. However, for all practical purposes they coopted with NAM countries to consolidate their own position and to launch an effective pressure on Western bloc led by United States of America. Besides, the anti-colonial sentiments of newly liberated countries against English, French, Dutch, Danish, Portuguese and Spanish rule easily coincided with the political agenda and ideological manifesto of Soviet Russia.

The United States of America took a hard-line attitude towards NAM countries. They wanted to extend their spheres of influence even inside the NAM countries and succeeded so far as it goes. Even now within NAM countries the Sheikdoms of West Asia and North Africa, most of Latin American NAM members and those of South East Asia are considered toeing the American line. On the other hand countries like India, Cuba, Afghanistan, Vietnam et. al., are deemed to be titling towards the Russian foreign policy initiatives.
This competitive bloc politics on the international plane has enhanced the prestige of third world countries as both blocs struggled to co-opt their support. However, the western bloc led by USA has, at best remained lukewarm towards the development needs of third world countries and it was only from these countries that development finance for third world countries could come in terms of soft aid and trade terms. In view of the same the present chapter deals with the attitude of the super powers towards NAM countries.

i) The Soviet Union and the Non-Aligned Movement:

The relationship between the NAM and the USSR has been a subject of debate right from the inception of the movement. The close proximity of views of various international issues between the NAM and the USSR has been interpreted in various ways. The stand of Non-aligned countries on major international problems, laid down in the basic documents of their conferences and meetings, coincides in the main with the position of USSR and other socialist countries. This is true of
such issues as the consolidation of peace and its spread to all continents, disarmament, support for national liberation movements, expansion of international cooperation and restructuring of international relations. The USSR has always supported the stand of the NAM on various issues. There has been no instance when there have been differences between the NAM and USSR.

The Soviet Union was the first big power to come out in support of NAM and has always been. The identity of views on various issues affecting the world has brought Soviet Union and the non-aligned countries closer. The opponents of the NAM in the west in the early days viewed the proximity of views of the non-aligned countries and the Soviet Union with suspicion. They even went to the extent of calling the movement as pro-Soviet and anti-West. The anti-imperialist content of the NAM was not to the liking of Western powers. The policy of keeping away from military alliances was interpreted as immoral.

However, as their military alliances failed to attack the newly freed countries and eventually collapsed
and more and more countries joined the non-aligned group. The western opponents of non-aligned began to change their tactics; grudgingly they began to recognize the NAM in a half-hearted manner. As the movement had come to stay and was playing an important role in the international affairs, they could not ignore it. They began to make attempts to see that the anti-imperialist content of the movement was watered down and that the movement was weakened from within. They started a campaign to wean the movement away from what they termed as "Soviet influence". However, they have not met with much success in watering down the basic content of the movement or in disrupting its unity. The successful conclusions of the New Delhi Summit and the documents adopted stand testimony to this. The anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist and anti-racist policy pursued by the non-aligned countries and their efforts to strengthen peace and international security have fostered greater cohesion of these countries in working towards stronger political and economic independence. Of paramount importance for the world

community was the non-aligned countries policy of principle against the racist regimes in the South of Africa and their imperialist patrons. The final documents of all the non-aligned conferences recorded their unanimous support for the peoples fighting for their national and social liberation and the condemnation of imperialist schemes in Africa.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries regard non-alignment as the policy of a large group of developing countries and the NAM as an influential force in the world arena and from the outset supported the movements resolutions and initiatives in every possible way. The Soviet Union and all the socialist countries welcomed and have always considered it a positive factor in the development of international relations. The socialist countries that are not members of the non-aligned movement build their relations with the non-aligned countries on the basis of equality, non-interference in the domestic affairs, mutual respect and
with due account for their common goals, the struggle for peace and peaceful co-existence and against imperialism and colonialism. The socialist countries invariably came out for stronger political and economic independence of the developing countries.

Soviet messages to the non-aligned Conferences, from the Belgrade Summit on, have spoken highly of the movement and wished it success in fighting for peace, national independence and freedom. Western powers are trying to emasculate the anti-imperialist, nature of NAM and to undermine cooperation between the non-aligned and socialist countries. Exposing these activities, Fidel Castro said at the Algiers conference that all attempts to drive a wedge between the non-aligned and socialist countries were in fact of counter-revolutionary nature and played into the hands of the imperialist forces alone. Addressing the concluding sitting of the

Conference, the late Algerian President, Houari Boumediene, pointed out in his turn that the NAM relies on the socialist community.\(^3\)

The fourth Conference adopted a declaration calling for stronger cooperation with the socialist States to oppose the imperialist forces. It also supported some of the Soviet peace initiatives, for example, to establish a collective security system. A separate resolution was also adopted on the national liberation movements denouncing the policy pursued by the NATO countries and reiterating the legitimate right of the oppressed nations to struggle for their independence with the help of arms.

Long before the NAM came into being, the young Soviet State consistently and resolutely defended the right of all nations to self-determination and the

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 24.
choice of independent development. Right after the socialist revolution triumphed in Russia in 1917, the Soviet governments' earliest measures with respect to the countries of the orient were to make public and annual secret inter-imperialist agreements, to which the Tsarist government had been party, to break fettering treaties which had been imposed by tsarism upon China, Turkey and Iran, to transfer concessions to Iran and annul to its debts. The Soviet delegation at Geneva Conference in 1922 proposed to restructure international economic relations on the basis of respect for sovereignty, non-interference in domestic affairs, equality and mutual benefit.\(^4\)

The Soviet Union always considered its internationalist duty to support the liberation movements of Asia, Africa and Latin American nations and welcomed the growing role that non-aligned states were playing in international affairs.

Diverse aid given by world socialism to the national liberation movements, which subsequently gave birth to the NAM, became especially manifest in the post-war period. In February 1946, the Soviet Union supported the appeal by Syria and Lebanon, would be members of the NAM, for the withdrawal of British and French troops from their territories.

In 1947, it backed the demand by Egypt that British troops should pull out of it. In early 1946, the USSR raised at the UN Security Council the question of Britain's stopping military operations in Indonesia, in 1947 and 1948, it again spoke out at the UN in defence of the young Indonesian Republic and against Dutch aggression, economic blockade and political isolation. In November 1956, at the heat of the military intervention by Britain, France and Israel against Egypt, the Soviet Union took a decisive step by demanding that the aggression be immediately stopped and announcing its firm determination to use force in its turn, if need
be, to defend the victim of that aggression. The economic, political and military potential of the USSR and other socialist countries forced the imperialist states to make concessions to the young developing nations and to refrain from direct acts of aggression and use of force.5 Consistently opposing imperialism's interference in the internal affairs of the young states and advocating the elimination of the colonial system, the Soviet Union worked to ensure the adoption of resolutions in support of the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. For example, in 1960 the USSR brought to the consideration by the UN General Assembly a draft Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. The UN General Assembly adopted the corresponding Declaration, which was formulated on the basis of Soviet proposals.6

5. Mukherjee, S. New Perspectives of Non-Aligned, Colombo Summit, New Delhi, 1976, p. 11.

6. The Hindu, August 9, 1976.
The Soviet Union has always actively imperialist aggression in the Middle East, rendering political, diplomatic and economic support to the movement members, such as Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq and Palestine Liberation Organisation. It opposed a concrete programme of easing tensions in the region, demanded that foreign troops be withdrawn from Lebanon and Jordan, and so on. It backed the Indonesian people in their struggle against the Dutch and American aggressors, consistently and actively upheld the independence of states such as Zaire, Cyprus, Cuba, Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea, and successfully helped normalise and stabilise the political situation in South Asia in 1965-1966 (The Tashkent Agreement Between India and Pakistan, January 1966). The USSR and other socialist countries actively supported the Nigerian government in its struggle to preserve the federal state against the separatists who proclaimed the establishment of the State of Biafra (1967-1969). The Soviet Union adopted an internationalist approach to the national liberation struggle and the right of peoples to self-determination when the Republic of Bangaldesh proclaimed its independence
(in 1971) and afterwards. Of tremendous importance was and continues to be the support given by the Soviet Union and other socialist states to the people's Republic of Angola and Ethiopia defending their independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and natural unity against the encroachments by the force of imperialism, racism and international action. 7

In the 1970s, cooperation between the socialist and non-aligned countries was increasingly turning into a factor of peace and easing tensions in international relations. The protocols and resolutions of the UN General Assembly sessions and specialized UN agencies furnish a convincing proof of the unvariable, consistent and principled position of Soviet Union in defending the right of non-aligned and all developing states to independence, non-interference in their affairs and social progress. Suffice it to recall the resolute efforts by Soviet delegations at the Sixth (April 1974)

and Seven (September 1975) Special UN General Assembly sessions in support of young states right to the utilization of their own natural resources. The Sixth Special UN General Assembly Session convened on the initiative of the developing states discussed problems of raw materials and economic development and also, in keeping with the resolutions of the fourth non-aligned Summit Conference in Algiers, the problem of restructuring international economic relations. Joint efforts by the socialist countries and young states resulted in the adoption of the well-known programme of New International Economic Order, which declared that all States had the inalienable right to use their own resources and, what is more important, the right to nationalise the property of foreign monopolies.

Guided by the leninist foreign policy principles which envision all-round support for the peoples of fighting their national liberation, the Soviet Union,

8. Ibid., p. 96.
along with its constant political and diplomatic support, gave young states and national liberation movements enormous economic aid without any strings of political, military or any other nature. In so doing it is not after any rights, including the right to profit from enterprises it has built or other projects. Economic Cooperation between the Soviet Union and other Socialist States, on the one hand, and developing countries on the other, helps the latter above all to develop their individual countries and to overcome the backwardness and dependence on imperialist states and their monopolies. This cooperation between socialist countries and young states made the imperialists in some cases ease the terms of their "aid".

The following figures give an idea of the scale of economic cooperation between socialist and non-aligned states. In 1955, the USSR and India signed an agreement on building with Soviet aid a major steel works in Bhilai with a capacity of one million tons of steel a year. During the same period agreements on trade and economic cooperation were concluded with Burma, Egypt,
Lebanon, Afghanistan and some other countries, later on agreements were signed with Indonesia, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Mali and others on Soviet economic and technical aid in implementing their economic development plans. By 1982, the USSR maintained economic and technical cooperation with the total of 70 Asian, African and Latin American States.  

By the early 1980s the Soviet Union had helped build 1,700 industrial enterprises, electric power plants, hydropower complexes and other economic projects in newly free states. These have a considerable role to play in their national economies. For example, the metallurgical enterprises built in India with Soviet aid account for 35 percent of the entire steel output (19 million tons), 50 percent of the country's oil output, 70 percent of the turbines and 80 percent of the mining equipment produced in the country. Soviet geologists found oil in Syria and now profit from

---

9. Ibid., p. 97.
oil exports exceed 50 percent of all currency receipts of the country. The Helwan Metallurgical plant built in Egypt with Soviet aid accounts for 100 percent of big iron, 74 percent of Steel, 70 percent of rolled goods, and 100 percent of coke produced in the country. Enterprises built with Soviet aid in Guinea give 20 percent of the overall output of bauxites in the country; similar enterprises built in Ethiopia give 100 percent of the country's output of oil products and those built in Algeria account for 100 percent of the national output of big iron and mercury. The building and equipment of major complexes with the help of Socialist States (for instance, giant Steel works in Bhilai and Bokaro, India and in Helwan, Egypt, as well as hydropower projects on the Nile and the Euphrates) forced the west to revise its "aid" strategy.

As industrial projects built with the help of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries were put into operation, the public sector began taking
shape in some of the non-aligned states, promoting their economic development and industrialisation, with every passing year the socialist countries are giving ever wider aid to young states in training their national personnel for industry, agriculture, transport, health service, education and so on.

Of no small importance is cooperation between the Soviet Union and non-aligned countries in strengthening their defence potential to enable them defend themselves from attempts of imperialist aggression. The aid given by Soviet military experts and the training of the national military personnel at military educational establishments in Socialist countries, some non-aligned Asian, African and Latin American states were able to form or re-equip their armies and withstand direct acts of armed aggression by imperialist states. The re-equipment of the Indonesian army (1961-65), the Cuban army (1961) and those of Egypt and Syria (1968-1973) provide characteristic examples of Soviet aid in this field. The selfless military aid given by the Soviet
Union to Afghanistan, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Angola, Ethiopia and Algeria illustrates the internationalist duty performed by the Soviet people to nations fighting for their national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and national unity.  

Active Soviet efforts to ensure peace and the security of all nations enjoy support among the non-aligned countries. They ensured the adoption by the UN of a number of resolutions on some burning problems, such as the strengthening of the world peace and security, disarmament, the prevention of aggression, the curbing of the arms race, and the struggle against colonialism and racism. At the 34th UN General Assembly Session (1979) the developing countries backed the resolution "on the Inadmissibility of the policy of Hegemonism in international relations" which had been proposed by the Soviet Union, and at the 35th UN General Assembly Session another Soviet proposal, the draft resolution "on some pressing Measures to Lessen the War Danger" also met with support by the majority of the world's nations.

non-aligned states.\textsuperscript{11}

In 1983, the Warsaw Treaty States proposed to the NATO members to conclude a Treaty on the Mutual Non-Use of Military Force and Maintenance of Relations of Peace in the interests of preserving universal peace and the security of nations, including the non-aligned countries. Thereupon, the Soviet Union brought for the consideration by the 38th UN General Assembly Session (1983) another important issue "Freezing Nuclear Armaments" and proposed that a declaration on "condemning Nuclear War" be adopted. The Soviet proposals were accepted by the World Community. Finally, the USSR proposed then an agreement on the renunciation of the use of force for military purposes be concluded, and in January 1984, the Socialist Countries passed to the NATO countries a draft agreement on the non-use of chemical weapons.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have actively been supporting the developing countries'-------

\textsuperscript{11} Review of International Affairs, No. 714, 1980, p. 16.
Proposals aiming at combatting colonialism, racism and neo-Colonialism and at strengthening security and stability on all the continents.

Active support for the developing states' struggle for the restructuring of international economic relations is another key element of the policy pursued by the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries.

The 25th CPSU Congress pointed out, "that with the present correlation of world class forces, the liberated countries are quite able to resist imperialist diktat and achieve just that, is equal economic relations". 12 The Soviet Union is an active supporter of developing countries' just demands for the radical transformation of existing unequal international economic relations and for an end to discriminating practices pursued by imperialist monopolies and international cooperation towards the young states. It has already been mentioned

earlier that the Soviet Union made proposals at the 31st UN General Assembly Session (1976), stating that "the nature of international economic relations, which took shape against the backdrop of an entirely different alignment of world forces and which meets only the selfish interests of imperialist monopolies, now the contradicts the vital interests of the vast majority of countries and the development of the general international situation. At the same time the socialist states criticise those provisions of the programme of the New International Economic Order, which reflect attempts to detach the solution of foreign economic problems from profound socio-economic transformation in the developing countries and to meet the requirements of the developing countries alone. International Economic Relations should be restructured in the interest of all countries and nations rather than in the interests of some separate group of countries.

The so-called theories of 'rich and poor countries' and of "North and South" ignore the differences existing between the socialist and capitalist states in order to
justify the equal responsibility and, consequently, equal obligations to the non-aligned countries by both the imperialist states, which rapaciously exploited the colonial and dependent countries, and the socialist states, which have never had colonies and always built their relations with other countries on the basis of equality, mutual benefit and non-interference in internal affairs. Unfortunately, the non-aligned movement in resolutions of its forums sometimes expresses support for the thesis of "equal demands".

The socialist states consider the restructuring of international economic relations as inseparably connected with the general improvement of the internationalist situation, attaching prime importance to detente, the ending of the arms race and disarmament in the world.

Developed socialist countries and many non-aligned nations maintain relations of friendship and diverse cooperation. Developing countries, especially, those of
socialist orientation, show considerable interest in the historical experience of the USSR and other Socialist Community countries, as many problems of socialist countries had to tackle in building their states, developing their economies, national relations and cultures, and training the national personnel are now being tackled by the young Asian, African and Latin American states.

ii) The United States Response Towards Non-Aligned Movement:

After the Second World War one of the main goals of American foreign policy was to suppress the national liberation struggle and to preserve the system of dependence of Asian and African countries on capitalist powers. American imperialism "updated" that goal depending on a concrete situation and changes in the alignment of forces between the two opposite socio-political systems—imperialism and socialism the constant element of the general strategy was the desire to keep the emergent states dependent on imperialism by using all sorts of
pressure (political, economic and ideological), subversive activities and direct interference in their internal affairs. In the military strategic field the attention was focussed on the conclusion of military pacts with the widest possible participation of newly free states, especially those bordering on the USSR and other socialist countries or located in close proximity to them. That was why whenever newly free countries refused to join aggressive military political blocs, imperialism became alarmed and hostile, resorting to all forms of pressure, threats and blackmail towards them. In the early 1950s imperialist powers put pressure to bear on India, Burma, Ceylon and Indonesia, that is to say, the pioneers and active organisers of NAM, who prepared and successfully conducted the Bandung Conference and then the first (Belgrade) Conference.

In the 1950s during the Cold War unleashed by the US and western countries against the USSR and other socialist countries, some newly free states found

themselves drawn into the sphere of imperialist influence, which greatly jeopardized the security and sovereignty of other developing countries. The ideological induction of the leaders of those newly free states was largely based on the thesis formulated by the then US Secretary of States, John Foster Dulles, to the effect that the policy of non-alignment was insolvent and unpromising. Later on he declared the concept of non-alignment outmoded and even amoral and shortsighted, with the exception of some of its principles.\textsuperscript{14}

As the non-aligned movement developed and its ranks grew, along with its prestige and influence on international affairs, the US realised that its former tactics was unpromising. In the early 1960s it renounced patently hostile pronouncements with respect to the non-aligned movement and used a different tactics.

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 14.
Already in the late 1950s different government and private research bodies in the US undertook an indepth study of the problems of preserving the position of capitalism in Asian and African countries and worked out measures capable of, to quote former US Secretary of States, Henry Kissinger, resisting "The force of attraction" and the pressure of communism on these countries. In his policy statement of 1962 President Kennedy spoke about the need to gain "new frontiers" and to revise some old fashioned ideas of the world. Under the new circumstances the imperialist powers could no longer hope to see the "Policy from strength" succeed which, however, is not to say that imperialism renounced its former goals. Its "updated" course was based on the idea of directing the newly free countries socio-economic development along capitalist lines. As before, the USA intended to use the potential and means of other capitalist powers to preserve and strengthen as far as possible the dependence of the emergent states on these powers and besides, re-distribute the spheres of influence, consolidating the US position
at the expense of former colonial powers. It was envisioned to give more active support to and to set up reactionary dictatorial regimes in developing countries that would pursue pro-American policy. The US modified its attitude towards the non-alignment policy. Chester Bowles, Under-Secretary of State, said in April, 1961 that the USA would 'respect' the neutrality of those countries that had opted for the policy of non-alignment and help them build stable and strong societies capable of maintaining independence. In 1961, the so-called Development Assistance Committee was founded by 20 Western capitalist countries, who wanted to use the organisation in the changed circumstances to maintain and enhance as far as possible the newly-free states dependence on the industrially developed capitalist countries and to pursue the neo-colonialist policy in more covert forms.

These steps were aimed at camouflaging the true goals of imperialism. It was precisely the 1960s that

saw the growing pressure to bear on the developing countries with the help of all sorts of means capable to disrupt the policy of non-alignment from within, to emasculate its anti-imperialist content and to weaken the links between the non-aligned states and socialist countries.

Imperialism began paying special attention to the ideological struggle against socialism. Stepping up its propaganda of the "advantages" of the capitalist world, Emphasis was placed on the thesis of the "Civilising" mission of colonialism, the need and expediency of planting and developing capitalism in the newly-free countries for the sake of their "accelerated economic growth".

It should be pointed out that the US often replaced these methods of neocolonialism with direct military aggression, which showed that American strategy towards the developing countries involved terrorist activities, destabilisation of progressive
regimes in these countries and disruption of the non-aligned movement. In August 1964, the US attacked the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and frequently used arms against Cambodia. It rendered vast aid to Portugal in suppressing the national liberation movements in its African Colonies. April 1965 saw the US armed aggression against the Dominican Republic. In mid 1966, the US administration declared the "Johnson's Asia Doctrine", the true purpose of which was to suppress the national liberation movements in Asia. The CIA began increasingly interfering in the developing States' domestic affairs.

American strategists wanted the Vietnam war to teach the emergent States a lesson, impressing upon them that they had nothing else to do but to seek US patronage and to follow its imperialist policy.  


vast military and economic aid given by the US failed to help the reactionary puppet regime retain power in Saigon.

The Vietnam war showed that, supported by the broad mass of the people and by the comprehensive aid of socialist countries, the progressive forces were capable of emerging victorious in the struggle for their freedom and independence, even if they were opposed by US imperialism.

The strategy of neo-colonialism aiming, among other things, at sapping the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist content of the non-alignment movement, centered as before largely on economic aspects. Aware of the futility of openly opposing the non-aligned countries striving towards economic independence, the neo-colonialists began looking for round-about ways of attaining their main goal to perpetuate these countries as an appendix to the developed capitalist states. For example, American economic aid to Egypt was openly
aimed at making that country dependent on the US, in February 1963, in response to the decision by the Ceylon government to nationalise the property of American Caltex and Esso Oil concerns and also that of the British-Dutch Shell corporation on its territory, the US presented it with an ultimatum to pay indemnities to American companies. 18

It is common knowledge that some developing countries managed to nationalise the property of western monopolies on their territory without any compensation, arguing that in the course of their 'activities' the latter had made enormous profits by ruthlessly exploiting the local labour and natural resources. In the late 1960s when it became clear that the US was to suffer defeat in Vietnam and in the conditions of a changed alignment of forces in the world, the US administration was forced to

revise all aspects of its foreign policy, including relations with the socialist countries, above all with the Soviet Union, to reconsider the terms of "Partnership" with West European countries and Japan and to devise new forms of relations with the non-aligned states. In a bid to maintain and consolidate the position of American imperialism in the developing countries, the US administration, headed at that time by Richard Nixon, declared for purely Propaganda purposes its determination to "avoid involving the US into world conflicts". This "new approach" to the developing countries found clear-cut expression in the so-called Nixon Doctrine, which hypocritically proclaimed the principles of "Partnership" and that of "Self reliance" as underlying American foreign policy.

According to the Nixon Doctrine, the American tactic of the period did not envision American withdrawal from those regions. The US intended to change the balance of world forces in their favour, particularly with the help of the regimes dependent on it politically and

20. Ibid., p. 1777.
especially economically, and by "tying" developing countries to imperialist powers. This tactic influenced some of the non-aligned countries, and the position they adopted provided a graphic illustration of attempt to sap the anti-imperialist nature of resolutions passed by the non-aligned forums.

In the late 1970s, the situation in the world worsened dramatically: US military spending reached record figures, while the US administration was bent on seeking military superiority over the Socialist Community and trying to justify the possibility of conducting a "limited","Protracted" and other types of nuclear war. The American strategy in international affairs became characterised by a sharp toughening of its policy towards the developing countries and by its stepped up activities to create tensions and conflicts among the developing countries. The destabilisation of regimes Washington found undesirable, extended military American presence far beyond its borders, the formation
and use of the American Rapid Development Force in the developing countries, and the building and expansion of military bases there are but a few practical actions that seriously jeopardize the non-aligned and for that matter all other countries of the world. The US has launched an offensive against the developing countries in general and the non-aligned states in particular. In political field intensive use is being made of the tactic of whipping up regional and bilateral conflicts with the aim of intruding in the conflict areas and building up its military presence there, suppressing the local national liberation movements and undermining progressive social and economic transformation. The non-aligned countries are being drawn into the arms race, which is an unbearable burden for their budgets and besides, breeds an atmosphere of suspicion among their neighbours who are eventually drawn into the arms race and inevitably land themselves in the snares of economic and, consequently, political dependence on the arms producers western imperialist states, first and foremost the US. The US expands the network of
its military strategic installations in different regions of the world and wrings out of the governments of some non-aligned countries (Somalia, Oman, Morocco, Egypt and Kenya) their consent to the American armed forces using their military bases. Another militarist action by American imperialism was the foundation, on January 1, 1983, of the so-called Central Command (CENTCOM) with its sphere of operation covering 19 non-aligned states in Africa and Asia, a considerable part of the Indian Ocean and also the Persian Gulf. It was made public that the Central Command has its disposal the rapid Deployment Force and military bases on Diego Garcia, in Oman, Somalia, Kenya and some other states. The forces under this command are ready to start military operations against the states in the region at any moment. During preparations for, and the holding of, the Sixth and Seventh Conferences American imperialism tried to use the conservative regimes in some non-aligned states to compromise the foreign policies,


22. Ibid., p. 9.
pursued by Cuba, Vietnam and some other socialist countries members of the NAM. The western powers were disappointed to see that the Seventh Conference, planned previously to be held in Baghdad, was not postponed indefinitely. Subsequently, in the course of preparations for the Conference the imperialists tried to ensure that it got "bogged down" in debates on problems of secondary importance and in this way to undermine the movement from within and to detract from its anti-imperialist character.

In spite of imperialist machinations, the Havana and then Delhi Conferences were a success and demonstrated the developing states striving after stronger peace and the security of nations, the termination of the arms race and transition to disarmament, the restructuring of international economic relations on just and democratic principles and complete and comprehensive decolonisation. The participants in the Delhi forum pointed out that only American patronage and support enabled Israel to carry through its expansionist
plans and perpetrate lawlessness and crime against the Arab people. Sharp criticism was levelled at American support for the racist South African regime.

Representatives of Latin American States spoke at the Delhi Summit about the threat of American military invasion in Central America. They cited indisputable facts of Washington's subversive activities against Cuba and Nicaragua and of impudent American interference in the internal affairs of El Salvador whose people are fighting against the reactionary dictatorship.²³

When considering economic relations between the non-aligned and western countries, the conferences, as before, denounced even more resolutely the policy of trade sanctions, blockade and other forums of coercion and blackmail pursued by the capitalist powers as a means of political pressure and interference in the domestic affairs of Sovereign States. The Delhi forum condemned

the attempts by the West, first and foremost the US, to sabotage. UN decisions on holding global talks on key problems of a New International Economic Order, including the problem of raw materials, energy sources, trade economic development and finances.

Speaking at Delhi Conference, Fidal Castro pointed out that the threat of war, which already existed during the 1979 meeting of the non-aligned countries, started heightening intensively when President Reagan decided to seek military superiority for the US over the USSR and that for NATO over the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. In his opinion, the runaway arms race was directly encroaching upon the security of the developing countries. The Conference paid much attention to the situation in the South of Africa. For example, Jose Eduardo Dos Santos, President of the people's Republic of Angola, said that some Western countries, members of the so-called contact group (the US, France, Britain, West Germany and Canada), instead of facilitating the immediate and unconditional withdrawal
of South African troops from Angolan territory invaded by them way back in 1979, are trying to distract the international community from the solution of that problem by marking time during negotiations and through diplomatic manoeuvres and pressure. The US ties the granting of independence to Namibia to the withdrawal of the Cuban international forces from Angola, though it is common knowledge that UN Security Council Resolution No. 435 on the elimination of the colonial regime in Namibia makes no mention of such a condition. The attempt to 'tie' the granting of independence to Namibia to the withdrawal of the Cuban military units was denounced at many international forums, since the presence of Cuban military units (on the result of the legitimate Angolan government) in no way violates the corresponding provisions of the UN Charter nor the principles or purposes of that international organisation. The Political Declaration of the Delhi Conference stressed that the attempt to make

25. Ibid., p. 63.
the two things conditional was nothing but interference in the internal affairs of the people's Republic of Angola. The non-aligned countries recorded in their documents their demand for an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from Angolan territory and their resolute condemnation of the acts of military, political and economic destabilization made by the racist South African regime against Angola, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and the Seychelles.

In response to the resolutions passed by the non-aligned states the South African regime committed in early 1984, with the conivance of the imperialist states, fresh acts of aggression against Angola by invading its territory far up to 300 kilometers. South Africa has elevated terrorism to the level of state policy and for a long time now has been waging, with American support, an undeclared war against people's Republic of Angola.  

26. Ibid., p. 64.
Turning back to the plenary meetings at the Delhi Conference, mention should be made of the active role played by the delegation of the people's Democratic Republic of Yemen. Ali Nasser Muhammad, Chairman of the presidium of the supreme people's Council and Prime Minister of Yemen, said that the emergence of new seats of tension was a direct result of the attempts by American imperialism to tip the balance of forces in its favour, to enslave independent countries and stamp out the national liberation movements, and to establish undivided imperialist rule in the world.27

American reaction to Delhi Summit and its results forcefully demonstrated the Reagan administration's actual attitude to the developing states. India was subject to tangible pressure on the part of the US, which refused to purchase some traditional Indian goods, textiles, in particular, while the Asia Developmental Bank, in which the US financial oligarchy is quite influential, refused to give loans to India, and the

27. Final Communique, Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Coordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries, New Delhi, 7-11 April, 1977.
American published maps of Indian territory in which some regions (for instance, the state of Jammu and Kashmir) were shown as not belonging to the country. Following the Delhi Conference the American imperialism nearly doubled its military aid to Pakistan, on whose territory military bases are being set up to coordinate the operation of the Rapid Deployment Force, a component of all units at the disposal of the CENTCOM. It is pertinent to point out these actions by the US are but a fraction of Washington's strategy, in keeping with which vast areas of the world have been proclaimed by the Reagan administration an "American Zone" or a "Zone of vital American interests". The "operations" in Nicaragua, crimes in Lebanon, support for the South African racists, militarisation of the Indian Ocean and the trepdeoing of the resolution of the non-aligned movement and the UN on turning the Indian Ocean into a Zone of Peace are but a few results of that strategy. It is not the first time that the US resorts to the "big stick" policy. But today the danger lies in that as the latest resolutions of the NAM expressed it, this policy is being pursued in new historical circumstances when
it is a matter of life and death not only for millions of people, but for humanity as a whole.

In the economic sphere, transnational corporation (TNC) whose rapacious, self-seeking activities bring colossal damage to the developing countries economies, serve as powerful levers of imperialist pressure to bear on the non-aligned and the rest of the developing countries.

In the field of ideology, the US is trying to wreck the anti-colonialist tendencies of the NAM, its struggle for the national independence and support for the national liberation movements. With glaring Cynicism, the imperialist, primarily American, Propaganda identifies the national liberation movements of our day and the struggle of the peoples for their freedom and independence with "international terrorism". Nevertheless, the then President Reagan did not hesitate to declare cynically in his message to the Delhi Conference, that the US was true to the principles of non-alignment. In practice,

however, the Reagan administration was stepping up its interference in the affairs of young non-aligned states by announcing various regions of the developing world to be "Zones of American Security".

Speaking at the 38th UN General Assembly Session on September 26, 1983, Reagan made discourteous remarks towards the members of the NAM. The Indian statesman, commenting on his statement, wrote that among other things, he called on the UN to "ressert" its moral authority and said that "Pseudo non-alignment" was not the way to go about it. He also declared that "Pseudo non-alignment" is no better than Pseudo arms control" and that some non-aligned nations contribute to polarization of the United Nations". 29

Non-alignment has been primarily as reaction against bipolar international system. It tried to project the point of view of developing countries across the global nations, confrontations and alliances. It did

inspire a measure of solidarity amongst the developing countries. Being pitted against super powers and highly powerful and systematically organised bloc politics, it was unavoidable that they should develop a bond/fraternity.

However, Non-Alignment was never and is not a monolith. There have been serious differences amongst NAM members themselves. They have often fought amongst themselves. We have been seeing Vietnam militarily intervening in Campuchea, Iran fighting against Iraq, India and Pakistan crossing swords, Libya fighting against Sudan and Egypt, Syria and Iraq being at loggerheads and lately Iraq invading Kuwait etc. Therefore, NAM countries have not been able to put up a united front against super power interventions. For example Iran-Iraq war took a heavy toll of human lives and destroyed infrastructure worth billions of dollars. NAM countries could do precious little to defuse this long-drawn-out war between its member countries. Even now, no NAM initiative has been of any help to defuse the Gulf crisis generated by Iraqi occupation of Kuwait and American military intervention in view of the same. There is every likelihood of a war taking place in the
Gulf shortly. Non-Aligned forum is only requesting for a peaceful settlement of the issue through its inter-ministerial meetings at Belgrade and at United Nations Headquarters. Nothing much can be retrieved from these pleas by NAM countries. It is a pity that NAM has not been able to play an effective role even in intra-NAM conflicts. That naturally leads to lowering of its international prestige and standing.

However, one cannot help saying that NAM should have taken a clear-cut stand on the present Gulf imbroglio. It should play a fruitful role. It should have told Iraq in no uncertain terms that its occupation of Kuwait is violative of UN Charter and the principles of NAM as well. Therefore, it should vacate from Kuwait as early as possible. However, there is another side to be taken note of as well. American intervention, although sanctioned by UN, is highly partisan and therefore totally unacceptable. Iraq's plea of working out a comprehensive solution is worthy of deep consideration. NAM should support and as well call for a UN sponsored International Conference in which all Arab questions including the problems of
Palestine and Lebanon could be peacefully resolved.

In the final analysis, the very validity and relevance of NAM seems to have come under the cloud in view of rapid dissolution of Soviet bloc. Is NAM relevant in view of Soviet Unions' abdication of its super power role.

Well arguments can be advanced for and against the validity of NAM in current international politics. However, the relevance of NAM should not be seriously doubted. NAM has to play a role vital to the interests of third world countries. It will have to stand up against NATO bloc interventions and other future scenarios in the womb of near future. The most important task of NAM is to fight for a New International Economic Order. The establishment of that order will be a long and a painful process. The dissolution of Warsaw pact alliance will make no difference to that struggle. In addition, NAM must take active interest in environmental questions as highly industrialised countries are playing with the future of entire mankind. Besides, NAM must actively struggle for the elimination of Nuclear armaments. Otherwise, both developing and developed countries will blunder into a nuclear winter.