CHAPTER I

CONCEPT AND OBJECTIVES OF THE NON-ALIGNMENT

Non-alignment may be described in three phases - (a) origins of the concept; (b) emergence of the idea in conferences and organizations, and (c) growth and development of the Movement. The idealism of Kant, Hegel and Green, the utilitarian liberalism of Bentham, Mill and Austin, the Marxian Socialism of Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-Tung enhanced the revolutionary fervour of the liberation movements throughout the world.

The Western domination of foreign far off lands aimed at maximum exploitation of the mineral and natural resources of the territories. The colonial policy and the Powers' dragon acts brought poverty and galling inequalities, challenged the social conscience and threatened the democratic principles. Carl Becker says: "Democracy does not flourish in communities on the verge of destitution", because power can corrupt only a few men at the top while poverty will and does corrupt the lives of the millions. As a result "the general discontent found expression in the demand for freedom from imperialism."

After the First World War, the United Kingdom, the United States, France, Germany, Italy, Turkey, Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria suffered from severely depreciated currency, financial chaos and widespread suffering. The imperialists were the Colonial Powers in Asia, Africa, West Asia, Latin America, the Pacific and the Atlantic regions. The Russian Revolution of October, 1917, recognised the right of the people for independence from foreign domination and her 'Declaration of the Rights of Peoples' asserted the right of self-determination. The Treaty of Versailles, signed with Germany on June 28, 1919, included

3. The main framers of the Treaty were Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States; Lloyd George, Prime Minister of Great Britain; George Clamenceau, Prime Minister of France; and Orlando, the Italian Premier. The Treaty was based on the 14-points of President Woodrow Wilson, presented at the Peace Conference in Paris on January 25, 1919, which became an integral part of the Treaty of Peace.
the Covenant of the League of Nations, which established foreign domination on other countries under the terms of Articles 22 and 23(b) of the Covenant. The Covenant was later replaced by the UN Trusteeship System constituted under Chaps XII and XIII of the UN Charter. The Soviet Declaration against 'Imperialism', spread the idea of independence in the colonial world and, consequently, the Cold War between the Socialist states and the Imperialist nations raised its ugly head to squeeze the blood of the innocent, backward and poor peoples. The world seemed threatened by another world war. During the 1920s, the USSR was relatively weak for some time, while the United Kingdom, the United States, France and other Western Powers continued to sustain their imperialist possessions. However, with the birth of the League of Nations, diplomacy by meetings, conferences and negotiations reached its culmination and the global problems began to be considered by this first international organization, as Wilson had hoped that "the League will act as a permanent clearing-house where every nation can come, the small as well as the great".

Rise of Nationalism in India

The world has been greatly influenced by the Indian nationalism making a permanent impact on freedom struggle in subject countries. The Indian nationalism is based on the ideas, mainly, of Gandhi and Nehru, who were firmly committed to the principle of Ahimsa, but differed on such basic issues as the character and extent of mass movement and socialism. Gandhi, a saintly politician, a democratic and tolerant character, had realised during the second decade of the twentieth century that unless social forces could be roused and mobilised, the political movement would never be able to make the British Raj move. To strengthen the social forces, Gandhi laid stress on Sarvodaya and Nehru on socialism. Gandhi ignored the social history in terms of class struggle, while Nehru appreciated the importance of

class conflict as the main source of social transformation, which identifies him as a leader and the spokesman of militant nationalism. Nehru was a contrast to Bose. While Nehru's hero was Gandhi that of Bose was Kamal Pasha, who led Turkey, revolting against the Caliphate. Bose, disillusioned with the concept of Ahimsa and Satyagraha, thought in terms of armed revolution and collaboration with foreign powers. Communal nationalism also emerged with the founding of the Muslim League in India in 1906 and the demand for Pakistan in 1940. Thus, there were several forces of nationalism in India - Gandhi's peaceful change, Nehru's radical change, Bose's revolutionary change and Jinnah's communal change. All these groups expounded the principles of decolonization - "Anti-imperialism, demand for complete independence, secularism, and anti-untouchability".

The American colonies were greatly inspired by Gandhi's speeches in South Africa, which injected the people with anti-colonial spirit. In 1927, Nehru, on behalf of the All-India Congress Committee, attended the International Congress Against Imperialism, which stressed national independence against imperialism. The imperialists were then the masters of a large number of colonies in the world and alienation from the imperialist sphere, if not impossible, was very difficult as the resources for technological and economic development and security were in their hands. In such hard days, India sowed the seeds of independent foreign policy in its resolutions from 1920s to 1940s. Therefore, during the Second World War, opposition of the Congress to the Axis Powers did not mean support to the imperialism and exploitation of the colonies. History witnessed that living against super powers was to invite continuous dangers for own existence. Mahatma Gandhi stated: "India wants to be independent of everybody who wants to own this country. We do not want a change of masters. We want to be masters on our soil". These words characterise the political foundation of Non-alignment. With this view, Nehru felt that "the burden of
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freedom was heavier than that of the imperialist rule. To come out of imperialist group, Nehru fearlessly planned to remove the curses of illiteracy, malnutrition, superstition and bigotry, poverty and unemployment. He convened an Asian Relations Conference in Delhi in March, 1947, and discussing common problems, advised the policy of Non-alignment. Nehru's steps were becoming guide to the subject peoples who were intensifying their freedom struggle, sacrificing their life and property.

On December 4, 1947, Nehru, in the Constituent Assembly, proclaimed:

"We will not attach ourselves to any particular group. That has nothing to do with the neutrality or passivity ... We have sought to avoid foreign entanglement by joining one bloc or the other. The natural result has been that neither of these big blocs look on us with favour".

Gandhi believed in the supreme power of non-violence and the futility of war as the means for settling disputes between nations as continuous reinforced violence is required to retain the fruits of violence, which forms a vicious circle. This principle marked the basic features of non-alignment, opposition to military pacts, peaceful co-existence, good neighbourly relations, anti-colonialism, special ties with the developing countries of Asia and Africa and the quest for peace and disarmament. According to Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the non-aligned policy of India is rooted in the teachings of Gandhi and Nehru. Referring to Nehru, she said: "He believed that in a world rent by conflict, freedom, not fear, faith, not doubt, confidence, not suspicion, would lead to friendship amongst the nations".

Big and Small Powers' Aspirations

The Cold War has entered the nuclear age and the problem of War and Peace has become a concern of all nations - independent or subject. The Big Powers try to dominate the economic resources of the developing countries and the latter, in turn, try to get rid of
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their influence. The Big Powers need to continue their exploitation of other lands so as to finance their war projects and to save their countries from foreign attack. All the nations are fearful of possible invasion by other nation. As fear begets fears and suspicion breeds suspicion, the increasing tension and occasional local wars induce the small nations to arm themselves for defence. With this object, the developing nations spend disproportionately large sums of money on armament resulting in reduction in developmental expenditure, which, by and large, creates problems of poverty, disease and unemployment. The small nations have limited resources and, thus, their huge expense on war preparedness affects their economy. Contrary to it, the big or rich nations are least affected as the big industries export war materials a lot with high profit and purchase raw materials from poor nations at the lowest prices. When the poor nations protest against the low prices of their raw materials, the rich nations get together and take an extremely negative decision. Thus, the rich nations become richer and the poor nations become poorer. This gap has been increasing and the poor nations have been very much indebted to rich nations, coming under the strong grip of neo-colonialism. If the poor nations seek financial assistance from international agencies, like UNCTAD, GATT, UNDP, UNESCO and the World Bank, the developed nations, having hold on these, adopt a repressive policy, denying funds to those who do not kneel before them and granting those who fall in line. Thus, a great tussle between the 'haves' and 'have-nots' continuously grows. Addressing the Second Conference of UNCTAD at New Delhi in February, 1968, Mrs. Indira Gandhi said:

"Today the rich nations find it more rewarding to invest their savings in their own security, in the advance of their technology, or even in establishing contacts with distant planets ... Thus the gap keeps growing ... Responsibility for development must primarily be shouldered by the developing nations themselves ... The question before the advanced nations is not whether they could afford to help the developing nations, but whether they can afford not to do so".
Rise of Freedom Movements in the World

With the rise of nationalism with slogans of equality, fraternity, democracy, right to self-determination and independence, there were constant occurrences of insurgencies, uprisings and demonstrations launched by the subject peoples. Faced with the growing opposition of the colonial peoples and their demand for independence, the Colonial Powers intensified their acts of sabotage and aggression to continue their rule and to exploit the natural and mineral resources of the territories. The Colonialists were strong countries - Britain, France, Germany, Spain, United States, Portugal, Belgium and Italy. The people resisted as much as possible to defend their sovereignty and independence, but they fell to the European superiority in arms and administration. It would be interesting to trace the imprints of freedom struggles which were in progress in different parts of the globe. The colonies in Asia, Africa, Latin America, Central America and South Africa were under 'Free Lance' and the order of the day was a state "where might was right and the stronger devoured the weaker ones". In the confused politics of the day, the Colonisers succeeded in establishing their domination. The causes of their success were that the indigenous army was unskilled, undisciplined and unorganised; the Colonisers had superior technology of arms and way of war; they could recruit the soldiers from the indigenous population to fight against their own countrymen; and they could enjoy political and commercial gains, taking sides of the warring local princes.

The political developments in the world, which led to the freedom struggle, emancipation of the people and spread of the idea of non-alignment are briefly stated below:

ASIA

Afghanistan, after Anglo-Afghan wars, had become independent
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in 1919, but was under British influence. In Bahrain, in 1935, the British established a military base, which provoked the people against the British colonial rule. In Burma, the Thakins launched an independence movement. In Cyprus, in 1931, the rebellion of the Greek Orthodox Church was crushed. In India, the Indian National Congress led by Gandhi and Nehru; the Muslim League, led by Jinnah; and the Indian National Army formed by Subhas Chandra Bose, were pressurising the Crown for independence. Many countries of Asia and Africa drew inspiration from the non-violent non-cooperation freedom struggle launched by Gandhi with the unarmed Indians against the mighty British Power. In Indonesia, the National Indonesian Party, led by Sukarno, was demanding independence. In Iraq, the Treaty of October, 1932, which determined the methods of British domination over the country, was violently opposed by the Iraqis. The British had a strong military base at Habbaniya. In Kampuchea, the Communist Party of Indo-China was the vanguard of revolutionary movements against the French colonialists. In Korea(PDR), the Korean Communist Party led peasants' and workers' insurrections in 1931 and 1932 against Japan's occupation of the territory. In Laos, during 1930s, the Communist Party of Indo-China fought against French imperialism, for regaining independence and giving the land to the peasants. In Maldives, the Sultan was forced to sign a treaty in 1887, accepting British rule, which caused discontent among the masses. In Nepal, as the Ranas were running a puppet government under British care and those who opposed were brutally killed, insurgent movements were coming up during 1930s. In Sri Lanka, the people were struggling continuously for share in the administration and though a constitution was promulgated in 1931, they continued their demand for independence. In Syria, there were popular uprisings against the French domination and suspension of constitution in 1939. In Vietnam, the Communist Party of Indo-China founded by Ho Chi Minh, intensified the struggle for freedom against the French colonialists, and the Japanese aggressors in 1939 and 1945 respectively.

NORTH AMERICA AND CENTRAL AMERICA

In Cuba, after the Sergeant's Rebellion on September 4, 1933, a Provisional Revolutionary Government was formed followed by brutal assassination of Guiteras in May, 1935, which caused a political upheaval. People's armed resistance was crushed. In Grenada, after the First World War, there was a great economic depression, which led the workers to form trade unions. The memory of Julien Fedon, who led the uprisings of black slaves and freemen in 1795-96, and who was hanged by the British, always inspired the people for freedom. In Jamaica, during 1930s, economic problem grew with the independence movement and trade unionism grew out of riots and unrest. In Nicaragua, the United States was determined to rule indirectly. The nationalist leader, Sandino, with an army of several hundred men encountered the US troops in more than 500 clashes and battles. The United States, under the Boxtorn Pact (May 4, 1927) with the local liberal and conservative bourgeoisie, helped Garcia and installed his associate, Sacasa, as President. When Sandino came for discussion with the liberals, he was assassinated on the orders of the US Embassy and, thus, Garcia was in power from 1933 to 1956, when he was assassinated. There was always a strong opposition party against the US policies, which aimed to dominate the territory. The freedom struggle of the Nicaraguans influenced the whole of the American territories. In Panama, since its separation from Colombia and proclamation of independence on November 3, 1904, the United States dominated the territory, imposed harsher conditions and cession of its sovereignty over the canal and the adjacent zone "in perpetuity" under a treaty and installed military bases, which posed a constant threat to Latin America. The people revolted against the US impositions and asserted that "the geographical position of our country is our principal natural resource".

SOUTH AMERICA

In Argentina, there was a political crisis during 1930s. In 1918, the Communist Party of Argentina was formed. In 1930, Yrigoyen
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were overthrown and military broke into the political life and General Jose Félix Uriburu came to power through electoral fraud. The country suffered from economic crisis. All these factors strengthened the revolutionary movements for freedom. In Guyana, due to British suppression and killings, the inhabitants left the region. The British recruited workers on contract from China, Portugal and India in 1917, and created a new form of slavery. During 1930s, they demanded higher pay. Their movement was brutally suppressed. There was rebellion demanding independence from time to time.

EUROPE

In Malta, the British granted relative autonomy to the people only to be revoked ten years later after popular demands and insurrections in 1921. In Russia, the USSR government, headed by Lenin, was established on November 7, 1917. In 1918, banks, insurance companies, large industries, mines, water transport and railways were nationalised. The Declaration of the Rights of Peoples conferred the right of self-determination upon all nationalities, which began a new era of socialism. The socialist ideal, "from each according to his capacity, to each according to his work" eliminated glaring inequalities in the society. Under the Economic Planning, industrialization taken up by the Government accelerated the economic, educational, cultural and scientific development at a very fast rate. Further, the constitution drafted in 1923 and later in 1935, assured equality to all the non-Russian nationalities which transformed the colonial subjection into emancipation. The popularity of socialism helped to mitigate discriminations based on race, colour and sex. Socialist ideas promoted universality and internationalism, which led to campaigns to put an end to imperialism, and to struggle for independence of all nations from foreign yoke. In Yugoslavia, the revolutionary forces, influenced by the great Socialist Revolution of October, 1917, founded the Yugoslav...
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Communist Party (YCP), which won 59 seats in the Constituent Assembly and was banned by the Government in 1920. As a result, struggle between the people and the government intensified. In 1929, the Yugoslav King declared by force absolute dictatorship, banned the trade unions and arrested and murdered the Communists and changed the name of the country to the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. The YCP grew in strength against the fascist regime. In 1937, Josip Broz Tito assumed the leadership of the YCP and formed a new Central Committee. Further, the YCP and the Union of Communist Youth, in the middle of 1938, began training their members in the use of weapons and military tactics.

AFRICA

Algeria struggled since promulgation of the Native Code. The deportation of Emir Khaled in 1923 was followed by emergence of various organizations in 1939 which openly struggled against colonial oppression. In Angola, the first political organizations to fight against the Portuguese colonial domination and to win freedom were formed between 1910 and 1920s, and the upsurge continued until 1930s. Brundi, the Belgian mandate, was influenced by freedom movements in Congo. In Cameroon, autonomist sentiments and national ideas developed during 1930s. As Cape Verde was exploited unchecked, it became a desert and people either migrated to other lands or suffered from famines. There was great unrest in the 20th century. In Central African Republic, the Baya and Ubangi tribes rebelled against French exploitation, but were brutally crushed. In Chad, after the First World War, nationalist movement against French colonialism was growing. In Congo, due to death of thousands of Africans forcibly engaged in the construction of the Congo-Ocean Railway line under inhuman living and working conditions added fuel to the fire of discontent, disturbances and revolts against the French. Egypt, under the 1936 Special Treaty, was under the heels of the British. Egypt was then ruled by the corrupt millionaire King Farouk. Equatorial Guinea was under a harsh Spanish rule during 1778-1968, and nationalist uprisings were crushed. Ethiopia was invaded by Mussolini (Italy) in 1935, backed by Britain and France and Haile Selassie's appeal to the League of Nations proved useless.
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There were intensive demonstrations. In 1937, the commander of the Italian troops in Addis Ababa was killed, which followed the notorious massacre of thousands of Ethiopians. In Ghana, the invasion of fascist Italy (1935-37) intensified pan-African liberation movements in British colony. In Grenada, after the First World War, workers' trade unions were formed to fight against British exploitation. In Guinea (RPR), since the arrest of Almamy Samory Toure, who fought against the French domination for eighteen years, and his death in 1900, there was always a great unrest and discontent among the people. In Guinea-Bissau, the people always resisted the Portuguese rule in different ways for independence. In Ivory Coast, though rebel tribes were subdued until 1912, there was always discontent against the French rule. In Kenya, during 1930s, Kenyatta's Kikuyu Central Association was outlawed but freedom struggle was in full swing. In Lesotho, the British disarmed the masses and appointed the local chiefs as Governors of their tribes who were controlled by British officials. The indirect forced rule and intensive exploitation of natural resources caused uprising and demand for national autonomy. Libya, in 1922, was divided into three zones to suppress the uprisings and, in 1931, the rebel leader, Omar Mukhtar, who lived in the mountains, was killed. As the population suffered from racial persecution and social and economic retrogression, there were revolts against the Italians. In Madagascar, after the deportation of Queen Ranavalona II, and the 'Pacification' programme, uprisings cost lives of about 7,00,000 people and progressive movements during 1916, 1929 and 1930s resulted in the death of about 1,00,000 people. However, there were continuous large-scale demonstrations against the brutal repression unleashed by the French authorities. In Malawi, the first spark of independence struck under the leadership of John Chilembwe in 1915. There was revolt against the British. Mauritius was being influenced by the freedom movements in India and Sri Lanka during 1930s. In Morocco, the French sowed the seed of discord and issued a Berber Decree demonstrations against which were brutally suppressed on May 16, 1930, observed still as a day of sorrow. Later political parties were formed which

were declared illegal. However, the masses continued the freedom struggle. In Mozambique, the Portuguese pursued a true colonial policy against resistance of the people. Namibia (earlier South West Africa) was a German colony, which, after the First World War, was placed under the mandate of South Africa as its integral part. In 1933, South African Government pressed the League's Mandate Commission to permit its annexation to South Africa, but the League's Mandate Commission turned down the request. During 1930s, popular unrest against foreign rule was growing. In Niger, though the people of Air and Tibesti strongly resisted, the French occupied the territory by force of arms in 1921, and deprived the people of fundamental rights, which created great abhorrence and discontent against the foreign rule. In Nigeria, though the north did not cherish ideas of modernisation, the educated and intellectuals of the south demanded electoral representation in the Legislative Council and freedom of the country. In Rwanda, a popular uprising, in 1928, was crushed by Belgian forces. In St. Lucia, after 1938, there was continued unrest against British domination. In Sao Tome, Principe and Annobon, there were signs of growing unrest against the Portuguese. In Senegal, since Lat Dior was killed in 1886, the people had become conscious of the French exploitation of their country's resources; but they had no united force to fight for independence. In Sierra Leone, the British imposed heavy taxes as rebellions broke out led by Bai Bureh and Poro Secret Society. The British consolidated their power to suppress the revolts. In Somalia, there was always fighting against the Italians in different parts of the area with greater or lesser success. In Sudan, in 1924, the British Governor and several Egyptian battalions were killed. As a result, Egyptian forces were withdrawn, and Britain took over Sudan under direct and strict control. In Swaziland, the Swazi King Sobhuza I known as "The Lion", demanded, in 1921, the restitution of his right to the country's mineral wealth. In Tanzania, although the Maji-Maji rebellion, in 1905, was suppressed by the Germans, killing 1,20,000 Africans, their resistance continued. In 1929, intellectuals formed a Tanganyika African Association to fight for independence. Togo,
after the First World War, was divided between Britain and France. The "Cry of Togo", the nationalist daily, and the Circle of Friends of France, founded in 1936, condemned many forms of French repression, demanded reunification of the country and independence. In Tunisia, nationalism emerged in the beginning of the twentieth century and in 1933, political parties became very active for independence. In Zaire, after the Betatele revolt, the Force Publique killed between 1890 and 1904, about 30,00,000 Africans. The Colonial Code (1908) caused rebellions, which the Belgians suppressed by force. In 1931, hundreds of Congolese were murdered and prisoners were executed without trial in front of women and children. As a result, riots broke out and 4,000 Congolese took up arms to overthrow the Belgian domination. In Zambûa, the British faced stiff resistance and between 1911 and 1935, several political parties emerged to fight for freedom. In Zimbabwe, after the British crushed the uprising and killed the King Lobengula in 1893, they deprived the people of voting and occupied the best lands of the people using them as cheap labour. Due to constant British repression, the people of the land were compelled to revolt.

Wave of Emancipation

From the end of the nineteenth century until the Second World War, colonialism was at its height and European powers struggled for stabilising their rule in the colonies. The uprisings of the indigenous peoples were manifest. To counter their resistance, they opened schools, constructed roads and railway lines. Thus, Western education spread the ideas of nationalism and philosophies of European nations. The transport and communication systems helped the colonial people contact each other and to exchange views. When indigenous men, educated in Europe, returned they brought new ideas. They told the people that foreign domination was not ordained by heaven. As a result, many religious and social reformists began to work for revival of their old culture, making the people conscious of their glorious heritage. In view of the culture, education, government and industrialization, the colonies found themselves very backward. The people
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loved their own cultural heritage and waged war with the Colonial Powers with more fervour and patriotism. This attitude was not expected by the rulers. Further, the Europeans also questioned the "justness of such domination" over far off countries, and criticised the repressive measures in Parliaments, being a matter of shame in the eyes of the world. The colonial rulers perceived the future in the rising discontent and realised that colonialism or imperialism would no longer prevail. But as the colonies were the producers of raw material, minerals, oil and other things for their parent industries and were profitable markets of their exports, they treated the colonies as "golden birds" and were not willing at any cost to let them slip from their hands save when they were forced to do so.

The people identified the causes of their poverty, hunger, ignorance, ruthless exploitation, discrimination and backwardness in the social and economic development, while the developed countries extracted every advantage from the subject and colonial position of vast majority of mankind. The problems of dependent countries needed urgent acceleration of economic and social development for which the nationalists even took up arms against the colonialists. The Anglo-Afghan Wars (1842-1919), uprisings in Libya against its division (1922), rebellion of the Greek Orthodox Church in Cyprus (1931), PLO resistance against Israel and rebellion of Poros Secret Society in Sierra Leone (1924), armed struggle in Namibia against South Africa and heroic resistance by A.C. Sandino against the US forces (1925-26), Berbers' and Arabs' demonstrations against the French due to the Berber Decree (1930), rebellion of the Pende Tribe in Zaire (1931) when 4,000 Congolese took up arms to overthrow the Belgians, peasants' insurrections against Japan in Korea (1931-32), Seigeants' Rebellion in Cuba (1933), resistance against invasion of fascist Italy (1935-37), killing of the Commander of the Italian troops (1937), Tito's leadership of the YCP, training the members in the use of weapons (1939) and his speeches in 1944 on the island of Vis and the liberated city of Belgrade and
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in 1945 in Ljubljana and Skopje; Bose's formation of the Indian National Army (1944), the Railway Workers Strike in Zimbabwe (1948) and freedom struggle led by Julius K. Nyerere in Tanzania (1953) reinforced the process of emancipation and opened new prospects for international action and insurgencies of the peoples against colonizers.

The Second World War

Hitler, disregarding the Treaty of Versailles, occupied Rhineland and Austria. England and France adopting the policy of appeasement signed the Munich Pact (1938) with him as they wanted the Nazis to destroy the Soviet Union. Germany, disregarding the Pact, occupied the whole of Czechoslovakia, instead of a part of it called Sudetenland.

In August, 1939, Germany concluded a non-aggression pact with the Soviet Union, the traditional foe of Nazism. Britain and France had guaranteed Poland for its independence. On September 1, Hitler invaded Poland. Therefore, England and France, being allies of Poland declared war against Germany. Germany occupied Poland, Norway, Denmark, Holland and Belgium in quick succession. In June, 1940, Italy joined Germany. Germany attacked the Soviet Union disregarding the non-aggression pact. Germany captured the Balkans, Greece, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and large parts of North Africa, and started bombing England in August. In the meantime, British-Soviet-American unity was signed and, on the other hand, Germany-Italy-Japan agreement aimed to establish a new world order. Italy had occupied Ethiopia and Albania. Japan attacked Pearl Harbour (Hawaii) and destroyed 20 US warships and 250 aircraft killing 300 people. Therefore, the United States declared war against Japan on December 8, 1941. Japan swiftly conquered Malaya, Burma, Indonesia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Hong-Kong and the Dutch Indies.

On January 1, 1942, twenty-six nations, including Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union, signed the United Nations Declaration, for fighting against the fascists in cooperation with one another and not to make any separate peace treaty. In August, 1942, the Germans
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were defeated by the Russians at Stalingrad. The Americans pushed back the Italians, who surrendered in 1943, and France was liberated in 1944. The Russians advanced from the East towards Berlin. At last the Germans laid down their arms on May 7, 1945. The Americans to take revenge, dropped atom bomb on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, killing 78,150 people, and another on Nagasaki on August 10, 1945, while the Japanese might have been repulsed by the Allied forces. On August 10, 1945, Japan surrendered unconditionally.

On the question of distribution of territories of the Axis Powers, the Allies split into two groups - Socialist and Communist led by the Soviet Union and China, and Imperialist and Colonialist led by the Big Three - the United States, Britain and France. The Big Five could not cooperate in securing world peace. During the war, General de Gaulle in France, Marshall Tito in Yugoslavia, Premier Winston Churchill in Britain, President Franklin D. Roosevelt in the United States, and Premier Stalin in USSR, advocated permanent peace in the world. The need of a peace organisation also became imperative due to freedom struggles in all the subject countries which had condemned the Nazi fascist aggression and sided with the Allies, supporting with men and material in the hope that they would be liberated in view of the various declarations for maintaining peace and freedom in the world after the war.

Impact of the Second World War

The bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki opened a new road to international rivalry. Nuclear fission was a landmark in the development of weaponry for war and destruction. The world was appalled by this

minor "dress rehearsal", which pales when compared to the terrifying destructive power of modern nuclear weapons in the super powers' nuclear arsenal, which can destroy the whole world many times. These incidents forced the world to take measures to end the new arms and technology race and to eliminate all-destructive and self-destructive weapons, which could be used for subjugating the entire world. The monopoly of nuclear weapons, ambitious programmes for perfection of nuclear weapons, big powers' rivalry in making other nations their "nuclear partners" to maintain "balance of power" and their effect on international relations led our planet towards the cold war. The refusal of the developing nations to join either of the Big Powers established a status quo between the nuclear powers, as they were afraid of the rival nuclear attack. This dilemma made the world majority combat the nuclear danger in case of conflict. They thought of "a genuine universal system of peace, based on security and equality of all states and nations" on the mechanism of cooperation, solidarity and mutual assistance.

Some of the colonies, which became independent, engaged in local wars and armed interventions. The super powers helped them with economic and military aid and tried to exert different forms of pressure on them and, on the pretext of restoring peace and order, they intervened in the internal affairs. These situations were gravely realized by the colonial people and the process of anti-colonial revolutions, decolonisation and internal transformation of newly liberated states started. Anti-colonial liberation movements in Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and Latin America, as well as in southern Europe and the Mediterranean region brought the world to the stage of constant upheaval to achieve national independence in different ways - from peaceful acquisition of power to violent resistance and anti-colonial destructive wars. The Colonial Powers used the most brutal kind of military
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intervention to curb the nationalist move. However, the Chinese revolution, establishment of popular rule in a number of East European countries, collapse of Fascists, Nazis and Japanese, who threatened the worst type of enslavement of the world, and victory of the Axis powers changed the entire structure of international relations. Socialism became a universal process and a number of states in different parts of the globe emerged and opted for socialism.

The United Nations Organisation

On August 14, 1941, Roosevelt and Churchill met "somewhere at sea" and their joint declaration, known as the Atlantic Charter, promised to "afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries" and assured all "freedom from fear and want". On January 1, 1942, representatives of 26 governments that were fighting against the Tripartite Pact, signed at Washington D.C., the Declaration by United Nations. On December 1, 1943, Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill declared to "banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations" so that people "may live free lives untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their own consciences". Therefore, in Washington, at the mansion of the Dumbarton Oaks, the UK and US representatives talked with the representatives of the USSR and China in 1944. In February, 1945, Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin met at Yalta (Soviet Union) and agreed to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference Proposals. Consequently, at San Francisco, on April 25, 1945, delegates of fifty nations drew up the 111-article Charter. On June 25, 1945, the delegates met in San Francisco and unanimously adopted the Charter and signed it the next day. It came into effect on October 24, 1945, when China, France, the USSR, the UK and the US and others filed their instruments of ratification. The main objectives of the UN is to maintain international peace and security.
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Article 2 of the Charter says that in pursuit of the purposes stated in Article 1, all the members would agree to "the principle of sovereign equality of all its members ... fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the UN Charter... shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means without endangering international peace and security ... shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state ... shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the Charter and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action ... shall ensure that states which are not members of the United Nations act in accordance with these principles and ... shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state".

The weakest point of the United Nations is the power of veto of the permanent members — the United States, the USSR, the United Kingdom, France and China. If any one of them in voting says "No" to the use of force even after a full investigation, the Security Council cannot use force to settle disputes. The United Nations differs from the League of Nations in one respect: "All members of the United Nations are bound to make available to the Security Council on its call and in accordance with special agreements a certain number of armed forces and other necessary facilities, including rights of passage. The military agreements with the member states have not been concluded so far". The work of the United Nations has been greatly hampered by the differences of opinion especially between the United States and the Soviet Union. The UN's success would lead to happiness and its failure may cause Third World War.

United Nations and Decolonization

Before the Second World War, colonialism had become customary which caused conflicts and wars among the European nations. The colonial people did not like the foreign rule and revolted to overthrow

the White regime. These affairs had disturbed the whole political realm. After the War, the establishment of the United Nations was the basis of the demands and expectations of the colonies regarding justice, peace, security and progress all over the globe.

To gain freedom for the colonial peoples, the United Nations incorporated in its Charter Chapters XII and XIII, under which the Mandate System of Non-Self Governing Territories (NSGT) flowered a seed sown by the League of Nations, as the League aimed at colonial supervision and the United Nations worked for decolonization. In 1945, the number of UN members belonging to imperialist group (31) was more than the socialist nations (20), which grew to 45 in 1955. With the increase of the voting strength of the socialist nations in the United Nations, the Colonial Powers lost their influence and were subjected to the obligations of the UN Charter. In the UN Trusteeship Council and the Special Committee for decolonization, the Colonial Powers began to refuse to submit annual reports on their territories on one pretext or the other, absolving themselves out of the UN jurisdiction, but they could not check the nationalist movements being violently carried on in the territories supported by the Soviet group, which created the First Cold War between the US and the USSR, during 1945 - 1955, when the United States gained nuclear superiority and resisted the growing upsurge of independence movement in the Middle East and Far East. The victory of Chinese Revolution, the partition of Vietnam and struggle against French and US imperialism, the internment of Malay guerrillas in Malaysia by Britain, the defeat of Philippines revolutions, the ouster of Mosadeq in Iran, freedom struggles in Guatemala, the Korean War and discussion with regard to the independance of certain colonies in Asia, Africa and Latin America in the United Nations, aggravated the Cold War. However, the group of newly independent countries continued to become members of the United Nations and their united force continuously grew in the form of non-aligned movement, which mainly emphasised disarmament and decolonization of dependent
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countries. Since 1955, with the growing African membership "there was no looking back for the African countries. Due to their own colonial past, the evils of colonialism had to be eradicated at any cost". In 1960, of the seventeen, sixteen nations from Africa, the Black Continent, entered and made the best use of the United Nations to voice their feelings and made it a hand-maid of the Third World.

Assessment of Power Blocs

The idea of non-alignment emerged from the disturbance of world order - violations of treaties and aggressions for maintaining balance of power. The League of Nations and then the United Nations failed to preserve peace.

The League failed to prevent Japanese aggression against China in 1931. Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935. The League resorted to economic and financial sanctions against Italy, but as the constituent members did not fulfil their obligations, it failed to ensure peace, and Italy withdrew from it and conquered Abyssinia. Germany occupied Rhineland in 1936, annexed Austria in 1938 and Czechoslovakia in 1939, but the League could not take any effective action. When Russia invaded Finland in 1939, the League could only expell Russia. The failure of the League in maintaining world order resulted in the Second World War.

The United Nations was successful in maintaining peace in the Korean and the Suez zone. The United Nations also restored peace in Congo. But as the UN Charter envisaged regional arrangements in consonance with its purposes and principles, group agreements came to maintain the 'balance of power', *a la* Roman theory, "If you want peace be prepared for war". Woodrow Wilson, apprehensive of this factor, had remarked: "There can be no League or alliances, special covenants and understandings within the general and common family of the League of Nations". Contrarily, Churchill in a speech
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at Fulton in 1946 propounded "the policy of containment" of Communism by fair or foul means. On June 11, 1948, the British Parliament empowered the Administration to favour the progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements, which resulted in the growth of regional pacts and treaties among nations. The pacts, arranged in chronological order, are given below:

**1945**

**Military Pact Among Arab States**: The Arab states - Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Lebanon, Yemen and Libya signed a pact on March 22, 1945, for economic and cultural cooperation and self-defence. UAR, Syria, Libya and Sudan entered into a military pact towards the end of 1970.

**1947**

**Dunkirk Treaty (or Treaty of Alliance and Mutual Assistance)**: The treaty was concluded at Dunkirk between France and the United Kingdom on March 4, 1947, for a period of 50 years, for mutual military and economic cooperation.

**Inter-American Defence Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (The Rio Pact)**: It was signed at Rio de Janeiro on September 2, 1947. Article 3 of the Treaty provides that an armed attack against an American State is to be considered as an attack against all the American States.

**1948**

**The Brussels Treaty**: It was signed at Brussels on March 17, 1948, by Britain, Belgium, France, Luxembourg and the Netherlands, valid for 50 years, to achieve collective security in Western Europe.

**1949**

**The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)**: It was signed in Washington by 12 members on April 4, 1949, for a period of 20 years, with a view to safeguarding the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples on the principles of democracy and liberty. Its members were Belgium, Britain, Canada, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands.


1950

Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance: It was concluded between USSR and China on February 14, 1950, for 30 years, providing full military and other assistance in case of an armed attack by Japan or by any State allied with Japan.

Baghdad Pact (Central Treaty Organization (CENTO)): In 1955, Baghdad Pact was concluded with Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, Turkey and the United Kingdom. The United States, although not a full-fledged member, is a member of the military committee of the Pact. Egypt protested against participation of the Big Powers and Syria against Turkey and Iraq. Iraq withdrew in 1958 and renounced US military aid in 1959. As a result the name, Baghdad Pact, was changed to Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) in August, 1959. As Russia has contacts with Iran, Pakistan and Turkey, CENTO has declined in its strength.

1951

US-Philippines Mutual Defence Treaty: It was concluded on August 30, 1951, for an indefinite period. It provides for mutual aid in case of armed attack in the Pacific area on either party.

The ANZUS Pact: It was signed on September 1, 1951, at San Francisco by Australia, New Zealand and the United States to strengthen security in the Pacific area on the basis of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid for an indefinite period.

US-Japanese Defence Pact: It was concluded on September 8, 1951, for an indefinite period, which provides for US aid to Japan in case of armed attack on it. They signed a new treaty on January 19, 1960, which stipulates that an attack on either party would be met by both.

1954

South-East Asia Collective Defence Treaty (SEATO)-Manila Pact: It was signed on September 8, 1954, by Australia, Britain, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand and the United States for an
indefinite period, especially against Communist aggression. Pakistan got into SEATO and evolved relationship with Communist China.

**Balkan Pact** : The Pact was concluded on September 9, 1954, between Greece, Turkey and Yugoslavia for 20 years, for military and other assistance.

**1955**

*Warsaw Pact or East European Treaty Organization* was signed on May 14, 1955, in Warsaw (Poland) for 20 years between USSR and the Communist States - Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland and Rumania supported by China for armed assistance in case of attack on either of them and to maintain peace in Europe, with headquarters in Moscow.

*Treaty of Friendship between France and Libya* was signed on August 10, 1955, providing all military and other assistance in case of war or threat of war in the area. The treaty was for 20 years and renewable after 10 years.

*Egypt-Syria Defence Pact* was concluded on October 20, 1955, for five years, providing for a joint command comprising all available armed forces.

**The Soviet System of Collective Security** : The Soviet Union entered into bilateral treaties with almost all the Communist countries e.g. Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and Yugoslavia for mutual assistance.

**US Bilateral Military Pacts** : Besides multilateral military alliances, the United States has entered into bilateral pacts with China, Iran, Japan, Korea, Pakistan, the Philippines and Turkey, in order to assist them in case of armed aggression by international Communism.

Besides the military treaties and pacts, several economic and political compacts were established by different countries. The agreement between Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg, known as **Benelux** was signed in 1944. A new agreement was signed in 1947, by the Benelux States to work toward a full economic union. The **Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC)** was established in 1948, for coordinating the work of the European States in operating the Marshall
Plan. The Organization of American States (OAS) was established at Bogota in 1948, for promotion of commerce and technical assistance. The Schuman Plan or the European Coal and Steel Community, signed on April 18, 1951, for 50 years in Paris, by France, the FRG, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg, aims at economic integration of Europe. The Colombo Plan was born at a meeting of ministerial representatives of Commonwealth of Nations Government in Colombo in January, 1950. The United States joined it in 1951. Other countries, such as, Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Laos, Nepal, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam joined it later. The Plan aimed at financial and technical assistance by advanced countries to the developing nations. The Plan was formally inaugurated on July 1, 1951, and was terminated on June 30, 1957, but its life was extended from time to time. Group of 77, formed in 1963-64, has now more than 120 members, who coordinate their activities and work out joint economic programmes by means of periodic consultations. It consists of several subgroups: most developed countries, least developed countries, countries with a medium level of development and also of subgroups with diverse political and social development and orientation.

The military and economic pacts and agreements have resulted in blocs of nations, each calling itself a defensive bloc and afraid of the other, engulfing both in a vicious circle. The dependence of developing nations upon the advanced countries due to these pacts has resulted in colonial dependence of the former.

The Cold War

The intensity of the Cold War may be assessed from the continued rivalry and race for supremacy between the United States and the Soviet Union from 1946 to 1962. The period may be divided into two phases - the first from 1946 to 1955, and the second from 1956 to 1962. Churchill's speech at Poulton on March 15, 1946, inaugurated the era of the Cold War. Further, Truman's Doctrine declared, in March, 1947, the United States an open "anti-Russian policeman". The imperialist bloc was joined by France and Italy, who ousted the Communists from Cabinets.

in May, 1947. In Hungary, the Communists destroyed the Hungarian Smallholders' Party and took over the Government in August, 1947, and seized power in Czechoslovakia in February, 1948. Further, the Berlin blockade by Russia in 1948; signing of NATO in 1949; Truman's apprehension that Russia had the Atom bomb; beginning of the Korean War in 1950, and America's explosion of Hydrogen bomb in August, 1953, brought the planet on the verge of destruction. The United States strengthened its circle by establishing the SEATO on September 8, 1954. The signatories agreed to take collective action in the event of either external aggression against any one of them or internal subversion. They emphasized military aid and anti-Communist policies.

The Cold War has divided the world into blocs, according to the view of the NAM countries. The term 'third world' is often used for the movement of non-alignment, the first and second - being led by the United States and the Soviet Union, the leaders of the West and the East respectively. The Chinese theory of the "three worlds" has a different meaning. Deng Xiaoping, in his address at the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on International Economic Relations in 1974, said that the "first world" embraced the two super powers - the United States and the Soviet Union, as the protagonists; the "second world" consists of the countries of Western and Eastern Europe - members of the Atlantic and Warsaw Pacts; and the "third world" includes all other countries - China, all NAM and developing countries, all newly liberated countries and all countries struggling for independence. According to the Chinese view the second and third worlds should "cooperate, work together and even form an alliance for the struggle against the "first world". These were the countries, which supported decolonization and helped to break the backbone of capitalism and colonialism.

In the second phase of the Cold War, revolt in Pozan (1956), and Hungary (1956), three-power attack on Egypt (1956), Soviet launching of ICBM and giving massive aid to Syria (1957) causing failure of
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Eisenhower doctrine in the Arab world, and the Formosa and Berlin crises called for the necessity of talks for peace between the Super Powers. Nixon visited Moscow in July, 1959, and Khrushchev visited USA in August, 1959. Although USSR had imposed on itself moratorium on nuclear explosions, it resumed the same in 1961 as a protest against the insincerity of the Western Powers in their approach to Berlin problem, in view of the war efforts of NATO. Similarly, the United States resumed nuclear blasts and other members of 'Nuclear Club' followed suit. The Soviet Union exploded 50-Megaton super bomb and the United States exploded bombs underground. In a bid to solve the problem, a partial test ban treaty was signed by the Big Three - US, USSR and UK in Moscow in 1963, when about one hundred nations signed the same. In consequence, the UN General Assembly gave top priority to the issue of disarmament. As the Non-aligned countries had played an important role pressing to halt the spreading hatred and anger between the Nuclear Powers, it was their ultimate success.

Jawaharlal Nehru as Vice-President of the Interim Government of India in a press conference on September 2, 1946, proclaimed India's foreign policy as based on non-alignment and hoped that it would be the policy of many nations. He considered the struggle between the Soviet Union and the United States as a struggle for power and not between democracy and Communism. As for instance, "the United States supported Tito with massive assistance when he defected from the Soviet bloc", and the Soviet Union supplied arms and supported the Egyptian position during the Trio (British, French and Israeli) invasion of Egypt in 1956, on the question of nationalization of the Suez Canal and financed the construction of Aswan Dam when the US and Britain refused to release the promised loan for the purpose; whereas, Nasser had announced in 1954, when the British forces were withdrawn from the Suez military base, that "no defence treaties with the Western powers were possible in the Middle East because the Arab peoples viewed

them as colonialism in disguise". Colonialism and imperialism are synonyms. Thus, every Big Power is imperialist and expansionist.

Obviously, the US or Soviet assistance is based on the policy of containment of imperialism or Communism and either of them has to keep the small states out of spheres of the other by giving them aid. Therefore, Nehru decided to develop industry, technology and agriculture of the country as rapidly as possible under democratic methods to avoid dependence upon foreign countries. On the other hand, Nasser, though, he was an enemy of Communism, established close relations with the Soviet Union and China for achieving peace and security and to introduce social reform and progress in Egypt. If Nehru in 1949, decided to remain in the Commonwealth before his visit to the United States, it showed he was not in the Communist camp so that he might get Western aid as the United States had decided to assist only those nations, which professed to be anti-Communist. Nehru tried to convince the United States that "he was interested in social reforms and the building of a strong economy, which the Western Powers considered necessary to combat Communism internally". On the other hand, Nasser refused to join the Baghdad Pact in 1955 to assure the Soviet Union that he was not in the Western camp so that he could secure as much assistance from the Soviet bloc as possible. Nehru, however, did not kneel down before the US policy of domination and boldly declared that "Where freedom is menaced or justice threatened or where aggression takes place, we cannot be and shall not be neutral". Nehru's visit to the United States revealed that he was not afraid of the Soviet Union or the United States and that he was free to establish friendly relations with either of them.

**Concept of Non-Aligment**

The colonial nations struggled for liberation from the political domination of imperialism to break their economic dependence, to build an independent national economy and to lay foundation of political

sovereignty. The October Revolution in Russia gave rise to the concept of common struggle for liberation. Further, the working class in capitalist countries also advocated socialism against imperialism. Recalling the experience of the Congress of Oppressed Nationalities, at Brussels, in February, 1927, Jawaharlal Nehru said:

"I do not know who originated the idea ... ideas of some common action between oppressed nations inter se, as well as between them and the Labour left wing, were very much in the air. It was felt more and more that the struggle for freedom was a common one against the thing that was imperialism, and joint deliberation and, where possible, joint action were desirable ...".

Nehru also said that active support to the idea of non-alignment also "came from Latin America, which was chafing at the time at the economic imperialism of the United States".

While the Brussels Conference (1927) sowed the seeds of the joint struggles, the idea of non-alignment as a movement was not conceived. It is difficult to trace the date of the origin of the idea of non-alignment as it has a long history. However, in practical shape, its origin may be traced to the 1940s, when the US and Soviet blocs emerged, and when the developing countries came forward for joint action to save their liberty.

The non-aligned countries were defined as "extra-bloc" states and their international activity as the "movement of extra-bloc countries" and policy of "non-attachment". The non-bloc and anti-bloc quality of the movement of non-alignment became all pervasive and these countries were described as a "third bloc", or a "third power". Explaining this quality, Tito said, on October 31, 1951:
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"In question is a broad-based popular striving and active struggle to achieve full national freedom and secure the right to social development in this freedom, in accordance with their own choice, a struggle against being the economic and political appendage of great world powers i.e. the centres of military-political and economic power, to safeguard themselves in this process against foreign domination and exploitation and proceeding from these positions to be able to influence the development of international relations."

In view of the military-political alliances and bloc politics of the United States and Soviet Union, the developing countries, to safeguard themselves from any form of domination, following the movement of popular emancipation, willingly adopted the policy of "positive neutrality". But "strict respect for neutrality" meant distancing oneself from those in conflict, but the non-alignment was not a neutral force as it always opposed "the world's division into blocs, or neutrality i.e. a pragmatic-oriented search for some kind of equidistance between the blocs, although such a policy did come to varying degrees of expression within some non-aligned countries."

The developing nations did not want to associate themselves with either the East or West, because there was a danger of domination of Big Powers and their independence could be jeopardised. Referring to the cold war climate and the problem of Indian defence, Jawaharlal Nehru, in a speech to the Constituent Assembly (Legislative) on March 8, 1948, said:

"Nothing is more important in the opinion of this Government than to make India strong economically and militarily - not strong in the Big Power sense, because that is beyond our capacity, but as strong as we can to defend ourselves if anybody attacks us."

Nehru, on March 22, 1949, said again:

"The first duty of every country is to protect itself. Protecting oneself unfortunately means relying on the armed forces and the like and so we build up, where necessity

---
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in 1948; Ho Chi Minh in Indo-China, who dethroned the pro-British monarch of Annam in 1945; Sukarno in Indonesia (independent in 1945), Yasser Arafat in Palestine, leader of the PLO; Lee Kuan Yew in Singapore (independent in 1950); John Kotelawala in Sri Lanka (independent in 1948); Fidel Castro in Cuba, who attacked the British military bases in 1953; President Josip Broz Tito in Yugoslavia; President Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt who seized power in 1953, and formed the United Arab Republic with Syria in 1958; and Premier Nkrumah in Ghana (independent in 1957); and other Afro-Asian nations practised non-alignment successfully, especially the United Arab Republic, whose foreign policy was most aggressive and dynamic among the non-aligned nations. India, Yugoslavia and the United Arab Republic drew inspiration from each other, established close cooperation and independently evolved a policy which became a special feature of the non-alignment. Nehru, thus, was not the only advocate of the policy. He admitted that "Asia and Africa had common experience and circumstances favouring non-alignment". Therefore, he always spoke of Asia and Africa and not of India alone. Nehru said:

"It is a policy inherent in the circumstances of India, inherent in the conditioning of the Indian mind during our struggle for freedom, and inherent in the circumstances of the world today... It represents every circumstance that goes towards making the thought of India on these subjects".

The policy of non-alignment was a pre-independence thinking of Nehru under the influence of Gandhi, who practised 'Non-violence' and 'Satyagraha', which was a part of the Indian mind. A phrase like "mental outlook of India" used by Nehru in his speech is the philosophical and cultural basis of India. Appadorai says: "The essence of that 'mental outlook' is a spirit of tolerance among the common
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people in India, who have inherited the traditions from their scriptures and from their history. At one time Nehru also said: "Peaceful co-existence is not a new idea for us in India. It has been our way of life and is as old as our thought and culture. About 2,200 years ago, a great son of India, Ashoka, proclaimed it and inscribed it on rock and stone". Similarly Nasser says: "Our policy emanates from our country, our land, and our conscience". Nkrumah of Ghana and others, in view of the weak position of their countries, cooperated with Nehru and Nasser. Thus, "Nasser, Nehru and Nkrumah ... seem to speak the same language and to draw inspiration from the same public philosophy when they discourse on neutralism and the cold war". Nasser, however, abandoned his idea of Islam as the "Third Circle" in favour of the more influential and powerful circle of the non-aligned States. Nasser's and Nehru's ideas of non-alignment are different due to their being under religious influence. Nasser did not believe in the policy of non-alignment to the extent of going down on his knees. He preferred to fight the aggressor under the teaching of Islamic Jehad as in the case of war against Israel, while Nehru preferred peaceful negotiation which he adopted in the case of Goa and the dispute with China.

During the Arab-Israel war, Indo-China war or US attack on Libya, other countries did not intervene. As a result, the wars left a permanent blot on the policy of non-alignment and its observers. They should realise that non-alignment does not mean 'non-interference' or 'non-intervention' in the affairs of others, which reduces non-alignment to mere neutrality. Nehru and Nasser have rightly said
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that non-alignment has little to do with neutrality or impartiality or even freedom from all obligations and commitments. Thus, Nehru's statement that "we are free to join any alliance" goes against and belies the claim that "in many matters the non-aligned countries have a duty to be neutral, in the traditional sense". Further, alternatively, if it is granted that non-alignment means "interference" or "intervention" in the affairs of others, it would justify aggression, or unauthorised use of influence or power on other states, which would encourage a policy of colonisation in disguise. For instance, the Colonial Powers intervened and signed treaties with nations assuring their protection and neutralisation, which reduced them to mere vassal states. Likewise, India also interfered in the domestic affairs of Nepal, Bhutan, Sikkim, East Pakistan (now Bangladesh), Hyderabad, Kashmir and Junagadh. Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim became vassal states. East Pakistan won freedom, and Hyderabad and Junagadh were forcibly occupied, and Kashmir, whose population was not given the chance of expressing its views through a referendum, is partly occupied by India and partly by Pakistan and has become a permanent source of conflict. It shows that the non-aligned countries have the right to interfere with and occupy others territories as the other Big Powers do or have done. For instance, Nasser crossed swords with Khrushchev in 1959, when the latter accused him of anti-Communism. Nasser boldly said:

"If Khrushchev rises today to defend a small minority of the sons of our country ... saying that he is defending Communism as a principle, we tell him that we do not consider this as defence of the Communist principle, but as intervention in our affairs".

Objectives of the Non-Alignment

Keeping in view the expansionist nature of Imperialism and Communism to widen their circle of influence, every nation is conscious of the danger of being dominated by them by any means - economic, political or military. So, the advocates of non-alignment were primarily concerned with pursuit of peace and security and progress.

Jawaharlal Nehru, speaking at the Columbia University in 1949, explained the basic objectives of Non-alignment as follows:

"The main objectives of that policy (non-alignment) are the pursuit of peace, not through alignment with any major group of powers but through an independent approach to each controversial or disputed issue; the liberation of subjected peoples; the maintenance of freedom; both national and individual; the elimination of racial discrimination; and the elimination of want; disease and ignorance, which afflict the great part of the world's population".

Further, the objectives of the members of the non-aligned group were peace and security of those countries which had recently become independent or the ones which were struggling for independence. They followed the ideology of the non-alignment with respect to the liberation of subject peoples before and after their independence as part of their strategy to protect their own freedom and security. Nehru, who championed Afro-Asian freedom movements, once said: "in the long run it is to the advantage of India to try to attract to itself the sympathy and hope of millions of people in the world without offending others". He also said: "I do not think it is purely idealistic: I think it is, if you like, opportunist in the long run".

Thus, it may be said that the objective of the non-alignment is neither an anti-Communistic nor an anti-Colonialistic policy. They opposed Communism or Colonialism when it posed threat to their security, and they came forward for the cause of the colonial peoples to strengthen the measures of their own security and they cooperated with the Big Powers in their own interest. Thus, India received substantially more aid than any other country from the Big Powers directly. Likewise, Pakistan, a member of the non-aligned nations is also a major recipient
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of US assistance for national security and economic development, although it was a most anti-colonial and anti-racial country as proved in the UN committees. In fact, these are features shared by all Afro-Asian countries, including those which are aligned, as may be seen in the brief history of the Afro-Asian countries. However, it may be inferred that, as Burton said: "Non-alignment then is a condition which tends to occur whenever the pressures of circumstances are not sufficiently strong to justify alignments", and Nehru observed: "We might have been compelled by circumstances, but we are not compelled by circumstances to give up, because it does amount to giving up our independence in order to gain the goodwill of this country or that country".

The above discussion makes it clear that the non-aligned nations, which receive military assistance from Power blocs, do not lose their independence. For instance, Pakistan had military aid from the United States and joined the Power blocs, but it retained its independent policy and established friendly relations with non-aligned countries. The idea that "non-alignment is synonymous with independence" is an extreme view. Nehru, in reply to a demand from a member of the Lok Sabha that India should withdraw from the Commonwealth of Nations, said on June 12, 1952:

"Nations must act with dignity and strength, adopt what they consider the right course and adhere. It is open to us to be associated in an alliance with any country. We have avoided alliances that might entangle us ... so far as we are concerned we are prepared to enter into a treaty of friendship with every country in the world".

Nehru, opposing the alliance at the cost of independent, said:
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"In an alliance, one invariably takes something and gives something in return. Each country binds itself down to a certain extent and relinquishes its freedom of action to the extent to which it commits itself in the alliance or agreement. An alliance, nevertheless, need not stand in the way of independence of the country".

The view that 'non-alignment' means rejection of alliance with any power, is not true. India associated itself with the non-aligned countries and opposed NATO, which supported Portugal on Goa. Nasser opposed NATO and the Baghdad Pact, which supported Israel. India's association with the Commonwealth and Nasser's treaty with Britain in 1954, showed that both India and UAR wanted British help for defence. India accepted British assistance in building its defence forces. For the training of Indian army, Panikkar wrote that British cooperation was necessary. He said: "It was impossible without adequate co-operation from one of the major Powers to acquire this knowledge. Close association with Britain was for India the only practical alternative and India chose it unhesitantly". The Commonwealth Prime Ministers in London in 1948, talking of the defence and maintenance of world peace, observed: "In the discussion there was agreement that the danger of war must be met by building up the armed forces in order to deter any would-be aggressor, and that freedom must be safeguarded not only by military defensive measures but also by advancing social and economic welfare".

Policy of Non-Alignment

The policy and principle of non-alignment is based on the theory of balance of power with the main objective of security and protection of the nations, which has various aspects. Nehru explained these aspects in the debate on Foreign Affairs in the Lok Sabha on September 9, 1958:
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"When we say our policy is one of non-alignment, obviously we mean non-alignment with military blocs ... This in itself is not a policy, it is only part of a policy ...".

But, 'non-alignment with military blocs' aims at peace and security and how it can be achieved Nehru continues:

"Security can be obtained in many ways. The normal idea is that security is protected by armies. That is only partly true; it is equally true that security is protected by policies. A deliberate policy of friendship with other countries goes further in gaining security than almost anything else ... The other positive aspects are an enlargement of freedom in the world, replacement of colonialism by free and independent countries and a large degree of cooperation among nations".

As far as protection of security by armies is concerned, it is not possible for small nations to defend their boundaries driving the Big Powers with force until and unless they fight unitedly. To gain a united force, the adoption of policy of friendship is inevitable, which demands cooperation with the subject nations for overthrowing colonialism, political or economic. All these policies unescapably has many aspects and every nation adopts its own policy, perceiving its own advantage and disadvantage. Therefore, Nehru says:

"Therefore, whether a country is imperialist or socialist or Communist, its Foreign Minister thinks primarily of the interests of that country. But ... of course some people may think of the interests of their country regardless of other consequences or take a short distance view. Others may think that in the long-term policy the interest of another country is as important to them as that of their country. The interest of peace is more important because if war comes everyone suffers, so that in the long-distance view, self-interest may itself demand a policy of cooperation with other nations, goodwill for other nations, as, indeed, it does demand".

The non-aligned countries have to look after their own interests and, at the same time, have to maintain world cooperation and world peace. But in case of aggression by another nation, the country has to meet it. Therefore, it would not be possible to maintain friendship with every country. Nehru says:
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"Naturally you are more friendly with those countries with whom you have closer relations ... Naturally, again, we are likely to be more friendly to some countries than to others because this may be to our mutual advantage ... but even so, our friendship with other countries should not bring us inevitably into conflict with some other country".

Each country maintains its relations with others keeping in view its own position and the international distribution of power. They would not make alliance with those which threaten their independence and may cause their downfall. Further, while making treaties with others they fear that "they would provoke a hostility of a rival group and be drawn into conflicts which they might avoid by remaining dissociated from either group". Their association or dissociation depends upon their geographical condition and natural resources. Thus, "the maintenance of defensive balance of power differs in different countries. What is common is the aim of survival". This is the main reason for shunning the Power blocs by the small nations. Nehru realised, after the Second World War, that the atmosphere was congenial for non-alignment. Hence, in 1946, he declared 'non-alignment' as India's foreign policy. The developing countries accurately judged the antagonistic character of the Big Powers who aimed to have as many Afro-Asian countries as possible on their side, and saw their peace and security in keeping themselves aloof from them as far as possible. Therefore, they preferred to join the non-aligned countries.

Nehru elaborates this point as follows:

"If you extend the argument, you will see that the only way to avoid conflicts is to accept things more or less as they are. No doubt, many things require to be changed, but you must not think of changing them by war ... Further by enlarging the area of peace, that is of countries which are not aligned to this group or that, but which are friendly to both, you reduce the chance of war".

To avoid antagonism, the developing countries, realising the danger of Cold War, did not like to join either the Soviet Union or
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the United States, as Nehru said: "It would have been quite astonishingly foolish to fall into this business of the cold war, either on grounds of principle or on grounds of expediency". He wrote to Menon and Asaf Ali on the eve of their departure respectively to Washington and Nanking as the first Ambassadors of independent India in 1947:

"... The Soviet Union being our neighbour, we shall inevitably develop closer relations with it. We cannot afford to antagonize Russia merely because we think that this may irritate someone else. Nor indeed can we antagonize the USA".

To maintain the non-antagonistic policy, Nehru decided to adopt non-alignment with the Power blocs. He did not want to antagonise Russia, because Russia was the nearest power having friendly relations with Communist China, which was rising as an Asian power and whose expansionist nature was a danger to India. He did not want to antagonise the West, especially the United States, because it was the only power to check the expansionist moves of the Soviet Union or China. Therefore, he warned the Communist powers:

"He would not hesitate to accept Western aid, if not an alliance, if India's security was threatened, by his decision to remain in the Commonwealth, by his support to the Burmese Government against the Communists, and by putting the Communists in India in jail in thousands. Stalin might have already learnt his lesson from Tito's successful defection from his control and the prompt support given by the United States to the latter".

Nehru, to counter the Russian and Chinese powers, had in mind to seek help from the United States and this was the policy of other nations also. Cecil says that "there has always been a tacit dependence upon the world balance of power and great Power support in times of crises". Panikkar writes that India's non-alignment "does not mean that in case she is actually attacked she would not accept assistance
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from others", as Britain and France sought help from the Soviet Union to check Nazi aggression, and Moscow welcomed assistance from America and the Western allies to fight the Nazis. Keeping this fact in view, Nehru on November 27, 1959, said in the Lok Sabha:

"The policy of non-alignment and of having friendly relations is, I believe, basically a right policy under all circumstances. But if two countries fall out and, in the extreme instance, go to war, obviously that policy does not apply to them. If peace is broken, we deal with the situation in so far as we can. The policy remains good all the same and it applies to the rest of the world, and later, to that part of the world too, because war is not a permanent phenomenon".

Nasser also held the same view. While talking with Eden, the British Premier in Cairo, on February 20, 1965, when the British Foreign Secretary was advocating the cause of the Baghdad Pact, Nasser, rejecting the Pact and British protection, is reported to have said:

"I said we could defend ourselves, and in the case of Soviet aggression we would have recourse to the Western Powers, and that we would ask for the help of the Soviet Union if we are attacked by the Western Powers".

As the Soviet Union responded to the cause of the non-aligned countries, Nehru and others felt that it would be a "moral failure" to abandon the principle, but they are apprehensive of their weak economic and defence position. They wanted some means to ensure their protection, to stand on their legs and to build their country's future in their own way. But it was not possible without the assistance of the friendly nations, especially Big Powers, who put conditions leading to alliances, for alliance was a sort of commitment to one side or the other, subordinating the country to a Big Power. In 1959, Nehru said in the Lok Sabha: "There is one fact which might be remembered when people think sometimes of obtaining outside help ... I do not want this idea to get into our people that others will help us and preserve our freedom. I do not want India to go on crutches".
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But when an aid came with conditions, it was rejected. During the Suez crisis, when Nasser asked for arms from Britain, she made a condition that he would neither attack nor oppose the Baghdad Pact, which Nasser rejected. In the same way, Nehru also did not accept the Western assistance at the time of Chinese aggression. That is why Nehru and Nasser laid the foundations of a self-sufficient defence force in their spheres. But since defence depends on industrial growth, Nehru, in the Lok Sabha on December 8, 1959, said:

"The basic factor in defence is the industrial growth of our country, and all the armies in the world without an industrial background cannot function adequately. Our Five Year Plans built up this industrial background".

To meet the military requirements for defence, Nehru felt the need of heavy industries. He added:

"Our stress, in particular, has been on peace and will continue to be on peace, but that does not mean any kind of forgetfulness of the country's basic requirements in regard to defence ... Both for guns and butter we have to lay, as rapidly and as firmly as we can, the foundations of heavy industry".

Like Nehru and Nasser, Nkrumah, Sukarno and Tito have also been Socialists and were apprehensive of getting aids from the Western countries and the United States, who insisted on some form of capitalism, which they rejected. The Soviet Union was the only country which came forward to aid them in a big way. Nehru opposed the Soviet and Chinese-backed Communists, who caused the fall of Sukarno in Indonesia. Therefore, whenever the Communists exceeded the constitutional limits, Nehru and Nasser crushed them with heavy hands. But as the Soviet Union accepted the policy of non-alignment, the Communist weapon of criticizing the ruling party being in the imperialist group became ineffective. On the other hand, the non-aligned countries saved themselves from the interference of the Soviet Union and China. This was a direct result of the non-aligned nations making themselves a third power and maintaining a defensive balance of power. They continued to keep themselves aloof from establishing some sort of relations with the West and also friendly relations with the Soviet

Union. Thus came the stage of "neutrality". Sayegh says: "Non-alignment is, rather the passive, first stage of neutralism. Neutralism has in common with non-alignment an expressed desire to remain aloof from bloc conflict". Brecher said: "Non-alignment is the policy guide of the neutralist state. Nehru called it a 'Positive policy for Peace'. But after the Korean War, Nehru realised that neutrality was not enough to maintain peace in the world. He, therefore, moved to the second stage i.e. non-alignment, and in the fifties, openly came out as a leader of non-aligned nations to avert a global conflict, which was sine qua non of India remaining free from war. In fact, the non-aligned countries always denied, like Nehru, neutrality or neutralism. Nehru did not accept the term 'positive neutralism', but the Arabs disliked the term 'non-alignment' and Nasser used both the terms "positive neutralism" and "non-alignment" stressing the positive aspects.

For Nehru, "neutrality" meant a policy which had little meaning except in times of war."If you think there is a cold war today, we are certainly neutral". Nehru, in December, 1947, in the Constituent Assembly said:

"We have proclaimed during this past year that we will not attach ourselves to any particular group. That has nothing to do with neutrality or passivity or anything else. If there is a big war, there is no particular reason why we should jump into it. Nevertheless it is a little difficult now-a-days in world wars to be neutral ... We are not going to join a war if we can help it. We are going to join the side which is to our interest when the time comes to make the choice. There the matter ends".

But neutrality works when non-alignment fails during war. Therefore, as a safeguard, India has adopted neutrality.
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The aim of the non-aligned countries is to avert war between the Big Powers for their own security as well as world peace, as Nehru said: "The supreme question that one has to face today in the world is, how can we avoid a world war", and "The only way to avoid conflicts is to accept things more or less as they are. No doubt many things require to be changed, but you must not think of changing them by war. Further by enlarging the area of peace, that is of countries which are not aligned to this group or that but which are friendly to both, you reduce the chance of war". Nehru meant to say that balance of power should not be changed by use of force, for it would result in war, especially between the two antagonist Powers i.e., the United States and the Soviet Union. However, he meant to conclude that balance of power would be possible if a third power sides one or the other without commitment to either side for maintaining peace. Thus, the real meaning of non-alignment is the "pursuit of peace not through alignment with any major group of Powers but through an independent approach to each controversial or disputed issue". Defining India's policy for non-alignment, Nehru said:

"I feel that India can play a big part, and may be an effective part, in helping to avoid war. Therefore, it becomes all the more necessary that India should not be lined up with any group of Powers which for various reasons are full of fear of war and preparing for war. That is the main approach of our policy".

Nehru further said:

"We have stated repeatedly that our foreign policy is one of keeping aloof from the big blocs of nations - rival blocs - and being friendly to all countries and not becoming entangled in any alliances military or other that might drag us into any possible conflict ...".
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Nehru, apprehensive of the situation in which he might have to resort to alliances with Big Powers, says:

"If by chance we align ourselves definitely with one group, we may perhaps from one point of view do some good, but I have not the shadow of a doubt that from a larger point of view, not only of India but of world peace, it will do harm. Because then we lose that tremendous vantage ground that we have of using such influence as we possess (and that influence is going to grow year to year) in the case of world peace".

The policy of Non-alignment, declared by Nehru, is similar to the British policy of 'Freehand'. He said: "The policy of isolation was not one of holding aloof but to 'avoid needless entangling engagements' ... It meant a free hand- with the implication that the hand could be applied as required by the cardinal principles of British policy". Again Lord Salisbury said: "the British policy was to keep absolutely clear of entanglements and to leave the country free to take any action which it might think fit in the event of war". Nehru took inspiration from the British foreign policy, which, as an English authority stated, "had to be directed so as to harmonize with the general desires and ideals common to all mankind ... England, more than any other noninsular Power, has a direct and positive interest in the maintenance of the independence of nations, and therefore must be the natural enemy of any country threatening the independence of others and the natural protector of the weaker communities". This typical view of that time was reflected in the Indian view. An Indian scholar wrote: "It so happened that many of the policies and actions of the Indian people (e.g. opposition to colonialism and racialism) were in harmony with the needs of world society and the general moral values prevailing in the world at large". Saul Rose interprets the British, saying that "What is good for the world is good

179. Saul Rose, n. 177, pp. 30-31.
for British\textsuperscript{181}, which, in reality, meant "that what is good for Britain is good for the world". Likewise, the leaders of the Non-Aligned Movement have been saying that "Freedom of the world is the freedom of the Non-aligned nations", which actually means that "Freedom of the non-aligned nations is the freedom of the whole world".\textsuperscript{182}

Based on the concept and policies of the Non-alignment and its Movement, the Ministerial Conference of the Non-aligned Countries at Belgrade held from July 25-30, 1978, affirmed the following principles and objectives of the Movement: achieving peace based on the universal application of the principles of active peaceful co-existence; national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, equality, the free social development of all countries; respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; realization of the right to self-determination and independence of all peoples under colonial and alien domination and to put an end to foreign occupation; the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, including Zionism and all forms of expansionism, foreign domination and hegemony; overcoming the division of the world into antagonistic military-political alliances; withdrawal of foreign military forces; dismantling of all foreign military bases; rejection of outmoded doctrines, such as, spheres of influence, and balance of terror, non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, non-intervention, inviolability of legally established international boundaries; inadmissibility of acquisition of territories by means of war or occupation; peaceful settlement of disputes; establishment of the New International Economic Order, and development of international cooperation on the basis of equality.\textsuperscript{183}

Belgian view on the Nonaligned movement is also important. Foreign Minister of Belgium, Leo Tindemans, visited India on January 18, 1983. He said that "the nonaligned movement could be important
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as a world force if it pursued an 'intelligent' approach and was 'genuinely' nonaligned. After a meeting with Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, at a Press Conference, he expressing his view on the non-aligned movement, said that if it was genuine, it would be a factor in improving East-West relations.

Egyptian view of the policy of Non-alignment is traced in President Nasser's statement at the Cairo Summit, held in 1964. Referring to the 'cold war' and blocs policy, Nasser defined the meaning and policy of non-alignment. First, in view of the dangers of dissipation and his positive action to evade it, he said: "the policy of non-alignment is not a trade in the strife between the two blocs, aiming at securing the highest portion of privileges from each". Secondly, in the light of his endeavours to deal with all the problems of his age under obligation of the UN Charter and the Charter of Peace based on justice, he said: "the policy of nonalignment is not passive, wishing to remain aloof from the problems of its world". From these two meanings, various facts emerge: "First, the policy of nonaligned is not a 'cold war' trade. Secondly, the changes in the situation of world blocs have no bearing on the policy of nonalignment. This policy retains its expression of humanity's conscience bound by the United Nations Charter, irrespective of the existence of two, three or four blocs. Thirdly, in its final form the nonalignment policy is for peace based on justice".

Sphere of Non-Alignment

The sphere of non-alignment politically generates ideas against colonialism and neo-colonialism, which exploit others' lands. European nations in the past were engaged in the conquest and political control of other groups. Europe, between the thirteenth and nineteenth centuries, conquered and established their rule in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The European colonisation of the world succeeded due to their strong maritime superiority, advanced technology, scientific knowledge, supremacy in war tactics, and intrigue with the local people.
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The race of colonialism was run by Portugal, Spain, England, Holland, France, Denmark, Sweden, Germany, Australia, Belgium, Italy, America and New Zealand. These colonialists exploited the natural wealth of their colonies, keeping the people uneducated, poor and under suppression. The political emancipation caused by the NAM forced the colonialists to realise that the people would ultimately stand up to fight for independence and, eventually, autonomy would follow. Therefore, after the Second World War, Britain fully accepted that it "had the responsibility of promoting economic and social advance in her colonies in order to provide the essential basis for political self-rule", which, later, led to the demand of 'self-government', 'self-determination' and independence. By the end of 1980, almost all the colonies had become independent.

Independence gave the countries complete control over their economic resources and political affairs. Though they were sovereign, but, in reality, their fortune was directed by their former rulers or the rich industrialised developed nations. This kind of indirect or veiled control of the developing nations by the advanced nations is known as 'neo-colonialism'. According to Nkrumah, "the essence of neo-colonialism is that the State which is subject to it is, in theory, independent and has all the outward trappings of internal sovereignty. In reality its economic system and thus its political policy is directed from outside".

However, the newly independent nations are deeply conscious of their economic backwardness and the appalling poverty of their people. The leaders held that without political power, economic development was impossible; but, at present, the experience showed that the logic was fallacious since the achievement of political sovereignty does not automatically lead to uplift of the economic lot of the country because the developing nations still depend on the developed nations for "capital, manufactures, capital goods, technical know-how and entrepreneurial skills, which they need in order to modernise and
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upgrade their fragile economies". Further, the developed countries, owing to their greatly superior economic and technological advantages, exploit the developing nations in every possible way and even to the extent of gaining indirect control over both economic and political affairs; "thus completely destroying the substance of their political sovereignty".

The greatest handicap of the developing nations is their loss in trade because each party seeks to promote its own product, which creates rivalry between the states and, sometimes, war results. Secondly, the developing nations, for want of money and technology, invite the rich industrial nations to "press their interests almost ruthlessly to the disadvantage of the poor nations". In this context, Boateng says:

"neo-colonialism is not really a new phenomenon; it is new only in the sense that in its contemporary manifestation it has become greatly intensified in its effects by the sharp and ever-widening division of the world into two distinct groups made of the very rich nations with rapidly growing economies, on the one hand, and the very poor nations, on the other hand, whose economies are either stagnant or growing at only a very slow rate".

To search the means to break this economic bondage, the NAM Conferences recommended and took many measures. But, in fact, the solution of the problem lies in the cooperation of the rich and the poor countries. Obviously, the rich nations would not help disinterestedly, but with the aim to serve their own purpose. The patterns of trade and economic development cannot be changed overnight, but it is possible if they follow "a policy of self-reliance and mutual cooperation", which are the foundations of stable government. Complete economic independence, however, is a goal which neither they nor indeed any other country can hope to achieve in the circumstances.
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of the modern world in which "all countries are becoming increasingly interdependent economically and politically".

The newly independent nations have broken the shackles of dependence to some extent, on the developing countries by establishing new relations and joining international and regional organisations. The Chairman of the Non-aligned Movement, Robert Mugabe, called for "restructuring of the 101-member organisation" saying that it lacks the necessary "teeth" to effect its programme. He said:

"There is need for the restructuring of NAM so that it can be given the teeth it must have, or at least people ... to exert political influence, now that the movement is being listened to by the superpowers".

Robert Mugabe observed that there was a growing recognition among the superpowers of the role that NAM had played and continued to play in terms of issues of internal peace and security. In view of the NAM's role, the United States has changed its stance and now sends representatives to brief him after each meeting with the Soviets. Likewise, the Soviet government also briefed NAM after their talks with the United States.

Since the topic of the present research is "Non-aligned Movement and Decolonization", attempt has been made to present as briefly as possible very extensive literature on NAM's development, struggle for independence from colonialism, surveying political situation in countries, which have achieved or are struggling to achieve independence.

Conclusion

After the Second World War, the founding of the United Nations divided the world into two power blocs - USA and USSR, followed by
Cold War and military treaties, which threatened the independence and sovereignty of newly independent nations. The rise of nationalism and freedom movements in the dependent countries heralded the end of colonialism. The policy of suppression and aggression of Colonial Powers made the people conscious of the Big Power's rivalries. Nehru, Tito, Nasser and Nkrumah advocated the policy of neutrality and then of non-alignment with the main objective of affording peace and security to all the nations in the world. A large number of non-aligned countries embraced the policy of non-alignment. They planned for development in the field of industry and technology to make themselves independent of Western aid and to save their countries from becoming vassal states.