Post-war nationalism and anti-colonialism and the pressing problems of economic under-development were the background circumstances in which nonalignment emerged and evolved. The newly created states of Africa, Asia and Middle East during the colonial era, developed a high sense of nationalism which later culminated in independence movements. Despite the absence of common language and cultural groups, as in Europe, the nationalist movements, in these countries were strong in many cases. For example, the former Dutch territories of Indonesia included many different ethnic groups and many different languages. In Africa also national boundaries were cut across tribal areas and people with a common cultural background were separated and at the same time people with different cultures were thrown together within one administrative unit. Yet, this did not weaken the nationalist movement. African nationalism, in the post-war period, was in one aspect Africanism. It reacted against racial prejudice and exploitation. This reaction led the 'Convention People's Party of Ghana' to formulate their party's motto as "We prefer self-government with danger to servitude in tranquillity".

In 1947 Britain conceded independence to India. This decision directed popular resentment against past history away from the colonial power and thus, promoted co-operation with Britain, and a less assertive nationalism, unlike Indonesia where freedom was won after bitter warfare.

However, 'newness' of nationhood was an important consideration in the nationalism of the colonised countries. The nations of Africa and Asia which won their independence after many years of struggle against colonial powers became self conscious about their new freedom, anxious to preserve it, and equally over-suspicious of any actions which were likely to threaten it. Most of the leaders of the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa were imprisoned. As a result, there was a deeply-felt pride in independence, and a wide-spread antagonism towards all remaining colonial powers, which was accompanied by a widespread sympathy for people not yet independent.

The Bandung Conference in 1955 reflected the character of Afro-Asian nationalism. At the Conference, all African and Asian countries were united, irrespective of their deep political differences, in their attitude towards colonialism and affirmed that self-determination and independence were the key to human dignity and progress. The Conference gave anxious thought to the question of world peace and co-
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operation. It viewed with deep concern the state of international tension with its danger of an atomic world war. The nonaligned nations that attended the Belgrade Conference viewed self determination and independence as a reflection of Afro-Asian nationalism. Among the colonised countries of Asia and Africa there was a desire to take a place in world councils as free and equal members, and the desire to be independent not only in respect of domestic matters but also in making judgement and forming policies in international affairs. There was, and still is, a close association between nationalism and nonalignment. Nationalism was evoked by leaders of the colonised countries of Asia and Africa to reinforce policies of nonalignment. Mr. Nehru, the late Prime Minister of India once commented:

A movement must define itself in terms of nationalism if it has to become real to the people. In any Asian country, a movement will succeed or fail in the measure that it associates itself with the deep-seated urge of nationalism.

In Bandung, apart from strong condemnation of nuclear weapon production, anti-colonialism was the main theme of the Conference in 1955. This attitude encouraged countries

toward nonalignment in their foreign policies. African and Asian countries viewed the past wars as European wars, which were related to winning and preserving colonial interests. What is more, the countries of the nonaligned, particularly India, Ceylon (Sri Lanka) and Middle East countries, were involved in two European wars. The colonised countries contend that their man-power and resources were used, and in some cases their territories were the battle-ground. The issues of the wars were not their direct concern, and the Second World War particularly demonstrated that colonial people were expendable.

A more powerful and continuing influence towards nonalignment was 'neo-colonialism' which was seen by the leaders of NAM as a threat to the independence of their new nations. For example, in terms of trade the shift was in favour of industrial products and against the types of exports on which underdeveloped countries relied. The leaders of under-developed countries felt powerless to remedy the position. This in their opinion was not different from their position as colonised peoples when their exports value returned to them in a similar reduced benefit. That notwithstanding, the leaders of the under-developed countries felt that economic aid was sometimes directed to ensure trade benefit and a dominant economic position for foreign interest within their boundaries.
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As the colonised countries of Asia and Africa grumbled over their economic experience, both sides in the Cold War claimed that the other was pursuing policies of imperialism. But as far as most of the underdeveloped countries were concerned, both the capitalist and the Communist blocs were great suspect. The exclusive Common European Market was regarded as a classic example of neo-colonialism, and the exclusive communist economic bloc permitted only those trading opportunities that were agreed as a result of arbitrary decisions. This situation led the newly independent countries to think of nonalignment. It was their strong belief that some of the dangers of neo-colonialism could be avoided if the indirect restrictions and controls one bloc tried to impose were limited by the competitive influence of the other. Nonalignment was conceived by the colonised people as a response to the pursuit by major powers of their political and strategic interests as well as seen as a means of self-protection against loss of independence.

Almost all the colonised countries were poor, and the urgent need for increasing standards of their living, and the consequent importance of industrial growth, became strong motivations for nonalignment and in particular, for endeavours to reduce tensions and to divert arms production in the main industrial countries to more useful purposes.

Within the colonised countries there was much psychological resentment to the widening gap between the living standards of the East and West. The nonaligned countries are among the 'have nots', to them freedom is not won, until equality in both social and economic standards are achieved.

Probably social and cultural feelings also influenced the countries of Africa and Asia toward nonalignment. These countries were made to feel that they lived in a world apart from Europe. This single feeling gave rise to mutual sympathy amongst the nations, more so, since the countries were economically exploited and politically dominated by others.

Apart from the countries of Asia and Africa there were other people who shared political attitudes in common with them, who were equally exploited and dominated. The common 'cultural' tie in nonalignment was far more related to traditional relations with major powers than it was to race. Nonaligned nations were, and are, predominantly non-European. Major powers tended to discriminate against Asian and African people and this became a causal factor in nonalignment. Burton writes that "... though the fact that the nonaligned nations happen to be predominantly non-European, and that major powers still tend to discriminate against Asian and African Peoples, cannot be overlooked as a causal factor in nonalignment".
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The twentieth century saw major revolutions that transformed the old international order. One of them was in 1917 when the Bolsheviks took over power in Russia and created a socialist system. The second revolution was the decolonisation process which occurred after World War II, in Asia and Africa, the Caribbean and Latin America. The 1917 revolution resulted in the emergence of a single major power. On the other hand, the Afro-Asian anti-colonial revolution brought into existence a myriad of States, most of whom were small, underdeveloped and politically weak. Their people were divided internally. They needed to create new political structures and get rid of their traditional feudal institutions. These countries were fragile societies who for many years, tried to escape from the hell of underdevelopment. These nations joined together as the non-aligned.

In 1961, the non-aligned countries met to create an independent path in world politics, an independent path which would in no way result in their becoming pawns in the struggle between the major powers. They realised that any international coalition should be flexible, as a result, they resisted institutionalisation and opted for consensus as a method of decision making. Because of this, countries with different ideological perspective joined the movement.
Historically, non-aligned movement have some guiding principles. Among the principles that guide the movement are: a commitment to peace and disarmament, especially the reduction of tensions between the major powers, independence—the right to self-determination of all colonial people and the right of equality between all races, economic equality—and interest in restructuring the existing international economic order, especially with respect to the growing inequality between rich and poor nations; cultural equality—a need for restructuring the existing world order in the realm of information since the movement was and is opposed to cultural imperialist monopoly of information system, especially those that exist in the West; faith in the United Nations and the movement has constantly sought to utilise the United Nations as the most appropriate organisation to deal with all global issues and therefore, has resisted any efforts at institutionalising its own movement at the expense of the UN system.

Peace and disarmament were the first principles of nonalignment. From the beginning the movement has been against the development of military blocs and compartmentalisation of the world into regions by the major powers. After the Second World War and the onset of the

nuclear age and Cold War, the movement became concerned over the creation of a military pact, which they viewed would result in the division of the world into opposing camps thus denying nations, especially new nations, the opportunity of making independent policy decisions about world problems. They refused to involve themselves in military pacts. Non-aligned countries attempted to create some basic rules of conduct for nation-states within the international system. The non-aligned argue that the practice of international relations, where a few powers dominate, does not reflect the present day reality were small and middle sized states have joined the world community in growing numbers with relatively little power in determining world politics.

The non-aligned movement envisaged that the growth of the number of nation-states since World War II, and concomitantly the growth of two major powers with capacity to destroy the entire global community necessitates the 'democratisation' of international relations especially so when the nations who do not have nuclear weapons can participate reasonably in global politics. Consequently, it sought nuclear disarmament and also an end to the arms race. In several summit meetings the movement attempted to identify crisis areas, specially areas that could escalate into conflict between the major powers and thence into nuclear warfare and global annihilation. In looking at disarmament and peace theoretically, the non-aligned
countries tried to distinguish between various types of confrontations that took place within the global community: (1) the confrontations between the major nuclear powers; (2) wars of self-determination and independence; (3) internal civil wars resulting from political secessionist movements; (4) armed conflicts between member nations that could result in a confrontation between the major powers.

Right of self-determination of all colonial people and the right of equality between all races was the second principle of non-alignment. Anti-colonialist and racial equality struggles pre-date the formation of the movement and contributed to its creation and growth. In 1955 at Bandung, a number of Asian nations were linked with a few African nations. By 1961, at the first non-aligned summit, Afro-Asian nations were linked with the nations of Latin America and Europe. During the 1960s and 1970s, newly independent states, especially in Africa and the Caribbean, joined the movement enlarging the movement's membership. In the 1980s the movement captured the fancy of the Americans especially from Latin American countries, notably in Central American where local populations struggled not against colonialism but against neocolonialism. Right from the word go the movement supported struggles against colonialism, imperialism, and racism in all its forms in every part of the globe.
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Equality was another fundamental issue raised by the non-aligned countries. They argued that the colonisation of the world by Europe produced at least three types of inequalities; between the coloniser and the colonised; between races; and between the rich and poor. They argued that one of the major problems of the twentieth century was to rectify these inequalities. In the 1960s they emphasised the achievement of political and racial equality. In 1970s they shifted the emphasis on economic equality as a precondition to political and racial equality.

There were major differences amongst the nonaligned countries on economic options before them. They, however, collectively agreed that the fundamental problem in the world economy was the domination of the global market economy, a problem created by the existing international economic order - imperialism. Colonisation disrupted the traditional economies of Africa, Asia and the Americas. Capitalism took these lands and transformed their peoples and cultures into one vast plantation. Majority of the people were diverted from producing food for their own survival into producing commodities to satisfy the tastes of an external society, thereby uprooting and turning the average Nigerian, Sri-Lankan, and Jamaican societies from traditional agrarian into wage labourers.
Internationalisation of capitalist expansion, as seen by non-aligned countries, produced a series of market economies that were dependent on the metropolitan centres. It also produced a social class system that set apart 'native' from 'Native', and created major psychological dilemma for the majority of their populations. They saw colonisation as having a traumatic effect on the cultures of the societies. Traditional peoples in the Americas were annihiliated and in Africa and Asia traditional social structures, in some instances, were destroyed and, in many, made subservient to the new dominant culture. Most of the nonaligned countries do not regard capitalism as a superior advanced social system that brought about modernisation and change. In other words, capitalism was not a liberating movement, as in the case of Europe, where it destroyed the shackles of feudalism and created a new market economy. Capitalism, the non-aligned said, brought poverty, unemployment, overpopulation, and malnutrition. At the 1973 Algiers Summit, the non-aligned concluded that the existing international economic order contributed to the poverty of the developing nations. They also argued that political independence and social equality could not be guaranteed unless there was a greater economic equality in the world and steps were taken to restructure world order. At Algiers they called for structural changes in the global economy and establishment of a new international economic order (NIEO).
There are other tenets of non-alignment, these are:

1. Non-alignment does not favour isolationism or neutrality, but allows a nation to act decisively in international affairs on the basis of national interests alone. Non-alignment does not absolve a nation from the responsibility of participating in finding meaningful solution to demanding problems, but it abhors taking critical decision as the tool of a superpower.

2. In its internal dimension, non-alignment enables a nation to establish and maintain its own institutions, and to support a way of life in accordance with the wishes and culture of its population without pressure.

3. Non-alignment recognises the need for economic and other aids from outside powers, but it insists that such aid be given without strings.

4. Non-alignment is against slavery, colonialism, neo-colonialism, and apartheid.

5. Non-alignment seeks to promote interdependence between industrial and developing nations. Such interdependence does not include neo-colonial economic relationships, rather, it stresses the transferring of real resources and technology from developed to poor countries. The transfer need not necessarily include resources acquired in
past centuries, but it certainly includes percentage of those being acquired today. Non-alignment, thus, insists on equal participation by poorer nations in the exploitation of the earth's resources.

6. Non-alignment insists on an international system in which all nations are actively involved in the decision-making processes on all matters, especially those directly concerning them. The non-aligned nations have been mere objects in international politics, but times are changing.

The basic demands made by the non-aligned nations for new international economic order are as under:

1. The establishment of producer associations following the pattern set by the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) for the producer nations;

2. Creation of new commodity agreements to assume just prices;

3. Indexation;

4. Sovereignty over natural resources;

----------------------------------------

5. Transfer of technology;
6. Control over two major international private organisations namely, transnational corporations and transnational banks.

The Non-Alignment Movement began as a broad anti-colonialist movement. It sought world peace by exhorting the powers to avoid a nuclear holocaust, therefore, its major demand was for disarmament of all sorts of arms and ammunition; it became the advocate for new political and economic order, and sought for the restructuring of world order in all areas. They submitted that the present world resources must no longer be the private resources of a few countries but be treated as the resources belonging to all people in the world. Redistribution of the resources of the world have always been on the agenda of the movement and they have pushed it further to the agenda of world politics.

This concern for disarmament on the part of the non-aligned countries brought awareness to most countries of the world which led to the calling of the conference on the Relationship between disarmament and development, even though before the time there have been discussions in the United Nations on disarmament.

In the Conference on Relationship between disarmament and development, the Swedish delegate while making his

---
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speech referred to the United Nations Charter which stipulates that military expenditures should be kept at a minimum. He said, "In the industrialised countries, including my own, important domestic social needs could be satisfied by the resources that an international disarmament process would". In pointing out that a lack of such progress aggravated the difficulties of the developing countries, he predicted that "...if the gap between the poor and the rich countries does not diminish, their security and, in the end world peace would be threatened". 12

Representatives of the developing countries proceeded from the recognition that disarmament and development were the most important problems facing humanity today. They viewed the establishment of a distinct connection between the two processes as both a prerequisite for stable economic growth and development, and a source of additional resources. At the same time, many countries, including those in South Asia and Africa, among others, emphasised the idea that disarmament and development had intrinsic mechanisms and trends of their own. In stressing this profound inter-relation, they stressed that slow disarmament progress would impede the implementation of measures

promoting development. As they discussed ways to safeguard security, the non-aligned countries without belittling the military threat, pointed to the growing threat posed to social and economic progress in the form of such things as hunger, disease illiteracy, population growth, the inequality of nations within the system of international capitalist division of labour, the increasing acute problems of indebtedness, etc.

Nonaligned countries cited impressive figures revealing the contradiction between the amounts of money many countries spend in armaments and the desperate poverty, disease and privations suffered by the majority of the world population, and the acute shortage of resources of overcoming such backwardness. The global growth of goods and services between 1960 and 1983 reached 8.4 trillion dollars, while in the same period more than 14 trillion dollars was spent on military projects. The funds poured into war production have "provided" every man, woman and child on earth with 3.4 tons of explosives. At the same time, more than one billion people live in conditions of extreme


poverty, another billion have practically no housing and 2 billion people have no pure water to drink.

Nonalignment's position on disarmament generated the spirit of disarmament talks in the UN. People all over the world saw the truth in the contentions of nonaligned countries on disarmament, because, it will be a catastrophe in future if more and more deadly weapons are developed to the detriment of man and the entire environment.

DISARMAMENT

The goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control was proclaimed by the United Nations in 1959 as the ultimate aim of disarmament efforts. A number of proposals were put forward for the reduction of armaments in stages, with variations as to which types of arms or forces would be reduced first, numerical limits to be set, time-limits, and methods of verification. Despite discussions in the United Nations, in the Geneva negotiating bodies and elsewhere, no agreement has yet been reached on an all inclusive plan leading to general and complete disarmament.

The most elaborate proposals submitted on the subject were the Soviet "Draft treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control" and the American "outline of basic provisions of a treaty on general
and complete disarmament in a peaceful world”, which were submitted to Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee (ENDC) in 1962. These proposals and revisions to them were discussed during the following few years, but no agreement was reached due to differences which arose between the two groups of states most centrally concerned, particularly with stages of implementation, nuclear issues and verification.

The discussions and negotiations in various disarmament forums confirmed that reaching an agreement to begin implementation of such measures has never been and is not easily at hand. Consequently, general and complete disarmament ceased to be regarded as something likely to be achieved through a simple, comprehensive instrument, which would specify various sequences for nuclear and conventional disarmament. Instead, general and complete disarmament began to be regarded as a goal to be reached step by step approach with the expectation that one achievement might be followed by another, in accordance with certain logical priorities.

In 1978, at its first special session devoted to disarmaments the general Assembly reaffirmed by consensus the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. At the same time, the Final Document of the Session explicitly called for the elaboration of the comprehensive programme of disarmament encompassing all
measures thought to be advisable to contribute to the realization of general and complete disarmament.

Although the concept of general and complete disarmament has been consistently referred to in statements in United Nations bodies and in other conference and negotiating forums, it was widely recognized that so far there is little real common ground that can be translated in practical action.

It may be opined that during the last four decades, the world's arsenals have grown to the point where the threat of a holocaust cast a shadow over everyone's life. World expenditures for military purposes are estimated to have exceeded the level of 900 billion dollars a year and may reach 1 trillion dollars, despite of bilateral and multilateral disarmament efforts which have led to some important arms limitation or disarmament agreements, the armaments situation has not stabilized.

It may be recalled that on 26 June 1945 the United Nations met in San-Francisco and signed a Charter "To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". They proclaimed the maintenance of international peace and security as one of the major objectives of the organization. The Charter prohibited the use or threat of use of force in
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international relations (Article 2, Paragraph 4), provided for the peaceful settlement of international disputes (Chapter VI) elaborated a mechanism for action by the organization with regard to threats to peace, breaches of peace and acts of aggression (Chapter VII).

The provision established the necessary legal and political framework for the promotion of the cause of disarmament and, through the years, have determined the special role of the United Nations in pursuing the goal. Specific responsibilities were conferred on the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations in connection with disarmament and the regulation of armaments.

As a result of the discovery of atomic energy, the question of the regulation of armaments was recognized as urgent and was given due prominence. In 1946, the General Assembly established the Atomic Energy Commission to ensure that such energy would only be used for peaceful purposes. To that end the United States proposed the creation of an international atomic development authority entrusted with all phases of the development and use of atomic energy. According to the proposal, once a system of control and sanctions was effectively operating, further production of atomic weapons would cease and existing stocks would be

destroyed. This was popularly known as the Baruch plan. The USSR, for its part, proposed a draft convention which prohibited the production and use of atomic weapons within three months from its entry into force; this was also known as the Gromyko plan.

In 1947, another body, the Commission for Conventional Armaments, was established by the Security Council. It was called upon to submit proposals for the general reduction of armaments and armed forces and for practical and effective safeguards.

In 1959, the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament was established, with East and West represented in equal numbers. Its negotiation function was recognized in 1962 with the establishment of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (ENDC). The ENDC, held its conference in 1962 with the addition of eight non-aligned members to the original ten. In 1969 the name was changed to Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), by this time the membership had been expanded to 26 nations. Again, in 1975, the membership was expanded to 31.

Irrespective of the fact that several important agreements for the regulation and limitation of armaments had been conducted, they were not sufficient to curb the arms in all its aspects, because of the super powers' game.
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The fact was recognised by the General Assembly, which led to the proclamation of 1970s as the First Disarmament Decade, and called upon governments to intensify their efforts to achieve effective measures relating to the cessation of the arms race.

In line with this all five nuclear weapon states as well as non-nuclear states outlined in some detail their views, which basically reiterated their longstanding position, thus confirming substantive divergencies in their approach to the entire question of nuclear disarmament.

In the case of China, a nuclear state, it reiterated its longstanding pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and emphasized that the United States and Soviet Union should take lead in stopping the testing, improvement and manufacture of nuclear weapons and means of delivery. After that, China said, they would be ready to join all other nuclear-weapon states in stopping the development and production of nuclear weapons in reducing their respective nuclear arsenals according to an agreed scale and procedure, as a step towards their elimination.

According to France, what was needed on priority basis was a gradual de-escalation of the nuclear arms race, of the two major powers. It further emphasized the importance of both eliminating destabilizing technology and reducing the imbalance of conventional forces, however, France maintained
that what had guaranteed peace in Europe since 1945 was the certainty that any conflict on that continent would trigger a nuclear catastrophe.

On its part the United Kingdom recognised that a better system of preventing war than nuclear deterrence must be sought, but held that it would be a perilous pretence to suggest that there was such a system within reach at that time. In its view, for the nuclear weapons Powers, the task, was to harness the existence of nuclear weapons to the service of peace - a task in which their duty was to show restraint and responsibility - while the role of the non-nuclear-weapon countries should be to recognize that proliferation of nuclear weapons could not be the way to a safer world.

Soviet Union addressed the issue of the cessation of nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament from two angles. It took a unilateral undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Among others, it stated that it supported the idea of a mutual nuclear freeze.

United States recognized that the agreement on arms control and disarmament could reinforce peace and emphasized that new and bolder steps were needed to calm an uneasy world. Equally it stressed that such agreement must be equitable, militarily significant, veritable and designed to stabilize forces at lower levels.
Non-aligned countries on their part, saw urgent need for multilateral negotiations on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, leading to the adoption of concrete measures. In their opinion, all nations, whether possessing nuclear weapons or not, had a vital interest in nuclear disarmament measures, as nuclear weapons threatened the entire world. They stressed that an unrestrained nuclear arms race, instead of strengthening international security, on the other hand weakened it.

On the whole, the Western States were of the view that nuclear disarmament should occur as a part of general process of disarmament involving reduction of nuclear and conventional armaments and arms forces concurrently. They believed that the first aim of maintaining a military capability, including a nuclear capability, was to prevent war of any kind by demonstrating the ability to defend oneself against any level of partial threat.

It must however be noted that notwithstanding the debates on disarmament there have been some positive bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union, regarding arms regulation and disarmament measures. For example, in April 1970, the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks between the Soviet Union and the United States opened in Vienna. After that, sessions were held in Helsinki and Vienna. In September 1971, at the initial
stage of the negotiations, two limited agreements were concluded. The Agreement on Measures to Reduce Risk of Outlook of Nuclear War, and the Agreement on Measures to Improve the USA – USSR Direct Communication Link.

The first phase of SALT I negotiations ended in Moscow on 26 May 1972 with the signing of two agreements: the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti Ballistic Missile Systems (ABM Treaty) which was later amended by a Protocol of 3 July 1974, and the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures with respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, with a Protocol attached. The Treaty was ratified by both sides.

By this Treaty both undertook not to develop, test or deploy mobile land-based or sea-based, air-based or space based ABM system. Anti-ballistic Missile (ABM) is a weapon to destroy incoming strategic ballistic missiles or their elements before they reach their target. They also agreed to limit ABM systems to two sites with no more than 100 launchers at each side. In 1974, the Treaty was amended by a Protocol which limited each side to one ABM deployment area only. The Soviet Union chose to maintain its ABM system in the area centered on its Capital, Moscow, and the United States chose to maintain its system in the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) deployment area in North Dakota. Subsequently, the United States decided not to deploy its ABM system at all.
The Interim Agreement on certain Measures respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms was concluded for a period of five years. The Agreement established quantitative limitations for the strategic offensive force of the two sides, which undertook not to start construction of additional fixed land based ballistic missile launchers and to limit submarine missile launchers and modern ballistic missile submarines to an agreed level for each side.

The provisions concerning verification of compliance with the ABM Treaty and the Interim Agreement were same. Specifically each party used its national technical means of verification and neither interfered in the use of such means by the other. Deliberate concealment measures were prohibited. A standing consultative Commission was established (by a Memorandum of the Understanding of December 1972) which discussed questions relating to each side's compliance with the SALT I agreements. The first such review was conducted in the fall of 1977.

Second negotiations on Strategic Arms Limitations, popularly known as SALT II began in November 1972 in Geneva. The important goal of the talks was to replace the Interim Agreement with a long-term strategic offensive weapons systems. The Agreement was signed at Vienna on 18 June 1979, and consists of three basic parts: (a) the Treaty on
the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and the Protocol attached thereto: (b) Agreed Statements and Common Understandings associated with various provisions of the Treaty and the Protocol; and (c) the Joint Statement of Principles and Basic Guidelines for subsequent Negotiations on the Limitation of Strategic Arms.

The Treaty set the initial aggregate number of strategic delivery system at 2,400 for each side, it took effect six months after the Treaty was ratified and entered into force. By the end of 1981 the number was reduced to 2,250. Launchers of Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs), Submarine Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBMS), heavy bombers and air to surface ballistic missiles (ASBMS) with ranges of over 600 Kilometres (324 nautical miles) were included in the totals. They placed a number of sublimits on specific types of nuclear systems within the aggregate ceiling. However, each party was free, within the overall total aggregate ceiling of 2,500 bearing in mind the sublimits to determine the actual composition of the aggregate.

In addition to these limitations, the number of warheads for each type of weapon was limited to no more than 10 per ICBMS and to no more than 14 for SLBMS.

A protocol to the Treaty banned the development of mobile ICBMS, of ground - and sea-based cruise missiles with
ranges above 600 Kilometres and of air-to-surface ballistic missiles through 1981. For the first time, the two sides, provided a complete picture of their strategic forces when they signed the Treaty as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>USSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Launchers of ICBMS</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>1,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Launchers of ICBMS</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>1,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launchers of ICBMS equipped with MIRVS</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launchers of SLBMS</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launchers of SLBMS equipped with MIRVS</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy bombers</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy bombers equipped for cruise missiles capable of ranges in excess of 600 Kilometres</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy bombers equipped only for ASBM (air-to-surface ballistic missiles)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASBMS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASBMS equipped with MIRVS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Treaty defined and identified various specific weapons and included numerous detailed limitations testing, development, modernization and replacement, or conversion of particular weapon systems.

Both the SALT I accords and SALT II treaty have similar provisions concerning verification based on national
technical means available to both sides (photo-reconnaissance and other types of satellites, monitoring of test signals). The provision banned interference with national means of verification or concealment which impede verification of compliance.

The SALT II Treaty was not ratified due to a deterioration of international situation. Each party in the past unilaterally stated that it would nevertheless abide by the Treaty's provisions as long as the other did. Since 1984 both states maintained that the other party violated provisions of the Treaty. In May 1986, the United States announced that it no longer felt constrained by the SALT II limits. The Soviet Union, for its part, stated in December 1986 that "for the time being", it would continue to observe the limits of the Treaty.

In any case that had been the game of disarmament between the two superpowers, which is contrary to the nonaligned concern on disarmament. It must be recalled that the superpowers ignored the nonaligned concern and preferred their interest. No wonder there were histories of lost opportunities in disarmament negotiations. The prime concern and intentions of the nonaligned nations, was to see the end of disarmament for the sake of development and security of mankind.
In furtherance to the strategic arms talks, the United States Administration, which took office in January 1981 was quite critical of SALT II, and proposed a new approach in the negotiations on Strategic nuclear weapons, which it termed the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START). Soviet Union though dissatisfied with United States for non-ratification of SALT II, agreed to begin negotiations, referring to the new talks as negotiations on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms.

The talks began in Geneva in June 1982. Specific proposals were put forth by both sides, and the issue was approached from different perspectives. Geographical position played a great role for the divergence in approach and in the composition and characteristics of the strategic forces of the two sides. The fifth session of the negotiations ended in December 1983. By this time the Soviet Union stated that the deployment in Europe of new intermediate-range missiles by the United States, namely Pershing II and ground launched cruise missiles, was changing the global strategic situation and made it necessary for the Soviet Union, "to review all problems under discussion at the START negotiations", as a result, there were no fixed dates for the resumption of the negotiations. This position was rejected by United States on the grounds that the deployment was necessary to offset Soviet intermediate-range forces (SS-20s) and the
resulting assymetries which, it held, had emerged in the nuclear balance.

Another talk on the Intermediate/medium-range nuclear arms talks negotiation between the Soviet Union and the United States began in November 1981 in Geneva. This was prompted by the development and subsequent deployment in Europe of more and more modern types of this category of weapons. The issue received particular attention in the late 1970s.

In 1979 at the NATO meeting, members of the organization stated that they noted, that the Soviet Union had been reinforcing its intermediate nuclear forces both qualitatively and quantitatively, most by the deployment of SS-20s, while Western capabilities in that area had remained static. In view of that, NATO countries decided to modernize their theatre nuclear forces by the deployment in Europe (in 1983 at the earliest) of United States ground launched systems comprising 108 Pershing II, which would replace existing Pershing I-A, and 464 cruise missiles. At the same time, the NATO countries pointed out that they regarded arms control as an integral part of the alliance's efforts to assure the undiminished security of its member states. They expressed their willingness to negotiate limits on the deployment in exchange for reciprocal Soviet limitations, particularly on the mobile SS-20 missile
system. That decision was known as the "dual track decision". The Soviet Union, for its part, stated that the deployment of SS-20s was intended to replace older SS-4s and SS-5s and that rough parity existed between the two sides on this class of weapons.

At first United States proposed the zero option, i.e. the elimination of all land-based intermediate-range missiles on both sides. Soviet Union maintained that there existed an approximate equality between Soviet and NATO nuclear forces in Europe and offered to reduce its SS-20s to the level of the nuclear forces of Great Britain and France, that is, to the level of 162 provided that NATO countries would forego their planned new development entirely.

In November 1983, Soviet Union reduced the proposed number to 140 in exchange for non-deployment. The proposal was not acceptable to the United States, nor did the United Kingdom and France agree to consider their independent nuclear forces as an integral part of the NATO posture. United States held that unless the Soviet Union accepted the zero option, the latter would retain a monopoly on land-based-intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe. The Soviet Union, however, continued to point out that the zero option was an inequitable proposition as it did not take into account the United States forward-based systems and the
British and French nuclear missiles.

The arguments on differences in parity between the two blocs notwithstanding, the new bilateral negotiations on nuclear and space arms were not long in following. Although following their game of disarmament, there was a 13 month break in the Soviet-American talks both, on the strategic and the intermediate/medium-range nuclear weapons. The two sides met in January 1985 at Geneva at the foreign ministers' level, and agreed to hold negotiations on a complex of questions concerning space and nuclear weapons, both strategic and intermediate/medium range, with all those questions considered and resolved in their interrelationship. The objectives of the negotiations stated that the two sides were to work out effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on earth, at limiting and reducing arms and strengthening strategic stability.

Following the commencement of nuclear and space talks in March 1955, numerous proposals and counter proposals were tabled by both parties, but important difference in opinion remained throughout 1985 and 1986. President Reagan of United States and General Secretary Gorbachev of former Soviet Union met in October 1986 at Reykjavik. Their meeting yielded positive result because they moved closer to an agreement on the issues of intermediate/medium-range nuclear missiles. In 1987 the remaining problems were
resolved. The two leaders met at Washington D.C., on 8 December 1987, where both sides signed the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic, on the Elimination of their Intermediate-Range and Short Range Missiles.

Both Washington and Moscow made significant progress at their Summit meeting in Washington in December 1987 concerning strategic offensive arms. They concluded the Summit and instructed their negotiators in Geneva to work towards the completion of a treaty at the earlier possible date to implement the principle of 50 per cent reduction. Among the issues that had further attention in that regard were sub-ceilings on certain types of strategic offensive arms, effective verification procedures and the time-table, the speedy conclusion of a treaty was dependent on progress on other issues, such as weapons deployed in space and, in that context, the interpretation of the 1972 ABM treaty, over which United States and Soviet Union remain deeply divided.

In late 1990, a Conference was held in Paris in which the participants (34 in number) signed a treaty on slashing their arsenals in Europe. It put a limit of 20,000 tanks and 6,800 combat planes for each alliance, the Warsaw Pact and NATO, inspite of some subterfuge in reaching the agreement. According to a German newspaper, the Soviet

Union "quietly withdraw" 20,000 tanks behind the Urals so that they did not have to be scrapped and the USA had two tank divisions transferred from Germany to the Gulf. If this is true, it shows how fragile is the Charter of Paris even though it declared "The era of confrontation and division of Europe has ended. We declare that henceforth our relations will be founded on respect and cooperation."

As a matter of fact attempts and efforts made to secure disarmament have always faced difficulty, as a result disarmament requires confidence and 'In order that it may be effective it must be controlled and guarantees given that those who observe it will not suffer'. In 1816 Alexander I of Russia, wrote an informal letter to Castlereagh, and proposed a general reduction of armed forces by the powers, this was at a period when Russia was the only country keeping her army on a war part in Europe. Metternich reacted to the proposal by Alexander to Castlereagh for the reason that 'the difficulty always of obtaining any true data from Russia ... to take the initiative here, uncertain of a reciprocity of confidence, would be impossible. For fourteen years arguments on disarmament continued and led to frustration.


The early history of disarmament negotiations under the League of Nations differed substantially from its present post-war counterpart. The reason for this was not only the obvious and essential difference that existed in weapons and armament during these two phases - difference between heavy bombers and Hydrogen bombs - but to a fundamental difference of approach.

Approach to disarmament between the two World Wars, was mainly unilateral, but since the Second World War it has been multilateral. In the inter-war period the problems of international inspection and control drew attention from few countries than after the Second World War, hence numerous disarmament agreements were signed between one group of states or another. It began with measures to disarm or demilitarize the defeated enemies of the First World War, and further went on to include limitations and prohibitions on the construction of aggressive weapons and their means of delivery, such as submarines, bombers, and battleships. Also agreements were signed to prevent traffic in arms and to outlaw the use of poison gas and bacteriological weapons. There were finally declarations renouncing recourse to war as a means of settling disputes. These agreements were signed and observed by all the powers until 1931, when Japan violated the agreements which Germany and Italy later joined. The result of this was the outbreak of the Second World War. These violations notwithstanding
disarmament agreements were continued to be drawn up and signed, it was however interspersed with increasing series of setbacks such as Germany's withdrawal from the Disarmament Conference and League of Nations in 1933, only a few months after she joined to accept the latest comprehensive disarmament convention drawn up in the League.  

The immediate search for disarmament ended by 1937 following Japanese aggression in Manchuria, Italy's attack on Ethiopia, and Germany's repudiation of the disarmament clauses of the Treaty of Versailles and reoccupation of the Rhineland. However, the spirit and desire to search for disarmament still lived. It survived not only the gathering war-clouds but equally the outbreak of the war itself.

By 1941 the allies looked forward to some system of general disarmament after the Second World War. It was made known in the Atlantic Charter, which was followed in January 1942 by the Declaration of the United Nations at Washington, and in turn led to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference of August 1942. This laid down the groundwork for the United Nations Charter and its provisions for
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general disarmament. By the end of Second World War in 1945 a more dangerous and complicated weapon was introduced - the atomic bomb.

The first initial attempt to grapple with the new discovery - atomic bomb - came immediately after the attack on Hiroshima. President Truman made a statement on 9 August 1945 which was followed by the declaration of the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada at Washington in November of same year, which agreed 'to share, on a reciprocal basis with other members of the United Nations, detailed information concerning the practical industrial application of atomic energy just as soon as effective enforceable safeguards against its use for destructive purposes can be devised.

In pursuit of this principle, the United States took the initiative in setting up an atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations which was to be composed of members of the Security Council with the addition of Canada. The principal task of the Commission was to work out a plan
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under which nations would agree to place the production of atomic energy under international control, to make sure it is used for peaceful purposes only, and to bring about total prohibition of atomic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

In June 1946 the United States launched the Baruch Plan for an International Atomic Development Authority to be entrusted 'all phases of the development and use of atomic energy, starting with the raw material' with managerial control or ownership of all atomic energy activities potentially dangerous to world security and power to control, inspect, and license all other atomic activities', and which should 'itself be the world's leader in the field of atomic knowledge and development' so as 'to enable it to comprehend and therefore to detect, misuse of atomic energy'. The Soviets agreed to the principles of the three power declaration of November 1945, at the Moscow Conference of foreign Ministers held in December same year. By their co-sponsorship of the Resolution they established the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. The Soviets rejected the Baruch Plan in favour of their proposals for
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immediate prohibition of the use, production, and accumulation of atomic weapons and for the distribution of all existing stocks.

For more than two years of argument on control importance for the destructive weapon - atomic bomb - the Soviets remained independent towards the West. They differed on two fundamental issues from that of the West. (I) the question of priority as between prohibition of nuclear weapons and the establishment of a system of control, and (2) on the character of the control which, under the Baruch Plan, was to become a wholly international monopoly, whereas the Soviets insisted it should be the responsibility of individual governments, with the right of veto to be exercised at will. In November 1948, and also in 1949, the General Assembly put the international agency project to veto, the Soviets voted against it on each occasion, on the basis it failed to prohibit atomic weapons and infringed national sovereignty. In actual fact, the Soviet Government played for time in order to develop its own atomic weapon programme, for a few months after the Atomic Energy Commission suspended its work in July 1949 the Soviet Union announced her first successful atomic bomb test. In turn she withdrew from the Commission.
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On the question of conventional armaments, no considerable progress was made. By February 1947 a United Nations Commission for Conventional Armaments was set up by the Security Council, in 1948 it recommended certain principles for a system of regulating and lowering arms and armed forces. Soviet Union vetoed the proposals for an arms census in October 1949. The Soviets counter proposed first, that the prohibition of atomic weapons should take place simultaneously with any conventional reductions, and second, that conventional disarmament should consist of a flat-rate one-third cut all round in armed forces. The West rejected this proposal on the grounds that they would leave the powers with predominating conventional forces in the same overwhelming superior position as before. After all, the Soviets walked out of the Conventional Armaments commission in April 1950.

In 1962, the US came up with a Draft outline of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World, which she submitted on 18 April, 1962. This was animated by the principle of balance. While the Soviet Draft Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament under

* The goals of US and Soviet Union defined their respective approaches to disarmament. A careful study of the disarmament negotiations would reach the conclusion that the two super powers were not interested in disarmament.

Strict International Control was submitted on 15 March, 1962. The draft was animated to a very great extent by the quest for unilateral Soviet advantage.

The game of disarmament played by both super powers was criticised by some neutral and non-aligned countries as such. For example, the Netherlands deplored the inability of the parties to the partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963 to fulfil their commitment to ban nuclear tests in all environments and called for giving priority to the objective of a comprehensive test ban over all other items on the agenda of the Committee of the Conference on Disarmament.

Nigerian delegate in the Conference, alluded to the refusal of the rich, industrial countries to see to the need for further trade, and economic, scientific and technological co-operation with the rest of the world. He decried the psychological weapons that created a psychosis of power and alien domination, he declared that, "We refuse to exchange one form of imperialism for another". Referring to NPT, he pointed out to the denial of economic and scientific benefits under Articles IV and V to non-nuclear weapons states. He wondered at the consequences of the lack of progress, or inaction on the part of the nuclear powers respect to the eleventh and ninth preambular
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paragraphs and Article VI of the NPT. He expressed Nigeria's dissatisfaction with progress towards nuclear disarmament, and said that ten years after the Moscow Test Ban Treaty there was no evident progress in negotiating a treaty to ban all underground nuclear tests, he stressed the fact that the world had been witnessing a competition between the two Super Powers to outmatch each other in nuclear advances and thereby vitiated the spirit of NPT. He demanded a linkage of economic development with the development in the field of arms control and disarmament. He referred to India's underground test and said:

I think it was expected, as long as the two super powers continue to speak of a generation of peace while they embark on a programme of developing new generations of nuclear weapon system.

It was expected as long as the nuclear powers refuse to share their scientific and technological knowledge with the rest of the world under Article IV and V of the Non Proliferation Treaty.

It is to say that both the Super Powers talked of disarmament while relentlessly they built their own armaments to dazzling levels, they prodded and aided their respective allied countries to do the same, though on a modest scale; thereby making the world more dangerous, even the nonaligned countries were compelled by them to keep their defenses high. After the Second World War that was
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how peoples and governments of lesser powers experienced super power politics.

Recently there has been winds of openness and change which has transformed what was once the Soviet Union leading to disquieting consequences. The birth of democracy there has seen a rebirth of national spirit and identity, raising fears there would be four new nuclear states - Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan - where there once had been only one.

For now there is introduction of market economy to replace the failed Soviet command economy. This measure has brought economic uncertainty and disruption - leading to worries that unemployed nuclear scientists may sell their services to third world countries having the highest bidder.

But it must be remembered, the former Soviet republics that now make up the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) have agreed to maintain all their strategic nuclear weapons under unified Russian command and control. Regarding tactical weapons, which are more difficult to locate, President Yeltsin is expected to have the last of them moved out of the other republics and out into Russian depots.

The Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (Start) agreement was signed last July 1991 by President Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev. It lays down the basic verification provisions and system-elimination rules under which both sides can reduce their strategic offensive forces. The treaty emphasizes reduction in most destabilising and threatening systems, and encourages each side to restructure its strategic forces to make them less threatening.

President Bush announced an initiative intended to fundamentally change the nuclear postures of the United States and the former Soviet Union on 27 September, 1991, by dramatically reducing the size and nature of US nuclear deployments worldwide. "And the CIS has been marching US cut for cut".

It may be opined that some countries became apprehensive after the fall of Soviet Union thinking that United States will seize opportunity to spread her nuclear tentacle; rather the contrary is happening as US is withdrawing from abroad and destroying all ground launched theatre nuclear weapons and in response, the CIS is equally withdrawing and eliminating all nuclear mines, as well as nuclear warheads on tactical artillery and air defense missiles.

On 29 January 1992, President Bush in his State of the Union address, upped the ante by focusing on increasing the
stability of offensive strategic forces. In quick succession, he announced the shutdown in production of B-2 bombers, of new warheads for sea-based ballistic missiles, and of Peacekeeper missiles; the cancellation of the small ICBM programme; and the end of purchase of advanced cruise missiles.

President Bush challenged the Commonwealth of Independent States to eliminate all land-based multiple warhead ballistic missiles. In return he promised to eliminate all Peacekeeper missiles, reduce Minuteman missiles to single-warhead status; reduce the number of sea-based missile warheads by about one-third; convert a substantial portion of American bombers to primarily conventional use.

Few hours after President Bush made his announcement, President Yeltsin responded by taking some 600 strategic nuclear missiles off alert status and sharply curbing the production of long range nuclear bombers. He also proposed that Russia and the United States reduce their strategic arsenals by 80 percent.

The disarmament race currently underway affects not only the peoples of the United States and the former Soviet Union, but the whole of the human race. Its effects are both real and symbolic—not just an enormous easing of security and economic burdens, but also a real lightening of 41. Ibid.
the psychic pressures generated by four and a half decades of pondering "mutual assured destruction" (MAD). It is necessary to recall some of the declarations of the non-aligned countries in different summit meetings on disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament. The moral persuasion by nonaligned countries have gone a long way to bringing about understanding between USA and USSR and the now CIS.

With the fall of Soviet Union it became uncertain who manss the former Soviet Union's Nuclear installations and which republic ratifies the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty with the USA.

But when the US Secretary of State visited Russia last December 1991, the Russian President Boris Yeltsin assured him that all 27,000 Soviet nuclear weapons will be put under strict control. He told reporters that a "single authority" would take charge of all strategic and nuclear arms.

He also said that three of the four Soviet republic with nuclear weapons will destroy those arms leaving Russia as the only nuclear state to emerge from the splintering Soviet Union.

* Some of the Summit declarations are already incorporated in the Chapters of this thesis.
The three republics that would relinquish the weapons are Ukraine, Byelorussia and Kazakhstan. All four will join the international non-proliferation treaty, Mr. Yeltsin said.

On nuclear weapons security Mr. Yeltsin said the republics would jointly exercise control with the aim of achieving "maximum safety".

According to him "We agreed on strict control over possible delivery or leakage of nuclear weapons or technology to others", he also emphasised that "Important principles will govern our approach". One such principle was strict controls over nuclear weapons.

Also in ratification of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), the Russian foreign minister stated that Russia alone will ratify it with the US, inspite of demands from other Soviet states holding nuclear weapons to be co-signatories. Start ratification has been delayed by the collapse of the Soviet Union, co-signatory to the treaty, Mr. Kozyrev said: "the production of nuclear weapons is on Russian territory thus dismantling must also be on Russian territory. If you have to choose which of the four nuclear states would sign the treaty, it must be Russia. It must be recalled that the Non-aligned States have reiterated
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their concern on nuclear disarmament and also continue to
demand for the stoppage and production of nuclear arms. They point out that production and storage of nuclear armament constitute a danger to humanity.

To make the world safe and to bring peace, justice and equality among States of the world the complete elimination of all weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons is imperative. If this is not achieved world order becomes a nightmare and entire world keeps leaving in fear. Non-aligned nations seek peace, justice and equality for the restructuring and achievement of world order.
The world is composed of communities of diverse size and degrees of institutional distinctiveness (culture). Not long ago the Western Europe and North America were the sole possessors of modern stance and technology, and some other related patterns of culture. In the present era the culture of science is spreading all through the world as ancient civilizations are revised and the relatively isolated folk societies of Asia, Africa, South America, and the Pacific come within the orbit of modernization and industrialization. The reality of interdependence cannot be neglected as it is proved that no country can claim itself to be self sufficient in all the needs and essentials of life. No one country can claim outright domination over other countries. Recently, in mid-December 1990, in the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade (GATT) meeting, the European representatives could not agree with the stand taken by the United States on certain basic issues. This led to a stalemate and the meeting was abruptly put off. With the present events in the world and the awareness dawning among different societies it becomes imperative to restructure the present existing world order. World Order in the past represented the "realists" approach of balance of power and deterrence, and the so called belief in First, Second and Third World slogans. Bipolarity of the world into Big and Small powers was prominent among the advocates.
of realism. Today, however, different thinking and approach to world order are beginning to emerge, although before this time efforts were made towards the restructuring of world order.

Many years ago Karl Jaspers wrote:

World Order with the abolition of absolute sovereignty, would mean the abolition of the old concept of the state in favour of mankind. The outcome would not be in a World State (that would be a world empire), but an order, perennially re-established in negotiation and decision, of states governing themselves within legally restricted domains: an all embracing federalism.

The demand for the restructuring of world order in recent times was raised by the non-aligned countries and the countries of Group of 77. Almost all these countries are the countries belonging to the so-called 'Third World'. The demand of these countries to restructure world order is not a demand made to be automatic; but gradual experimentation should be adopted. Karl Jaspers again wrote:

A common world order could not arise as a finished whole, but in numerous gradation of freedom. These will be stages in the evolution of the order. That which holds all men together as their common concern may be confined to a few factors, but it must under all circumstances take sovereignty away from all in favour of one comprehensive sovereignty. This

sovereignty can be restricted to the elementary power problems: the military, the police the creation of laws—and in this sovereignty the whole of mankind can participate by voting and collaboration.

Modern world is a caldron of aspiration for a better life on the part of millions of human beings. A lot of institutions are beginning to make reconsiderations in the light of the contribution they make to the realization of human dignity. This, of course, has been possible as a result of the moral contribution of force of the demands of the non-aligned countries. World Order however, has a long history.

The evolution of world order system has been continuous throughout international history. The basic units of interaction have changed, the degree of global interrelatedness increased, and the intensity of violent conflict has grown. These trends are the thrust of long term movements which are unambiguous. In recent international history the preeminence of the sovereign state emerged at the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 and has not been altered since, in any fundamental respect. Before World War II, world order systems were basically concerned with the organizational structure of a Eurocentric system. The rise of a universal system of world order was originally as a result of European colonizing movements. Over the last
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many decades decolonizing movements in almost all regions have produced state actors who are participating directly in the dynamics of the world order system. 46

In 1890, the only important international actors were sovereign states (this designation included imperial clusters of dependent societies). During this era world order system was Eurocentric; the United States and the Soviet Union were not preeminent among states. The system was a simple structural grid that rested almost exclusively on traditional modes of diplomacy among a few powerful state actors. In this world order system, alliance relation played a major role, and no central guidance mechanism of a nominal sort existed. World War I shook the confidence that Statesmen and world public opinion had in the capacity of interacting governments to sustain a tolerable world order. 47

During the 1920s the League of Nations was embodied by the Eurocentric System of world order that survived World War I. The non-European world was "represented" through the participation of the main colonial powers. Important countries like the United States and the Soviet Union (Until 1933) did not take part in the League activities. Because of the domestic sentiment, America isolated herself from global
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politics, and participation by the Soviet Union was restricted by revolutionary nature of its regime as well as ideology.

By 1920 a few functional agencies were established to carry out minimal tasks of international cooperation. No regional actors existed at that time, although there were formal and informal alliance partners which provided the foundation of international security. Serious disarmament negotiations were held in the 1920s, whose impact were neutralised by geopolitics.

Structurally, by the 1950, the world order system altered in several significant respects. The United Nations replaced the League of Nations and in the process became a more nearly universal actor. A lot of decolonization took place in the 1950s and was accompanied by the collapse of all colonial systems except that of the Portuguese, and by the rapid increase of Afro-Asian membership in the United Nations. The complexity of international life by 1950 augmented greatly in the role of functional agencies.

Since World War II, the impetus towards generalised cooperation among states closely aligned by geographical

position, traditional affiliation, ideological outlook or ethnic identity generated regionalist tendencies in several parts of the world. The emergence of a variety of regional actors who changed in intergovernmental cooperation produced an important structural change in the whole world. These developments led to some degree of national integration at the regional level. These integrative tendencies on a regional level were accompanied by the rise of transnational relations of all kinds.

The declaration made by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1948 on 'Human Rights' must not be forgotten. This declaration proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as,

> a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure a universal and effective recognition and observance....

Thus every individual and every organ of society was called upon to participate in a global movement to secure overall implementation of human rights. This declaration strengthened the urge for the restructuring of world order,

because individuals and societies had become aware of their rights and freedoms which had been denied to them for several years. This was in addition to what was stated in article 28 of the Declaration that; "Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realize".

In our present era of 'competition between distinctive' societies, world order can no longer be reduced to the ideal of eternal peace between sovereign, parochial states. World order is not only a problem of better international organization... order in interstate relations may be conducive to more international peace and security but the predominance of the sovereign state in the social organization of the world is... the most important obstacle to world order. Hoffman conceives world order as a condition under which "men (divided in so many ways) are able not merely to avoid destruction, but to live together relatively well in one planet".

To live well on one planet, the resources of the world should be equitably distributed without bias and there should be equality among states. The dismantling of the old
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order was assisted by the transformation of the legal and moral climate of international relations in which the Third World States themselves, grouped with one another in the Afro-Asian movement, the Non-aligned Movement and Group of 77, played a principal role. According to Bull, "they have over turned the old structure of international law and organization that once served to sanctify their subject status".

It was at the Bandung Afro-Asian Conference in Indonesia in 1955 that the developing countries began to call for redefinition of relationship between what came to be known later as the 'North and South'. The new countries of the developing world who gained national independence in the late 1950s and early 1960s wanted equal participation in the international political system, and also asked for far reaching changes that would lead to a more equitable international economic system. The idea of reforming the international economic system evolved over a long period of time, but during the 1970s the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) raised oil price which led the developing countries to demand aggressively fundamental reforms in international economic system.

In the early 1970s the developing nations introduced the idea of a New International Economic Order (NIEO) whose

harbinger was the outcome of the declaration made by the Non-aligned countries in Algiers in 1973. This led to questions by the Third World countries on the fundamental premises of the present international order. They hoped that their proposals would help to correct inequalities, redress existing injustices and permit them the opportunity to participate in reforming the existing system and help in shaping their destinies. As a result, since the early 1970s there have been multiple negotiations in many developed and developing countries on a wide range of issues and in many different forums. The Charter of Economic Rights and duties issued by non-aligned countries necessitated the call for a New International Economic Order, which in turn gave rise to an intensive and unprecedented set of North-South negotiations.

These negotiations led to commendable trends and transformations which indicate:

a) that despite many problems a process of turbulent yet favourable changes has forged ahead in the world.

b) Man's Creative power and strength has grown formidably and grows still greater

c) freedom and peace have developed and are still developing more and more into foundations of

political, economic and cultural agreements, and action among individuals, states and nations, across the world, the international community - United Nations and the non-aligned movement in particular have gained more influence in resolving all important problems (national, international and global)

d) people have become increasingly aware that the world's division into blocs and the arms race are senseless and that a new war would be fatal to all mankind.

e) processes of integration on a regional and global scale have strengthened and come to more powerful expression, thus, creating scope for more universal and integral resolution of acute development problems worldwide.

f) there are better conditions to achieve more complete and lasting security of the entire human community, and of every individual country, that is, to check and master all global sources of danger (or source of global threat).

As said earlier the non-aligned countries have from their moral force in international politics made these things to come into place. Just like what they upheld in

Belgrade in 1961. In Belgrade they put forward a number of programmed positions and proposals in many crucial areas of world politics, ranging from general and complete disarmament on earth under international control to the creation of an international body on the peaceful uses of outer-space from doing away with colonialism and racism to the liquidation of the economic inequality inherited from colonialism and imperialism, from the elimination of the immediate threat of world war to the assertion of peaceful coexistence as the only basis for all international relations.

It can be said that from Bandung, via 1961 Belgrade Conference to the one held in Belgrade in September 1989, a new world is beginning to emerge. When in 1955 twenty four countries met in Bandung, they made far-sighted "Declaration on world peace and cooperation", they formulated principles to guide them in mutual relations, but which also applied to the whole world, as well, for the benefit of peace, security and well-being of all. They looked towards the restructuring of world order; a world where there should be human rights and self determination, mutual respect, non-interference, equality, refraining from use of force.

settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means.

No doubt Bandung introduced tolerance, peace, friendly cooperation, and disarmament on the world's scene. Bandung was the first clear manifestation of a new perception of international relations. The necessity for the restructuring of world order, as the forerunners of non-aligned movement deemed it, was to keep the world off from domination, confrontation and inequality, and usher in a new world which would be founded on freedom, equality, social justice, and well-being for all segment of the world.

It was deemed necessary that if world order is to be completely restructured, all facets of life must be touched. As equality, freedom and removal of domination are some of the demands made mostly by the third world countries, it is believed that there should be uniform communication pattern among countries. This led to the demand for New International Communication Order.

For more than a decade and a half there has been the demand for a new international information order (doctrine of free flow of information). The doctrine invoked the sanction of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights. Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights provides

that everyone should have the right to freedom of opinion and expression and that the right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and import information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers. Article 29 holds and stipulates that these rights and freedom may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Presently, there still exist imbalances, quantitatively and qualitatively, in the international flow of information, inequalities in communication capabilities, allocation of radio frequencies and geostationary orbits, disparity in communication tariff and barriers to scientific and technical information.

Developing countries to further their demand for the restructuring of world order, submitted that there are a lot of imbalances in the information flow, as well as distortions and gross injustices which are inherent in the situation of one flow of information which has lingered for so many years. Disparities in communication capabilities they assert accentuated the imbalances and thereby hurts the interests of the developing countries who account for more than half of the world's population.

In 1972 in United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Conference an adoption was made declaring Guiding Principles on the use of Satellite broadcast by a vote of 55 to 7 with 22 absentions, this was in sequel to the concerted step taken by the developing countries in the early 1970s to project and insist on their rights in their pursuit for the restructuring of world order. The UNESCO Declaration qualified the doctrine of free flow of information invoked by the West for Satellite broadcast, by saying: "It is necessary that States, taking into account the principles of freedom of information, reach or promote prior agreements concerning direct Satellite broadcasting to the populations of countries other than the country of origin of transmission". As a result of this, the U.N. General Assembly voted 100 to 1 (the United States alone dissenting), directed the U.N. Outer Space Committee to formulate guiding principles governing direct satellite broadcast.

The U.N. action opened wider debate on the whole areas of information policies and practices in the UNESCO and other information gatherings, with the countries of the non-aligned movement taking a leading part in it. As a result, an international Commission for the Study of Communication Problems comprising leading international experts under the
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chairmanship of the former Irish Foreign Minister and Nobel Laureate, Sean MacBridge, popularly called the MacBridge Commission, was set up in 1978. In 1980, an International Programme for Development Communication (IPDS) was constituted under the UNESCO auspices to help the developing countries bridge the gap in communication capabilities. In 1978, UNESCO adopted a Declaration on the Fundamental Principles concerning contribution of mass media in strengthening peace and international understanding to promote human rights and to counter racism, apartheid, and incitement to war.

The non-alignment movement was in the forefront of the struggle for New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO). The movement was the first to call for the "decolonisation of information" and was a precursor to the new international information order, at the Algiers Conference of the heads of States and governments of the non-aligned countries in 1973. The Summit adopted a plan of action which visualised the following:

i) reorganisation of existing communication channels, which are a legacy of the colonial past, and which have hampered free, direct and fast communication among the developing countries;

ii) initiation of joint action for a revision of existing multilateral agreements with a view to reviewing Press Cable rates and facilitating
faster and cheaper communication;

iii) urgent steps to expedite the process of collective membership of communication satellites and evolving a code of conduct for directing their use; and

iv) promotion of increased contact between the mass media, universities, libraries, planning and research bodies and other institutions so as to enable developing countries to exchange experience and share ideas.

The concept of new international information order also emerged at a non-aligned forum - a symposium on communication policies which the movement organised in Tunis in March 1976. The participants in the symposium asserted in a resolution that: "Since information in the world shows disequilibrium, favouring some and ignoring others, it is the duty of the non-aligned countries and other developing countries to change this situation and obtain the decolonisation of information and initiate a New International Information Order".

In July 1976, Ministers of Information of the non-aligned countries met in New Delhi, India, and elaborated on the need for a New International Information Order, they stressed the need for a political backing for the
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establishment of a new order, and to highlight this, they created a Pool of News Agencies of Non-aligned countries when they met in Colombo. The same year the demand for a new order was voiced for the first time at a forum of the UNESCO; at the Inter-governmental Conference on Communication Policies in Latin America, sponsored by UNESCO in Costa Rica.

In 1978 UNESCO enshrined the concept in a formal declaration, and set out the guidelines which included:

1. free flow and a wider and better balanced dissemination of information;

2. access for the public to information through diversity of sources and means of information;

3. for journalists, freedom to report and the fullest possible facilities of access to information, as well as protection guaranteeing them the best conditions for the exercise of their profession;

4. for the same media to be responsive to concerns of people and individuals, thus promoting the participation of the public in the elaboration of information;

5. the establishment of a new equilibrium and greater reciprocity in the flow of information, and the correction of the inequalities in the flow of information, to and from developing countries, and
among these countries;

6. the securing by the developing countries' mass media of conditions and resources enabling them to gain strength and expand, and to cooperate both among themselves, and with mass media in the developed countries.

The whole international community has realised the need to restructure world order in all areas. On 21 May 1990 the International Peace Institute of Vienna, organised an international symposium devoted to considering the possibilities of safeguarding peace by means of interdependence as a specific strategy for peace. All this was done for the purpose of restructuring world order. In the present world, it is no longer possible to divide the world, through partial divisions, blocs or bloc weapon, arsenals. It is imperative that we seek lasting foundations for security and peace.

The question of restructuring world order will continue to dominate the world scene, because of steady democratization of international relations. In this process, the ideas articulated by non-aligned movement are likely to contribute to the emergence of a democratic equitable, non-hierarchical and non-power centric world
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order. This, of course, is the agenda of the twenty-first century. Certainly this seeks to reverse the development of international relations during the last five hundred years. This reversal is the aspiration of the majority of humankind and finds its expression in the deliberations of non-aligned movement.