CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The study of international relations has primarily been a study of relationship between states, more specifically, the foreign policies of states. However, since World War II there have been efforts to study the international or global system in its entirety and these efforts have resulted in a number of studies appearing on regional and international organisations and foreign policies of states. Very few studies, however, have attempted to examine international movements that seek to transform world policies, especially in the area of peace, justice, and world order. One such significant movement to emerge in the post World War II period is the non-aligned movement. Unfortunately, this movement has been studied by the dominant intellectual tradition in international relations within the framework of power politics.

But the second half of twentieth century has witnessed the decline of the traditional model of international relations and the emergence of a new model. In the wake of the Cold War, the balance of power model initially tended to culminate in bi-polarity of the international system. However, the inner contradictions of the Cold War gradually led to polycentrism and detente on the one hand, and a
rapid development of the non-aligned movement on the other. Originating from India, and beginning in a small way with a few inspired statesmen as its philosophers and architects, the non-aligned movement proliferated rapidly as a counterforce to the balance of power during the last forty years or so, and a universal and futuristic movement. The threat of nuclear annihilation in the wake of the rapid escalation of the Cold War, added a new urgency to the policy of non-alignment.

The policy of non-alignment stands against bloc rivalry, as also against the tendency of imposition of a bloc's strategic interest on the rest of the world. In positive terms, non-alignment seeks to regulate the relations among states, based on the principles of equality, active co-existence, and seeks to relax tensions among states and enlist efforts towards the democratisation of international relations. Non-alignment intends to promote active struggle of all people for a better future to be shared by all. Hence, it reflects aspirations and needs of humankind for peace and progress, and provides a new framework for foreign policy making.
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As a consequence of this perspective in international relations, it viewed the frenzied arms race ushered in by the nuclear blast over Hiroshima and Nagasaki towards the end of the Second World War, as jeopardizing for the first time in human history, the very survival of human society. The strivings to end the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, are identified with the endeavours to preserve not only world peace and security but life on our planet.

It is against the background of this briefly described perspective of non-alignment on international relations that the link between non-alignment and nuclear disarmament evolved through various non-aligned summits and conferences where declarations against the production of nuclear weapons and its consequences have been made.


However, there is no single authorship of the term non-alignment. The Encyclopedia of Social Sciences describes it thus:

Non-alignment can be viewed as a strategy maximizing one's security in a bipolar world. It can also be viewed as a foreign policy expression of domestic, political, cultural, and psychological needs, and as well a policy of newly independent countries for securing their regional interests.

In certain circumstances Non-alignment can be viewed as a strategy of deterrence without commitment to military alliance. An assertion of non-alignment may be directed at one bloc with the implied warning that active intervention will result in closer relations with the other bloc.

Thus we find that the term non-alignment covers Egypt's "positive neutralism", Afghanistan's "equal friendship", Morocco's "Non-dependence", Jordan's "active neutrality", Nigeria's "independent view", Guinea's "active formal neutralism", Malawi's "discretional alignment and neutralism", as well as, India's policy of keeping away.

5. There is however, no single authorship of the term Non-alignment. An informed Yugoslav scholar-official has written as follows: "The term non-alignment came into usage only late in the 1950's in newspaper and government statements. Some believe that the term became accepted even earlier ..... it is difficult to establish the exact date because it had been used in verbal statements of which there are hardly any written traces. Leo Mates: Non-alignment Theory and Current Policy (Belgrade, Oceana, 1972), p. 75.


from the power politics groups - aligned against one another.

About the different interpretations of the meaning of non-alignment, Jawaharlal Nehru in his address to the First Summit Conference of the Non-aligned countries in 1961 in Belgrade, said:

We call ourselves non-aligned countries. The word 'non-aligned' may be differently interpreted, but basically it was coined and used with the meaning of being non-aligned with the great power blocs of the world. "Non-aligned" has a negative meaning. But if we give it a positive connotation it means nations which object to the lining up for war purposes, the military blocs to military alliances and the like. We keep away from such an approach and we want to throw our weight in favour of peace. In effect, therefore, when there is a crisis involving the possibility of war, the very fact that we are unaligned should stir us to feel that more than ever it is up to us to do whatever we can to prevent such a calamity coming down upon us.

The objective of non-alignment is to reverse the course of history of the preceding centuries marked by colonialism and imperialism. It rejects Schwarzenberger's view that "power politics signifies a type of relation between states,
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in which certain patterns of behaviour are predominant: armaments, isolationism, power diplomacy, power economics, regional or universal imperialism..." It also rejects not only power politics, the view held by Morgenthau that 'politics is the struggle for power', but considers that power politics is just one kind of politics and that there are other varieties of politics which are well worth following for the sake of peace, justice and development. Non-aligned countries are guided by the realization that world peace is the primary condition for progressive social transformation in national and international proportions.

Non-aligned perspective on international relations is vastly different from the contemporary dominant perspective. It does not reify the state in so far as 'National Security' framework is not conceived as sacrosanct, from which follows the often uncritically accepted notion that the primary goal of states is to acquire incremental power. Rather, it promotes the idea of world citizenship. It rejects the hierarchical model of international relations. Non-alignment seeks equality, freedom and world order based on justice.


That is why from its very inception, the non-aligned movement articulated its attitude towards the arms race, perceiving it as a phenomenon endangering world peace and security. Hence, it has striven to bring about general and complete disarmament and the complete destruction of nuclear weapons under strict international control.

To further their aspiration for peace and security, the non-aligned countries have endorsed all the agreements hitherto reached in the domain of disarmament. The Treaty banning the use of Antarctic for military purposes (1961), the Moscow Agreement on a partial ban on nuclear tests (1963), the Treaty on the peaceful outer space (1967), the Treaty on Nuclear Non-Proliferation (1968), the agreement proclaiming Latin America a denuclearized zone (1968), the Treaty banning the use of the sea bird for military ends (1972), the Convention prohibiting bacteriological and toxic weapons (1974), the Agreement on the maximum strength of nuclear explosion (1974). However, the nuclear non-proliferation treaty as realized by non-aligned countries, for its zeal and possible positive effects, objectively stabilizes and ensures the monopoly of the big powers over the possession of nuclear arms. Hence the movement's demand for a complete and total destruction, and a stop in further production of nuclear weapons.

The non-aligned movement is alive to the fact that a nuclear war would lead to human extinction. Therefore, it demands a complete liquidation of these weapons for the survival of humankind. It also seeks to direct the resources released from weapon making to development.

Besides non-aligned countries, this thinking is shared by some other countries as well non-government international organisations and governmental international organisations. In the United Nations, the group of six put forward the proposal, that resources used in the production of arms and armament be channelled to research and development.

**EVOLUTION OF NON-ALIGNMENT FROM BANDUNG IN 1955 TO BELGRADE IN 1961**

Evolution of non-alignment may be traced back to 1946 when Jawaharlal Nehru as a member of the provisional government of India addressed thus to the people of India:

We propose, as far as possible, to keep away from the power politics of groups, aligned against one another, which have led to disasters on an even vaster scale. We believe that peace and freedom are indivisible and the denial of freedom anywhere must endanger freedom elsewhere and lead to conflict and war. We are particularly interested in the emancipation of colonial and dependent countries and peoples, and in the recognition in theory and practice of equal opportunities for all races. We repudiate utterly the Nazi doctrine of racialism, wherever and in whatever form it may be practised. We seek no domination over others and we claim no
privileged position over other people. But we do claim equal and honourable treatment for our people wherever they may go, and we cannot accept any discrimination against them.

However, it is not easy to mention the exact date for the beginning of non-alignment. Since it is possible to identify it as a reaction to the Cold War politics of NATO and Warsaw Pact alliances, and since it also coincided with the resurgence of the nations of Africa, Asia and later, of Latin America, after centuries of colonial domination, it is correct to say that the concept of non-alignment was born in the early 1950s. The propounders of this new political philosophy of non-alignment were the leaders of the newly independent nations emerging from the shadows of colonialism. This, of course, is no accident.

The statesmen who made substantial contribution to the emergence of non-aligned movement are Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India, President Nasser of Egypt, President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, President Sukarno of Indonesia and President Tito, of Yugoslavia. With the exception of President Tito, all of them were leaders of nations emerging from a colonial past as independent

nations. President Tito was a leader who firmly set his face against identifying his nation with subordination to the Communist International or its military counterpart, the Warsaw Pact.

Some scholars are of the view that non-aligned movement grew out of the Afro-Asian Conference held at Bandung in 1955 which laid down a Code of Basic Principles known by the Asiatic name of Panchsheel or Five Moral Precepts for the conduct of foreign relations.

However, there are others who believe that the real foundation of non-alignment was laid prior to the Bandung Conference in several Afro-Asian Conferences. One such Conference is the Asian Relations Conference held at New Delhi in March, 1947, amidst political confusion and constitutional deadlock for the transfer of power from British Raj to free India. Twenty-eight countries attended this conference as members. An observer of the Arab League was present, representing all its members. The Jens of Palestine and the Central Asian Republics of the Soviet Union were also invited to this conference.


Indonesia was the "hero" of the Conference. This conference was an unofficial conference held under the auspices of the Indian Council of World Affairs. In his welcome speech at the conference, Nehru observed that "it was not only a vague desire but the compulsion of events that forced" Asian Relations Conference to meet.

One of the remarkable trends in this conference was that the problems of Asia were linked with those of Africa, manifesting the seeds of Afro-Asian movement. Nehru explained that Asia had a special responsibility to the people of Africa and must help them to their rightful place in the human family.

However, the anti-colonial bias of the conference provoked some criticism. It was denounced as a "Hindi Show" by Moslem League (represented in the then interim Government of India). Werner Levi, an American Scholar, observed, that "the Conference marked the apex of Asian solidarity and the beginning of its decline. The reasons for this were the intense rivalry between India and China in
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the Conference and the common distrust of the two Asian giants among the smaller countries of the region".

After the Asian Relations Conference in 1947 another Conference was held in New Delhi in 1949. The conference was purported to be the foundation of Afro-Asian Movement. Egypt and Ethiopia represented Africa. One interesting thing to note in this conference was the presence of Australia, represented by her foreign Minister. The conference deliberated on Dutch attack over Indonesia. It made specific proposals to move the reluctant Security Council to get the Dutch out of Indonesia. Thereafter, the Indian initiative alongwith other non-aligned countries to end the Korean war was a morale booster for the Afro-Asian movement and probably proved a precursor of non-aligned movement.

In 1954, the Prime Ministers of India, Pakistan, Ceylon (now Sri Lanka), Burma and Indonesia decided to meet in Colombo, the capital of Sri Lanka. The major issue dealt with was the settlement of Indo-China crisis. In this meeting, Ali Sastramidjojo, the Prime Minister of Indonesia put forth the idea a larger Afro-Asian Conference in Bandung which was accepted by all. This "sprouted" into the Bandung Conference of 1955.

On 28-29 December, 1954, a preparatory meeting for Bandung Conference was held in Bogor. It was attended by the Prime Ministers of five countries, Burma, Ceylon (Sri-Lanka), India, Indonesia and Pakistan. It was held against the backdrop of Pakistan's entry in South East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO), in September 1954. As a result, there arose a sharp division among participants between the supporters of alignment with blocs, and those criticising it. There were also, however, signs of the Afro-Asian non-aligned movement beginning from a regional movement to universal movement.

The movement was strengthened by the emergence of Colonel Nasser in Egypt. The struggle of Algeria for its liberation also had its impact on the growing movement.

As pointed out above, the Bogor Conference lacked unanimity. At first it was claimed that India was hesitant to hold the Conference because of Pakistan's entry into SEATO - a military bloc as already stated above. However, with the lurking danger of military alliances it turned to lead a concerted reaction against such alliances. There were differences on the question of invitation to prospective participants. India turned down the proposal of inviting Russia, describing it as not an Asian Power.
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The invitation to Israel was equally barred as its presence was thought to lead to the abstention on the part of Arab countries. This was widely criticised, mainly by Burma. The critics felt that a principle had been sacrificed to expediency and went to the extent of saying that the conference had been blackmailed by the Muslim bloc led by Pakistan. Australia was excluded from the conference, on the ground that it was a separate continent. Its elimination from the conference was criticised by Jansen. He observed that Bandung could not avoid the criteria of race and colour. Jansen's view does not hold good if Nehru's statement in Bandung is carefully analysed. Nehru observed, referring to New Zealand and Australia, "they are next to us and I should like indeed Australia and New Zealand to come nearer to Asia.... I would welcome them because I do not want what we say or do to be based on racial prejudices. We have had enough of this racialism elsewhere". This was affirmed in his statement in Lok Sabha on 30 April, 1955. The reason for this statement was due to the arguments raised by some countries opposing the invitation to Australia and New Zealand as they are deemed to be separate continents from Asia and Africa.
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The Bogor meeting decided to convene Afro-Asian Conference under the joint sponsorship of the five participating Prime Ministers. The main purpose of the conference was:

To promote goodwill and co-operation; to consider social, economic, and cultural problems and the problems of special interest to Asia and African peoples and finally, to view the position of Asia and Africa in world to day and the contribution they could make to the promotion of the world peace and co-operation.

Thus, after a series of conferences from Delhi to Colombo through Bogor, the main foundation of what has come to stay today as a universal movement 'Non-alignment' was laid in Bandung, Indonesia in 1955. The conference took place between 18-24 April. The conference was a successful crusade of Asian and African countries against imperialism and cold war rivalries having ideological and moral basis.

As a backdrop to the conference, the world situation was tense. Quemoy and Matsu Islands under Formosa's control were heavily bombarded by People's Republic of China because Formosa had entered into military pact with the US. Gaza town of Egypt was raided on 28 February, 1955 by Israel causing human loss to both sides. As a result, the Soviet Union rushed military aid to Egypt which in turn led to

America's withdrawal of financial help for Aswan Dam of Egypt, Egyptian nationalisation of Suez Canal, and the tripartite aggression of France, England and Israel on Egypt in October 1956. Besides SEATO, Baghdad military pact was signed between Iran and Turkey on 24 February, 1955. Colonel Nasser was critical about it and did not hesitate to oppose it. He called the pact as 'Crazy' aimed at isolating and disrupting the Arab League. No wonder then he leaned towards India and other countries who criticised military pacts.

The Conference met with a distinct division between aligned and non-aligned countries, both projecting their righteous direction.

The agenda included the problems relating to economic co-operation, peaceful uses of nuclear energy, cultural co-operation, relation to dependent people, human rights and self-determination, the promotion of world peace and co-operation, control of weapons of mass destruction and


The Super powers response to this conference was mixed. The Soviet Union (by its change of leadership from Malakov to Moltov) favoured it and accepted the five principles of co-existence which according to Moltov had always been the policy of Russia. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State of US was not happy with the movement. He dubbed the conference as "double dangerous". Dulles's statement made Phillipines, Turkey, Japan, Pakistan, Libya, Ethiopia - who were US allies hesitate in joining the conference.
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universality of United Nations membership. In his opening address as the president, Ahmed Sukarno stressed and observed:

"....Let us remember that the stature of all mankind is diminished so long as nations or parts of nations are still not free. Let us remember that the highest purpose of man is the free liberation of man from his bonds...."

Within the committee of the whole Conference human rights and self-determination, racial discrimination and segregation were considered, special attention was given to the Union of South Africa due to its apartheid policy and the question relating to the position of nationals of Indian and Pakistan origin who lived there. "Colonialism in all its manifestation" was condemned. This common condemnation brought the aligned and the non-aligned within the conference together as they defended their stance to achieve the goal of anti-colonialism.

Burton upholds that the character of Afro-Asian nationalism is perhaps best described by reference to the Bandung Conference at which almost all African and Asian countries were united, despite their deep political differences, in their attitude toward colonialism, and in
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their affirmation that self-determination and independence were the key to human dignity and to progress.

In Bandung certain declarations were made, prominent among them include provision for collective defence within the purview of United Nations Charter. This does not mean that Bandung Conference permitted military pacts. Further, the declaration moved for two specific safeguards, i.e. there should be no external pressure on nations with regard to this and that collective defence arrangement should not be used to serve the particular interest of the big powers. This ruled out any military pacts with big powers and the declaration adhered to values of human rights.

The Conference deliberated on aspects of mutual co-operation with regard to trade and transport problems, and called for the creation of special United Nations fund for economic development. Similarly with regard to cultural field, the conference called for the furtherance of mutual exchange of cultural values.

The machinery for the implementation of declaration made in this conference could not be created, instead, they relied on bilateral and multilateral treaties and existing
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machinery. The lack of such an arrangement hindered cooperation. That is why an analyst, Rubein Stein, remarked, "the conference lacked machinery for implementing its resolutions. Moreover, it composed of desperate political elements which foreclosed co-operation". An Indian journalist, Inder Malhotra added to this criticism by saying, "No wonder the Bandung Myth that swept the four corners of Asia and Africa had very little to do with the realities of the Bandung Conference or of the world". He further stated that "it was on the bleak of Himalayan heights in the autumn of 1962 that Panchsheel (part of Bandung Myth) was blown to bits".

As a consequence, after the Bandung Conference in 1955 came the period of consolidation triggered by the meeting between Jawaharlal Nehru of India, Colonel Nasser of Egypt, and Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia, at Brioni, on July 18-19, 1956. This was followed by its role in the Suez crisis and as a result, non-alignment developed its clout in international relations. The year 1960 brought Egypt and Yugoslavia closer to each other. The two countries took initiative to hold a conference of the non-aligned countries. The preparatory conference to hold a non-aligned conference was held in June 1961 at Cairo. In this conference nineteen countries were present with seventeen
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countries from Asia and African continents, and Cuba and Yugoslavia from Latin America and Europe.

In Cairo, the countries outlined the criteria which qualify a country to be a member of non-aligned movement. It defined it thus:

i. A country should follow an independent policy based on peaceful co-existence and non-interference or should be showing a trend in favour of such a policy.

ii. It should consistently have supported movements for national independence.

iii. It should not be a member of multilateral military alliance concluded in the context of great power conflicts.

iv. If it had conceded military bases these concessions should not have been made in the context of great power conflicts.

v. If it were a member of a bi-lateral or regional defence arrangement, this should not be in the context of great power conflicts.

This was the first time that the non-aligned states tried to define non-alignment.

The preparatory conference chose Belgrade as the venue for the first summit conference of the non-aligned countries to be held in September, 1961.

A movement that began by treading rough roads finally emerged successful on 1 September 1961 in Belgrade, the Capital city of Yugoslavia. Agenda for the Belgrade Summit was laid in Cairo. Jansen calls it "an omnibus agenda", which includes among others the liquidation of colonialism and neo-colonialism, racial discrimination, disarmament and military bases, co-existence, the role and structure of the United Nations, and problem of unequal economic development and economic co-operation.

The spirit of non-aligned movement stood like a rock in the wake of nuclear explosion by Soviet Union on 31 August 1961, the eve of the first non-aligned Summit. The explosion could neither demoralise nor deter the leaders, instead, this strengthened their will to forge ahead with the conference. (The leaders, it seems, took this explosion as a twenty-one-gun salute to usher in one of the great movements in the world.) Many scholars expressed surprise at conference's lack of criticism towards the Soviet explosion, although seven members out of the lot present in Belgrade conference did condemn the Soviet nuclear test. Subha Rao observes, "surprisingly enough the non-aligned 37. Ibid., p. 286.
countries in the conference could not tone up against the Russian atomic detonation". Simultaneously tension between East and West Berlin flared up with creation of Berlin. But these world tensions further strengthened the resolve of the participants to promote world peace. The theme of peace was articulated in Belgrade.

Nkrumah the late President of Ghana, in his speech remarked: "humanity has arrived at the crossroads of destiny and we have met in Conference here in this ancient city of Belgrade to decide whether, we the non-aligned nations, shall allow humanity to proceed on the way to tragedy and destruction or on the way of peace and reconstruction. For the first time in modern history a conference such as this has been summoned positively in the interest of peace—solely for peace and nothing else but peace".

The movement of the non-aligned is not in anyway a third bloc, rather, it is a moral force and balancing force and confluence between the East and the West in the cause of peace. The Belgrade summit emphasised the dangers of nuclear weapons and the need for its destruction.
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The importance of non-alignment as a moral force and its stand on nuclear disarmament was emphasised by Nkrumah who expressed the consequence of nuclear holocaust in the following words:

I shudder to think of the horrors and destruction that would follow in the wake of a nuclear war. I imagine half a dozen hydrogen bombs, each equivalent to 100 million ton of T.N.T. dropped on Accra, New Delhi, London, Moscow, Cairo, Peking, New York or Berlin: Again I shudder at the vision I see. Surely neither the United States of America nor the Soviet Union could want war.

In this conference Nehru observed that "the old imperialism is fading away and the era of classic colonialism is gone and dead, though of course it survives and gives lot of trouble, yet, but essentially it is over".

Although Jansen criticised the Belgrade conference as singularly unproductive of concrete results, yet the Conference was a milestone in the evolution of non-alignment. It provided for diplomatic method of consultation between non-aligned countries in expanding and enlarging the membership of the UN disarmament Committee in 1962, and tried for convening a world disarmament conference.

---
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important fact to be recognized is that the Belgrade Conference which seemed political in nature did stress the importance of economic co-operation. This perception led to Cairo Economic Conference in 1962 and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in 1964.

NON-ALIGNMENT AS A REFLECTION OF THE ASPIRATION OF THIRD WORLD.

The foregoing reveals that most of the third world countries belong to non-aligned movement. There are by and large, poor and developing countries who have been victims of exploitation and injustice.

The newly independent countries opted for non-alignment as a tool of their foreign policy in order to promote their national interest. The Prime Minister of Jamaica, stated: "The non-aligned movement did begin simple because there were blocs. It opposed bloc power configuration... because this involved limitation imposed by the world political environment upon freedom". For the third world countries of Asia and Africa, non-alignment is an assertion of their countries' hard won sovereignty in the context of safeguarding international peace, which was an essential condition for the economic, social and political development of the newly-independent nations.

The aspiration of the third world is reflected through the expression of the doyen of non-aligned movement, Nehru about the prevailing sentiment of the Asian people when he declared:

For too long have we of Asia been petitioners in Western Courts and Chancelleries. That story must now belong to the past. We propose to stand on our own legs and to co-operate with all others who are prepared to co-operate with us. We do not intend to be play-thing of others.

It is this anti-imperialist edge of the struggle that brought other nations in different continents to appreciate the basic trust of non-alignment. It sought to insulate these countries from the pressures of the military blocs and as a consequence of such efforts it gained adherents in Africa, Latin America and even in Europe, thereby making it a world-wide movement.

Non-alignment was viewed as the external manifestation of the national liberation movements. As the non-aligned movement was joined by an increasing number of states, it started to reflect the common denominator of the specific policies of the member states reflecting their historical backgrounds, geographical locations, economic and political levels of growth and linkage with other countries. The year 1956 is a landmark in the history of the non-aligned

movement. The crisis over the nationalization of the Suez Canal led to an Anglo-French military invasion of Egypt in collusion with Israel. This resulted in the greatest confrontation between radical nationalism and imperial powers in the first twenty years of the post war era. The Polish uprising and the Hungarian revolt led to a clearly defined shift in Yugoslav foreign policy. This "double crisis" brought India, Egypt and Yugoslavia together which become the nucleus around which the non-aligned movement gathered momentum.

One of the leaders of non-alignment upholds non-alignment as the aspiration of the third world. Nkrumah stressed that "we are convinced that by our policy of non-alignment we are able to speak our minds frankly and without fear and favour on issues as they arise". He further emphasised that this attitude of non-alignment does not imply indifference to great issues of our day. Nkrumah was apprehensive of the increase in the production and stock pile of weapons of mass destruction. Hence, he stated that "we view with fear and apprehension the arms race between the great powers and the terrible weapons of destruction at their disposal. Our own continent of Africa has become a testing ground for the atomic explosions. With all the


wonderful new field of knowledge and with power at our
disposal as never before to command the natural resources of
the world man has so far shown himself capable only of
increasing his own fear and future. I earnestly hope that
there may be effective control of nuclear weapons and
general disarmament (as well as complete destruction of all
nuclear weapons) before it is too late).

To keep their struggle for peace in the world for the
sake of human survival, the non-aligned countries continue
to co-operate with and support the United Nations in their
affort to promote and maintain international peace and
security, and have reaffirmed their faith in the Charter of
the United Nations.

As consequence of these philosophies non-alignment
movement increased in number with the countries who attained
their independence, mostly from Africa joining it. Alongside, the number of observer countries have equally
increased with countries embracing almost the whole
continents of the world who are impressed by its policies
and achievements, especially in the area of peace, justice
and safeguard of man from nuclear annihilation. The growth
and gradual increase in membership can be seen in Table 1.1.
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TABLE 1.1


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Conference/Summit</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>No. Members</th>
<th>Observers</th>
<th>Guests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>First summit</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Second &quot;</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Third &quot;</td>
<td>Lusaka</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Fourth &quot;</td>
<td>Algiers</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Fifth &quot;</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Sixth &quot;</td>
<td>Havana</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Seventh &quot;</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Eight &quot;</td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Nineth &quot;</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:


1983: Ibid., Vol. 34, no. 792, 5 April, 1983.


The historic message of non-alignment thus offers the vision of a new world in which it will be possible to reconcile real peace with the necessary objective changes in the system of international relations, a system still based on power. It is evident that non-alignment is not an ephemeral phenomenon dependent on the nature of relations between the great powers and blocs, but an ever present factor whose vitality has been tested and whose sources are inexhaustible. That is why despite changes in international relations following the collapse of Soviet Union, NAM continues to be relevant.

The essence of the non-alignment is determined by the common interest of the developing countries. It includes: struggle to prevent war, against the policy of force, dictate and aggression pursued by the imperialist countries, struggle against the arms race, particularly nuclear race on global and local levels, struggle for peace and disaramament, against military bases and facilities, and military blocs. Struggle against the rudiments of colonialism, facist policies and apartheid includes the struggle against all forms of colonialism, economic, financial, technology etc., for democratization of international economic relations, for the New International Economic Order; struggle against all

forms of ideological and cultural neocolonialism (brain drain, informational imperialism, etc.) and, struggle against Western "conflict strategy" against imperialist attempts to initiate, use and "control" conflict situation in the developing world.

III. BASES OF INTER-ACTION AMONG STATES.

Thus, the policy and movement of non-alignment have a global perspective, a world view and not a sectoral one. Non-alignment is not simply a political association. It's agenda is vast and comprehensive and is linked in the ultimate analysis to the emancipation of the downtrodden segment of humanity and the establishment of a new world order based on the concept of equality. The objective of the non-aligned movement is not any adhoc gain in short term for the developing countries in the political, economic, social, cultural, scientific and technological spheres but it is the reshaping of the world order in a "peaceful global environment in the context of global inter-dependence and collective self-reliance". This objective, the movement seeks to promote by providing new bases of inter-state relations.

49. Ibid.

These bases of interaction among states take roots from the five principles India and China approved as a long detailed and prosaic Agreement on Trade and intercourse and relating to Tibet in Peking on the 29 April 1954. The principles are:

i. Mutual respect for each others territorial integrity and sovereignty.
ii. Mutual non-aggression.
iii. Mutual non-interference in each others affairs.
iv. Equality and Mutual benefit.
v. Peaceful co-existence.

This "utilitarian document" was signed by the Chinese vice Minister of Foreign Affairs and by the Indian Ambassador to China. The same principles were laid down in Bandung a year later as the code of basic principles for the conduct of foreign relations between states.

Thus, non-alignment rejects the dominant perspective of international relations where balance of power and hierarchical order in international relations is regarded as imperative in the conduct and inter-action among states. In one of his 'Six Principles of Realism', Morgenthau acclaimed. "The main signpost that helps political realism to find its way through the landscape of international politics is the

concept of interest defined in terms of power". He continued by laying emphasis that "without such a concept, a theory of politics, international or domestic, would be altogether impossible, for without it we could not distinguish between political and non-political facts, nor could we bring at least a measure of systematic order to political sphere".  

John Burton, himself not an exponent of realist school of theory of Realpolitik, suggests that "there is probably no greater common factor in all thinking on international relations than the assumption that states depend for their existence upon power, and achieve their objective by power, thus making the management of power the main problem to be solved".

But, contrary to this dominant view of inter-state relations, non-alignment does not build on this power centrist approach as far as relations among states are concerned. Rather, it promotes the idea of world citizenship. It rejects the hierarchical model of international relations. It seeks equality, freedom and world order based on justice, hence, interest should be defined as such and interaction among states based on that.

52. N. 11. p. 5.
53. N. 32, p. 46.
Another realist scholar Robert Hupe maintains that international politics (or relations) is "dominated by the quest for power", and that "at any given period of known history there were several states locked in deadly conflict, all desiring the augmentation or preservation of their power".

On the contrary, the non-aligned countries believe in global interdependence, non-intervention, non-interference in the internal affairs of countries and peaceful co-existence, equality and mutual benefit among all countries rather than the quest for power which creates and brings chaos among states in their relations.

The movement of non-alignment is basically a movement for peace, a movement which defines peace as not merely absence of war, or peace of graveyard, but a vibrant and dynamic peace which provides stimuli and an environment for happiness, welfare and progress of mankind without any discrimination-racial, economic cultural or social. Its concepts have evolved from the principles of peaceful co-existence which came to be accepted universally after the Cold War had run out of its steam. Non-alignment does not

seek static peaceful co-existence. It stands for dynamic evolution of international relationship on the bases of equality and justice, on the bases of undisputed fact that peace and prosperity are both indivisible, that peace and prosperity should be universal so as to be durable and long lasting. These are the main bases of interaction among states which the non-alignment movement seeks.

Hence, the guiding idea in non-aligned movement is communality, without domination by the stronger and imposition of their will on others. That is why the concept of independence is so frequently stressed by the non-aligned movement as it is seen as the right to independent decision making, and not avoiding openness or close ties with the rest of the world.

This concept of interdependence engendered the demand for equitable cooperation and strengthening the economic position of countries, since it is the only sure basis for equality and for safeguarding self determination and independence. This principled stance therefore, ruled out joining the blocs of the highly developed countries, where less developed nations could only be obedient followers of the policy of cold war confrontation without any kind of say. Alongside, it ruled out taking a hostile attitude to

56. N. 50. p. 2.

one or the other bloc, as blocs were seen by the non-aligned as the products of conflict between the leading powers and states connected to them, as a reflection of unhealthy relations in the world. Hence, non-membership in the blocs implied making the maximum possible contribution to changing the general State of relations and eliminating the motivation for bloc groupings.

By the most lapidary definition and strictly historical determination, the policy and movement of non-alignment emerged, developed and ensured their lasting raison d'être in international relations on antithesis of power politics of the policy of domination and hegemony. In this sense, the policy and the movement of non-alignment engaged themselves on all the fronts of history, against all forms and manifestations of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

58. Ibid., p. 6.

59. Josip Borz Tito, "We never did judge the blocs by the order of their emergence, or by any other distinctions. However, from the beginning we consistently declare ourselves against bloc policy and foreign domination against all forms of political and economic hegemony, and for the right of every country to freedom, independence, and independent development. We never agreed to be anyone's transmission or reserve, for this is incompatible with the absence of the policy of non-alignment". Speech at the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, Havana, 3-9 September, 1979. Final-Document of the Summit of Head of States of Non-Aligned Countries 3-9 September 1979.
In sum the basic thrust of the bases of inter-action among states stemmed from the principle of peaceful co-existence, mutual non-interference in each others affairs, and equality and mutual benefit among states.

In this introductory chapter, the reasons for the rejection of dominant perspective of international relations by the non-aligned countries has been explained. The main thrust non-alignment rejects not only power politics but also the view, held by Hans Morgenthau and others like Schwarzenberger, that all politics is struggle for power. It cannot be fully denied however, that non-alignment is not cognizant of power, but it rejects power politics with all its attendant values. Hence, their pursuit of peace, equality and just world order for the interest of humainty.

The following chapters deal with the non-aligned perception of world order, reasons why the non-aligned countries reject the hierarchical view of world order, and why they stress on equality of states and why justice and peace are preferred in international relations and bases of world order. Then, the reasons for the centrality of nuclear disarmament in non-alignment as well as disarmament and development are studied.

In line with the above the succeeding chapters deal with role of non-aligned movement in nuclear disarmament. Thereafter non-alignment conception and restructuring of world order is analysed.