Problems become global when their solutions cannot be achieved within the boundary of the state. With the growth of such problems, world order deteriorates. When thinking about global problems, most people experience a profound sense of frustration because of the persistent failure to implement seemingly obvious solutions which would democratically increase the level of world order.

What is order?, one may ask. The word "order", from the Latin Ordo, means arrangement which enables a society or soul to attain certain ends. These ends presumably, are fixed by ethical and political philosophies which must also consider the relation or means to the end defined. Order denotes an absence of problems. For example, if a mechanic indicates that a car is in good working order, it is then assumed that the car is problem free. Tucker argues, for example, that what may 'appear as order to one observer may appear as disorder to another'. According to Clark

'what is order for the policeman may not be order for the anarchist'.

Of course, scholars differ in their interpretations of what is meant by 'world order'. One of the famous German philosophers Karl Jaspers defines World Order, as unity without unifying force other than that afforded by common decision in negotiation. By world order, Bull means those patterns or dispositions of human activity that sustain the elementary or primary goals of social life among mankind as a whole, while international order is order among states.

There are three models of World Order, namely the liberal model, the socialist model and the realist model. For the liberals, the organizing goal for order is the promotion and protection of negative freedom. In the negative sense freedom is defined as absence of human interference. Isaiah Berlin very well stipulates negative freedom when he says:

I am normally said to be free to the degree to which no man or body of men interferes with my activity. Political liberty in this sense is simply the area within which a man can act unobstructed by others. If I am prevented by others from doing what I would otherwise do I am to that degree unfree; and if this area is contracted by other men beyond a certain minimum, I can be described as being coerced...The wider the area of non-interference the wider my freedom.

Another major proponent of pure liberalism, Hayek, also talks of negative freedom as thus:

To regain certain fundamental truths which generations of demagoguery have obliterated, it is necessary to learn again to understand why the basic values of a great or open society must be negative, assuring the individual of the right within a known domain to pursue his own aims on the basis of his own knowledge. Only such negative rules make possible the formation of a self-generating order, utilizing the knowledge, and serving the desires, of the individuals.

Thus, the pure liberals are concerned with negative freedom of the individual or society. The socialist and the realist differ a great deal in their concept of World Order.


For the socialist the major goal in promotion of world order is the protection of equality. The liberals as well as the realists are not directly concerned with the promotion and protection of inequality. Although the realists do accept substantial inequality, they are more concerned rather, with its amelioration than its eradication. To the pure liberals, inequalities in individual initiative are one of the main driving forces in their system.

Inequality to the socialist is not inevitable, except in the area of inequalities in individual physiology or talent which, short of genetic engineering according to Tawney, certainly not advocated, cannot be removed. Inequality as the socialists maintain is only inevitable under non-socailist system of social organization.

Therefore, the pursuit of equality is only possible under a socialist system of organization in which all the institutions and structural arrangements that harbour inequality have been removed. Equality entails the elimination of those features that perpetuate domination or control. World order, therefore, can be achieved through equality of nations.

Socialist conception of equality does not relate to the equality contemplated by realists or liberals, which is
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occuring through necessity on balancing or countervailing inequalities. It does not mean the meritocratic pursuit of equality of opportunity or, a homogenisation of society whereby individuals would be reduced to a collection of clones. For the socialists, the pursuit of equality means the removal of relations of domination and exploitation in all areas of social life - or as Marx puts it: "(The') overthrow (of) all conditions in which man is a debased, enslaved, neglected and contemptible being'-such that collectively individuals are free to develop their own full potentials. It is the "right of self realizaton, an inalienable right of personal growth" in a context free of domination and exploitation that constitutes the core of the socialist goal of equality.

The realist goal of world order is to establish and maintain a society of sovereign states. There are two dimensions to this goal. First, it entails that the principal concern of each state is to preserve its independence. Secondly, it presupposes that the independence of the state can only be secured within the framework of an international society. As against the theory of other thinkers, realists insist that a state can only be comprehended in its international setting.

A realist's goal is premised on the belief that the state can only maintain its independence and pursue its interest in an international society. As Watson has observed, the absence of diplomacy, which he sees as providing the bedrock for an international society 'would mean a world which would have to resign itself to a condition of anarchy and isolation, of chronic insecurity and war: just like the state of nature of Hobbes. States would have to live by and for themselves'. For the realists the promotion of an international society is necessary. International society, according to Bull, can emerge "when a group of states, conscious of certain common interests and common values, form a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relationship with one another, and share in the working of common institution".

Realists believe that a sovereign state can only survive if a government can translate power into authority. This end can, of course, be achieved when the nation accepts the legitimacy of the government. Legitimacy, therefore, represents a fundamental dimension of internal sovereignty.

13. Ibid., p. 22.
Realists, however, do not agree that the interest of the state or its raison d'etat as it was known in earlier centuries, must necessarily be defined in terms of pure power. Northedge explains:

Raison d'etat was never in theory, though, it may have been so bandied about in the practical arena of politics, equivalent to the crude and ruthless maximization of power in a particular state. It has generally and more accurately been regarded as a certain political and indeed moral obligation: the duty of government to study intensively and without pause what is required to preserve the security and satisfy the needs of the state in an anarchical society.

Thus, the realists believe that states must seek to defend themselves and protect their well-being, but they do not believe that these endeavours must give rise to their persistent conflict and perpetual trials of strength. These problems can be avoided in an international society, where there are rules and institutions to restrain the power capabilities of the member states, and state sovereignty is universally acknowledged.

In essence, the realist is primarily concerned with preserving the sovereign independence of the nation state. To achieve this, two approaches have to be applied. In the first instance, it is essential that a nation acknowledges

---

the legitimacy and accepts the authority of the state. This relates to internal sovereignty. On the other hand, it is essential that the nation state operates within an international society where the members acknowledge each other's right to exist and pursue their own interests. This feature relates to the external dimension of sovereignty.

Realists insist that these two features of sovereignty cannot be considered independently. Hinsley observes that the internal and external dimensions of sovereignty 'are complementary' they are inward and outward expressions, the obverse of the same idea'.

Realists identify a norm of non-intervention which gives the state freedom to pursue its own course of internal development unfettered by outside control. The norm of non-intervention is advocated primarily on the grounds of prudence. For example, Morgenthau, believes that 'we have come to over-rate enormously what a nation can do for another nation by intervening in its affairs - even with the latter's consent...in truth, both the need for intervention and the chances for successful intervention are much more limited than we have led to believe'.

The existence of international hierarchy complicates the task of establishing an international society because it tends to undermine the capacity of some states to maintain their sovereign equality. Hence, the non-aligned rejection of hierarchical view of international order and their stand on the equality of states.

According to realists, reciprocity implies equality of treatment, and is seen as the foundation for all cooperation in international society. This mechanism can be seen as providing the genesis of international society. Because the prerequisite condition for the establishment of an international society is the willingness of its members to acknowledge each other's independence.

1. NON-ALIGNMENT AND REJECTION OF HIERARCHICAL VIEW OF INTERNATIONAL ORDER.

As already mentioned, the existence of international hierarchy complicates the task of establishing an international society because it tends to undermine the capacity of some states to maintain their sovereign equality.

Non-aligned countries are attempting to create certain basic rules of conduct for nation-states within the
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international system. The existing practice of international relations where a few major powers dominate, the non-aligned argue, does not reflect the present day reality in which new small and middle sized states have joined the world community in growing numbers with relatively little power in determining world politics. Hence, the movement of non-aligned felt 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 that those nations who do not have nuclear weapons can participate meaningfully - as equals - in global politics.

In 1961 at the first non-aligned summit meeting in Belgrade, President Sukarno of Indonesia pointed out that, in every single case, the cause, the root of international tension, is imperialism and colonialism and the forcible division, of nations. Nations cannot co-exist meaningfully with the existence of hierarchy in relation among states. Different social systems can co-exist, but there can be no co-existence, according to Sukarno, between independence.

and justice on one side and imperialism-colonialism on the other.

The spread of non-alignment constitutes, for an ever-increasing number of countries, an indispensable alternative to the policy of total division of the world into blocs. The growth of non-alignment into a broad international movement cutting across racial, regional and other barriers constitutes an integral part of profound changes in the structure of the international community. The fundamental principles of non-alignment, their universal value, and the persistent struggle of the non-aligned countries for equitable relations among countries and peoples provide, due to their permanent nature, inspiration to people and countries in their struggle for a world of independence, equality and justice. The policy of non-alignment constitutes a true expression of the interests and aspirations of an ever-larger number of countries and people of the world, as well as the appreciation of the significance and effectiveness of the policy and movement of non-alignment in the entire sphere of international relations as it rejects the policy of international stratification of countries or hierarchical view of international order.

According to Bull, modern states have been united in the belief that they are the principal actors in world politics and chief bearers of rights and duties within it. Society of states, he emphasises, has sought to ensure that it will remain the prevailing form of universal political organization in fact and in right. Non-aligned countries, however, contend that these cannot be achieved with the maintenance of hierarchy among states in international arena. Any adequate view of world order must embrace the individual uniqueness, the small groups' intimate ties so essential for the development of the person and a common humanity that, while not destroying individual or group particularism, is nevertheless very real to the achievement of order.

The great problem of today from the perspective of world order and peace has been that the great powers have graded countries of the world, e.g., super power, great powers, regional or middle powers, poor and rich countries, etc. This has developed to such an extreme extent that in the view of the non-aligned it denies to the majority of the world the idea of the personal individuality and of humanity.

World order, as the non-aligned perceive it, is reflected in what Sibley wrote: ...'image of new world order would be one in which order arises not because of the

threat of superior force which culminates from hierarchy of states but rather because the organs of humanity recognise the claims alike of individual eccentricity, small group intimacy, cultural autonomy, and common humanity'. Thus, the primary objective of non-aligned view of world order is positive and not negative in nature.

Fanon rightly wrote that 'each generation must, out of relative obscurity, discover its mission, fulfil it, or betray it'. The non-aligned countries have long discovered that maintenance of hierarchy in relation among states result in anarchy. As a result, the non-aligned have both resisted the work of erosion carried on by colonialism and also helped on the maturing of the struggle against domination.

The fundamental problem of the present era as the non-aligned contend is not the struggle between the socialist regime and the imperialists but the division of the world into parts.

That is why the non-aligned envisages that world order must be maintained through 'free collectivity', because without it, as Kothari writes, a free man is not likely to -
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emerge. Free collectivity cannot of course be met when hierarchy exists in international relations. In his speech at the fourth conference of the non-aligned countries in Algiers in 1973, the president of Sierra Leone, Siska Stevens said: 'international relations should be based on understanding which can be achieved only by equalizing the interest of all countries both the rich and the poor'.

In the same conference the late Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi also spoke on the dangers of fragmentation of the world or grading of countries by placing them in hierarchy. She said:

We often hear the phrase 'third world'. Is this not a product of the unconscious desire of the small affluent section of humanity to continue as oases of prosperity in the midst of vast waste lands of want? Surely our world is too small to be further fragmented.

From the above it may be inferred that the non-aligned countries vehemently reject the idea of hierarchy in international order, just as the Europeans decided in Westphalia in 1648, after thirty years of war, that world order system is constituted exclusively by the governments -
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of equal sovereign states. These governments have complete discretion to rule national space (or territory) and can also enter into voluntary arrangements (e.g. treaties) to regulate external relations and interconnections of various sorts. But these governments are sovereign and equal by judicial fiat, rather than by virtue of some higher authority within the world order system, which is the prevailing system in the present international order. No one government is entitled, according to Westphalia logic, to a greater formal status than the other by reason of wealth or power of size. "Law and Order", in such circumstances rests upon the volution of governments and upon perception of common interests.

The view evolved in Westphalia, whereby states resolved to maintain equality without placing any in hierarchical form is exactly what the non-aligned nations seek for in the contemporary international order.

The non-aligned have always considered that world conflict is not inevitable; conflict in international order is the culmination of hierarchy in relation between states. That is why they (the non-aligned) have totally rejected the view that international peace can be based on the balance of power or that security, can be assured by countries joining power blocs and military alliances with great powers. Non-
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aligned nations have consistently upheld the principle of international co-operation as the basis for a secure world order and have opposed the notion that confrontation resulting from hierarchy and inequality can be the only course for the comity of nations.

Finally, the realities of the present day world must be followed accordingly, and one of the realities is that hierarchy breeds anarchy. The General Secretary of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) and its President; Mikhail Gorbachev stated:

One of the realities of the present day world is the appearance in world arena of states in Asia, Africa and Latin America, which are striving to overcome the pernicious consequences of colonialism. The overwhelming majority of them follow a policy of non-alignment. The emergence of the non-aligned movement and the fact that it has become a major factor in world politics is in natural order of things in the present times. This potently reflects the striving of newly independent peoples for cooperation of their legitimate rights and interests by others, for elimination from international life of any manifestations of domination and diktat and claims to hegemony.

Gorbachev understands that international tension persists so long as there is existence of hierarchy in international sphere and domination of the rich over the

poor countries. He further stressed that the newly independent countries do not want to be regarded any longer as objects for profit making or as territory for installing military bases and support points.

II. NON-ALIGNMENT AND EQUALITY OF STATES.

Speeches of statesmen, diplomatic notes and the preambles to international treaties abound in protestations of belief, in and compliance with, the canons of international morality. The most frequently recurrent themes that come to mind are notions such as good faith, justice, equity, peace, humanity, civilisation, friendship, freedom and equality of States, natural rights of States and individuals, and last, but certainly not least, the honour of States.

At the Peace of Congress of Vienna in 1815, Talleyrand suggested adoption of a wise principle of inter-state relations: "The only means of avoiding future wars consists in not dishonouring .. nations".

According to the Preamble to the Holy Alliance between the sovereigns of Austria, Prussia and Russia of September
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26, 1815, the contracting parties had acquired the intimate conviction of the necessity of setting the steps to be observed by the Powers, in their reciprocal relations, upon the sublime truths which the Holy Religion of our Saviour teaches.

The essence of all the above is to see that peace, justice and equality is maintained among the states without discrimination so as to avoid further tension and anarchy among their respective states. Non-aligned nations realize the necessity of equality among states.

Equality is, of course, one of the problems facing political philosophers. Equality, according to John Rees, is an ideal or principle, something men aim at or by referring to which they guide their conduct. Some thinkers contend that inequality is sanctioned by nature, and equality can only be founded on the rules and standards that men themselves make—a view, which seems to run counter to what in modern context has been the more popular belief, namely, that by nature all men are equal. In the state of nature, says Locke, men are free to do as they wish and are also in a state of equality, wherein all the power—
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and jurisdiction is reciprocal, no one having more than another.

According to Wilson, 'equality can mean identity in amount or size; and secondly, being 'on the same level in dignity, power, excellence ... having the same rights or privileges'. Hence, there are two kinds of equality. First, natural equality as when men are of equal height or two stones are of equal weight. Second, artificial or man made equality, as when two objects are taken to be of equal value or 'two men may have an equal voice in the governance of a country'.

Plato and Aristotle distinguish equality from two angles; one is 'arithmetical' equality and the other, geometrical equality.

Arithmetical equality gives equal shares to all alike, irrespective of worth. As Plato as well as Aristotle put it, it gives equal shares both to equals and unequals; or following Jeremy Bentham, that 'everybody is to count for one, nobody for more than one'. Both Plato and Aristotle regard this as a mistaken principle, which invariably they replaced by geometrical or proportionate equality, giving equal shares to equal persons and unequal shares to unequal.

persons. Arithmetical equality represents the democratic concept of distributive justice, proportionate equality the aristocratic concept.

Equality in the most general sense means a condition of being the same, in terms of possessing quantitatively, similar attributes. Inequality, on the other hand, suggests a want of equality and diversity among comparable entities.

The non-aligned seek equality whereby no nation claims to be superior than the other. After the Second World War, the United Nations was established as a world organization, based on democratic principles. These principles were, however, limited by the special status of Great Powers which they provided for themselves in the principal areas of the organization's activities. Almost immediately, the polarization of international relations on a bipolar basis took place. This was manifested by the establishment of two blocs headed by the USA and the USSR which were, particularly in the first post war years, in a sharp conflict in all domains. This conflicting stance took the name and shape of Cold War. It is no gainsaying that this conflict forced a rigid international organization on the bloc structures, with a distinct supremacy of the Great

Powers heading the groups, particularly in the period when the Cold War reached its climax. The two bloc groupings of East and West in relation to the outside world acted in keeping with the interests resulting from their confrontation which on both sides was considered the most imperative line of international relations. These interests in a way dictated the attempts to draw other states into conflict on one of the confronting sides. The bloc attempts were made in various forms, from alignment on the basis of ideology, economic or military aid, to the inclusion of states within the military alliances established in the context of the bloc rivalry.

The problem which arises from this polarization of the world into two rival, blocs was realized by the founders of the non-aligned movement, and so their rejection of joining any bloc. They realized that this breeds inequality and with the existence of inequality in the relation between states there must always be instability in the world. To remove this instability, it is necessary that equality among various states of the world is established in international arena. This stands in consonance with what Locke says, and which already has been referred to above, that in the state of nature men are free to do as they wish, and are also in a

state of equality.

To show that with the existence of inequality tension persists, one of the founding fathers of non-aligned movement categorically expressed that the countries belonging to the non-aligned movement would feel wronged should their countries be relegated to a place of third rate importance in these fateful days when the destiny of various countries is being decided and others tailored their fate for them. The nonaligned refused to reconcile themselves to such treatment.

Because of their steadfastness in the doctrine of equality they want to sit down with the weak and powerful at the table where the destiny of humanity is being decided. This is why according to Tito, justice, peace, equality and order is imperative to non-aligned nations in interaction among different countries of the world. With equality as one of its watch words, the non-aligned believe that great days lie ahead, great days of liberty and equality, but also great days of effort of fresh struggle to create a new world where inequality and disorder will not exist.

The non-aligned believe that inequality in the present era is man made and can also be removed by man. As


Rees said; ... all conventional inequalities arisen from human choice, can be abolished or amended as a wish.

Non-alignment originated as a natural continuation of the anti-colonial revolution or revolution of independence as a form of rallying these countries and their linkage on the global scale, primarily with the aim of self-protection, for example, of defending their independence and averting the extension of bloc rivalries to their territories. In like manner, non-alignment was also an expression of historical need for the establishment of a new world in which independence, equality and cooperation among states on equal basis constitute fundamental values and in which relations based on democratic principles of active peaceful co-existence will become the basic norms of behaviour. In a world where democracy is being paralysed as a result of bloc divisions and rivalries which result in inequality, non-alignment automatically becomes the principal stimulating factor of revival of democratic transformation on global scale. Non-alignment is the only force during the Cold War period, which could secure independent development of new sovereign countries. As a result, its stimulating role has wider scope, because it is a necessary prerequisite for revival of the process of democratization of relations in international framework, to relax tensions along the East-West line, 'as well as relieving the danger of a new global
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war conflagration which, in view of the high level of nuclear armament have endangered the very survival of world civilization'.

Among the principles of non-alignment is the right of self-determination of all colonial people and the right of equality between all races. Anti-colonialist and racial equality struggles pre-date the formation of the non-aligned movement and have contributed to its creation and growth.

It is the strong belief of the non-aligned that equality among the states will reduce world tension. Non-aligned nations in order to undertake the international obligations in totality and to help solve the problems of the present era, where inequality and domination abound, have tried to change the international relations on the basis of democracy and equality among states and have made sure that no decision which concerns large and small countries will be made without their full participation, on an equal footing.

In the twenty sixth paragraph of their political declaration in Algiers they have stated viz:

In order to undertake the international obligations in totality and to help solve the problems of our times, which concern the fate of all nations of the world, the non-aligned countries should, together with all progressive forces,
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work to change international relations
on the basis of democracy and equality
of all states and to make sure that no
decision which concerns large and small
countries will be made without their
full participation, on an equal
footing.

Apart from the Political Declaration which seeks for
political rights and equality among states, they have also
put forth the Economic Declaration for economic rights among
states. The heads of State at Algiers noted that
imperialism is the greatest stumbling bloc to the
amancipation and advancement of developing countries, which
are striving to attain a standard of living in accordance
with the most basic norms of welfare and human dignity.
Imperialism is one of the roots of inequality in
international relations, it is not only opposed to the
economic and social progress of developing countries but
also adopts an aggressive attitude towards those who stand
in the way of its designs and seeks to impose political,
social and economic strictures which facilitate domination,
dependence, or neocolonialism.

The non-aligned submit that inequality is the result of
systematic policy pursued everywhere by imperialism, which
does not change, even though its implementation may take
different forms, depending on place and circumstances.
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Imperialism and inequality violate the principles of sovereignty and independence, the heads of states contend, because the policy of imperialism sometimes acquires the character of open aggression against the economies of states which do not submit to foreign domination.

The policy of imperialism leads to the use of force and has instigated "criminal wars", such as those suffered by the people of Indo-China and the type which presently persists among the Arab peoples of the Middle East.

Further, many countries are still subject to imperialist domination and neocolonialist exploitation, which threaten the sovereignty of states and mortgage the growth of these nations. This situation explains the large gap which exists between the industrial and the underdeveloped world and the constant widening of this gap.

Therefore, the heads of state declared that, the imperialists are pursing policies which resort to open or disguised economic aggression, as illustrated by the multifarious and increasingly pervasive activities of multinational and monopolistic commercial, financial and industrial companies. The non-aligned in their struggle for an independent economic development and complete equality in international relations are successfully withstanding imperialist aggression and have emerged as an

important force in the struggle against imperialism which breeds inequality in the world.

In their assessment of the international strategy of development they state as follows:

"Even if the aims set for the second decade of development were to be achieved, which is doubtful, the capital gross national income of the developing countries would only rise by US $ 85, as against $ 1,200 for the industrialized states.

"in view of all this, the outlook for the period after 1980 can only be very pessimistic.

"The third world, which includes seventy percent of the world population, subsists on only thirty per cent of the world income. (This is great inequality).

"At the end of this decade, the average annual per capita income will be US $ 3,600 in the advanced countries but only US $ 265 in the developing countries. Of the 2.6 billion inhabitants of the underdeveloped world, more than 800 million are illiterate, almost one billion suffer from malnutrition or hunger, and 900 million have daily earnings, of less than thirty cents (US $).

"The unanimous acknowledgement failure of the international strategy of development is explained both the lack of political motivation of the rich countries to carry out urgent measures and by the fact that development targets do not accord with the real preoccupations of the developing countries.

"In effect the necessary international cooperation has failed to materialize. The policies of the
governments of some advanced countries, as well as the behaviour of multinational cooperations and other monopolistic companies, which derive benefits from robbing developing countries, have not helped create a foreign economic situation which would correspond to the goals of the international strategy of development.

"To these points should be added the inflationary increase in import costs, the pressure brought to bear on payments balances because of transfers required by private foreign investment, repayment of capital and the heavy servicing of foreign debts and the increasingly dire effects of the international monetary crisis.

"The arms race and the space race continue to consume enormous sums of money, whereas assistance from multilateral international cooperation is shrinking in relation to the growing needs of the developing countries.

"The numerous projects intended to make it possible for developing countries to use the result of scientific research and technological progress in an organized manner have still not seriously begun to be put into effect, and the advanced Western countries continue to attract a large number of scientists and engineers from the developing countries.

"It is clear that only a correct concept of developments, which provides for the internal structural changes that are necessary and specific for each country, and which include the growth of all key sectors, can make it possible to attain the goals of progress which we have set ourselves. This process is inseparable from another process, of a social character, which includes the raising of employment to the highest level, income distribution and the solving of all problems, such as health, nutrition, housing and education. It is also clear that these objects can be
attained only with the deliberate and
democratic participations of the popular
masses, who are the decisive factor in
any national efforts to achieve a
dynamic, effective and independent
development.*

This range of inequality disturbs the non-aligned world
and their leaders, just as Rousseau was disturbed by the
inequality which existed in Europe at his time especially in
France. As a champion of a certain idea of freedom,
Rousseau wrote in favour of specific sorts of equality, even
as Plato, as a champion of a certain idea of Justice, wrote
in putting everyman in his place. Although Plato believed
that men were never equal, Rousseau believed that they had
once been equal but now they no longer were due to man made

*NOTE:

This passage has been written verbatim. The essence is
to acquaint the reader with the efforts made by the
heads of State of non-aligned countries to point out to
all humanity the range of disparity between the rich
and poor countries.

Hence, this vindicates the efforts made by them to
correct the imbalance and inequality between countries,
especially the industrialized world and the developing
world in which 2/3 of the humanity lives.

The figures quoted above are as at the period when the
conference was held, that is, 1973. Every year the gap
keeps widening, although some third world countries
have excelled in certain areas of life; but, the
countries belonging, to this movement (non-aligned)
are still in dilemma economically. However, the
movement continues to strive in bringing at least a bit
of equality in relation among states. Complete
equality may not be achieved, but certain equality
should be maintained as far as international relations
are concerned.
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disparities. To the proposition that all men are born equal he could be said to subscribe only in the sense that "all men were originally equal". He argued that equality prevailed in the state of nature. However, Rousseau mentioned that it would be wrong to expect, even to desire such equality in civil society. At the end of his Discourse on the Origins of Inequality (hereinafter called the Second Discourse) he wrote in 1753: "Distributive justice would still be opposed to the vigorous equality of the State of nature, even if it were practicable in civil society".  

Inequality as is seen is man made, that is why the non-aligned need this to be restructured. Because it is man made, it can equality be amended also by man: Non-aligned needs real not wish equality.

Finally, equality of states in international relations is imperative to non-aligned countries. Equality removes the skirmishes or scrimmage between countries which arise due to domination and inequality. The fate of the world cannot depend upon the decision of a few great powers, who on their own have placed themselves on a higher footing than the rest of the humanity. That was why Tito, in one of his speeches and writings unequivocally expressed: "We are opposed to the fate of the world and millions of people should depend
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upon the decision of a few great powers... We are for the establishment of equal rights between peoples, we consider that big and small powers should talk to each other as equals and bring decisions for the good of mankind as equals".

Eradication of inequality as the non-aligned see it is simple because it came into existence due to man. Let us therefore, trace the origin of inequality as Rousseau pointed out.

According to Rousseau, inequality dates from the time when men first started to associate as neighbours. This was a period when the true state of nature—in which each individual lived a wholly solitary life, with no home, no mates, no regular commerce with any other person, ignorant, innocent and idle-terminated; it ended as men started to build huts or furnish caves, for as soon as men began to live in settled dwellings, they started remaining with the same female for long enough to acquire an awareness of fatherhood and to found families. As other men constructed their dwellings nearby, they were introduced to life as neighbours; and thus from sheer proximity, society was
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born. Inequality was born at the same time. For as people saw each other regularly they appraised each other.

"People became accustomed to judging different objects and to making comparisons; unconsciously they acquire ideas of merit and beauty, which in turn produce feelings of preference.... Each began to look at the others and to want to be looked at himself and public esteem came to be prized. He who sang or danced the best; he who was the most handsome, the strongest, the most adroit or the most eloquent became the most highly regarded, and this was the first step towards inequality...."

Maurice Cranston has pointed out that Rousseau at this point in his argument, picks up the thread of his First Discourse: Culture corrupts—moving further from the state of nature and further into society and inequality, man moves closer to vice. Nascent society was a sort of golden age, the loneliness of the state of nature had ended, and the evils of the civil state were as yet unknown. But corruption developed swiftly, frequent association between the sexes bred love, jealousy and conflict. Original self-love, amour de soi, which is natural and good, turned into amour-propre, which is cultivated and injurious.
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"As soon as the man learned to value one another and
the idea of consideration was formed in their minds,
everyone claimed a right to it, and it was no longer
possible to refuse consideration to anyone with impunity".

Such is Rousseau's account of origin of inequality,
there are natural differences of looks and talents in
individuals, when some characteristics are esteemed more
than others, these differences become inequalities, and when
the idea of consideration enters men's heads, bringing with
it the demand for some esteem and desire for more,
inequality becomes part of the human condition itself.

The desire of some particular geographical areas of the
world to dominate and dictate the rest of the geographical
areas of the world is the root cause of inequality in
interaction between states, which, the non-aligned nations
vehemently resent, and hence, their stand on equality among
states in international relations.

III. JUSTICE AND PEACE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.

To achieve a just world order, justice and peace are
required in international relations. Without justice and
peace in international relations every other thing is
inconsequential. That is why the non-aligned countries
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strive for the maintenance of justice and peace in international relations for the good and progress of all humanity. Justice as is known, is a complex concept. It is used both of law and of social morality.

To call something just is to express approval of it as being right in a specific way. Justice may be regarded on the one hand as a concept concerned with the order of society as a whole, and on the other hand, as an expression of rights of individuals in contrast to the claims of general social order. Again, justice is a Janus-like concept looking both to past and future, conserving and reforming.

The term 'justice' is used in the law, to cover the whole field of principles and procedures that ought to be followed. In legal parlance, the system of law as a whole is often called, the system of justice. Justice in short, is the "foundation of social morality, and without it the rest would collapse..."

Be it in legal or moral thought, the idea of justice is plainly concerned with the general ordering of society. A breach of order in a society is called a breach of justice, while penalties for that breach are invoked in the name of justice.
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In Plato's Republic there is an idiosyncratic notion of justice in society. Plato's idea of 'justice in the souls' is conceived as analogous to justice in society and still relates to a form of order, harmonious order between the different elements of the soul, as justice in society is, according to Plato, harmonious order between different social classes.

Raphael has distinguished Plato's idea of justice in two different forms. One, he calls conservative justice and the other reformative justice. Plato's view of justice Raphael maintains is in fact an aristocratic one. According to Raphael, "Conservative justice protect the established order of society with its established distribution of rights, and in the event of breaches it requires restitution of the rights of the status quo so far as that is possible. Reformative justice calls for revisions of the social order and a redistribution of rights to suit current ideas of fairness".

Some theologians like Niebuhr usually associate justice with love. They assert that on one hand, justice is a function or political application of the law of love, and
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that on the other, love is the fulfilment of justice. In
a society of love all the demands of justice would be
fulfilled. Conversely, in a society where mistrust is
eminent, injustice reigns.

The justice demanded by the non-aligned in
international relations is that justice which functions with
love and trust among all nations. It is the conviction of
the non-aligned that mistrust between nations invariably
creates injustice.

Just order in the world is based according to Pieper,
on the notion that "man give man what is his due. On the
other hand, everything unjust implies that what belongs to
man is withheld or taken away from him - and, once more, not
by misfortune, failure of crops, fire or earthquake, but by
man". Sibley, is of the view that indispensable to the
idea of world order, peace and justice is the conception of
a world in which humanity as such can express itself
deliberately and collectively, while yet respecting personal
uniqueness and the vitality of multifarious groups.
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Hence, demand for justice as a whole in world politics is often a demand for the removal of privileges or discrimination, equality in the distribution or in application of rights as between the strong and the weak, the large and the small, the rich and the poor, the black and the white, the nuclear and the non-nuclear, or the victors and the vanquished.

Let us now go into the fourth prerequisite to 'World Order', 'peace'. Peace is a term that is used in referring to a state of concert secured through the mutual assurance of basic conditions necessary for independence and autonomy. Peace is defined as a State without war.

Peace has two concepts (1) negative peace, this is defined as the absence of organized violence between such major human groups as nations, and also between racial and ethnic groups because of the magnitude that can be reached by local wars and (2) positive peace, which is defined as a pattern of cooperation and integration between human groups.

Peace, of course, has both cognitive and evaluative components and it designates a state of a system of nations. Positive peace is what the non-aligned yearn for and which
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through their moral force they always voice. Positive peace stands on practical preventive measures against war, possibly through a series of mutually cooperative steps.

It promotes, instead of the reckless idea of anti-war, a forum of international dialogue of nonviolence based on mutual trust and collaboration. This kind of peace bring to the world the relaxation of international tensions, the reduction of armaments and of course, a permanent peace on earth through the removal of idealistic absurdity and 'injustice that give rise to war'.

The non-aligned nations are of the view that a constructive way of establishing world peace must commence with uniting our minds into one rather than instituting systems or concluding treaties for surveillance purposes. The work of establishing peace begins, they contend, with erasing alien feelings and, at the same time, advocating peace loving ideas. In as much as the motive of all warfare originates from the human mind, war cannot be prevented without changing the mind itself.

Kenneth N. Waltz, in his significant work, Man, the State and War, distinguished three images of international relations in terms of which the cause of war is analysed. According to one of the images, war is traceable to human
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nature and behaviour.

Granting that what Waltz said is correct, the non-aligned strongly stand by their moral force in stressing again and again that war can be prevented through the changing of minds of men from war to peace.

Thomas Hobbes in his Leviathan, emphasised that national societies, owe their peace and order to the existence of a state which, endowed with supreme power within the national territory, keeps peace and order. He argued that without such a state national society would resemble the international scene and the war "of man against everyman" would be the universal condition of mankind.

In Belgrade, 1961, in his speech, the late President Nasser of Egypt said that if all mankind hails the power of science which managed to soar high into world's space and go beyond the sphere of the earth's gravity, discovering new horizons, we are here and now called upon to make this power of conscience fulfil what the power of science has fulfilled in our time. He went further to say that 'we are here and now called upon to set the power of conscience free from the bonds of egotism and go beyond the sphere of its gravity, discovering a new horizon needed by mankind more than any

other space horizon. By this I mean the horizon of peace... peace based on justice'. It is in the atmosphere of peace alone that we can develop life and augment its creative genius Nasser said. Peace, therefore, cannot be achieved through the endowment of supreme power, rather, it can be attained through the power of conscience that is free from bonds of egotism, discovering a new horizon which is peace based on justice.

Peace should be just and democratic. This follows the contributions made by various heads of State in Belgrade.

The non-aligned, as can be deduced from most of their Summit meeting declarations, realise that peace is the supreme achievement, for which people must strive. In Belgrade, almost all the heads of government who participated stressed on the need for peace in the world. They equally realised that peace is one of the major challenges confronting the world. In the words of Haile Sellassie:

The major challenges confronting the world today are two: the preservation of peace and the betterment of the living conditions of that half of the world which is poor. These are, of course, mutually interdependent. Without peace, it is futile to talk of improving man's lot; and without such improvement, the task of guaranteeing peace is rendered many-fold more difficult.
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The assault on these two problems must be made simultaneously, and all of our actions should be taken with an eye to the solution of both....

Power is not everything, that is the reason why the non-aligned remain steadfast on their policy of peace and justice in international relations. Even the super powers realise this fact. No wonder the Premier of the Soviet Union, late Brezhnev in his television address to the people of America in 1973 said, "To us peace is the Supreme achievement, for which people must strive if they want their lives to be of any worth. We believe that reason must prevail and feel sure that this belief is shared also between people of the United States of America and other countries. If this belief were to be lost, if it were to be replaced by a blind reliance of force (Power) alone, on the might of nuclear weapons, or some other weapon, then it would be a sorry outlook for human civilization and for humanity itself. Also in his address to World Congress of Peace Force on October 26, 1973, he outlined that peace must be democratic and based on respect for rights and interests of all peoples.

The importance of peace in international relations as non-aligned nations always emphasise has caught the fancy of
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many in the world. The late President Kennedy of USA firmly believed that world was possible when strong nations exercised power with courage and restraint. He stressed that the family of nations must understand each other's institutions, history and national differences. "The family of man, Kennedy said, "can accept differences of ideology and economics. For our problems are man made, and they can therefore, be solved by man". In June 1963 he said: "What kind of peace do we seek? Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war. Not the peace of grave or the security of the slave. Not merely peace for the Americans but peace for all men and women. Not merely peace in our time but peace for all the time".

Hence, the relevance of justice and peace in international relations is well acknowledged by everyone. Because of the importance of peace and justice in international relations the non-aligned nations made both prominent in their agenda.

The following discussion makes it clear that non-aligned view of the world is rooted in the universal values of liberty, equality, justice and peace. There values have been articulated and defined at the numerous conferences of the non-aligned. They are the values which seeks to shape the non-aligned conception of a just world order.
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This conception of a just world order is clearly reflected in non-aligned demands for a new international economic order, new information order and democratisation of the United Nations. As we will find in the next chapter, the non-aligned perspective on nuclear disarmament also emanates from the values discussed above.

IV BASES OF A JUST WORLD ORDER

The policy of non-alignment, has a global perspective. It is not a conglomeration of politicians. Its agenda is vast and comprehensive and at the same time 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, peace and justice. The bases of a just world order is derived by the non-aligned from the five principles which India and China approved as a long but detailed and prosaic Agreement on Trade and intercourse and relating to Tibet in Peking of the 29th April, 1954.

The agreement which later became the bed rock of the policy of this movement (non-alignment) is the basis on which a 'just world order' can be achieved. The non-aligned are of the realization of the fact, that, in our time the responsibility of the future of mankind cannot be borne only by a few states, irrespective of how large and powerful they
may be. The problem of the world cannot be solved by one individual state, or few states, but by the full participation of all nations of the world.

In a world where reason has been displaced by despair or fear, the logic which seems to impress is the logic of force, and a substantial extent of this force is directed towards maintaining the status quo between the strong and the weak, the affluent and the dispossessed. In a world of this sort just world order cannot be achieved. Just world order can only be achieved when nations participate equally and share the world resources equally, through just and peaceful methods.

For more than two-thirds of the world's inhabitants, life is a ruthless and continuous struggle for survival, and the major or primary concern of the nation-states to which they belong is to develop and stabilise social orders which will provide the shortest route to satisfy their minimum basic needs. In contrast to what exists in these poor zones, the political and economic structures in most affluent nations are built around consumerism and the main concern of most of these societies is to sustain or assure the continuity of their high-obsolescence, high-waste productive processes. Their interest in the needs of the developing societies, or in the other affluent nations, is at best

incidental to their own main concern. To them the results of altering their present course are far too disagreeable to face. As the economic crisis grows and resources become increasingly scarce, subconscious fears among the wealthy nations result in a conscious indifference to the basic maladies in their own societies. The strategies in relation to the poorer two thirds of the world whether concerning aid, trade or defence are directed more towards strengthening the bulwarks of consumer elites than joining in the process of alleviating mass poverty; more towards carving out spheres of influence in a common endeavour to serve a human purpose; more towards acquiring the resources of the developing nations rather than sharing sorrows.

With this kind of attitude and style of functioning, just world order is a dream. Therefore, in the interest of all who inhabit this planet a call was made by the non-aligned nations in 1973 for the restructuring and equitable distribution of world resources. This call led to the establishment of a New International Economic Order (NIEO) in 1974 by the United Nations (UN).

The urge for economic emancipation and democratisation of international economic relations lies at the heart of the demand for the establishment of the NIEO. The call for an NIEO was not just a call for an "income redistribution from
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rich to the poor". It was according to the UN resolution on the subject (1 May, 1974) a call for a restructuring of international economic relations on the basis of:

.... equity, sovereign equality, independence, common interest, and cooperation among all states irrespective of their economic and social systems... The NIEO) shall correct inequalities and redress injustice, make it possible to eliminate the widening gap between the developed and the developing countries, and ensure steadily accelerating economic and social development and peace and justice for present and future generations.

The movement for a democratization of international economic relations, however did not start with this formal UN resolution. Actually it was coeval with the struggle for the liquidation of colonialism in all its forms. However, the process of decolonization coincided with the establishment of the Bretton Woods system, which replaced the economic order of the period preceding the second world war. The Bretton Woods system went with the European Recovery Programme to rebuild the war-shattered European economic and social systems.
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economies—under the overall leadership of the United States and the United Kingdom. Bretton Woods did not address itself to the problems of the economic recovery of the Third World. It had no place for the newly independent countries. Nor did it envisage any role for them. The newly independent countries could not expect to receive any real help for their national development within its overall framework. It also tended to perpetuate the essentials of the colonial nexus in the relations between the former metropolitan powers and the newly independent countries. Although it showed a new order, but it was only for the countries with developed market-economy. To transform it into a just economic order became the goal of the struggle of the Third World against colonialism, neo-colonial exploitation, and the structures of economic dominance.

There are generic linkages between the non-aligned movement and the NIEO. The struggle for an NIEO is inherent in the wider struggle of non-alignment for the elimination of colonialism-imperialism and neo-colonialism in all their manifestations. In theory and practice, the non-aligned movement and struggle for NIEO are complementary to each other.

The process of unfolding the generic linkages between the struggle for an NIEO and the non-aligned movement has passed through three stages, viz. (i) that of awareness, (ii) that of identification and articulation of objectives.
and the taking of the first few steps and (iii) that of militancy and assertive action.

The first non-aligned summit in Belgrade in September, 1961 called for the efforts to remove "economic imbalances inherited from colonialism and imperialism". It felt that such efforts were "necessary to close through accelerated, industrial, and agricultural development, the never-widening gap in the standards of living between the few economically advanced countries and the many economically less developed countries. It reiterated the principle of independence and national sovereignty in the exploitation of natural resources and the utilization of foreign aid by a developing country. Most essential it decided to convene an international conference to discuss and agree upon the most affective measures" to remove the hindrances in their way to economic and social development.

The reason for all this is to see that justice is applied in the sharing and distribution of world wealth. The non-aligned are of the view and believe that countries will live in harmony the moment inequality, injustice and 
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imbalances are removed from the relations and intercourse among the nations of the world, no-matter where located. A just world order is, therefore based on equality of states, justice in international relations, peace among nations and equitable distribution of world wealth and free flow of information and communication among states.

To further stress their call for equality in distribution of world resources as well as the need for economic cooperation among all nations of the world—Capitalist or Socialist, the non-aligned movement in 1962 with other developing countries, underlined the resilience of the non-aligned movement in enlisting the cooperation of even those countries of the Third World which were members of military blocs in the struggle for economic emancipation, since in terms of economic objective there was no basic contradiction between the non-aligned countries and the other developing countries. Second, the Cairo Conference made the first attempt to articulate the developmental demands of the Third World and to evolve a consensus on the broad parameters of the changes needed in the international economic system. On the basis of this analysis of the international economic situation the Declaration denounced the attempts that were being made to perpetuate "past structures of international economic relations. It said that these attempts were creating difficulties in "the
Finally, with the Cairo Conference of July, 1962, the Third World launched concerted efforts in the United Nations Conference which led eventually to the establishment of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). The UNCTAD held its first meeting in Geneva from 23 March, to 16 June, 1964. The UNCTAD and the Group of 77 have since become the principal forum and instrument respectively of the Third World's struggle for an NIEO.

The second non-aligned Summit in Cairo in October 1964 imparted a fresh thrust to the conclusions reached by UNCTAD. In the first place, the Declaration of Cairo Summit identified the "Colonialist attempts to maintain unequal relationships, particularly in the economic field", as a source of serious danger to the newly independent countries. Unlike the Belgrade Declaration, which had carried only a reference to the subject in its Preamble and devoted some three paragraphs to it subsequently (paragraphs 21-23), the Summit assigned a full section (Section X) to the subject of economic development and cooperation. It clearly urged all the countries to contribute to the rapid evolution of a new and just economic order under which all nations can live without fear or want or despair and rise to their full stature in the Family of Nations, (because) the structure of
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the world economy and the existing international institutions of international trade and development have failed to reduce the disparity or to rectify serious and growing imbalances between developed and developing countries. Thus, the basic elements of the UN resolution of May, 1964 on NIEO had already been identified and even articulated in Cairo.

The evolution of interaction during the 1960s and even later between the non-aligned conferences and the sessions of the UNCTAD makes it clear that the non-aligned movement - functioned as a motivating force and as a catalyst in gearing the Third World towards an NIEO. It did so largely through the United Nations, its various agencies, and other international economic institutions. By means of the pressure they exerted at various levels and in all forms concerned, the developing countries succeeded in making some marginal gains. This was evident in the field of resource transfers in gross terms from the developed to the developing countries. Growing rapport and co-ordination among the non-aligned countries also facilitated moves towards mutual cooperation among them.

The main thrust of the efforts made during that period was to give a push to the process of industrialization and improve the export earnings of the developing countries. To
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this end Article XVIII was introduced in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and two waivers from the most-favoured nation principles were granted to help the developing countries in improving their export trade. These waivers enabled the Generalized Scheme of Preferences (GSP) to come into existence. Thus some processed and manufactured products of the developing countries found their way in developed markets under preferential treatment. The idea of trade preference was also utilized to further the efforts of the developing countries to increase their mutual trade. These provisions, though accepted in UNCTAD I UNCTAD II, came into practice in 1971.

These gains were, however, peripheral and even insignificant when compared with the failures. The transfer of resources in the form of Official Development Assistance (ODA) remained far below the stipulated target of one percent of the gross national product (GNP) of the developed countries.

Under this range of gap and disparity a just world order cannot be possible. Apart from the area of economy, there is equally a very wide margin in the field of information and communication. For many years there has

been a demand for a new international information order. This doctrine is the doctrine for free flow of information among and within states. On the face of it, the doctrine which invokes the sanction of the UN Declaration of Human Rights, is noble and unexceptionable. Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Rights provides that everyone has the right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and seek, receive and import-information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers. Article 29 stipulates that these rights and freedom may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

There exist imbalances quantitative and qualitative in the international flow of information, inequalities in communication capabilities, allocation of radio frequencies and geostationary orbits, disparity in communication tariffs and barriers to scientific and technical information.

The call for a new international communication order is a political necessity, if one looks back over the developments of past years affecting communication and international information flow. This call was and is a historical inevitability. While the political map of the world underwent a metamorphosis in the second half of this century with scores of countries emerging into independent Statehood in the wake of disintegration of colonialism, 84. N. 21. p. 274.
norms of international relations, especially economic relations, failed to adjust themselves to this new reality. As a result, the inequalities and imbalances carried over from the colonial past had steadily deepened and were growing into a new form of colonialism. This, of course, had become anachronistic and an impediment and barrier to the development of the newly emergent countries. The demands for a new international information order, are a manifestation of the common desire and determination of the developing countries to set right these past inequalities and imbalances. For the sake of the achievement of a just world order based on justice, equality and peace among nations.

World order cannot be achieved if the developed nations restrict themselves to themselves alone without embracing and accepting the rest of the two third majority of the world. And the acceptance must be on the bases of removal of hierarchical order and denunciation of the balance of power syndrome in international relations. The world must be rid of racial discrimination in all its present forms. These demands have been voiced many a times by the non-aligned nations. If the developed nations improve their lot within themselves alone they lose humanity, and this will not make for a just world order. Rather, the world will be full of conflict and tension.
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For a just world order there must be justice, equality, peace and equity in international relations. If this is strictly, adhered to world order cannot be impossible.

Men shapes and reshapes events. Karl Jaspers once said that:

World order.... is impossible because of what man is and because of the situation in which, by the nature, of the matter, agreement is out of question, and decision by war-the 'appeal to heaven' is inescapable. Man is inadequate. He falls short of what is required of him in possessiveness—in disregard of others—in the fight from order into confusion, and then into the spiritless struggle, power—in self assertion through the breaking of communication with 'irreducible' demands in the urge to destruction.

He finally reiterated that a mankind which desired only to be itself would, in restricting itself to itself lose humanity.

It is due to this that the non-aligned vociferate always for the unity of all nations to make humanity proud of what it is. Its' evolution was guided by the experience and also the values of old civilization of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Its political leadership conscious of its civilisational past, was enlightened enough to synthesise the values of the past with needs of the future. That is
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why our discussion of the non-aligned view of World Order in chapter two of this study gives an indication of this. As a consequence the approval of NAM towards the states of power in inter-state relations and the issue of conflict resolution led it to impart a place of centrality to nuclear disarmament.

Having discussed the role of NAM in the desirability and necessity of nuclear disarmament, it may be relevant to examine the question of restructuring of World Order. After all NAM is talking about nuclear disarmament, not in a vacuum. It has a framework of restructuring world order which is the reflection of its philosophies.

These guided the national liberation movements and now seek to define the contours of not only a new World Order but a just world order. Thus, the NAM, vision of a just world order transcends those of liberalism and socialism.