Chapter II

POLICY OF NON-ALIGNMENT
The national liberation movement in Asia and Africa, growing strength of Socialist countries, the disarray of world economic system, all together in combination brought a new turn in India's foreign policy. Soon after her independence India found many Asian and African countries trying to follow the path of peaceful co-existence. From the beginning, India had played an active and constructive role in various international fora. "In fact India's growing participation in international fora has reflected two principles. First, the United Nations and subsequently the non-aligned movement gave impression to fundamental Indian beliefs in peaceful cooperation between nations, to decolonisation and to the achievement of full independence through economic development as well as political freedom".¹ Though non-alignment as a movement started in 1961, it was a national impulse much earlier. It had been a prominent feature of Indian foreign policy since independence. "Non-Alignment is not a value, non-alignment in not a goal, non-alignment is a policy instrument."² A foreign policy of Non-alignment means an "anti-imperialism, anti-colonial policy for the strengthening of colonial liberation movement, world
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peace, mutual cooperation among the equal entities." It symbolises mankind's search for peace and security among nations and determination to establish a new and equitable international economic, social and political order. It is a vital force to struggle against imperialism in all its forms and manifestations, and all other forms of foreign domination. Non-alignment inspires to pursue independent strategy for development and sustains participation in international forums. The policy also protests against politics of pressure and interference in national problems. The basic postulates of non-alignment are freedom, peace and economic prosperity and following these principles the non-aligned states are trying to stand on their own feet with independent course of actions.

As a concept, non-alignment does not mean neutrality in its classical sense. Nor does it simply imply equi-distance between two rival power blocs. It does not even imply equi-distance between two friendly nations when they are engaged in a dispute. It has never implied to create a third bloc. Apparently, it reconciles with world peace as peace is vital for the progress of mankind in this overarmed and turbulent world. It is an important point to note that there are several reasons which prompted the non-aligned states to

work in cooperation. The historical, political and economic factors are responsible to form a concrete bond among the newly liberated countries. In the past they were suffering from exploitation of the colonial powers, politically and economically. They were not prepared to sacrifice their hard-owned independence. So they wanted to keep themselves aloof from big powers conflict without joining or supporting their war-drive aims. They, therefore become "keen to develop their economies and become self-reliant in the shortest possible time and importantly, they needed peace inside their own countries and in the world outside".

The idea relating to non-alignment first conceived in 1947. Jawaharlal Nehru, vice-president of the interim government of India, made a radio broadcast on 7th September, 1946 which provided basic framework to our policy of non-alignment. He said:

"We propose as far as possible, to keep away from the power politics of groups, aligned against one another, which have led in the past to world wars and which may again lead to disasters of even vaster scales."\(^4\)

But the NAM did not originate only to avoid wars."NAM is neither in the image of inter-imperialist rivalries of the
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west nor is it the example of proletarian internationalism. It is a mosaic of different social systems, of different cultures but united in their desire to survive and progress...... NAM represents a multilateral process of discussion and decision as different from the one seen in negotiations on issues of security, arms limitation and reduction....It is a process that extends its hands of cooperation to those who plead for a restructuring of international relations on the basis of equality, justice, cooperation, development and peace.  

Thus, non-alignment, in substance, is an affirmation of independence. But at the same time, to assert independence other things are taken into considerations. As for example, if national interest is undermined, if it is threatened by pursuing the policy of non-alignment, then primary consideration is given to national interest and policies are moulded, diluted or manipulated accordingly. Moreover, a country cannot be non-aligned ignoring other societies. Every nation has to depend on others, somehow or because a country is not self-sufficient in all respects. So co-existence and cooperation is as vital as pursuing national interests. It is true that the newly liberated developing countries should not come under military alliances and should opt their own course of

actions. Their primary task is to work for betterment and upliftment of their societies. This, however, does not show that a non-aligned country should not be active in international developments. India, as for example, had been active in international issues, starting from Korean War till Gulf War where the imperialist powers were engaged in fighting to strengthen their hold. The liberated countries extended their full support in all times. India also took part in resolving confrontation and restoring peace and thus involved in almost every issue to solve, the world faced now and then. The non-aligned countries refused to accept the destabilising attempts of the imperialist powers. They strived for sub-reliance in their economic, industrial and technical developments, without coming under the grip of imperialist powers. "The major formulation in the congress(I) was a reiteration of the party's faith in the foreign policy of non-alignment. The congress(I) identified itself with the Third World and asserted the country's right to develop nuclear technology irrespective of the attitudes of the superpowers."7 To the contrary the United states had always sought to influence the decision-making process of developing countries by its massive economic and military package. "The recipient countries this way found themselves

under the control once more and the United states always sought to convince the developing third world countries to adopt American concept of development".8

In Afghanistan, the results were not so good. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan had proposed for an early political settlement and it was ready for direct negotiation with Pakistan and Iran. In Pakistan and Iran all the political parties urged their governments for a political settlement, but the Zia regime at the behest of the US imperialists did not hesitate to aggravate the conflict and thereby threatened territorial integrity of Afghanistan. India called on the concerned parties to hold discussions for withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan. But the US imperialists and its allies refused to hold any talk with Karmal Government. This way imperialist forces had been working to disrupt the non-aligned movement. The imperialists by arming their client states were openly abetting aggressions. The non-aligned countries with the support of India were determined to frustrate impact of western capitalist countries. V. Shirokov writing in Pravda "accentuated India's steps

towards the Afghanistan problem and applauded India's stand in which she criticised the US position and asked it to stop military aid to the Mujaheeds."9 "The BJP opposed all kinds of racism, colonialism in all their manifestations and urged the government to defend human rights whenever threatened. The party sought to build an international environment conducive to the free flow of knowledge and information and to cultural exchanges among nations. In its view, the government should make efforts to improve relations with the immediate neighbours. The BJP stood for genuine non-alignment adopted during the Janata regime and strived to pursue independent foreign policy aimed at preserving world peace and promoting and safeguarding the enlightened self-interests of the nation."10 To quote A.B.Vajpayee, stated in Lok Sabha:

"To abide by the principles of policy of non-alignment is not enough, rather we shall have to demonstrate that we are following and acting on those principles. In that account the government should outrightly condemn the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan which is against all canons and principles of the non-alignment as well the United Nations Organisation. To keep themselves aloof from imperialist intervention and superpowers hegemony, the newly independent nations have opted non-alignment and if they are not protected against the superpowers intervention, not get the support of the NAM, then it is rather the NAM is irrelevant."11

It would be wrong to say that we had lost flexibility as far as non-alignment was concerned. The outstanding achievement of India was that it could bring all non-aligned countries to common table and could pursue to act together. Had the non-alignment lost its flexibility, it would not have been possible to achieve consensus in the non-aligned ministers’ conference held in New Delhi in 1981. Now that India is pursuing its policy of non-alignment, it would help many Third World countries to meet their needs. "Our movement has consistently worked for the eradication of colonialism, racism and imperialist domination. We have supported liberation struggles all over the world. Peaceful co-existence is one of the first articles of the credo of non-alignment. The elimination of nuclear weapons and of war is imperative if the people of the world can grow to their fullest stature. Big power presence have increased in various parts of the world. Armed conflicts have increased. These developments give special urgency to efforts to find peaceful resolution of tensions. Non-alignment thus assumes added relevance".12 "In a gathering of independent sovereign countries, practicing their own forms of self-governance, differences of approach, and emphasis are bound to

exist. Such differences testify to the health of the movement rather than to its weakness. Resilience is a greater sign of strength than rigidity. What is significant is that the harmonious manner in which we resolve differences. So long as we continue to be motivated by a spirit of conciliation, non-alignment will continue to be a source of strength to us and a benign influence in the world."\(^\text{13}\) It is true that performances of non-aligned movement have not come to expectations and some major problems continue to persist in the world. There are mounting pressure on the non-aligned countries to bring them under the influences of imperialist countries, the outside powers intervene in the internal affairs of non-aligned countries. These countries have turned to be battle grounds for bloc rivalries, but it must be noted that those nations rejected to be coming under Western countries and struggled to achieve their target of self-reliance and all round development.

It was a fact that increasing foreign intervention in the affairs of non-aligned countries was a grave danger to their security and integrity. Most of Third World countries were economically and militarily weak and so they thought it proper to get themselves associated with the non-aligned
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movement to concentrate on their developmental efforts. The BJP party resolution remarked that "the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan was a violation of U.N. Charter and a blow to aspirations and ideals of the non-aligned movement."\(^\text{14}\) "Decolonisation, Detente, disarmament and development are intertwined with each other and only by adhering to the principle of genuine non-alignment, India would be able to contribute its mite towards freedom, peace and progress in the world."\(^\text{15}\)

The Indira Gandhi regime suffered from criticism from many quarters with regard to its Afghan policy. It was pointed out that Mrs Gandhi was wavering her stand on Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. The Indian government justified Soviet intervention as a bilateral problem between the USSR and Afghanistan and at the same time it opposed the presence of foreign troops in Afghanistan in corroboration with the policy of non-alignment. "It was clear that India could not go to the whole hog with the Soviet Union on Afghanistan, nor it could support Soviet moves in the Gulf region where super power intervention was fraught with grave consequences."\(^\text{16}\) According to the BJP, "India is the only
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country in South Asia which is left to Soviet Union to rely on and so Soviet Union could not afford to lose India or even a little bit of its support particularly with regard to Afghanistan. 17 In the view of the BJP, "by acquiescing to USSR's military intervention in Afghanistan the Government of India tarnished the country's image in the world, and isolated India completely from the neighbouring countries, the non-aligned nations and the Islamic world." 18 Replying in a debate in Rajya Sabha, Jaswant Singh said, "We have no flexibility of response. We seem to have tied our option to a single thread. There is an absence of alternative policy postures." 19 The BJP was dissatisfied with the working of the Congress government under Indira Gandhi. In its view the original principle of non-alignment had been sacrificed. India's stand on Afghanistan and Kampuchea could not improve India's image abroad. The party noted that to ensure positive thrust to our principles and policies of non-alignment the government should see the world with open eyes. Both the Super Powers should be unequivocally condemned, may it be Vietnam, El Salvador or Afghanistan problem & The BJP


strongly rejected that "there was any superpower exclusivity in giving directions to world events, nor the party recognised the right of nations to intervene in the affairs of others on the basis of the imperial concept of sphere of influence."20 "The BJP was opposed to racism, colonialism in all their manifestations and vowed to protect human rights wherever threatened. The party stressed that it would seek to build an international environment conducive to the free flow of knowledge and information and to cultural exchanges among nations. It adhered to the paths of non-alignment adopted during the Janata period and advocated to pursue an independent foreign policy aimed at preserving world peace and promoting and safeguarding the enlightened self-interests of the nation."21 However, Government of India, under the leadership of Indira Gandhi, took a realistic stand on Soviet action in Afghanistan. As Mrs Gandhi said, "The non-aligned movement is not a mere or casual collection of individual states. It is a vital historical process. It is an assertion of mankind's will to survive despite oppression, despite the growing arms-race and ideological divisions. We challenge the doctrine and practice of racism. We now strive to enforce the right to economic


self-reliance. Alignment denotes dependence. That is why something akin to the non-aligned outlook is spreading noticeably even among people of aligned countries."22 Brajesh C. Mishra, India's permanent representative in the UNO, expressed India’s stand on Afghanistan issue in these words:

India was deeply concerned and vitally interested in the peace, security, independence and non-alignment of this traditionally friendly neighbour. India cannot look with equanimity on the attempts by some outside powers to interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and encouraging subversive elements to create disturbances inside Afghanistan. We hope that the people of Afghanistan will be able to resolve their internal problems themselves without any interference from outside. India hopes that Soviet Union will not remain a day longer than necessary."23

The non-aligned countries viewed NAM as a movement to support anti-colonialism, racism and to secure economic and social development, and for better cooperation among nations throughout the world. Whenever any conflict arose, it was assessed on its merits, as for example during the Afghan crisis. India being a firm follower of the movement opposed any type of intervention in the foreign soil by any power and so it condemned Soviet aggressive design. The Indian government asked for withdrawal of Soviet troops with an immediate effect, but it could not rule out military aid to
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the Mujahideens by the US satellites. India upheld her principled stand when she condemned US military interference and insisted for an end of US action before the withdrawal of Soviet forces.

In the same period, India's relations with the US had been marked by more divergences than convergences. It has been seen that the US was not Courteous to all that India had been doing in the diplomatic field. "The two specific events - the Korean war and the Japanese treaty - that took place in the early fifties were a bad start in our relations with America."24 There were many reasons for US antipathy towards India. "America's support to any country was conditioned to its policies of global domination which India had been unable to give because by and large the US policy had been to support the status quo in a rapidly changing world and so the US had generally tended to support decrepit dictatorships rather than incipient democracies."25 But it would be improper to say that United States and India were at loggerhead without any sign of improvement of their bilateral relations. The United States had always attached great importance for developing cordial relations with


India. President Reagan observed the invaluable contribution India contributed for maintaining international peace and disarmament. The American policy makers acknowledged the leading role India played in world affairs as the leader of non-aligned movement.

The Iran-Iraq War had been escalated and it was not conducive for world peace. In this situation, the Non-aligned Foreign Ministers Conference opened in New Delhi in 1981. But the meeting was overshadowed with bitter dissensions and bickerings revealing contradictory and hostile stands on many problems. In this situation the critics remarked that the non-aligned movement was under virtual collapse. However, the BJP remarked, "such divisive trends did not imply any danger to the break up of the movement in near future because both the superpowers were interested in its continuance."26 Reacting to the suspicion of the critics on the role of the NAM, Indira Gandhi, the then Prime Minister of India, expressed stated India's approach in these lines:

"We express our profound regret at the Iran-Iraq conflict and the grievous loss of life and destruction of property which it has caused to the two nations and their peoples.... The non-aligned movement should exert every effort to bring about a speedy and peaceful termination of this tragic conflict.... I shall continue consultations and take all possible and appropriate measures towards this objective."27


Human civilisation confronts a big challenge of annihilation in a nuclear disaster. Hiroshima disaster is not forgotten and the mankind faces danger with the production of nuclear arsenals. It is estimated that there are more than 60,000 nuclear weapons all over world which can destroy the world hundred times. To add fuel to flame, non-nuclear countries are importing destructive nuclear weapons and this way inviting nuclear war to their doorsteps. Thus, it is the time to think of disarmament. The Indian government also supported disarmaments efforts. But the BJP had some differences with the Congress government's foreign policy. A.B. Vajpaee in the Lok Sabha remarked that "the Indian government should formulate such policy which would keep India aloof from superpowers game, to halt arms race and nuclear weapons programme. This would enable to preserve world peace. The party added, we should condemn the racist regime, should give support to the Namibian people who were struggling for their natural rights."28 In the view of the BJP, "non-alignment is not equi-distance, not neutrality and certainly not leverage to be used for politicking between superpowers. The BJP unequivocally rejected all theories which confer any exclusivity of superpowers interests in the comity of nations. The BJP wished to

reiterate that in its perceptions, the basic postulates of India's foreign policy, providing the needed anchor of continuity, along with the ability to cope with change, lie in the three precepts of a) genuine non-alignment, b) peace and cooperation with neighbours, c) beneficial bilateralism.\textsuperscript{29}

The arms race, production of nuclear weapons and their deployment, spending money for military purposes enforced the leader of the NAM to accelerate the process of nuclear disarmament. Many questions arose before them, would we able to save the mankind from annihilation? Would the world be drifted away from nuclear arms race? To complete this herculean task the NAM had always strived for peace and disarmament. It is really wondering then why the small countries were so keen to stockpile arms, frittering away their scarce resources and why the developed nations wanted to spread their nuclear tentacles. Therefore the Heads of state of non-aligned countries "appealed to the great powers to halt the arms race which was consuming at an ever increasing rate, the scarce natural resources of our planet, destroying the ecological balance and wasting much of our scientific talent in sterile and destructive pursuits. This should be used to revitalise and restructure the world
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economy. The resources released by measures of disarmament should be diverted to promote the development of developing countries."30 "Just as growing confrontation and armament race was dangerous to world peace, so also the gap between the rich and the poor. So the NAM had a double role to perform first, to focus on the more basic problems, and second, not get involved in bilateral issues or anything like that. And the basic problems were of peace and war and the economic development of third world countries. So to have greater cooperation among the developing countries was the major task of the time."31 It may be correct to say that by possessing nuclear weapons Third World countries would be in a position in influencing international relations. But it can be said at the same time that not only the nuclear weapons provides opportunity to play a dominant role but through arbitration and mediation too they can influence.

So India took initiative for world disarmament. She had always advocated against flow of arms and defence spending in the sensitive parts of the world. India had stood for peaceful relations with all countries including the


Super Powers. On this basis Indo-Soviet relations were based on. The visit of Soviet defence minister Dimitri Ustinov to New Delhi in 1982 and the return visit of Indira Gandhi to Moscow in 1983, their meetings and talks testified strong bond of relationship between India and the USSR. Mrs Gandhi passed her message to the world that friendship between the two nations were not based either on ideology or on sentiment. She cited that the bilateral relations between India and the USSR was based entirely on the compatibility of the national interests. President Brezhnev of the Soviet Union in his talk with Mrs Gandhi said, "The USSR would like to see greater unity among the non-aligned nations. The USSR would continue to make every effort to strengthen India and the movement."32

Initially the non-aligned movement did not get sufficient support from other countries but gradually its policies and programmes attracted many Afro-Asian countries and drew sympathy from the Super Powers. "At one time India was virtually alone and many critics decried India's isolation. Gradually, the movement encouraged scores of other countries to join hands. Mrs Gandhi, too, pushed the movement forward and gradually hundreds of members joined in the

movement."33 By attaining such a wide recognition and popularity the first and foremost task ahead was to attain self-reliance in economy, science, agriculture; to find problems and solving them according to their own genius by dissociating themselves from bloc approach. The non-aligned countries were worried to their problems pertaining to their economic conditions. Without imitating for their economics they were thinking of spending money for lifting the poor and ameliorating the deplorable conditions of the depressed class. Even if they denounced political alignment, the invisible economic alignment spread its tentacles. The strings attached to economic package they received from capitalist countries made the matter worse. "The experience of India shows that the design of the neo-colonialists can succeed only if they penetrate the political process.... The basic interests of world capitalist countries in the newly liberated countries are economic but they are pushed through politics in which the local groups play an active role. The non-aligned countries cannot meet the challenge of neo-colonialism without insulating their politics external interventions. Unless the governments of non-aligned countries attach great importance to social justice,

imperialists cannot be kept at bay."34

The problems being complex and difficult, the call of the hour was to strive for individual as well as collective self-reliance, to have a fair and equitable terms for transfer of technical know-how or resources from the Western industrialised countries. Therefore, India endeavoured to consolidate on her national identity. "Alignments might bring more aid but it does not strengthen the self-reliant foundations of freedom. It inhibits people from making their own economic conditions. Hence, non-alignment helped us to become more technologically self-reliant."35 Thus, NAM persists for a new economic order and as a challenge to Western capitalist countries sticked to this demand. It was also realised that unless there is a sense of mutual cooperation, efforts to pool their resources, skills and talents together, unless they explore their complimentaries in their economies, sordid stage of the developing world would further deteriorate. They will have to battle all attempts


of imperialists to divide the non-aligned world. If a problem crops up, it needs to be solved bilaterally instead of looking to other powers. Instead of pre-judging any problem and without showing any room to the access of imperialists, attempts should be made for independence of judgements deciding all issues on their own merit. So long the outside powers stick to their lines and become reluctant to think for newly born states, policy of non-alignment will remain as a foreign policy option to get the demands implemented, to see a world free from hunger and poverty.

The economic problem occupied a major item on the agenda of the Seventh Non-Aligned Conference in 1983. The worldwide economic recession and mainly Soviet Union's economic crisis brought attention of the non-aligned countries. There was a strong feeling that unless there is an economic regeneration and unless a NIEO is established the economic prospects and progress of developing countries seemed bleak. The most significant contribution of the Seventh Non-Aligned Summit was that it opted two phased global negotiation strategies. Those included North-South dialogue on economic aid, trade, food and energy. It called on changes in the existing system on monetary help from World Bank and IMF, so that the hardship the non-aligned and developing countries were facing would be reduced. Besides these, the summit had wide range discussion on South-South cooperation. A substantial economic cooperation among the member states taking into account their potential-
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and credibility in the movement has been rehabilitated."36 The Soviet Union expressed satisfaction on the non-aligned movement. Presisely Speaking, "the decisions of the Summit were aimed at consolidating detente and spreading it to all the regions of the world and restructuring international economic relations on a just and democratic foundations."37 "The Chinese government also deeply appreciated and supported independent, sovereign and non-bloc principles followed by this movement."38 The American reaction was that, "on balance, many of the radical imprints that had characterized previous Summits was excised."39 India, the pioneer of the movement, leaving aside the criticism of the conservative sections, was successful in bridging the misunderstanding of the member and non-member states of the NAM with full-hearted cooperation of many like-minded parties. Her dynamic and peaceful approach to the conflicts, that cast a shadow in the eighties, boosted the working of the movement. Initiatives were taken at different phases of the movement and continuous endeavour of the Socialist countries, took the non-aligned approach to such a height that now about two-third countries all over the world express
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their strong faith in this movement. In subsequent years, leaders of the NAM extended their support to strengthen the movement. But the BJP was not satisfied with the achievements of the NAM. The BJP's criticism was that "though India is committed to the non-aligned movement or its concept, we are committed to the concept of the movement as it was originally conceived of by the founding fathers of the movement, yet the movement has got totally derailed from its track and has gone into wrong direction and has acquired principles and purposes which would shock the founding fathers. If the movement has failed in its purpose because the movement is not able to clean its own Augean stables, it cannot clean that filth from its own stables, it will be in no position to make any serious moral impact on others. We have not able too bring the movement in harmony with this accepted new notion of International Law."40 The Bharatiya Janata Party did not approve the policy of non-alignment of the Congress government. The party alleged hat "it has been dominated and overtaken by the forces of religious fanaticism. We are in a bad company, in the company of people who do not share the internal values of our democratic politics and our effort should be to stay in that company knowing the dangers of it. The Soviets and their supporters

support this movement because it happens to further their purposes and because it is dominated by them. Soon the movement goes contrary to their purposes, they will go against it".41

Relations with the Super Powers has been a major concern of India's foreign policy since independence. Being a champion of the policy of non-alignment India has always been seeking to maintain equidistance from the Super Powers. No doubt the 1971 treaty of peace and friendship brought criticisms to India's foreign policy that it had aligned with Soviet Union. But the Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi had always opted independent course of action in international relations. In the words of Indira Gandhi, "Non-alignment is neither neutrality nor indifference. It involves active and free exercise of judgement on certain principles. Peace is not passive... Today, let us concern ourselves with future, mobilising all our resources, material and moral, in our cooperative quest for such a peace."42 So India started deepening bilateral relations with the Soviet Union not because it is anti-American but Soviet Union had shown ample eagerness to give India an important role in her global strategy. "It is unambiguously clear


that India's relations with the Soviet Union in political, economic and security fields are based on mutuality of interests. In a sense closeness of relationship is inherent in their geopolitical and geostrategic locii. Gorbachev was forthright in recognising India's political and military status in South Asia specifically, and also in the larger sphere keeping in view its eminent position in the non-aligned movement. The Soviets have fully understood the parameters of Indian diplomacy. They have been assiduous in consolidating the Indo-Soviet friendship but have never tried to entice India into a closer embrace. The Indo-Soviet relations had been extended on political, economic and security aspects. But the security requirements had been dominated over all other fields due to America's military and economic aid to Pakistan. Both the countries had their own perceptions to extend friendship. It revealed that their interests being the same in the region, Soviet Union had accepted India as a major partner in South Asia. India wanted to check Pakistan's dominance in South Asia and on the other hand the Soviet Union could not allow US to expand her influence and the US-Pakistan axis was one among many reasons why India and the Soviet Union came closer to


each other. Inspite of being a member of the non-aligned movement Pakistan allowed its territory to be used for the interests of US. The Bharatiya Janata Party alarmed the Indian government to be vigilant infront of US-Pakistan military alliance. The party remarked that "the possibility of such a military alliance was pregnant with serious potents for the South-Asian region, which would bring a series of geo-strategic changes and would push the region closer to a superpowers confrontation."45 The BJP viewed that "the NAM could be a serious movement only if the military and dictatorial regimes were kept firmly out of it."46

The policy of non-alignment upholds the equality of men and equality of nations. So when the people of South Africa were fighting for their rights and liberties, the non-aligned countries played a crucial role and extended their support to the people of South Africa. Similarly, the non-aligned movement expressed its support to the people of Namibia and Palestine to restore their rights and liberties. The non-aligned countries led by India committed to their cherished principles, aspired the people struggling against imperialistic forces, and mobilised world public opinion to give their support for reasserting inalienable rights of

those countries. They thought that unless the imperialist forces were withdrawn and exterminated, the struggle is incomplete. The germinated principles of the NAM inspired the countries of Asia and Africa to work together, bestowed and to look after one another. Anti-imperialism being the bedrock of the policy of non-alignment, Third World countries consistently pursued and worked for it, which testified their independent and dynamic action. India's Chairmanship witnessed many hurdles on its way. The Namibians were fighting to inherit their natural rights. The non-aligned countries under the chairmanship of India put continuous pressure on the South African government. Several meetings were organised to draw the attention of other countries who were not parties to the movement. Apartheid was severely condemned and the non-aligned movement at that moment evolved the way for Namibians to enjoy justice and human rights. An UN resolution was passed condemning the South African racist regime. Extraordinary ministerial meeting was organised to put the resolution into effect. The NAM supporting the rights of the people of Namibia to self-determination was determined for liberation by all available means, and worked for an end of apartheid. "The AICC(I) strongly deplored the persistence of racist regimes and extended its whole hearted support to the brave struggles of the people of South Africa and Namibia. The AICC(I) wished to pledge the services and support of the Congress
Organisation in India's endeavour in the International sphere. Reiterating the faith in the principles of non-alignment, the AICC(I) expressed the confidence that the movement would continue to grow, both in number and in effectiveness and serve as a beacon of hope in the encircling gloom the world over. "Articulating the protest of the erstwhile colonial countries against economic inequality, socio-political injustice, and discriminatory treatment based on colour, race and creed meted out by major industrial and ex-colonial powers, it represents a protest movement against multiple patterns of domination and hegemony, dependence, 'Satelitism', and neo-colonialism. In its main focus, non-alignment is a movement of solidarity of the newly liberated countries aspiring to a position of independence and equality in a highly interdependent world."48

Apart from these problems, the NAM had another task before it. The growing militarisation of the Indian Ocean was a challenge before the non-aligned movement. So, the non-aligned countries took initiatives in the developments of the Indian Ocean. The escalation of military disturbed in the Indian Ocean region thwarted the congenial atmosphere
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of the adjacent countries. Several meetings were organized to declare Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. The imperialists exercised their influence not only in Indian Ocean but other parts of world were also equally suppressed. Central America was facing a serious political, social and economic crises and Nicaragua was being suppressed by the United States where the people suffered from poverty, inequality and misery. The urgent task before the NAM was to find out a non-violent way of solution to the grave disorder. The NAM during India’s chairmanship held several meetings which formulated different policies to resist imperialists’ pressures and at the same time the US was pressurised to withdraw from her imperialistic design. Iran-Iraq war, Palestine problem were other problems which required speedy and peaceful solution and the non-aligned movement provided necessary skills and a way out to these problems. The NAM supported the Palestinians with the help of Arab frontline states to ease the tension. Israel was motivated to desist from its hostile actions. Thus the steps taken by the non-aligned countries were constructive and non-confrontational. In a nutshell, the movement during India’s chairmanship and mostly under Mrs. Gandhi’s auspices had strived hard to solve the problem of the Afro-Asian countries. But the BJP viewed the achievements of NAM with a different angle. The main criticism of the BJP was that India could not able to persuade the big powers to stop their arms aid.
and that was main drawback of the Indira Gandhi government. Taking part in the discussion in Rajya Sabha, Jaswant Singh, the BJP member of Parliament, "urged the government to move away from global aspirations to our Asian realities." Further, the party added, "the Indian government was not able to make any purposeful move for the cessation of Iran-Iraq war and for resolving the mutual conflict between Palestinians. The aims and objectives of our foreign policy, the BJP emphasised, should not be to promote the image of an individual but to preserve and protect the interest of the nation. The party did not deny the usefulness and relevance of the non-alignment policy, but they differed in the manner of its implementation."

In a nuclear age when the nuclear powers are competing among themselves, non-alignment works as a balance of power getting support of two-third nations of the world. At the same time it provides necessary pliability to negotiate with the nuclear powers and contributes a lot to desist themselves from any sort of nuclear catastrophe. It is a positive direction to step up detente and reduce tensions. This is thus imperative that the non-aligned movement should be


strengthened to forge greater unity, to eliminate wars and
destructions, to drop off the mistrust of East-West divide.
If there is a nuclear war anywhere in the world it would
destroy the whole mankind. The only way to come over this
major crisis of the world is to stick to the strict prin­
ciples of non-alignment or else the globe would be divided
into camps and their followers where the prevalence of peace
would be outspoken. In this context as Mr. Arnold Rutel
rightly remarked that "the 1971 peace and friendship treaty
between India and the Soviet Union was a treaty of coopera­
tion for peace in Asia and the world and the progress of the
two countries. It was not a treaty to preserve peace in the
continent alone, but all over the world. He said that both
the countries would work for peace in times of peace and
war."51 And the Indo-Soviet treaty should not be viewed as
a breach of the policy of non-alignment. It still provides
an opportunity to both India and the Soviet Union to contin­
ue their struggle for peace and security. On the occasion of
the 37th year of independence of India, the Soviet Union
noted that it was because of the policy of non-alignment
that India had been able to achieve success in economic and
cultural field and could preserve country's unity and integ­
rity. The USSR hailed India's stand on many occasions, as
for example in halting arms race and preserving

51. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), 23rd August 1984.
peace by eliminating nuclear race. The Soviet Russia willingly extended her cooperation and supported the policy of non-alignment. Significantly, Soviet recognition of India's role in the NAM came from the highest level like Gorbachev's Vladivostok speech when he said, "the recognised leader of this movement is great India, with it moral authority and traditional wisdom, with its unique political experience and huge economic possibilities." The Bharatiya Janata Party advocated also to follow an "independent foreign policy committed to world peace, disarmament and a new international economic order. The party believed in the task of freeing the world from economic exploitation, external influences, domination and colonialism in all its new forms. For this a continued strengthening of the non-aligned movement was the policy plank of the BJP which would work towards re-impacting dynamism to the non-aligned movement." The party also reiterated that "fresh endeavours should be taken for withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan, a political solution of the Afghan problem, free from outside intervention should be made so that Afghanistan and its identity as an independent, non-aligned nation could be re-established."  

54. Ibid., p. 21.
In 1984, India and five other countries made an appeal to the nuclear powers to halt nuclear race and particularly its deployment in Third World countries to avoid the possibility of nuclear war. They attempted to lodge a world wide campaign through the auspices of the UN and countries who were non-aligned also welcome to join in the struggle. The Delhi Declaration and the Mexico Declaration were other important steps in favour of nuclear disarmament. The initiative of the six nations were widely acclaimed by the Socialist countries like the Soviet Union and China. Apart from this, the movement was highly concerned about global economic situation. Mrs. Gandhi appointed a group of experts from five countries to make necessary recommendations on the improvement of economic situation. The group worked for and produced a report for a more stable and equitable global economy. What disturbed the movement throughout the years about the worsening economic conditions of the African countries. Subsequently, the group battled to do something concrete for bettering off the economy of the African nations. Several meetings held and monetary packages extended to the African countries for quick economic recovery and to emerge out of the unprecedented drought. The developed countries also urged to raise the level of their aid.

Like the Indo-Soviet ties, the Indo-American relations developed without any harm to non-alignment. A critical
analysis of Indo-American relations reveals that despite India's inclination towards West for financial aid and training for its scientists and technicians, yet the Indian attitude signifies that Indian classes were pursuing a policy of anti-imperialism. "There is no doubt that on a range of issues, the Indian government had found itself in contradiction with world monopoly capitalism. Thus, India's foreign policy of non-alignment had some ant-imperialist features which revealed the confrontational character of the Indian bourgeoisie."55

On almost all issues alliance between Soviet Union and developing countries had been opposed by the Western capitalist countries. Inspite of that the non-aligned countries worked together inside and outside the UN. They drew moral support from the Socialist countries. The assistance from the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries could help the non-aligned countries to build their infrastructure and self-reliant economy. Moreover, the Socialist countries extended their full support to the non-aligned movement, as a result of which the movement had been able to prove itself a movement standing for the causes of the developing world. In an interview with the PTI, Gorbachev firmly stated that

"Soviet Union greatly appreciated India’s contribution to the collective effort to preserve peace and remove the nuclear threat. India was doing much for the developing countries against imperialist oppression, for strengthening non-aligned movement."56 "They had done much for the rise and development of the non-aligned movement as an important positive factor in the present-day world."57 "To a significant extent, India’s non-alignment gave greater bargaining leverage to this countries than its alignments to either superpower."58

Despite India’s denial of any fundamental shift in its non-aligned foreign policy approach, some observers viewed India as a betrayer of the policy of non-alignment, particularly when India under Rajiv Gandhi had accepted the conditions suggested by the West as a prelude to transfer of hi-tech, which Indira Gandhi had rejected with contempt. The Bharatiya Janata Party viewed this alliance and the on-site inspection by the US against India’s interests as it would mean breach of India’s sovereignty. The party condemned the Congress government’s preference to the US "when

57. Ibid., p. 134 (Gorbachev’s Speech at a dinner in honour of Rajiv Gandhi).
when other countries were willing to meet our requirements
at less severe terms than those of Washington.\textsuperscript{59} The
Bharatiya Janata Party recalled the rule of the Janata
government when India's warm relations with the USSR con-
tinued and also good rapport was built up with the US. The
resolution of the BJP observed that "during Rajiv Gandhi's
days India's friendship with the USSR was viewed with suspi-
cion by the Western bloc, the policy of non-alignment was
distrusted particularly with the Libyan incident.\textsuperscript{60}

But it was the even pitched Indo-American relations
that never undermined the non-aligned policy of India. It
is seen that there are several criticisms about the role of
the non-aligned movement, its performances on different
occasions. But we can well note that after 25 years of its
existence, "the movement had shown its capacity to act in a
meaningful and principled way and contributed significantly
to lowering of tensions globally. We have not been neutral
or fence-sitters when our principles have been challenged or
violated."\textsuperscript{61} "The non-aligned movement's increasing

\textsuperscript{59} Agrawal, A.K., "Rajiv's U-turn towards USA", \textit{Organiser},

\textsuperscript{60} \textit{Presidential Address} by L.K.Advani, \textit{Plenary Session},
Ekatmata Nagar (Indraprastha Stadium), New Delhi, 9
May 1986, p.18.

\textsuperscript{61} \textit{Foreign Affairs Record}, vol. XXXII (3), March 1986,
pp.81-82. (Speech of Shri B.R.Bhagat on India's Foreign
ities, skills and available resources would be first and foremost task of the concerned countries, the summit emphasised. The gains so far they had attained would be consolidated further if there is unity of purposes and close cooperation. So the task before them was to strengthen NAM, to restore its credibility and to do it the summit urged to work with unified mind and spirit. Most of the member states were over burdened with foreign debt. Having limited resources and potentialities they were afraid of huge debt burden. Therefore they gave primacy to the financial and monetary issues. So they unanimously recommended for an international debt restructuring facility to avoid the emergence of a serious debt crisis. And, it was believed, all these can be attained if there is universalisation of decision making process of the international financial institutions.

After the Seventh Summit it is clearly evident that the contribution of non-aligned movement has been widely recognised. It is because "by skillful management of conflicts within the movement, a sense of unity has been restored; by choosing the right kind of priorities, giving more importance to economic matters, and atmosphere of greater faith recognition was taking place in the world. At one time it was called immoral. Subsequently it was accepted by all na-
tions. The principles and practices of non-alignment were seen as the only path for assured peace, stability and prosperity in the world."62 Gorbachev spoke high of the role of the non-aligned movement. He remarked "Great India, with its moral authority and traditional wisdom, with its specific political experience and huge economic potentialities, is the recognised leader of this movement. It has played a remarkable role in looking for ways to diminish the nuclear threat, in rejecting and condemning exploitation as well as the policy of aggression and neocolonialism."63 The Indian Prime Minister also equally appraised of the Soviet assistance to the non-aligned movement. Moreover, he reiterated that "with the support of the non-aligned countries India had been in the forefront of the non-aligned movement for abolition of the nuclear arsenals."64


63. Pravda (Moscow), 29 July 1986.

64. Dialogue Between Trusted Friends, a Publication of the Information Department of the USSR Embassy in India, New Delhi, 1986, p.8.
The Harare Summit once again drew attention of the Super Powers regarding disarmament issue. The non-aligned countries tried to create awareness among the people through seminars, meetings and media. Delegates were sent to foreign countries to halt the arms race. But the Super Powers were not much influenced by the appeal of the non-aligned countries. Though desired result could not achieve, the summit worked with remarkable unity and speed for an early halt of testing, using and deploying of nuclear arms. A commission was set up to coordinate the works of the NAM. This way the NAM demonstrated that it was not only a moral force but also on many occasions proposed concrete plan of action. "Non-Alignment was no longer looked upon as a means of protecting one's own interests and a way to overcome bloc divisions but rather as a policy which advocated democratisation of international in general. It had become a dynamic factor which was mobilising increasingly broad forces and inspiring them to action and struggle for independence and equality against every form of domination and interference in the internal affairs of other countries, a struggle for the settlement of acute international problems, for the promotion of international cooperation and for peace and progress in the world."65 The achievement of the NAM can be best seen in the statement of Rajiv Gandhi. He

stated, "We have moderated areas of conflict and forestalled a scramble for allies. Without the non-alignment, disaster might well have overcome the world." Whatever wrong doors that may be laid on its way, whatever the criticisms may be, it cannot be denied that the task before the NAM was uphill. "The outside powers always tried to influence the non-alignment summits and to twist the deliberations in their favour." The great powers were not quite responsive to the non-aligned approach. In order to achieve their goal the members of the NAM will have to acquire a better understanding on each other's problems and work in one mind and spirit. They will have to demonstrate that in an explosive international market where the world has been dominated by the great powers, it is the non-alignment which can supply independence to them, in their judgement and action, and above all can forge strong domestic ties. It has been rightly pointed out that it will be wrong "to deny that the Eighth Summit of the non-aligned movement at Harare had proved purposive and successful within the parameters that define the 25 years old initiative."
One among many problems which concerned the non-aligned countries was the naked act of aggression and illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist regime of South Africa. The frontline states who supported the NAM were afraid of the consequences. They were facing acute problems not only on economic aspect but also political and social. Robert Mugabe, the Prime Minister of Zimbabwe proposed for a Security Force to guard the frontline states. But India was not in favour of creating a military force, not in favour of sending military help to tackle the aggressive designs of South Africa. Rather it offered agricultural cooperation if the frontline states meet drought conditions. Thus, the only way to supplant South Africa’s firm position was mandatory sanctions. Apart from immediate sanctions the important task before the summit was to make the frontline states self-reliant, so that it would reduce their dependence on South Africa. So the members of the NAM agreed to create African Fund to assist them and India was chosen as chairperson of the fund. Moreover, the apartheid policy being pursued by the South African government resulted the confrontation between the people and the government. The people fought for their inherent natural rights and the government went on suppressing the blacks. The country was on the verge of a civil war. The African Congress leader Joe Modise was determined "to avoid the struggle from
becoming black-versus-white." The non-aligned movement appealed to the government as well as the people to sort out their differences and to find out a solution to the problem. The leaders of the NAM raised the issue in the International forums and urged all countries to pay serious thought on the issue.

The Non-alignment as a movement built up by Nehru and followed up by Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi stood for anti-colonialism, anti-racism and peaceful cooperation. The role India played in Harare summit consolidated the movement and gave it a positive direction. In the eighties India's policy of non-alignment sought to update the long chosen policy of Nehru. Rajiv Gandhi always worked on the settled principles, judging every question on its merit and did not show any tilt towards any Super Power. No doubt, India and the Soviet Union shared similar views but it would be utter foolishness to categorise India pro-Soviet. They shared similar views when both of them felt that they were striving for peace, disarmament and international cooperation. They worked jointly when they realised that their cooperation would be to the mankind's needs. Significantly, Rajiv Gandhi emerged with a tall figure, adequately persuasive, a

69. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), 4 September 1986.
matured and sober statesman -- combined with firmness and flexibility after the Harare Summit. On major international issues he preferred joint actions and appealed to the statesmen to work on the principles of the NAM. This democratic diplomacy brought India popularity and the NAM as a more credible world movement. However, the BJP was not satisfied with the performance of the NAM. The BJP alleged that "the non-aligned approach and judging of issues independently on merit is the right policy for India. In its view, the effective application of this policy the government had failed, because the government could not ensure a coordinated execution of policy as it lacked clarity of perceptions. As a result, the party added, India had lost its credibility."70 "India's policy of non-alignment could not be able to make a headway in the improvement of our relations with the superpowers because the government did not have a clear-cut policy."71 The Bharatiya Janata Party condemned the way Congress government was functioning in formulating India's foreign policy. The party asserted that, "the foreign policy of Rajiv Gandhi's government had critically affected the totality of our foreign policy formulation, its conduct and all our external relations. The country's foreign

70. Two Years of Congress Misrule, A Charge Sheet, as adopted by the BJP National Executive at Jammu on October 19, 1986, p.9.
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policy was totally adrift: Issues of vital national importance were being so amateurishly handled as to critically affect the nation's immediate and long term interests."\textsuperscript{72} It was surprising that the US had persistently refused to appreciate Indian standpoint on different issues, as for example, non-alignment. "Whether we like it or not, Pakistan was America's ally in the South-Asian part of the world, while most Americans considered India as a Soviet ally."\textsuperscript{73} So the policy of non-alignment was criticised because the Western countries had never shown their support. The BJP, therefore, urged the government to revamp the policy so that India could play an influential role in the world. Being attacked from several quarters that India's policy of non-alignment was under trial and India was considered as a Soviet ally, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi remarked:

"Non-aligned does not mean aligned in any way. It is an euphemism for convenience. It is really seeing the world in a more democratic way in a sense where you have the right to speak your mind without being constrained by bloc-boundaries or bloc positions on issues. Non-alignment is becoming more and more accepted in the world."\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{72} National Executive Meeting of the BJP, Jodhpur, October 9 to 11, 1987, p.6.

\textsuperscript{73} Organiser, December 20, 1987, p.2.

\textsuperscript{74} Statement of Foreign Policy, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi (New Delhi: Publication Division, Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, May 1988), p.30.
Even if there were criticisms, it is beyond doubt that the non-aligned movement provided directions to Third World countries. The movement ensured India to find a place in the international forums. It gave India option to retain her independent judgements in foreign affairs. India’s plea for peace was not because it was militarily weak or incapable of countering threats from the imperialist forces, but because it was only one choice before the mankind to prevent calamity of extinction. As Rajiv Gandhi stated, "Non-alignment stands above all for human dignity and human rights. The exertions of the NAM have brought freedom to many of those countries who are today members of the movement. That is why we have been in the forefront of the struggle against colonialism and racism. But the struggle is by no means over. Areas of primary concern to the non-aligned movement are apartheid in South Africa, colonialism in Namibia and the destabilisation of the frontline states by the depredations of Pretoria. Our strength and our future lie in the unity, solidarity and cohesion of the non-aligned movement."75 The Soviet Union in its fight for peace and disarmament extended full support to the non-aligned movement. The nuclear race which created conflicts and tensions was the major concern for both India and the Soviet Union.

75. Statement of Foreign Policy, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi (New Delhi: Publication Division, Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, November 1986), pp.73-75.
"Co-ordinating its efforts with the national liberation forces, the USSR had always been determined and uncompromising in supporting the non-aligned movement at all stages of its struggle against imperialism and colonialism and it had been consistent in rendering effective help to the people who were courageously defending and consolidating their newly won freedom. In effect, this was the joint position of socialism and non-alignment."

Combodia was under the influence of China. The Heng Samarin government captured the capital and adjoining territories and the Pol Pot regime was overthrown. The Chinese government opposed Vietnamese action and insisted on withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia. The USSR and the US were also involved in this issue and supported Vietnam and China respectively. India's position was quite different in this regard. It was of the view that the two claimants, Sihanouk and Pol Pot, should not be allowed to have a seat in Kampuchea till the tangled issue is solved. Malaysia, on the other hand, favoured Heng Samarin government. Other members like Laos and Vietman strongly opposed the Malaysian stand. "The AICC(I) commended India's active participation in her efforts for a peaceful solution of the

Kampuchean problem and urged the government to preserve in promoting the peace process."\textsuperscript{77} In 1989 bilateral relations between China and the USSR improved and the Soviet Union pressurised Vietnam to withdraw its troops. Subsequently the UN intervened and the Cambodian problem was solved.

The non-aligned movement strongly condemned the US policies and actions towards Third World countries. But there was no unanimity of opinions among the members and there was always an atmosphere of suspicion and allegations towards each other. In the Harare Summit Burma walked out of the movement alleging India Pro-Soviet. The notability, and unassociated character of of the movement was disturbed with such mutual bickerings and suspicions and so the movement was going to lose its credibility. The movement was appeared to be lacking ample integrity. India, on the other hand, working for peace and amity through the lines of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru had chosen peaceful way to settle problems and kept faith on Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam, and never discriminated between weak and strong nations. India never lost her faith on the policy of non-alignment and continued her efforts for relaxation of tensions that had been erupted out of nuclear threats and military

\textsuperscript{77}. Resolution Passed in the AICC Meeting in New Delhi on 4th and 5th November 1988, p.29.
alliances. Even in the odd days India discouraged the developments of freezing the world into two ideological camps, communists and non-communists. With this division, there was danger for Europe and America and the poor nations fighting among themselves fell prey to the imperialist countries and joined in the game of nuclear race. The non-aligned countries had their own stake regarding non-use of nuclear weapons and so they worked for peace and cooperation. The major thrust of the non-aligned countries was to create world public opinion in favour of the disarmament issues, collective security and strategic stability. Speaking on the collective security and disarmament efforts of the non-aligned movement, Rajiv Gandhi said, "Nonalignment is the assertion of the possibility of all the diverse systems of the world living together in peace and harmony. We believe the mutual interaction of systems promotes the evolution of societies by each emulating what it finds of value in the other. The cross fertilisation of ideas and experience is an essential attribute of peaceful coexistence." There are also UN resolutions regarding non-use of nuclear weapons. But the nuclear race still continued. The non-aligned countries sought increasing involvement of the United Nations to declare the use of

nuclear weapons illegal and immoral. In case of any violation, proper actions should be taken. But the approach of the non-aligned countries was not equally responded by nuclear powers. Instead of disarmament they preferred arms control. The main reason why the non-aligned countries could not succeed to their satisfaction was that there were a range of issues on which there were no complete unanimity. They differed in their attitude and perceptions and often unable to take firm action to solve a problem. While they relied on the United Nations and kept faith on its resolutions, at the UN meetings they differed. It was realised that in a scenario of the possibility of a nuclear war there should be no difference and to save the lives of millions of innocents the disarmament efforts must be given top priority. So the need of the hour was to demonstrate the superiority of the NAM, contrary to common criticism by the detractors of the movement. Moreover, the non-aligned movement should have to readapt and readjust itself to various power configurations in the world. The most challenging problem it faced was the policy of Western capitalist countries towards militarisation. So the strength of the movement had been dependent on the United Nations. The United Nations proved as a useful forum for debating global concerns, provided ample opportunities to negotiate with one another, to mobilise world public opinion and to catalyze
the world powers so that the disarmament efforts could progress. "Hence the need and the current call for transforming the UN system on their part"79 was the most urgent task before the NAM.

In 1988, in the conference of the foreign ministers of non-aligned countries held in Nicosia they emphasised the need of nuclear disarmament. In their opinion, the Super-Powers should adopt and carry out a programme for the elimination of nuclear weapons. In this period the role of the NAM was also challenging. It was accepted that the non-aligned movement "should not only help consolidate new thinking, nor merely assist in reducing tensions between the two great nuclear powers, but also promote a climate of confidence and detente throughout the world and ensure the irreversible nature of the favourable process that had begun. Naturally, it is also impossible to avoid the question of building a new equitable and just economic order and expanding cooperation between the developing countries themselves to further their economic and social progress."80 The other major task of the NAM was freedom of
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the newly liberated countries. For the newly liberated countries of Asia and Africa "independence meant the freedom for each country to choose its own individual path of development and steer its own course in international affairs unimpeded by the distorting prisons of bloc rivalries". 81 "The basic tenet of non-alignment is peaceful co-existence between different social and economic systems," 82 and happily the Super Powers had shown their readiness to hold talks to bridge their gap as well as the differences between the East and the West.

The cold war between the USSR and the US started subsiding towards the end of the eighties. Both the Super Powers showed greater spirit of accommodation and strived for removing their bilateral differences on various issues. Despite occasional failures they continued to make renewed and persistent efforts to halt the armament race. The cold war which characterised the relations between the two Super-Powers and their allies for over four decades came to an end when heads of the two governments showed their willingness to end tension on nuclear armaments. With this a new


82. Ibid., p.47.
situation arose before the non-aligned countries. Since the cold war was almost over, A.B.Vajpayee spoke in the Parliament, "the first and foremost task of the Indian government should be to give new relevance to the policy of non-alignment. There are certain principles of the policy on which the government should work to solve the contemporary problems." 83

Turning to the relations with the Super Powers after the end of the Cold War, a sea change appeared to have occurred in the last years of the Rajiv Gandhi's reign. Personal friendship occupied more importance than the international cooperation. "There was a tendency to identify oneself with certain policies which were the products of the internal and external compulsions of one or the other side." 84 Thus, we had failed in keeping away from the Super Powers' game. At the pace at which Gorbachev was moving towards disarmament proposals, non-alignment was expected to give serious thought to world economic and industrial problems rather than regional and military alliances between nations. For a healthy economic and industrial developments North-South cooperation on these fields was the most urgent


task. "If these goals are to be achieved, the NAM will have to regenerate itself and discontinue its routine exercises of updating a draft document within a rigid framework."

The Ninth Summit of the non-aligned countries was held in Belgrade from 4th to 7th September 1989, were the representatives of 102 countries took part. In political sphere the summit called for solution of problems of Afghanistan, speedy democratisation of Latin America and restoration of natural rights of the Palestinians. It called for the concerned parties to convene an international peace conference to settle Arab-Israel conflict under the auspices of the United Nations. The summit also called on complete disarmament to safeguard outer space and to ban sea bed explosions. The summit called on the international community to widen the sanctions against South Africa. The economic problems also touched in the Ninth Summit of the NAM. The increasing debt burden was a major stumbling bloc for the progress of developing countries. Self reliance and economic independence which were primary tasks before the NAM can be achieved" "if the non-aligned countries structurally delink themselves from the capitalist world order. It, however, does not imply any total break of

the economic relationship between them. A total break is neither possible nor warranted in the present stage of world development." So, first and foremost task of the non-aligned countries should be to urge the developed countries to come for result-oriented North-South dialogue to overcome crippling economic burden of poor countries.

The Tenth Summit of the NAM held at Jakarta was attended by 108 nations adopted the Final Document and the 'Jakarta Message'. The call was given in Jakarta for an equitable economic order, nuclear-weapons free world and for peaceful settlements of international disputes. Emphasis was given for South-South as well as North-South cooperation. Reviewing the international scenario, it was assumed that the powerful and affluent non-aligned countries like India and Singapore, should come forward to utilise their resources, technical knowledge and skills for their mutual benefit. It all appeared that the Super Powers were convinced about the economic restructure of the world. The voice of the non-aligned movement was distinctly heard in the world and the Super Powers showed their support to the movement. The Soviet leader, Eduardo Shevardnadze in an interview to the English daily Patriot said that, "Soviet Union had extended its support to the aspirations of the

non-aligned movement not only to preserve but also to enhance its role in the world arena. He assured that the non-aligned countries would always have the Soviet Union as a partner who respects the status of non-alignment, its philosophy, its basic goals and principles.\textsuperscript{87} The Bharatiya Janata Party recommended that India should take initiative in solving international problems under the principles of the NAM so that the NAM continues "to play a role of achieving peace and amity in the world. The party mentioned that it would urge upon people of India not to indulge in any demonstration in favour or against any side in the war."\textsuperscript{88}

The critics allege that the foreign policy of India still lacks to be an integrated one. There are still departmental sub-divisions, disorder and inter-departmental disorientations. It has suffered from some errors and committed many mistakes. It is not functioning satisfactorily and there by blurred the image of the NAM. Whether or not the foreign policy succeeds, it is an undeniable fact that the policy of non-alignment remains to be a 'jehad' that provides a strut to carry foreign policy forward. It is also true that the non-aligned movement has not achieved


\textsuperscript{88} Sharma, Narendra, "Whither BJP?", \textit{Mainstream}, vol. XXIX, No. 7, 16 February 1991, pp.4-5.
any thing commendable. Even if arduous struggle it was not successful in solving international disputes.

Inspite of this, the movement is getting popular and its strength is increasing day by day. The simple reason is that the new states have no desire in the struggle for power or to influence the rest of the states. They condemned the imperialist ambitions and hegemonic policy of the Super Powers. There are also many geopolitical reasons which prompted newly born states of the world to pursue the policy of non-alignment. Furthermore, the world has ceased to be bipolar and many Asian and African countries look for their development after a long haul of imperial exploitation. It is also true that the great powers still exercise their influences in economic and political fields. So, they are not included in the membership of the NAM aiming that they would not be able to overpower the weak and poor countries. The NAM has looked for disciplined members who will work to remove the potential causes of recurring wars and conflicts and to create a new world order, where the international system will be managed by democratic norms and values free from great powers' hegemonistic ambitions. The NAM is strong-willed to knit the world into a close associated group of nations when all the states would exercise freedom of policy and action in international affairs.
The critics allege that the aspirations and capabilities of the great powers in exercising hegemony over the rest of the world demonstrates the irrelevance of the United Nations and the NAM. Though the Super Powers at present no longer hostile to the policy of non-alignment, though they have been sending good will to the states of the NAM, it is asserted that the movement has no relevance in the present day world, especially after the end of the cold war. However, in the view of new detente, the non-alignment is not outdated. The new detente has not changed the traditional game of power politics. The vast majority of the nations still witness great powers' financial colonialism. Recently, the United States had threatened WHO to withdraw her contribution and it was done only to prevent Palestine from being admitted to WHO and ultimately the United States succeeded. So whenever the policies of great powers get obstructed or nations go contrary to their wishes, they try to win them. So it would be improper to relate non-alignment with the cold war. We have seen the cold war blown off in the seventies but non-alignment persisted. Therefore, in the wake of periodical changes in the international scenario non-alignment showed its potential. Unless there is an altogether change in the world sovereign state-system or the primitive sovereign state-system, the non-aligned movement will continue in the interests of the people and governments. Thus the Non-aligned movement has a bright
future ahead promoting the causes of Third World countries. The only need of the hour is the non-aligned states should strike now to enforce their decisions rather than going for fresh decisions always and appealing great powers to abjure their dangerous course of actions.

To protect the globe encircle by military bases, the non-aligned countries should be non-aligned both in letter and spirit. Unless they are able to focus it to a particular angle of treatment to a particular power, unless the movement becomes energetic, forceful, resonant and real, we cannot tackle the impecrating countrie roaming and creating disturbances around us and there lies the future of the non-aligned movement.

Finally, the non-aligned countries "would undoubtedly benefit from careful matching of means to ends, instruments to purpose, and by concentrating more on correcting its own manifest disabilities and less on drafting rhetorical flourishes". 89 "The presents of the non-aligned movement has indeed been sturdy and concrete. Perhaps the most abiding of its achievements has been the successful propagation of an alternative vision of international relations based on

independence, national sovereignty and peaceful co-existence in the peace of the concept of power blocs and confrontation".90