CHAPTER III

NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT:
ITS EVOLUTION, PRINCIPLES AND GROWTH
The post-war era in the fifties witnessed the decline of the traditional model and the emergence of new model in international relations. The balance of power model tended to culminate in the bipolarity of the international system as a whole in the decades following the cold war. The war left the colonial powers completely shattered and shifted the centre of power from the European continent. The powers that stepped in, led to the bipolarization of international community. The bipolarity owes its origin to the Bolshevik Revolution (1917) and emergence of Communists in Russia. America emerged as the leading capitalist nation and established its supremacy through the explosion of the atomic bomb towards the end of Second World War. The victory of the Communists in China in 1949 established the need to contain communism by the capitalist nations of the world. Henceforth, there were efforts to stop the spread of communism, which resulted in the formation of various alliance-systems. What re-enforced bipolarity was formation of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) by US efforts and Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO) of the Soviet Union and East European nations.

This bloc formation resulted in the escalation of cold war and intensification of rivalries among nations and arms.
build-up. Subsequently, it led to the emergence of many more nuclear powers and a growing gap between the military might of nations in an effort to maintain supremacy over one another. The development of nuclear weapons and means of their delivery has turned, practically every part of our shrinking globe into a potential battle-field. Thus the war that started, and was being fought at an ideological level - capitalism versus communism - was now, being fought at all other levels too. Alliances were being formed and military parity being sought among nations. Power politics was playing its vicious role in international relations.

Nationalism was on an upsurge and the colonial empires were breaking down. This process was accelerated by the Second World War. The world economy was in shambles due to the two world wars fought over three decades. Even the developed and the rich nations needed time for reconstruction and consolidation. This loosened their hold over their colonies and gave way under the pressure from nationalistic forces. The newly created states had been exploited economically, politically, socially and culturally. Thus all of them faced similar problems of under-development, lack of resources and technology. The problem of differences of levels of development in the world was quite naturally paralleled by the unequal position reflecting economic differences. All international
institutions, their rules and practices, including legal interpretations, were worked out among the few developed countries before the anti-colonial revolution. The whole order reflected the state of the world in which a few states were the only real autonomous actors on the scene. What underlines the basic urge of many nations to follow the policy of non-alignment can be stated in Jawaharlal Nehru's words, "We are not copies of Europeans, Americans or Russians. It would not be creditable for our dignity and new freedom if we were camp-followers of America or any other country of Europe."

Most of the Afro-Asian countries, emerging lately from the clutches of colonialism were very conscious about their independence and thus wanted to maintain their autonomy by keeping away from bloc rivalry of the super-powers. They developed a strong urge to maintain their independence in foreign affairs and keep away from policies being pursued by the big powers for their own purposes. This was equally supported by an urge to play their role in world affairs by democratization of international community. Though there had been no prior consultation or agreement, these nations were inspired by common ideals, prompted by similar circumstances and spurred on by like experiences. Many of

its people embarked upon the final struggle for their self-determination and achievement of national independence. The non-aligned countries firmly opposed the acceptance of the fact accompli imposed by force, and demanded the cessation of aggression, intervention and interference.

Evolution of Non-Alignment

The birth of the concept of non-alignment has been traced to Jawaharlal Nehru’s broadcast, as Vice-Chairman of the Viceroy’s Executive Council, on 7 September 1946. Outlining India’s foreign policy he had stated:

We propose, as far as possible, to keep away from power politics of groups, aligned against one another, which had led in the past to world wars and which may again lead to disasters on vaster scale. We believe that peace and freedom are indivisible and the denial of freedom anywhere must endanger freedom elsewhere and lead to conflict and war. We are particularly interested in the emancipation of colonial and dependent countries and peoples, and in the recognition in theory and practice of equal opportunities for all races.

The Asian Relations conference was convened in Delhi in early 1947. The fundamental messages conveyed by the conferences were: peace, freedom and emancipation from foreign rule, mutual cooperation on a footing of equality, non-alignment from big powers and finally, support to the United Nations. Nehru pointed out that the future of Asia lay in freedom, peace and cooperation among its people within one world. Only when nations are free and people
enjoy freedom, security and scope for development, can there be peace, not only political but economic too. The next step in the direction was the Bandung Conference in 1955 of newly liberated Asian and African countries, China being one of its ardent supporter. Here the principle of peaceful co-existence, based on people's right to self-determination and free-development, was formulated. The next year, Tito of Yugoslavia, Nehru of India and Nasser of Egypt met at Brioni and initiated the concept of a new policy - the non-aligned policy which later became a movement. It was Nehru's prime concern with the right of self-determination and the capacity of states to retain their sovereignty; Tito's interest in peace and reduction of tensions between US and USSR and Nasser's challenge to foreign intervention and external influences, that brought them together to formulate a common policy.

The prime interest of non-alignment has been to help emerging nations to promote their interests even though they lacked the military and economic power to do so and to ensure a capacity to operate as independent sovereign states without external dictation over domestic or foreign policy. Initially, the prime importance of the doctrine was attached

to countries' refusal to join military-political alliances and to their striving actively to promote the cause of peace. In international relations, the concept of non-alignment manifested itself in three forms:

(a) as a foreign policy doctrine of most of the developing countries, having roots in their similar colonial, imperialistic and exploitative past;

(b) as a specific foreign policy orientation, more clearly evident in the non-aligned policy followed by India, Yugoslavia and Egypt in the early fifties and thereafter;

(c) as a political association of the developing countries - the non-aligned movement.

In spite of its negative connotations, non-alignment is a positive concept. Terminologically, non-alignment since its inception, has been misunderstood and has more often been used synonymously with 'neutrality'. Thus, at times, non-alignment has been misconceived as neutrality of Switzerland, Austria or Finland. Despite the fact that both neutrality and non-alignment are opposed to bloc politics, they are essentially different. 3

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

Non-alignment was partly an outgrowth of bipolarity that emerged in the post war era in the 1950s, but it should not be adjudged as the only cause. The sources of the movement lie in the consistent and committed struggle for peace, independence, and security for all. The international situation as such was in a transitionary state when, in the aftermath of the Second World War, the colonial empire of the European powers began crumbling. The new nations wanted to safeguard themselves from all kinds of hegemony and imperialism in future. They wanted to retain their sovereignty and maintain autonomy in domestic and international affairs. The global climate was faced with the superpower rivalry, intensified by the cold war politics. To stay free from all sort of domination and carve out a role for themselves, the newly independent states opted for the non-aligned policy. But it would be wrong to co-relate non-alignment as equidistance from both the power-blocs. Such an application would be unrealistic because a non-aligned country's relationship with a bloc is also shaped by the requirements of its national interests. Autonomy in decisions of national interest had been a major factor in pursuing a non-aligned policy, and thus every non-aligned nation has the right to take decision after making an assessment of the situation. In this it could, if it

consider it necessary, shift towards any one of the two blocs. Although non-alignment proclaims its disassociation with any particular group, it does not imply passivity or isolation in international affairs. It is a dynamic independent foreign policy with a readiness to cooperate on an equitable basis with all countries and support, on specific issues, those whose position coincided with their national interests.

With the abolition of colonialism, slowly, practically all the peoples of the world entered a global system of interaction, facilitated by modern means of transport and communication. The policy of non-alignment emerged as a stronghold and reliable basis of the process of national and social emancipation which brought about new independent states into the global community. The emergence of non-alignment was inevitable and it is no peripheral or temporary phenomenon. It emerged in resistance to the bloc division of the world but, at the same time, it has an expression of the aspirations of the people to attain full national freedom, to develop according to its own choice, to participate on a footing of equality, in international relations and to influence their development. This was emphasized by the opening part of the Belgrade Summit Declaration:
The Heads of States or Government of non-aligned countries, noting that there are crises that lead towards a world conflict in the transition from an old order based on domination to a new order based on cooperation between nations, founded on freedom, equality, and social justice for the promotion of prosperity...

Scholars have stated that non-alignment originated as a natural continuation of the anti-colonial struggle. It has defended their independence and averted the extension of bloc rivalries to their territories. A similar note had been made by President Sukarno at Belgrade 1961: "A policy of non-alignment is the best guarantee for safeguarding our national and international position have undoubtedly helped others to come to a similar conclusion."

Principles of Non-Alignment

On 29 April 1954, during a summit meeting of the leaders of India and China, the Panchsheel principles of peaceful co-existence were enunciated as: mutual respect for


sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-aggression, non-interference in domestic affairs of another nations, equality, mutually beneficial cooperation and peaceful coexistence. A similar past unites all developing nations in their foreign policy aims and interests, into a single international political entity. These aims were enumerated as:

- protecting national interests and national sovereignty, upholding the right to independent development;
- Struggle for equality and democratization of international relations by restructuring of international economic relations;
- Fighting against past isolation of developing countries in international politics;
- Making efforts for "collective diplomacy" by developing countries.

But the common concerns that brought all these nations together, are, the fundamental principles upon which the non-aligned countries based their activities and decisions, and therefore, need further elaboration.

**Peace**

All the non-aligned states have a commitment for peace and disarmament. They especially strive for diffusion of tensions between major powers. Historically, the non-
aligned movement had emerged in opposition to bloc formation and has resisted any attempts towards being a third bloc itself.\textsuperscript{8} Their basic objective has been to stop the division of the globe by its compartmentalization into spheres of influence. Security is indivisible and therefore disarmament must be viewed in the context of a global vision of the world and its survival and progress. They have argued that with increasing number of member nations, after the war, no few big nations have the right to dominate in international relations. The non-aligned countries emphasized that the peace, security and a relaxation of tensions could not rest on a policy of power equilibrium, the division of world into blocs, sphere of influence and arms-race. To preserve peace it is essential to remove the roots of crises and tensions in the world and international security cannot become a reality without changing overall international relations. There is need for 'democratization of international relations'. Nor could the emergence of few nuclear powers hold the whole world hostage to nuclear weapons, thus necessitating the need for disarmament, both nuclear and conventional.

A theoretical examination of peace and disarmament by the non-aligned movement distinguishes various types of confrontations within the global community and identifies

\textsuperscript{8} Ibid.
crises areas: 9 (a) confrontation between the major nuclear powers; (b) war of independence and self-determination; (c) political secessionist movements resulting into internal civil wars; and (d) conflicts between non-aligned states which might enhance into superpower confrontation due to their interests involved.

As its basic tenet, non-alignment upholds right of people to resist colonialism in all forms. There exists a specific linkage between the struggle for independence and national liberation movement and the right of self-determination and racial equality. The wars of national liberation and independence are justified, and hence should be sanctioned and supported. The movement's categorical emphasis on the right to take up arms against colonialism absolves it from the criticism of being pacifist and neutral in world politics. It also sets standards by which nations can support just wars globally. But in case of civil wars it is difficult to locate and identify the faction one wants to support. The considerations, are complicated and states are too sensitive to charges of intervention in internal affairs of sovereign states.

The conflicts between member states, more often due to

border disputes, have invited criticism from all fronts. Moreover, it worsens the situation if such crisis come to involve the major powers, because in such cases it often becomes difficult to control the situation. But a very simple question remains unanswered: most of the border disputes have been the result of borders left behind by the colonial powers; therefore, where does the responsibility lie in such a crisis? The bitter experiences of Koreas and Vietnams have cautioned all nations against the view that such wars are just. Thus the movement has sought to reassert the principle that national integrity of states should be maintained. Most existing tensions in the global system have resulted in the evolution of weapon culture, which has not only threatened peace but also diverted large resources towards purchase of arms. Therefore, if the issue of disarmament is to be properly addressed, it should be considered in the context of world development strategy.

**Independence**

Struggle against colonialism and for racial equality have been the common past of most of the non-aligned countries and have contributed to the movement's creation

10. The recent manifestation of such conflicts have been Iran-Iraq, Somalia-Ethiopia, Uganda-Tanzania and Kampuchea-Vietnam.
and growth. The political independence of colonies has been fundamental to non-alignment. In the 1960s and the 1970s most of the newly independent states joined the movement. Even before their independence, the NAM welcomed nationalists as leaders and provided legitimacy to new states as they entered world politics. Marshall Tito while explaining the orientation of the policy of non-alignment stated, "Non-Alignment by its social and historical nature is anti-imperialist and anti-hegemonist. Therefore, it cannot and will not become anybody's instrument. Nor will it serve as the reserve of anybody's or any other's policies." 11 Although, the task of decolonization had been nearly complete by the end of seventies, the most blatant colonialism was Namibia where South Africa refused to give up its occupied territories. On the other hand, what was even more condemnable was the apartheid policy followed by South African Government, in spite of its denunciation by the international community. A parallel is often drawn between the situation of South Africa and Palestine, where the policies of the ruling settlers has resulted in domination, exploitation, segregation of indigenous population and state terrorism.

Redefining the contemporary international relations, the NAM provided a vehicle for small and middle sized states to participate in global affairs. It also emphasized the fact that growing power of the transnational corporations (TNC) would turn the host into client states and destroy their capacity to be independent, autonomous units in world system. Thus they recognized that political independence unaccompanied by economic independence would give way to neo-colonialism and dependence. Hence, in due course, the movement put forth the demand for restructuring of the contemporary economic order.

Economic Equality

All through the sixties, the movement emphasized political and racial equality but soon it realized that centuries of domination had left the developing states far behind and a wide gap existed among nations on the economic front. Here capitalism and scientific revolution did not have the same effect as in Europe. Instead it generated the relationship of the exploiter and the exploited. Colonialism disrupted the traditional economies of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The expansion of capitalism produced a series of market economies, dependent upon metropolitan centres and resulted in alienation of three-quarters of the world from itself. For most non-aligned
countries capitalism, under imperialism, underdevelops. Therefore, they concluded that the fundamental problem was domination by the global market economy. They argued that political independence and equality could be guaranteed only with greater economic equality in the world. Hence in 1973, the NAM proposed for structural changes and a new international economic order, demanding:
- establishment of producer associations by producer nations;
- creation of new commodity agreements to assure just prices;
- indexation;
- sovereignty over natural resources,
- transfer of technology,
- greater control over transnational corporations and transnational banks.

But such demands, in no way equate them with belief in socialism. While most economies have remained capitalistic, their structural linkages to world capitalist system contributes to their economic inequality. Institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), controlled by developed powers, prove to be more of political institutions rather than economic ones. Hence the international economic system weighed heavily against the
non-aligned economies. As an alternative the Third World nations also proposed South-South linkages and developing a strategy of collective self-reliance to achieve greater economic equality. Non-alignment has established itself as the only international factor capable of affording comprehensive long term solution that could lead the world out of economic crisis.

Cultural Equality

The non-aligned countries acknowledged the need to preserve their cultural identities which were being threatened by predominantly western controlled communication systems. It was observed that, "cultural alienation and imported civilization imposed by imperialism and colonialism should be countered by the establishment of a national personality, a continual and resolute return to their own social and cultural values...."\textsuperscript{12} Domination by other nations had denied the people of their historical past and often assigned them a negative image in world history. Import of information technology and media productions generate values, goals and objectives which are quite alien to their society and reverse the process of national integration and creation of cultural identity. Also, such a

\textsuperscript{12} Item XIV of "Economic Declaration", Algiers Summit Conference Documents.
process could have disastrous consequences, as it could transfer and determine domestic politics threatening the political sovereignty and independence of nation-states."

Such cultural domination has been rightly defined as:

A kind of cultural domination which is even more difficult to shake off, because it is a cultural infiltration of the minds and souls of people. Even as in the nineteenth century the flag followed trade, in the present era trade and economic domination follow media domination.13

In an effort to free itself from such dominations, the non-aligned called for the formation of the new world information and communication order. The creation of non-aligned news pool is an effort towards having horizontal linkages between their regions and encourage a more balanced flow of information between the non-aligned countries and western alliance states.

**Universalism and Multilateralism**

This is one of the paramount principle underlining non-alignment. The movement has no intention to counter or run parallel to the United Nations system. Instead it extends full support and cooperation to the UN charter. As the major international institution and the real future for humanity - it is at the United Nations that non-aligned movement brings its final declaration for implementation.

There is mutual permeation of the United Nations and the policy of the Non-Aligned Movement. However, the latter elaborates the principles of the UN charter, enriching them with new substance and interpretations. The UN also offers them an opportunity to meet regularly as a group outside their own gathering. Such meetings act as a clearing-house of issues before being presented at the summit meetings.

At the UN, the non-aligned states plan an active role in introduction of new issues and acts as coalition on issues which they agree. They were primarily responsible for calling the two Special Sessions on Disarmament at the UN. The other issues which are highlighted in the agenda are - end to colonialism and racialism in all forms, the implementation of the demand for new international economic order, new world communication and information order - and disarmament, peace and 'New World Order'. Despite this, it would be wrong to assign a 'bloc-character' to the non-aligned movement at the UN. As stated at Belgrade in 1961, the movement had no intention to be a bloc, it is only their common concerns that add to their cohesiveness. Otherwise, every nation has right to state its view. Moreover, consensus and not majority vote has been principle followed by the non-aligned in its decision making. Thus in case of disagreement, every non-aligned state can differ and summit its reservations on the issue.
The non-aligned countries have become the basic factor in demanding the democratization of the UN. They have tried to reduce the scope for superpower domination, disputing their monopolies and provide for better participation of more countries in the UN system. They have established a precedent in global politics by treating leaders of liberation movements as spokespersons for their peoples even prior to their independence. This resulted in the United Nations accepting the new states as members of the international community.\textsuperscript{14}

The activities of the non-aligned movement have brought about favourable conditions for the UN action in solving problems like decolonization, disarmament, international economic relations and settlement of crises. Building up mechanism and platforms for settlement of disputes, the NAM used its good offices to bring about rapprochement among warring factions and thus opened the way for United Nations to diffuse the crisis completely. The non-aligned movement has strengthened and improved the level of discussion at the UN, which earlier had been only a white men's club. Thus the movement contributed to democratization and universalization of the UN as most of the states became members of this

\textsuperscript{14} The Angolan MPLA, and the Algerian NLF, with their leaders were members of the movement even before their independence. Similarly SWAPO and PLO hold full membership status.
organization. Presently, when security cannot be enclosed in ideology nor is exhausted in ideology, non-alignment proposed a new formation of the concept of security, not based on the balance of military alliances, divisions into blocs and spheres of interests, or maintenance of status quo, but on new system of bonds and relations among countries and people of the world. The whole idea was that security can only be ensured in the form of 'single world' outside the ideological framework.

The non-aligned countries, who created a new path in world politics in 1961, were fully aware that any international coalition should be highly flexible. Thus resisting all attempts towards institutionalization they adopted consensus as the method of decision making. Over the years, countries with different ideological persuasions joined the movement, thus it was only at the sixth summit at Havana 1979 that the movement could finally attempt to enunciate the principles of non-alignment. Before this no comprehensive definition was made, although the demand was made for a 'newer and strict' interpretation of the concept, twice. The movement, which lacked any structure in the beginning, never cared to define the concept authoritatively, precisely and comprehensively. Thus it was stated:

There is nowhere a comprehensive statement coherently integrating all the elements into one.
composite whole, with the result that it was not always clear what is the connection between elements and relative weight that needs to be attached to each one of them in a balanced and well rounded view of the concept.\footnote{M.S.Rajan, "The Concept of Non-Alignment and the Basis of Membership of the Movement", in K.P.Misra and K.R. Narayanan, eds., n.4, p.232.}

It was further argued that the criterion of membership, as defined in 1961, was inadequate and its practitioners are responsible in not making the admission requirements more strict. The criterion adopted was simple: the country should adopt an independent foreign policy based on co-existence of states with different social and political systems; it should consistently support the movement for national independence; the country should not be a member of multilateral treaty/alliance, concluded in context of great power conflict, if one has a bilateral military agreement or is a member of regional defence pact, such should not be concluded in the context of great powers' conflicts and while conceding military bases to foreign powers, such concession should be free from great power conflicts.\footnote{M.S.Rajan, "The Non-Aligned Movement and the Criteria of Membership", \textit{The Non-Aligned World} (New Delhi), no.1:2 (April-June 1983), p.234.}

Though, to some extent, the criticism seems valid enough, it cannot be accepted as a whole. Given the multifaceted orientations non-alignment has, and the diverse
set up from which its members come, a strict membership standard would have resisted acceptance of non-aligned policy. With differing system, ideologies and political set up, nations would have found it difficult to join NAM under a rigid framework. Non-aligned movement does not aspire to be called a monolithic unity. Inherent in non-alignment is ideological pluralism. It is their geo-political positions, cultural characteristics and the socio-economic and political system that result in a vast diversity of interests in NAM. Every nation had different compulsion to follow a non-aligned path as did Nehru, Tito, Nasser, Soekarno and Nkrumah. They had a different world view, though their objective was the same i.e., to maintain their sovereignty in world politics. A more rigid system would have resulted in these states joining one of the alliance system. A non-aligned dilemma offers a brilliant defence of the movement's existing membership system. It is pointed out by a scholar that 'a country might be striving to apply the principles and aims of non-alignment while objectively, it is still bound to a particular bloc structures. By encouraging the former and ignoring the latter, the movement avoids being an exclusive group.'
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global situation do enhance their interests in the non-aligned activities. A rigid standard of membership would deny such opportunities which help them, at times, to opt for non-aligned policy.

In spite of the absence of institutions and structures to carry our various functions, one of the strengths of the non-aligned movement has been its ability to develop rules and procedures to enable it to survive and adapt to new global situations. The Movement started without any structure, and in due course has kept the process towards institutionalization to the bare minimum. Rejecting simple majority rule as one that could alienate dissenting minority, the movement adopted consensus as the method of decision-making. No recommendations on this method were ever suggested by a Special Working Group created for the purpose by Foreign Ministers meeting in 1978. Though such a method causes delay, it gives ample opportunity for discussion among participants so that a majority consensus can be reached. It is remarkable that the movement has achieved consensus on many difficult problems over the years. Such a system helps to understand and respect differing views. In all, consensus presupposed, understood and respected differing views, including those in mutual disagreement. It implied mutual accommodation on the basis that agreement could emerge by a sincere process of
adjustment among member nations in the true spirit of non-alignment.

Growth of Non-Aligned Movement

Although the pronouncement of the policy of non-alignment was made as far back as 1946, and emphasized at the Asian Relations Conference in 1947 and the Bandung Conference in 1955, it was not until 1961, at Belgrade, that all committed nations came together for a joint summit. It was preceded by the Cairo Preparatory Conference of June 1961 which finalized the agenda, members and the activities of the forthcoming summit. They met on adhoc basis with no rules regarding successive summits or formal institutions. From then till date, the NAM membership has swelled from twenty five to hundred and eight at the last summit at Jakarta. Till date, ten summit conferences of the non-aligned movement have taken place. The movement today comprise of 40 per cent of the world population, has 36 per cent of the earth's area and 66 per cent of the countries under its umbrella.18 The growth and strengthening of NAM and its policy is in direct proportion to the decline in power of imperialism and expansion of circle of independent forces in the international community today.

The summit took place in a period of increased East-West tension over Berlin, Congo and Cuba. Wars of national liberation were being fought in Angola, Algeria and Vietnam and Yugoslavia was adamant to maintain her independence in spite of Soviet pressures. In the final declaration, the Movement stressed the need to oppose colonialism and imperialism, spoke against war and formation of military bloc. The non-aligned tended to see the threat to peace as larger than the East-West struggle and declared existing international system as unequal and based on exploitation. They intended to challenge the world order and establish a new one based on just and equal relations.\(^{19}\) Finally while objecting to the United Nations as a mere reflection of the existing global power structure, the non-aligned expressed all support for this international organization. Issuing identical letters to both Kennedy and Khruschev, the non-aligned warned the United States and the Soviet Union for deterioration of global situation and asserted that they alone could not determine world events while the non-aligned too participate in global politics.\(^{20}\)

\[^{19}\text{The Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, Belgrade, 1-6 September 1961 (Yugoslavia, 1961), pp.13-14.}\]

\[^{20}\text{Two Decades of Non-Alignment: Documents of Gathering of the Non-Aligned Countries: 1961-1982 (New Delhi, Ministry of External Affairs), pp.9-10.}\]
The Cairo Summit 1964, had twenty African nations among the twenty-two new states that joined NAM, marked a shift in the movement's centre from Asia to Africa. The same year the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development was called at Geneva by the efforts of the non-aligned countries to discuss conditions of world trade as a basis for promoting development. Hence was born the 'Group of 77' composed mainly of the nations from non-aligned movement and dealing mainly with economic issues. Its membership later increased to a hundred and twenty seven. The thawing of relations between the superpowers resulted in increased attention on colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism and enhancement of national liberation struggle. The non-aligned specifically called attention to international tensions caused by external interference and the link between war and persistent foreign hegemony in all forms. Even this summit was on ad-hoc basis with no future commitments.

It took nearly six years to convene the next summit conference of the non-aligned due to highly unstable situation and conflicts in many of the member nations. The non-aligned stalwarts were either overthrown or replaced from their office. The superpower rivalries were intensifying again and western powers tended to control the degree of political and social change throughout the globe.
Yet by the time of the Lusaka Summit, detente was setting in. Decolonization progressed in face of continued opposition. Meanwhile, on demand and pressure from a number of countries, the membership of the UN Security Council of non-permanent members was increased from six to ten, reflecting a regional distribution. In Cambodia, the war had resulted in a dispute over representation and membership of provisional revolutionary government.

The Lusaka Summit 1970, reiterated the primary objectives of peace, decolonization, non-interference and support for the UN. Disillusioned with the progress during the First UN Decade of Development, more attention was given to economic development. It concluded that a 'structural weakness in the present economic order' was responsible for poverty and economic dependence. With efforts of Kenneth Kaunda the idea - that collectivised non-alignment should be regularized and maintain some continuing momentum - was given credibility. It was agreed that:

i) Summit Conference of the non-aligned states should be held regularly at intervals of about three years,

ii) the host country of the last conference shall act as principal spokesman during the intervals between summits,

iii) the host country, acting as chairperson, shall assume responsibility for convening such meetings as may be
desired necessary.

This process was stretched further when it was decided at Georgetown Conference of foreign ministers in Guyana (1972) that henceforth ministers of non-aligned nations should meet every two years to consider economic issues of mutual concern. Thereafter, the non-aligned also developed the practice of organizing informal meetings of their delegation, on the eve of the UN General Assembly Session in New York, to work out a common strategy.

The Algiers Summit (1973) was a step forward in the process of institution building where recommendation for setting up the Co-ordinating Bureau was accepted. The Bureau was entrusted with responsibility of supervising the implementation of the decisions of summit conferences, to organize various non-aligned meetings and conferences between summits and carry out work of the movement during that period. There was a major shift in world politics due to negotiations among the United States and Soviet Union, though there was split in the Sino-Soviet relations. Tensions reigned high in West Asia and thus the movement was militarily on the defensive. But there was basic shift on the non-aligned agenda from political to economic issues and therefore it was stated 'economic liberation must follow political independence'. Outlining the need for a global framework it was stated:
The aim of our socio-economic transformation is not merely to augment the Gross National Product or to build consumer societies but to balance growth, social justice and the inculcation of cultural values which are inspired by perception and compassion.\(^{21}\)

As by the mid-seventies most of the ex-colonies gained independence, their was increased assertiveness and self-reliance with consolidation of general strategy by the movement. Genuine independence was defined more broadly than ever before to include cultural and social aspects as well as economic and political concerns. The Economic Declaration, demanding establishment of New International Economic order, called for a global strategy to restructure economic relations between the developed and developing worlds and adopted economic independence and collective self-reliance as goals of non-alignment. Their demand for a New International Economic Order was later adopted at the United Nations Special Session in 1974.

The Columbo Summit (1976) took place when the Arab-Israel war had spread to neighbouring states, there was militarization of the Mediterranean on the issue of Cyprus, there was a Sino-US rapprochement and detente continued though there was no significant reduction in arms-race. On the economic front, continued demand for Third World

\(^{21}\) Speech of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi of India at the Fourth Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, Algiers, Review of International Affairs, vol.24, no.564, 5 October 1973, p.8.
resources by the industrialized world and the transformation of the world capitalist economy had major repercussions in many non-aligned countries as inflation and recession in the west spilled over to the Third World. There was triple threat – direct intervention in domestic politics by means of a strategy of destabilization, the consequences of global inflation and recession, and the inability of the non-aligned countries to pay their debts.

In its political declaration, rejecting balance of power as a notion of peace, the non-aligned once again emphasized international cooperation as the goal of global community. Decolonization though completing its first phase was condemned in South Africa and Namibia, with a condemnation of Israel for the violation of the UN Charter and the right of self-determination of the people of Palestine. 22 As political pressures and economic domination continued to threaten the independence of states, there was opposition to the policy and techniques of destabilization adopted by major powers. For the first time, non-aligned countries linked politics and economics throughout their declarations. With the majority of non-aligned states poor and underdeveloped, economic affairs must be the primary concern if political autonomy is to have

a real meaning. A complete change of political attitude and the demonstration of a new political will is an indispensible prerequisite for the realization of New International Economic Order.\textsuperscript{23} As the North-South dialogue tended to become a monologue, the movement reaffirmed its faith in mutual interdependence and horizontal linkages. To sum up, the Summit revealed the increased strength and coherence of radical grouping within the Movement; highlighted debt crisis and techniques of destabilization and the political and economic consequences of such activities for national sovereignty of states. It saw emergence of efforts to destabilize the movement, though there were formal adoption of centralized structures and specific procedures and finally revealed the contradictions between various ideological tendencies within the movement. The summit also witnessed efforts to build up a New International Information Order in the field of information and communications. The non-aligned news pool was formed to set the news media free from the cultural domination of the developed and promote and strengthen cooperation among the non-aligned. But in this it was only working to establish news agencies in non-aligned countries which do not have them.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid, pp.786-7.

\textsuperscript{24} M.Berberovic (the Yugoslavian Information Minister), \textit{Patriot}, 12 March 1976.
The Havana Summit (1979), though controversial, was remarkable as a large number of Latin American countries were present which represented their determination of independence from the United States. Despite his pro-socialist thinking and reference to Soviet Union as a natural ally of NAM, President Castro steered the movement through all odds, though one of non-aligned member—Burma left under protest for defining non-alignment in more definite terms. It was at Havana, after 18 years of existence that the movement did spell out its principles and objectives for the first time. It condemned the western powers by name who were supporting the racist regime of South Africa and extended support to Latin American issues like Grenada, Nicaragua and Bolivia. It also took up the question of cultural heritage. Considering public documents and archives of colonial or formal colonial states to be an integral part of national heritage of the people and called for their return. The summit reiterated that the international economic crisis was a result of historic inequality, dependence and exploitation. They insisted that the energy crisis was a global matter and interrelated with other economic problems. A Working Paper submitted on Commission for the settlement of Border-disputes argued that tensions and armed conflicts often grow out of disputes over
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boundaries drawn by former colonial powers. There was always danger of such disputes to be exploited by 'interested parties'. The conference stated that no distinction was to be made between Bureau and Non-Bureau member and increased the strength of the Non-Aligned Coordinating Bureau to 36.

The New Delhi Summit (1983) was originally scheduled to be held at Baghdad. But due to the war between Iran and Iraq, the choice fell back on India. The change of venue itself was an indicator of the turmoil the world was facing at the moment. Due to Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, the Iran-Iraq war, the Arab Israel conflict and situation in the Latin American and Carribean nations, the international climate had suddenly turned more explosive. There was resurgence of cold war and the US administration was talking in terms of Strategic Defence Initiative and Star Wars. The New Delhi Declaration noted not only the dangers of several concurrent war zones, but that there was a conscious effort to transform wars of liberation in the Third World into testing grounds for the East-West Conflict with potential of a global war. The movement called for complete and general disarmament under international control, with high priority to nuclear disarmament, anchored faith around the concept of an interdependent world.

The seventh summit conference advocated a 'multilateral
framework for resolving economic crisis. It emphasized that no single country or group could alone solve the present international crisis. The movement, understood the linkage between peace and development as vast resources are wasted in unproductive arms-race. The Heads of State adopted a new approach to the economic crisis by advocating a two stage process towards restructuring global economic relations - they first outlined areas of critical importance to all developing countries with recommendations to ease the situation; then they made recommendations in essential areas like science and technology, environment, human resources and development etc. It opposed intervention of ideology and politics into global economic policy. The movement analysed the existing economic crisis as global and interdependent. Any solution, thus, necessiated international participation. Nonetheless, the recent evolution of the international situation fully justifies the policy of non-alignment, its principles and objectives, as a positive, non-bloc, independent global factor in international relations.  

The Harare Summit (1986) witnessed a resurgence in the US-Soviet rivalries which resulted in unprecedented arms-race in qualitative and quantitative dimensions. There was extension of East-West confrontation to local and regional
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disputes that complicated them further. There were increasing acts of aggression and destabilization of neighbouring countries by South Africa. The movement regretted the initiation and continuation of hostilities between Iran and Iraq and was perturbed by world wide escalation of terrorism in all forms. It was dismaying to note that security and independence of non-aligned countries was being increasingly threatened by policies of great powers and the movement was subject to pressures, of all kind, to weaken it.

The summit declaration stressed the increasingly dependent character of world economy, while deterrence led vast amounts of human, material and technological resources, from economic and social development, towards creation of newer weapons of mass destruction. They noted with grave concern the continuing escalation of arms-race, especially nuclear weapons. They stated that greatest peril facing the world is the threat to survival of humanity posed by existence of nuclear weapons. The movement applauded the 'Six Nations Peace Initiative', launched in May 1984 by Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and United Republic of Tanzania, calling upon nations to halt all testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons.

------------------------
The NAM also expressed support for the frontline states against the acts of South Africa. Condemning Pretoria's policies as state terrorism they called for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. They also condemned brutal, illegal colonial occupation of Namibia. It strongly condemned the unprovoked US aggression against Libya, which constituted an act of state terrorism and violation of international law. They called upon states to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in terrorist acts or jeopardizing fundamental freedom and endangering territorial integrity and security of states. Yet no consensus emerged on the definition of 'terrorism' as the movement emphasized that legitimate struggle for peoples under colonial and racist regime can in no way be equated with terrorism.

Having deep concern for the critical economic situation faced by the African states by imposing mandatory sanctions against Pretoria, the 'Africa Fund' was created on the initiative of the Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi. It was held that cooperation between the non-aligned and the other developing countries would definitely improve their negotiating strength. The interrelationship of problems and interconnection of their solutions makes it urgent for both developed and developing countries to engage in a serious

28. ibid, p.36.
dialogue. Expressing concern over the worsening environmental situation, NAM suggested the need for ecologically balanced and rational development. It also highlighted the growing problem of drug-abuse and its illicit trafficking all over the world.

But since Harare, the world scenario has undergone a radical transformation. The US and Soviet Union have signed the INF Treaty, to limit and do away nuclear weapons and thus deaccelerate the arms-race. The Iran-Iraq war has come to an end after nine years and the Geneva Accord has been signed on Afghanistan. A new climate befalls the Horn of Africa due to ceasefire between Somalia and Ethiopia, and hope for peace in Angola due to withdrawal of Cuban forces. There are reinforced hopes of peace in Namibia too. Decolonization is entering a decisive stage. It is under such an atmosphere that Belgrade hosted the ninth NAM Conference in 1989. With improvement in international political climate, there has been a fervent of new economic and political ideas. Even countries like Soviet Union are undertaking wide ranging policy reforms under the impact of 'glasnost' and 'perestroika'. With enhanced disarmament prospects, there are new opportunities for additional financial resources, human energy and creativity into development. Lasting peace and security can only be achieved by pooling the efforts of the entire community.
Growing environmental problems, which pose a threat to the very survival of mankind, testify to the interdependence of interests of all nations.

The NAM reaffirmed the rights of the people of Afghanistan to decide independently its destiny, their social, economic and political system. It welcomed the complete withdrawal of Soviet forces from Kabul and called upon UN Secretary General to continue efforts aimed at facilitating an early and comprehensive political settlement in accordance with Geneva agreement and United Nations General Assembly Resolution 43/20. On the Iran-Iraq, the NAM claimed satisfaction with the ceasefire of 20 August 1988 and the desire to hold talks under the auspices of the UN Secretary General achieving full rapid implementation of resolution of UN General Assembly. Endorsing their position at Harare, on Palestine, it was called upon the UN General Secretary to convene a Peace Conference on the Middle East.

But in a special declaration on Namibia, the non-aligned expressed grave concern on the disturbing situation in Namibia caused by South African non-compliance with UN resolution of 1978. It condemned the racist election of September 1989 and pledged support to the liberation struggle.

In its Economic Declaration, it stated, 'Though integrationist tendencies are being followed yet disparities
between the developed and developing had accentuated. Thus calling for a constructive and integrated approach, it became necessary to forge global consensus centred on growth and development. NAM reaffirmed its conviction that convening special session of UN General Assembly in April 1990, devoted to international economic cooperation, in particular to revitalization of economic growth and development of developing countries, is an opportunity to reach agreement on the nature of problems. There was lack of progress in the North-South negotiations in virtually all areas as well as erosion of multilateralism in spite of several constructive initiatives put forward by developing countries. It endorsed deep concern on glaring dichotomy between politics and economics in the field of international economic relations.

The Tenth Non-Aligned Summit was held in Jakarta (1992) when the international relations had taken turns which even its cleverest observer would not have anticipated. They accepted interdependence, integration and globalization as among the new realities of the world economy. The emerging trends have pointed towards a new international order that is firmly rooted in the rule of law, the principles of United Nations Charter and a shared responsibility towards global cooperation or solidarity. Although some progress has been made towards limiting nuclear and conventional
weapons, it is the establishment of nuclear weapon free zones (NWFZs) that alone can ensure human survival, which is the prime responsibility of all nations. Concerned over the negative impact of global military expenditure, the non-aligned countries re-emphasized the dependence of peace and security as much on socio-economic factors as on military and political ones. By a shift in focus of multilateral cooperation for development, the concept of collective self-reliance can be translated into reality. The Summit Conference also welcomed the outcome of Rio conference which addressed itself to environment and development as two inseparable subjects. Finally, while reposing all confidence in the UN as the universal embodiment of multilateralism, NAM referred to the UN as unique opportunity and a collective instrument to a new just and equitable world order.

Non-alignment has important defence and security aspects and represents compatible and converging national security doctrines. It was to maintain their political and economic security that nations decided to adopt a non-aligned policy. It was a pledge to work for decolonization, international peace and security and for a world order which was free of domination and racism, assuring equal opportunities to all peoples. The problem of peace and security are common to the international community. The
non-aligned ideology and policy stressed on the need for general peace and equal security of all states. The NAM rejects the power concept in international relations as it rejects the concept of bloc politics. It is the system of balance of power and deterrence which justify wars and intervention in the name of peace and security. It ensures a special and privileged position to the powerful. There is inherent, in the doctrine of deterrence, a commonly shared perception of the bipolarity of the international system. When the superpowers extend their two-person zero-sum game into the non-aligned world, they are called upon to deal with nations and elites whose motivations and behaviour patterns are not familiar to them. Consequently such intervention has risks of escalation as had happened in Angola, Mozambique and the Horn of Africa.

The basic principles of non-alignment aim at promoting one world, by frustrating the power struggle and making its continuance counterproductive. The non-aligned countries advocate a new international system based on peaceful coexistence and active international cooperation among all countries with the object of solving crucial issues on which peace, security and development in the world depend. The strategy and the policy of the non-alignment has been used to improve the security position of the individual member of the movement in the long run. During the last three decades
non-aligned states have both individually and collectively reacted to and acted on, numerous issues bearing on global security. Peace and security, therefore, acquire a universal character as being the responsibility of all nations and not that of big few. Apart from autonomous solutions to the national security problems, non-aligned nations have developed elements of group security. Yet, they are rather far from being a military bloc, instead, they are champions of international security under the auspices of the United Nations.

It has been the attempt of NAM to sustain the heterogeneous character of its members, democratize international relations and make joint efforts to have positive influence on behaviour of non-aligned states. In such a situation of heterogeneity, antagonism and differences are quite normal. Among the historical causes of conflict is the question of unsettled frontiers and efforts of various people to attain self-determination. The ideological clashes are much more correlated to internal political instability of the nation. All these manifestations of conflict are direct consequence of the general economic, social, political and security contradictions of the present world order. Non-Alignment was originally operationalized as a short term reaction to realities of cold war tensions of two military coalitions.
The policy of non-participation remains its major mark as non-alignment has prevented the world's complete division into blocs, through the constant expansion of 'belts of independence' primarily in areas of most direct military intervention.

In spite of all national and regional conflicts, the global antagonism between superpowers remain the single important factor governing all other issues. The global dimension of security raises many interconnected issues of extremely complex nature. One should not lose sight of the fact that there will be no better prospects for resolution of acute world problems if rapid progress is made in investing world with new quality of weapons. The nuclear weapons have turned the globe into a potential battlefield. International security is indivisible and thus it is vital to realize that struggle for disarmament is struggle for peace. Disarmament is based on two general assumptions: the fear of 'total war' and that disarmament releases huge economic resources which would be bound to be diverted to economic development. Poverty, unemployment and inequality produce tension, insecurity and war. There can be no stability or lasting peace without socio-economic development, just as peace is indispensable for economic progress and social justice. It is absurd to believe that security and peace could be achieved by force of arms or
that increased military forces can bring greater security for the world or individual nations. The perception of security from the pre-atomic period is largely outdated. Today, it is the security of single world that should be ensured, outside ideological framework.

On principle, non-aligned states build their security on twin foundations of (i) system of collective security based on principles, strengthening the UN system; (ii) autonomous national defence and security systems, supplemented by elements of group security. Their military doctrine usually envisage a purely defensive strategy.29

Thus the policy of non-alignment opened up new vistas in treatment of issues related to peace and security, rejecting obsolete formulas of reliance on force, the balance of terror, spheres of interests, bloc rivalries, the imposition of social development models and interventionism in the name of 'general security'. The NAM has no treaty of mutual security and thus its states are under no mandatory obligation. It lacks formal and informal arrangements providing for security outside the United Nations and there are no institutions of military and security cooperation. Yet, the non-aligned countries have sought self-consciously to submerge on occasions, their own national interests in

the interest of larger international community.

The policy and movement of non-alignment, understandably, do not have and cannot have ready-made answers to all national and international problems. The world has changed a lot since the inception of non-aligned movement and still non-alignment stands as an independent factor. It must have its own policy as a movement which will be a synthesis of policies of all member countries and reflect their national interests in strengthening the independence and security of each individual nation. It should thus be remembered that the bargaining power of developing countries is, in substantial measure, dependent on the degree of their unity which should be strengthened further.