

THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Author(s): Jayantanuja Bandyopadhyaya

Source: *India Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 2 (April-June 1977), pp. 137-164

Published by: Sage Publications, Ltd.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/45071355>

Accessed: 08-04-2020 02:17 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Sage Publications, Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *India Quarterly*

THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

By JAYANTANUJA BANDYOPADHYAYA

THE second half of the twentieth century has been witnessing the decline of the traditional model and the emergence of a new model of international relations. The balance-of-power model tended to culminate in the bipolarity of the international system as a whole during the first two decades or so after the Second World War. Like the summit of a parabola described by the path of an artillery shell, nuclear deterrence represents the highest point in the development of the balance of power. But it often happens in history that an accelerated movement produces dialectical contradictions from within itself, which in turn create the necessary conditions for the growth of a new movement. The inner contradictions of the Cold War gradually led to polycentrism and *detente* on the one hand, and the rapid development of the non-aligned movement on the other. Originating in India, and beginning in a small way with a few inspired statesmen as its philosophers and architects, the non-aligned movement has proliferated rapidly as a counterforce to the balance of power during the last thirty years or so, until it has today become virtually a universal and futuristic movement. At the Colombo Summit Conference of the non-aligned states, held in August 1976, there were 86 member participants, constituting a two-thirds majority of the membership of the United Nations and a clear majority of the world population. Non-alignment thus marks the end of one era and the beginning of another in the history of international relations.

AN ANTI-IMPERIALIST MOVEMENT

All evolutionary movements in history are to a certain extent conditioned by the accumulated environmental contingencies of the past, but none are wholly controlled or determined by them. The non-aligned movement is no exception. The contradictions of the Cold War certainly created the context in which it became necessary for the newly-independent states to declare their determination to avoid military alliances dominated by the two contending power blocs. The systematic attempts made by the two power blocs to draw the new states into their own global strategies, and to dragoon these states into their own spheres of influence, merely led to the strengthening of the determination of the new states to preserve and protect their independence and to the crystallization and consolidation of the non-aligned movement. Perhaps, the context of the Cold War was also responsible for the nomenclature of the strategy. Initially called an 'independent', 'positive' or 'dynamic' foreign policy, it was gradually styled as non-alignment, largely as a reaction to the persistent attempt by the two Super Powers to divide the whole world into two mutually antagonistic power blocs, although

the negative nomenclature seems to bear the imprint of the Indian cultural tradition which tends to express many positive values and actions in negative terminology.¹

But, it is quite incorrect to say, as is often done, that the Cold War had a determining influence on the development of non-alignment as a foreign policy strategy. This is evident from the fact that the proliferation of the non-aligned movement took place, *pari passu*, with the transformation of the international system from a bipolar to a polycentric one. If we take 1956 as the year marking the beginning of polycentrism (the Sino-Soviet conflict, revolt and recalcitrance in Eastern Europe, divisions within the Western bloc on the Suez issue, etc.), and 1962 as the year marking the end of the Cold War and the beginning of *detente* (Cuban missile crisis), it is to see that the proliferation of non-alignment has largely taken place in a polycentric international system. The first conference of the Heads of State or governments of the non-aligned states, which may be said to mark the beginning of the non-aligned movement as such, took place only in 1961, five years after the beginning of polycentrism. Of even greater significance is the fact that between 1964 and 1976, the membership of the non-aligned movement more than doubled itself, and in the latter year stood at three-and-a-half times the figure of 1961, as would be evident from the following table² :—

Year	Conference	Members		Observers		Guests	
		Coun-tries	Organi-zations	Coun-tries	Organi-zations	Coun-tries	Organi-zations
1961	Belgrade Summit Conference	25	—	3	—	—	—
1964	Cairo Summit Conference	47	—	10	2	—	—
1970	Lusaka Summit Conference	53	—	12	1	—	5
1973	Algiers Summit Conference	75	—	9	—	3	12
1976	Colombo Summit Conference	86	1	9	13	7	—

It may, of course, be pointed out that the late fifties and the sixties witnessed an accelerated rate of de-colonization, particularly in Africa, and that this swelled the ranks of the non-aligned during this period. But this only proves the point that the Cold War was neither a necessary condition nor a determining cause of non-alignment. It had already undergone considerable erosion. It is also noteworthy that between 1970 and 1976, that is, after the de-colonization process had been virtually completed, and *detente* had become a more or less established fact, the membership of the non-aligned movement increased by over 62 per cent. In other words, although

there is a high correlation between de-colonization and the proliferation of non-alignment, there is no such correlation between the intensification of the Cold War and the growth of non-alignment. In fact, the proliferation of non-alignment seems to have been directly proportional to the erosion of the Cold War.

The most important cause of the emergence of non-alignment as a foreign policy strategy can be found in the de-colonization process itself. De-colonization took place in approximately the third quarter of the twentieth century mainly as a result of the national movements in Asia and Africa in the first half of this century and afterwards. These national movements were aimed against the imperialist and racist policies of White and capitalist Europe. When the former colonies regained their independence after several centuries, their first categorical imperative was to assert their identity and autonomy, above all to reject completely and permanently Western imperialism in all its manifestations. Hence Nehru declared, as far back as 1946, anti-imperialism and anti-racism to be the kernel of India's foreign policy. Hence the Bandung Conference of Afro-Asian nations declared itself against imperialism in all its manifestations. Undoubtedly, the foreign policies of the individual non-aligned states have been conditioned by a wide variety of factors arising out of their unique geography, problems of economic development, political culture, domestic milieu and international milieu³; and these individual characteristics have caused considerable variation in the detailed formulation and implementation of the foreign policies of the numerous non-aligned states. Surely, the foreign policies of India, Yugoslavia, the UAR, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Burma, Nepal, Kenya, Algeria, Cuba and Panama are determined by quite different compulsions. But anti-imperialism is the common refrain which has provided the necessary orchestration to the non-aligned movement.

Non-alignment was, first and foremost, the assertion by the new Afro-Asian states of their determination to remain independent of the hated imperialists and racists of the West, particularly at a time when the latter appeared to be closing their ranks and making a renewed and determined attempt to bring the former under their hegemony through military alliances and other forms of control. It was the revolt of Asia and Africa against the imperialists, against the racists, against the West, against the Whites. It was a catharsis of their repressed and impotent rage caused by centuries of imperialistic exploitation and racial humiliation. It was a declaration of their independent humanity.

This fundamentally anti-imperialist motivation of the non-aligned movement has been emphasized by the non-aligned states themselves at various non-aligned conferences. The Lusaka Summit Conference, for example, declared: "The growth of non-alignment into a broad international movement cutting across racial, regional and other barriers, is ... the result of the world anti-colonial revolution and of the emergence of a large number of newly-liberated countries which, opting for an independent political

orientation and development, have refused to accept the replacement of centuries-old forms of subordination by new ones This has been the substance and meaning of our strivings and actions; this is a confirmation of the validity of the Belgrade and Cairo Declarations.”⁴ The Algiers Summit Conference similarly observed : “More and more countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America are demonstrating a desire for emancipation and willingness to take up the challenges imposed by neo-colonialist tutelage and imperialist monopolies. By the same token, the movement of non-alignment is expanding and is finding an increasing response which demonstrates on an international scale the aspirations of an ever greater number of states, national liberation movements, and all forces for emancipation and progress throughout the world.”⁵ Finally, the Colombo Summit Conference said of non-alignment : “It is a vital force in the struggle against imperialism in all its forms and manifestations, and all other forms of foreign domination. Non-alignment upholds the right of all peoples to freedom and self-determination and of all nations to pursue their own independent strategy for development and for participation in the resolution of international problems. It strengthens resistance to the policies of pressure and domination from whatever quarter.”⁶

Needless to say, the role of the Soviet Union in world affairs has not been altogether irrelevant to the growth of the non-aligned movement. But for a variety of reasons, the thrust of non-alignment has been against the West, rather than against the Soviet Union. The most tangible evidence of this tilt is that while a number of declarations and resolutions passed at every non-aligned summit conference have been directly aimed against the United States and other Western countries (which have been always mentioned by name), not a single declaration or resolution has been adopted at any of these conferences which has been directly aimed against the Soviet Union, or which has mentioned the Soviet Union by name. This visible partiality of the non-aligned movement has been due to a number of factors rooted in the historical and national experience of most of the non-aligned countries.

In the first place, for most of the Afro-Asian states, the Soviet Union had been, during their freedom struggle, the enemy of the enemy, and, therefore, a strategic friend. Whatever its own strategic considerations might have been, it had persistently championed the independence of the colonies, and thus objectively assisted their emancipation. Most important of all, by containing the Western imperio-racist Powers and gradually putting them on the defensive, the Soviet Union had created the global conditions in which the freedom struggles in the colonies could make significant headway. Secondly, even during the Cold War period, the Soviet Union did not at any stage try to form hegemonistic military alliances involving the new states of Asia and Africa. Its direct military alliances, with the exception of the one with China, have remained confined to Eastern Europe. While the Western Powers seemed to be returning to Asia and Africa through

SEATO, CENTO etc., the Soviet Union did not make any such attempt. Thirdly, unlike the Western Powers, the Soviet Union has consistently voted in the United Nations against all forms of racist policies and practices based on colour prejudice, in southern Africa or elsewhere. In this respect, its policy and practice have been consonant with those of the non-aligned states. The new states have also generally believed that racism is not an integral element of the domestic and foreign policies of the Soviet Union, as they think it is the case in respect of those of the Western states. Fourthly, the Soviet example of the rapid industrialization of a predominantly agricultural country through planned economic development, and without any significant foreign assistance, fired the imagination of the leaders of the anti-colonial national movements. It not only gave a socio-economic content to their struggle for freedom, but made them acutely aware of the possibility of attaining not only political but also economic independence from the West. Finally, while the rejection of the West by the nationalist elites of Asia and Africa on ideological grounds was total, the rejection of the Soviet ideology was only partial, mainly relating to its political aspects. Most Afro-Asian nationalist leaders have believed that capitalism not only leads inevitably to inequality and exploitation, but what is more important from their point of view and more relevant to their historical experience, also to imperialism. They have also generally believed that the democratic principles and forms of the Western polities are a sham and a make-believe, for these did not apply to the colonies, and at any rate could probably be sustained only so long as imperialism existed in one form or another. Some new states like India have of course experimented with some of the Western political norms. But an attempt has been made here also to give them a new definition and content by removing them from their traditional socio-economic moorings and synthesizing them with the economic forms of socialism. But even the Indian experiment in this respect has not been wholly successful, and has in any case been the exception rather than the rule of Afro-Asian development. On the other hand, almost all Afro-Asian leaders have accepted in theory the economic aspects of socialism, with serious reservations about the Soviet political structure. Even such a strong critic of the Soviet system as Mahatma Gandhi stated repeatedly that the economic structure of Soviet communism, involving collective ownership of production and distribution, would be wholly acceptable to him, provided it could be established without violence and dictatorship.⁷

The foregoing points would also explain why the Afro-Asian states have often appeared to be unequally non-aligned between the Soviet Union and the West, particularly to Western observers. Their perception of the partiality of non-alignment towards the Soviet Union, has certainly been correct, but their understanding of this phenomenon has almost always been faulty. For, they have failed to understand and evaluate the broad historical forces which have gone into the making of non-alignment as a foreign policy strategy, and erroneously regarded it entirely as a stance of professed

neutrality in the contemporary bipolarity of international politics. The Western perception of the Cold War as a mortal struggle of the West in defence of "freedom" clouded the Western understanding of the nature of non-alignment. Western observers failed to see the palpable reality of the Afro-Asian disbelief of their professed struggle for global "freedom," and the historically conditioned broader sympathy of the Afro-Asian peoples and their leaders for the Soviet Union in the balance of world forces.

But the broader sympathy of the new Afro-Asian states for the Soviet Union as against the West did not, and could not, lead to their entering into military alliance with the Soviet Union. For one thing, the anti-colonial nationalist movements in Asia and Africa were generally fought on a broad national platform representing a conglomeration and consensus of classes and masses, castes and tribes. Such consensual politics was the base of the political elite during the freedom movements, and has remained so even after independence. The political elites in the new states generally, therefore, do not visualize their political future within the framework of class struggle and of ideologies integrally related to it. Theirs has always been a distant sympathy for the Soviet Union. Secondly, the periodic interference by the Soviet Union in the national freedom movements of the Afro-Asian states through the local Communist parties, and in their new political systems even after independence, during the Stalin era, made the political elites of these states somewhat suspicious of Soviet motivations. Even in the post-Stalin era, when Soviet foreign policy abandoned the earlier strategy of "party-to-party" and "people-to-people" relations and adopted instead the almost exclusive strategy of "government-to-government" relations, some new states like India moved relatively close to the Soviet Union at the governmental level, partly with a view to containing the domestic Marxist force politically. Thirdly, the Stalinist excesses in the domestic sphere, and the twists and turns of Soviet foreign policy immediately before, during and after the Second World War, particularly in Eastern Europe, made many Afro-Asian leaders sceptical of the supposed Soviet idealism. Fourthly, most of the new states were opposed to the Soviet form of political authoritarianism, although some of them apparently did not mind their own form of authoritarianism. Fifthly, the new states of Asia and Africa were, without exception, jealous of their newly-won independence, and most of them did not want to compromise their sovereignty by entering into military alliances with the Soviet Union, although they were otherwise more opposed to the West than to the Soviet Union. Sixthly, all the new states were in urgent need of large amounts of foreign capital, and many of them believed that they could maximize their receipt of foreign aid only by diversifying the sources of aid as much as possible. Finally, the new states required international peace for their domestic political stability and economic development, as well as for the consolidation of their external sovereignty. It was not, therefore, in their national interest to get involved in military alliances or in acute confrontation with any major Power.

If the foregoing analysis is correct, it would appear that most of the determinants of non-alignment as a foreign policy strategy of the new states were rooted in colonial history, in the process of de-colonization, and in the sociological, political and economic situation of the new states; and that most of these determinants have their origin in the period prior to the onset of the Cold War. The rapid escalation of the Cold War, particularly the threat of nuclear annihilation, added a new urgency and poignancy to the policy of non-alignment and reinforced the factors which provided its rationale. But non-alignment as a foreign policy strategy of the new states was not caused by the Cold War, nor was it dependent on the Cold War for its survival. On the contrary, the Cold War demonstrated, as never before, the limits and futility of military alliances, particularly for economically and militarily weak states, and led to a rapid proliferation of non-alignment in the period of *detente*.

NEW ECONOMIC DIMENSION

In the course of its rapid development as an international movement, non-alignment has changed its character and content in an important aspect. From a primarily political strategy individually and collectively followed by the new states, it has transformed itself fundamentally into a collective economic movement of the Third World countries, entered forcefully into the North-South economic confrontation, and spearheaded the demand and the struggle for a new international economic order based on equality and justice. Anti-imperialism and anti-racism still constitute the dominant motivation of the movement, but with an increasingly economic overtone.

The Belgrade Summit Conference of the non-aligned states was primarily concerned with broad political issues like anti-imperialism and anti-racialism; the threat of war, aggression and intervention; foreign military bases; national self-determination; disarmament, peaceful coexistence and world peace. The participants demanded the "total and final abolition of colonialism" and resolved "to make a concerted effort to put an end to all types of new colonialism and imperialist domination in all its forms and manifestations." In particular, they condemned and demanded an immediate end to French colonialism in Algeria and Tunisia, Portuguese colonialism in Angola, and Belgian colonialism as well as foreign intervention in the Congo. They also condemned "the imperialist policies pursued in the Middle East" and demanded the restoration of the full rights of the Palestinian people in accordance with the Charter and the resolutions of the United Nations. They supported the Cuban demand for the withdrawal of the US military base at Guantanamo, and the right of the Cuban people to choose their own political system freely. Having condemned and demanded the immediate abandonment of the policy of *apartheid* as practised by the Government of South Africa, they further declared that "the policy of racial discrimination anywhere in the world constitutes a grave violation

of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights." Referring to the danger of the Cold War transforming itself into an open global war, the participants stated that foreign military bases were aggravating this danger. In this situation, they called for a "general, complete and strictly and internationally controlled disarmament." In particular, they demanded "the total prohibition of the production, possession and utilization of nuclear and thermonuclear arms, bacteriological and chemical weapons, as well as the elimination of equipment and installations for the delivery and placement and operational use of weapons of mass destruction on national territories." In addition, they demanded that all future disarmament negotiations should be held under the auspices of the United Nations, that non-aligned states should be represented in all such negotiations, and that disarmament should be guaranteed by international teams of inspections and control which must include representatives of the non-aligned states.⁸

The Conference declared that the peaceful coexistence and co-operation of states with different social and political systems was the "only alternative to the Cold War and to a possible general nuclear catastrophe." But it was quick to point out that peaceful coexistence and international co-operation must never mean the curtailment of the right of national self-determination in any sense. The principles of peaceful coexistence, it was explained, "include the right of peoples to self-determination, to independence, and to a free determination of the forms and methods of economic, social and cultural development."⁹

The Belgrade Summit Conference was not, of course, altogether devoid of economic content. But the economic resolutions were relatively low in priority and significance, as well as of a preliminary and exploratory nature. Thus the participants merely said that they "consider that efforts should be made to remove the economic imbalance inherited from colonialism and imperialism." But the major remedy suggested for this imbalance was accelerated economic development of the new states, rather than an economic confrontation with the industrialized states. The structural aspects of international economic organization were barely noticed. They recommended the establishment of a United Nations Capital Development Fund. They "further agree to demand just terms of trade for the economically less developed countries, and, in particular, constructive efforts to eliminate the excessive fluctuations in primary commodity trade and the restrictive measures and practices which adversely affect the trade and revenues of the newly developing countries." All developing countries were invited to promote economic co-operation and exchange among themselves. Finally with regard to foreign aid, the participants demanded the freedom of the recipient states "to determine the use of economic and technical assistance which they receive, and to draw up their own plans and assign priorities in accordance with their needs."¹⁰

The second Summit Conference of the non-aligned states held at Cairo

in 1964 was not fundamentally different from the Belgrade Conference in so far as its primary concern was global political issues. The resolutions of the Conference were grouped under the following eleven main headings in the final declaration, only one of which, it will be noted, deals with economic issues :

- (i) Concerted action for the liberation of the countries still dependent : elimination of colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism.
- (ii) Respect for the right of peoples to self-determination and condemnation of the use of force against the existence of this right.
- (iii) Racial discrimination and the policy of *apartheid*.
- (iv) Peaceful coexistence and the codification of its principles by the United Nations.
- (v) Respect for the sovereignty of states and their territorial integrity : problems of divided nations.
- (vi) Settlement of disputes without threat or use of force in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.
- (vii) General and complete disarmament, peaceful use of atomic energy, prohibition of all nuclear weapon tests, establishment of nuclear-free zones, prevention of dissemination of nuclear weapons and abolition of all nuclear weapons.
- (viii) Military pacts, foreign troops and bases.
- (ix) The United Nations: its role in international affairs, implementation of its resolutions and amendment of its Charter.
- (x) Economic development and co-operation.
- (xi) Cultural, scientific and educational co-operation and consolidation of the international and regional organizations working for this purpose.¹¹

The resolutions against imperialism and racialism as well as those against foreign military bases were stronger and more elaborate than those of the Belgrade conference, the emphasis on national self-determination was stronger, and new items such as nuclear-free zones and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons were added to the comprehensive resolution on disarmament. But otherwise, the Cairo Conference also remained in substance a fundamentally political movement. There was, however, the beginning of a new consciousness (though not yet of a collective endeavour) regarding the structural aspects of international economic relations. The Conference noted that "the structure of world economy and the existing international institutions of international trade and development have failed either to reduce the disparity in the per capita income of the peoples in developing and developed countries or to promote international action to rectify serious and growing imbalances between developed and developing countries. It recommended a programme of action "to provide access for primary products from developing countries to the markets of industrial countries,

on an equitable basis and for manufactured goods from developing countries on a preferential basis.” It welcomed UNCTAD-I (which it considered to be the result of the Belgrade Summit), recommended an upward revision of the targets of the UN Development Decade, and called for a new international division of labour. Apart from calling for closer economic co-operation among the developing countries and the consolidation of the efforts of the “Group of 77” which had worked unitedly at UNCTAD-I in Geneva earlier in the year, it declared for the first time “that it is the duty of all countries to contribute to the rapid evolution of a new and just economic order.”¹²

The Lusaka Summit Conference of non-aligned states, held in 1970, marks an important stage in the evolution of the content of non-alignment, in so far as international economic questions relating to the basic structure of the international system assumed major significance at this conference. The old political issues were not ignored. General resolutions were adopted on *apartheid* and racial discrimination, de-colonization, disarmament, the United Nations, and on strengthening the role of the non-aligned countries. More specific resolutions were also adopted on the Portuguese colonies of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau, Zimbabwe, Indo-China, the Middle East, Namibia, Cyprus, Israeli aggression against Lebanon, and the sea bed. As before, almost all of these resolutions contained open or veiled attacks on the West.¹³ It was in the economic sphere, however, that a new awareness of the structural imbalance between the developed and the developing nations was clearly discernible. The conference reviewed the lack of progress in the implementation of the global economic policies and objectives of the non-aligned countries by the international community. It observed that the rapidly widening gulf between the developing and the developed states constituted a threat to international peace and security. It noted the decline in the share of the developing states of world export trade from one-third in 1950 to one-sixth in 1969, the decrease in financial flows from developed to the developing states in terms of percentage of GNP and the increase in the financial flows from the latter to the former. It declared that “the poverty of developing nations and their economic dependence on those in affluent circumstances constitute a structural weakness in present world economic order.” It stressed the urgent need for preventing “technological colonialism.” It expressed the hope that the Second UN Development Decade would lead to “structural changes in the world economic system.” It pleaded for a massive transfer of investment from armaments to development projects on a global basis. It urged the United Nations “to employ international machinery to bring about a rapid transformation of the world economic system, particularly in the field of trade, finance and technology, so that economic domination yields to economic co-operation and economic strength is used for the benefit of the world community;” and “to view the development process in a global context and to adopt a programme of international action for utilization of world resources in

men and materials, science and technology." It demanded that the net financial transfers from the developed to the developing states should constitute at least 1 per cent of the GNP of each developed state, and that 75 per cent of these funds should come from official sources. The demand was also made for restraining the "alarming" increase in freight rates and for eliminating discriminatory and restrictive elements from such rates. As regards their own strategy, the participants resolved to increase their economic co-operation and integration at the sub-regional and inter-regional levels; to accelerate the conclusion of commodity agreements among themselves; to strengthen the capabilities of the United Nations; to further the unity and solidarity of the "Group of 77" at all levels, including the convening of a ministerial meeting to prepare for UNCTAD-III.¹⁴

The Algiers Summit Conference of 1973 continued this trend. The old political resolutions were generally repeated. But there was greater criticism of the US role in Vietnam and Cambodia, and of American neo-colonialism in Latin America. The participants also gave vigorous support to the Arab peoples in general and against Israel in particular. There was also a general condemnation of "the neo-colonialist exploitation of developing countries." The "creation of zones of peace and co-operation in the various regions of the world on the basis of the principles of the UN Charter" was recommended. In this connexion, the adoption by the 26th session of the UN General Assembly of a resolution declaring the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, and the Kuala Lumpur declaration by the five ASEAN states regarding the neutralization of Southeast Asia were welcomed.¹⁵

But it was again the emerging economic dimension of the collective non-aligned movement which added a special significance to the Algiers conference. The participants took note of the deteriorating condition of the developing countries *vis-a-vis* the developed ones "in the international context since the Lusaka conference, with special reference to the United Nations' international development strategy, the Third UNCTAD, the United Nations conference on the Human Environment, preparations for multilateral trade negotiations, reform of the monetary system, and the important Conference of Foreign Ministers of non-aligned countries in Georgetown [Guyana]." The growing economic gap between the two worlds was demonstrated with statistical data, and it was unanimously stated that the international strategy of development had failed. It was observed that the otherwise modest share of the developing countries in the world's economy was steadily diminishing, whereas the conditions of trade were constantly deteriorating, and that developed countries continued to appropriate to themselves a considerable number of scientific and technical personnel from the developing countries. The Heads of State or government also made the radical declaration that "economic aid has been misused so far, wiping out the developing countries' aspirations." They observed that the international monetary system worked out at Bretton Woods had served only the interests of some developed countries, and demanded its radical

restructuring. As regards multinational corporations, they “denounce before the world public the inadmissible practices of multinational companies, which encroach upon the sovereignty of developing countries and violate the principles of non-interference and the right of nations to self-determination, which are the basic conditions for political, economic and social progress in those countries.” So far as protection of the human environment is concerned, they “consider economic backwardness to be the worst kind of pollution,” which should, therefore, receive the highest priority. The conference requested the United Nations to adopt “a charter of the economic rights and duties of states” at the 28th session of the General Assembly on a priority basis. It pleaded for greater co-operation between the developing and the developed states in the economic and technological spheres, but declared the sovereign rights of the developing countries over all their natural resources.¹⁶

On their own part, the participants resolved to increase economic co-operation among themselves and to co-ordinate their policies against the multinational corporations. An “Action Programme of Economic Co-operation” was adopted at the conference with this end in view. The co-operative action programme included such items as (1) the establishment of communication channels, (2) relations between advanced and developing countries, (3) international monetary and fiscal systems, (4) transfer of technology, (5) primary products, (6) environment, and (7) co-operation with the Socialist countries. The last item, introduced for the first time at a non-aligned summit conference, envisaged wide-ranging co-operation between the non-aligned and the Socialist countries including the setting up of joint committees for mutual economic co-operation and development. In particular, it was observed that the Socialist countries “should in their development plans make a provision for the needs and export possibilities of non-aligned countries,” and that they “should grant more favourable terms to intensify trade, economic relations, and scientific and technical co-operation with the non-aligned countries.”¹⁷

A new and interesting feature of the Algiers conference was the awareness of the participating states of the need to preserve their cultural identities. The acknowledged fact, they said, was that imperialism did not limit its activities to political and economic domains only, but branched out into cultural and social domains as well, thus imposing its “ideological domination alien to the peoples of the developing world.” They 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...”¹⁸

The Colombo Summit Conference (1976) was an important landmark in the evolution of the non-aligned movement for a variety of reasons. In the first place, it was the first summit conference to be held in the continent of Asia, the original home of non-alignment. Secondly, it gave greater

prominence than before to African and Latin American issues. As regards Africa : "The Conference noted that the identification of the African continent as a whole with non-alignment was a development of major significance in the history of non-alignment. Africa gave numerical strength to the movement which contributed to making it a powerful force in the UN. Africa gave a firm anti-colonial and anti-racist content to the movement. As a continent which has suffered from big Power deals, and from the worst ravages of slavery and colonialism, it brought out most sharply the prerequisites of a new international order. As the continent with the largest number of least-developed countries and one which suffered the enormous Sahel famine, it gave impetus to the demands for a new international economic order." The political declaration as well as a number of resolutions denounced at great length White racism in southern Africa and the Western Powers like the United States, France, the United Kingdom and West Germany which were extending moral and material support to the racist regimes in that area. The political declaration further stated that "the emancipation of Africa, the ending of racial discrimination against people of African origin all over the world, the protection of Africa from the rivalries of external Powers, the de-nuclearization of Africa, and international co-operation for the economic and social development of Africa should not be merely regional or continental concerns but the priorities of the non-aligned movement and of the United Nations." As regards Latin America, the conference noted that it was one of the areas of the world that "has suffered most intensely from the suggestion of colonialism and United States imperialism." It denounced "threats and new aggressions against Cuba made by United States imperialism" and also reiterated its "condemnation of the blockade imposed by United States imperialism in an effort to isolate and destroy the Cuban revolution." It supported the struggle of the people of Belize for self-determination and "backed and encouraged the nationalist and independent measures" adopted by Ecuador, Venezuela, Colombia, Panama, Mexico and other Latin American states and condemned "every attempt at coercion or aggression" by the United States. In recognition of the great role played by Latin America in the non-aligned movement in recent years, it was decided to hold the Sixth Non-aligned Summit Conference in Havana in 1979.¹⁹

Thirdly, in a resolution on "the Use of Veto," the Colombo Summit Conference called for the abolition of the veto system and the amendment of the UN Charter accordingly. The resolution stated, *inter alia* :

2. [The conference] Considers that the hegemony of the big Powers within the Security Council and their use of the veto have diminished the prestige of the United Nations and the importance of its resolutions *vis-a-vis* the international community.
3. Calls upon all United Nations member states to direct all their efforts towards the reconsideration of the United Nations Charter,

particularly as regards the right of veto, enjoyed by the permanent members of the Security Council.

4. Requests all non-aligned member-countries to strive for the amendment of the United Nations Charter with a view to safeguarding their interests and attaining their aspirations, and in order to implement the principles of equality among all United Nations member states.²⁰

All previous non-aligned conferences had pledged loyalty and dedication to the United Nations. But the Colombo summit for the first time called for a radical amendment of the UN Charter to ensure the political equality of nations.

But the most significant feature of the Colombo Conference was the developing trend of the pre-occupation of non-aligned states with international economic issues. The Economic Declaration stated that the widening gap between the developed and the developing countries was "one of the most threatening sources of tensions and conflicts," and that "the existing system cannot ensure the promotion of the development of the developing countries and hasten the eradication of poverty, hunger, sickness, illiteracy and also the social scourges engendered by centuries of domination and exploitation." The conference explained in detail the economic inequalities and injustices perpetrated by the richer nations on the poorer ones, welcomed the resolution adopted at the twenty-ninth session of the UN General Assembly regarding the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and denounced the obstructionist policies followed by the developed countries with regard to the implementation of this Charter and the allied resolutions and action programme. It declared that "nothing short of a complete restructuring of international economic relations through the establishment of the new international economic order will place developing countries in a position to achieve an acceptable level of development." The new international economic order must include (a) fundamental restructuring of international trade, with special reference to the terms of trade; (b) fundamental restructuring of world production on the basis of a new international division of labour; (c) radical overhauling of the existing international monetary arrangements; (d) adequate transfer of resources "on an assured, continuous and predictable basis"; (e) urgent and adequate solution to the problem of external debt, particularly of the "least developed and the most seriously affected nations;" (f) financial and technological assistance to the developing nations for the development of their agriculture; and (g) free access to sea for land-locked countries."²¹

As regards the efforts of the non-aligned countries themselves for their own economic development, the conference emphasized the need for collective self-reliance and the "interdependence within the global economy" It welcomed the "exemplary unity" of the non-aligned states at the UNCTAD-IV and in the General Assembly of the United Nations with

regard to global economic issues. It adopted a detailed and itemized "Action Programme for Economic Co-operation" among the non-aligned states themselves as well with other developing states. The programme of co-operative action consists of the following major items : raw materials, trade, monetary and financial co-operation, industrialization, food and agriculture, fisheries, transport, telecommunications, insurance, public enterprises, health, technical co-operation and consultancy services, scientific and technological development, employment and human resource development, role of women in development, research and information system, tourism, transnational corporations, private foreign investment, nuclear energy, and sports. Each item was subdivided into detailed programmes of action. As many as 15 co-ordinating groups of non-aligned countries were set up to look after the implementation of the different items of co-operation.²²

Thus, it is evident that while the non-aligned movement has not lost its essentially anti-imperialist and anti-racialist character, in recent years it has increasingly assumed the character of a predominantly economic movement of the ex-colonial and developing states. Anti-imperialism and anti-racism have in fact shed some part of the political vehemence associated with them, and put on a new economic garb in the contemporary international milieu. In a sense, this was inevitable. The virtual completion of the process of de-colonization has led to a basic alteration in the political structure of international relations. The political aspect of imperialism is not as deeply felt by the developing states today as it was a quarter century ago. On the other hand, various forms of economic domination and exploitation are existential characteristics of their collective historical condition today. They feel that their acute economic frustrations are largely due to the inequity and injustice of international economic relations, in particular to the wanton and exploitative machinations of the rich nations. They regard the inequitable international economic system as a vestige and a legacy of historical imperialism. But while direct political imperialism is by and large only a past experience, economic imperialism practised by the same imperialist Powers is an obnoxious contemporary reality. Needless to say, White racism, the inevitable concomitant of White imperialism, is still a degrading, humiliating and revolting reality in southern Africa. But with the virtual disappearance of political imperialism, the edge of the political aspect of anti-racism has to some extent been blunted. Global White racism as a major factor in international relations still remains,²³ but it has become newly identified, in the eyes of the non-aligned nations, the overwhelming majority of whom are non-White, with the global economic domination of the White and industrialized nations. Finally, it may be noted that while the non-aligned nations are characterized by different ideologies and political systems, and often have conflicting or divergent political interests, they all share the common urge for rapid economic development and for a new international economic order. Global economic issues,

therefore, constitute the most important unifying bond among them.

The non-aligned states themselves are fully aware of this gradual shift of their movement from political to economic issues, and have even taken care to explain that their recent pre-occupation with global economic issues does in no way indicate a downgrading of their common international political objectives. Thus, while the Colombo Summit Conference "noted with satisfaction that non-aligned meetings are giving increasing importance to economic affairs," it also cautioned the participating states against adopting a non-political attitude. A declaration on "Politics and Economics" said, *inter alia* :

It is incontestable that there is an integral connection between politics and economics, and it is erroneous to approach economic affairs in isolation from politics. A complete change of political attitude and the demonstration of a new political will is an indispensable prerequisite for the realisation of the new international economic order.

The increased importance given to economic affairs at non-aligned meetings does not imply acceptance of the view that the political aspects of international affairs should be left to the rich and powerful states, while the poor and weak should mainly concern themselves with economic affairs. That view has to be regarded as part of an imperialist strategy aimed at preserving an international order favourable to the rich and powerful. It is appropriate for the non-aligned to be concerned with the political as well as economic aspects of international affairs. The importance given to economic affairs does not diminish the importance given to political affairs at non-aligned meetings.²⁴

INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THE MOVEMENT

The non-aligned movement could not have proliferated to such an extent and gathered such momentum within a relatively short period of time without considerable institutionalization, including procedure building for participation, organization, interest articulation and aggregation, and international communication. As a matter of fact, such institutionalization has proceeded *pari passu* with the growth and proliferation of the movement, and imparted stability and vitality to it which have made it a viable new model of international relations.

Perhaps, the origins of non-alignment as an international movement can be traced to the Asian Relations Conference held in New Delhi in March 1947, five months before the independence of India. The Interim Government of India led by Nehru had already declared an independent foreign policy free from the influence of the rival power blocs, although the term 'non-alignment' was not used at that stage. The leaders of Asian states assembled at the conference also generally advocated a similar policy for

their own countries and expressed a common solidarity against imperialism and racism. The conference of Asian states held in New Delhi in 1949 in support of Indonesia's independence from Dutch rule further consolidated the gains of the earlier conference. The Bandung Conference of Afro-Asian states (which included both aligned and non-aligned states) held in 1955 extended the bases of non-alignment and of the solidarity of the Afro-Asian states and national movements against imperialism and racism. Although none of these three conferences were held in the name of non-alignment, they certainly laid the historical foundations for the future proliferation of the non-aligned movement. The Nehru-Nasser-Tito meeting at Brioni in 1956 was the first conference which, though attended only by the three principal founders of the non-aligned movement, can be called a non-aligned conference proper. But the institutionalization of non-alignment as an international movement did not begin until the Cairo Preparatory Conference of June 1961, which was convened by Nasser, Tito and Nehru, and attended by 20 states and one observer (Brazil). It was as a result of the deliberations of this preparatory conference that the first non-aligned summit conference was held in Belgrade in September 1961.

The Cairo Preparatory Conference adopted the following criteria for the issuing of invitations to prospective participants for the Belgrade Summit Conference :—

1. The country should have adopted an independent policy based on the coexistence of states with different political and social systems and on non-alignment, or should be following a trend in favour of such a policy.
2. The country concerned should be consistently supporting the movements for national independence.
3. The country should not be a member of a multilateral military alliance concluded in the context of Great Power conflicts.
4. If a country has a bilateral military agreement with a Great Power, or is a member of a regional defence pact, the agreement or pact should not be one deliberately concluded in the context of Great Power conflicts.
5. If it has conceded military bases to a foreign Power, the concession should not have been made in the context of Great Power conflicts.²⁵

These criteria became, through invitations to the non-aligned conferences, also the criteria for membership of the non-aligned movement in subsequent years. Contrary to popular belief, the emphasis was not on ideological neutrality, but on an independent foreign policy, anti-imperialism, and the avoidance of military alliances dominated by the big Powers. As a matter of fact, the participation of Yugoslavia and Cuba gave an ideologically plural character to the non-aligned movement from its very inception. The proliferation of the movement in the sixties and

seventies among the newly-independent and developing states spread over four continents further added to the diversity and plurality of the ideologies, politico-economic systems and socio-cultural traditions of the member states. But the basic criteria for membership adopted at the Cairo Preparatory Conference have not so far been relaxed. Prior to the Colombo Conference, the nearly universal demand for participation in the conference had aroused the suspicion that interested big Powers were trying to subvert the movement through the induction of subordinate states which did not satisfy the original criteria for membership. The conference, therefore, sounded a note of caution in this respect. The Political Declaration of the conference "considered that the growing role and importance of non-alignment made it imperative that its members exercise unceasing vigilance to preserve intact the essential character of non-alignment, maintain unswerving fidelity to its principles and policies and show full respect for its decisions as the best safeguard against any threat to the integrity and solidarity of the movement."²⁶

An attempt has, however, been made to allow certain peripheral states, national freedom or "liberation" movements, regional political organizations, and international organizations including the United Nations, to attend the various non-aligned conferences as observers, and since the Lusaka Conference of 1970, also as guests, the status of guests being presumably lower than that of the observers. The list of invitees, observers and guests is always prepared at the various preparatory conferences on the basis of consensus. Observers have sometimes, though not often, been promoted to the rank of full members between two summit conferences.

The organizational aspects of the movement have also assumed a stable, systematic, and continually developing character. The Cairo Preparatory Conference, as already noted, led to the Belgrade Summit Conference. Since then the various preparatory conferences have not only determined the membership of the movement, but also the venue and time, the agenda, procedures, organization and administration of the subsequent summit conferences. They have also prepared many of the draft resolutions of the summit conferences. In other words, the institution of preparatory conferences has been playing a fundamental organizational role in the evolution of the non-aligned movement. In addition, there have been a number of "informal" and "consultative" meetings, and meetings of various Standing Committees. Thus, between the Belgrade and the Cairo Summit Conferences, there took place a Preparatory Conference at Colombo in March 1964. Between the Cairo and the Lusaka Summit Conferences, there took place a Consultative Meeting at Belgrade in July 1969, an Informal Meeting in New York in September 1969, an Asian Meeting at Colombo in March 1970, a Preparatory Conference at Dar-es-Salaam in April 1970, and two Standing Committee meetings (arising out of the Dar-es-Salaam Preparatory Conference) at New Delhi and Lusaka in June and July 1970 respectively. Between the Lusaka and the Algiers Summit Conferences were

held a Ministerial Consultative Meeting at New York in September 1971, and three Preparatory Committee Meetings at Georgetown in February 1972, Kuala Lumpur in May 1972 and Georgetown in August 1972 respectively. An important Conference of Foreign Ministers was also held at Georgetown in August 1972. After the Algiers Summit Conference, there was a Foreign Ministers' Conference at Lima (Peru) in August 1975, three meetings of the Co-ordinating Bureau and a 'mini-summit' at New Delhi in July 1976 with the specific agenda of a non-aligned news pool. The non-aligned states have also developed the regular practice of organizing informal meetings of their delegations in New York on the eve of each General Assembly Session in order to work out a common strategy, as far as possible. A similar practice has also been developed at the various UNCTAD conferences under the auspices of the "Group of 77" (which in fact has 117 members at present).

The non-aligned states have also tried in recent years to set up a relatively permanent organizational nucleus in the form of a Co-ordinating Bureau, although the movement does not as yet have a permanent secretariat. At the Georgetown Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-aligned Countries, held in August 1972, the participants adopted a resolution recommending to the next summit conference the setting up of a Standing Committee of Non-aligned Countries to review all preparatory work of the yearly ministerial-level meeting of the non-aligned countries in September, on the eve of the UN General Assembly session. It was to consist of 7 non-aligned countries elected on the basis of geographical distribution and yearly rotation by the annual September meeting at New York. The Burmese delegation, however, expressed the reservation that "it is inopportune and impractical to institutionalize the non-aligned movement."²⁷ The Algiers Summit Conference, which took up this recommendation for consideration, set up a Co-ordinating Bureau, consisting of 17 member states, with the responsibility of supervising the implementation of the decisions of the summit conferences, to organize the various non-aligned meetings and conferences between two summits, and to carry on the work of the non-aligned movement during the same period. There was also a proposal at the Algiers Summit Conference for the establishment of a permanent secretariat which, however, was shelved until the next summit conference.²⁸

The Co-ordinating Bureau, which seems to have been created on a somewhat tenuous and *ad hoc* basis at Algiers, was given a more statutory basis at the Colombo Summit Conference. At its final session, the conference adopted a major "Decision Regarding the Composition and Mandate of the Co-ordinating Bureau" on the basis of a recommendation of a meeting of the non-aligned Foreign Ministers also held at Colombo during the summit conference. The composition and functions of the Co-ordinating Bureau, as decided at the Colombo Summit Conference, are to be as follows :

1. In the intervening period between conferences of Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries, the Co-ordinating Bureau is the organ of non-aligned countries entrusted with the co-ordination of their joint activities aimed at implementing decisions and programmes adopted at summit conferences, Ministerial Conferences, meetings of the Group of Non-aligned Countries at the United Nations and other gatherings of non-aligned countries.
2. The Co-ordinating Bureau shall be composed of representatives of non-aligned countries taking into consideration the principles of balanced geographical distribution, continuity and rotation.
3. The Co-ordinating Bureau shall meet :
 - (i) at the level of Ministers or special Government representatives once a year or as necessary;
 - (ii) on a continuing basis at the level of permanent representatives of non-aligned countries at the United Nations Headquarters in New York once a month as a rule.

Detailed guidelines were given to the Co-ordination Bureau regarding its functioning, including implementation of summit conference decisions, economic co-operation among the non-aligned countries, co-ordination of the work and strategy of the non-aligned nations at the United Nations and in relation to the "Group of 77" etc. The Bureau's decisions "shall be adopted by consensus and in the spirit of and in keeping with the practice of conferences of non-aligned countries." The proceedings of the Co-ordination Bureau would be open to participation by all members of the non-aligned movement, but only the members of the Bureau would have the right of decision-making. The representative of the host country would be the Chairman of the Bureau, and the 25 members, elected regionally by consensus and holding a tenure valid up to the next summit conference, would be geographically distributed as follows: Africa, 12; Asia, 8; Latin America, 4; Europe, 1.

The Colombo Summit Conference did not establish a permanent secretariat for the Co-ordination Bureau, but it decided that "in keeping with the need of efficient functioning and co-ordination, the Chairman of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the non-aligned countries shall arrange for the provision of supporting services and facilities at his permanent mission at the United Nations Headquarters in New York supplemented, as necessary, by the permanent missions of other member countries of the Co-ordinating Bureau."²⁹

The various non-aligned conferences have also succeeded in articulating and aggregating the national interests of the member states to a considerable extent. Both at the preparatory conferences and the summit conferences, there has always been a persistent and systematic attempt to accommodate as many issues and points of view as possible on the basis of consensus. The various national delegations have usually come to the preparatory

conferences equipped with reports, memoranda, data papers and draft resolutions on issues considered by them to be vital to their respective national interests, and openly articulated and ventilated their views at the conferences. The deliberations of the preparatory conferences have usually resulted in the ironing out of differences and the evolution of a consensus wherever possible. The process has been continued into the summit conferences. Residuary disagreements have usually been expressed in the form of reservations to the various declarations, resolutions and communiques. The documents and background papers of the numerous conferences provide interesting insights into the process of articulation and aggregation of common as well as divergent national interests arising within the broader framework of the non-aligned movement.

The articulation and aggregation of the common objectives and approaches of the non-aligned countries, such as anti-imperialism and anti-racism in their political, economic and cultural aspects, and a new international economic order, have already been referred to. But many other issues of a regional, local or specifically national nature have also found a place in the various declarations and resolutions of the non-aligned conferences. Thus, the active and indispensable role played by the UAR in the non-aligned movement from the beginning has imparted an anti-Israeli character to virtually every non-aligned conference. The active participation of Cuba since 1961 mainly accounts for the strong condemnation of the imperialistic policies pursued by the United States in Latin America. With the progressive de-colonization in the continent of Africa in the sixties, and the corresponding increase in the number of African members of the non-aligned movement, the resolutions against racism became increasingly militant. The active intervention of such important non-aligned states as Indonesia and Malaysia led to the adoption by the non-aligned movement of the proposal for the neutralization of Southeast Asia floated by the ASEAN countries. The resolutions for converting the Indian Ocean into a permanent zone of peace reflected basically the national interests and objectives of India and Sri Lanka in the context of the growing Super-Power confrontation in the Indian Ocean, particularly the construction of the Diego Garcia base by the United States. The resolutions on the rights of the land-locked countries sought primarily to protect the interests of such active members as Nepal. And such instances can be multiplied.

The non-aligned countries have also succeeded in establishing and developing communication channels among themselves. As is now generally recognized, the existence and development of such communication channels is a primary precondition for the growth of international co-operation and integration. During the phase of historical imperialism, today's non-aligned nations had remained completely dominated by, and dependent on, the communication channels of the imperialist Powers. Even after their political emancipation, they had much less communication among themselves than between themselves individually and the former imperialist Powers. One

of the objectives of the non-aligned movement was to promote the solidarity of the new states of Asia and Africa through increased international communication. At the Asian Relations Conference in 1947, Nehru had spoken emotionally of the nations of Asia meeting one another at the conference after long centuries. Similar sentiments were also expressed generally at the Afro-Asian conference at Bandung in 1955. From the beginning, the various non-aligned conferences congratulated themselves for the coming together of the new states and resolved to increase contact and communication among themselves in the political, economic, technological and cultural spheres.

But, in recent years there has developed a sharper awareness among the non-aligned countries of the need for ending their dependence on the communication channels of the industrialized countries and for developing such channels among themselves in a planned and co-ordinated manner. The initiative in this regard was first taken by the Algiers Summit Conference in 1973. The Action Programme of Economic Co-operation adopted at the conference urged the "reorganization of existing communication networks which were inherited from the colonial past and which have prevented them from communicating freely, directly and rapidly," and incorporated provisions regarding collective self-reliance on the part of the non-aligned nations with regard to communication channels.³⁰ The Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-aligned Countries held at Lima in 1975 supported and further developed this proposal. An International Symposium of Non-aligned Countries organized in Tunis in March 1976 with a view to exploring the possibilities in this field made a number of concrete suggestions. Finally, the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-aligned Countries at the level of Foreign Ministers, meeting in Algiers in June 1976, decided to organize a Ministerial level Conference of Non-aligned Countries for the establishment of a Press Agencies Pool in New Delhi in July. The Co-ordinating Bureau characterized this proposed conference as "a significant step forward in co-operation among non-aligned countries in the field of information" and called for "the participation of all the non-aligned countries in ensuring the successful outcome."³¹

Accordingly, a conference of Information Ministers of non-aligned countries (popularly known as the 'mini-summit') was held in New Delhi in July 1976. It was attended by 59 members, 3 observer states and 4 observer organizations, including the United Nations. The participants tried to place the problem of international communication among the non-aligned countries in the structural context of international relations. "They expressed commitment to the improving of the flow of direct information and fast communication between each other, thereby promoting both greater mutual awareness and understanding of their common political and economic goals and also increasing mutually beneficial co-operation in the social and cultural fields. They stressed that the de-colonization of information is essential for these purposes and that the establishment of a new International

Order for Information is as necessary as the New International Economic Order.”³² The most tangible outcome of the conference was the launching of a Non-aligned Press Agencies Pool (popularly known as the ‘news pool’), complete with a constitution and a Co-ordinating Committee. It was also decided to develop the domestic communication systems of the member states as well as “mutually beneficial communication infrastructure and tariff.”³³ But the conference also pleaded for a general development of multi-dimensional communication in the political, economic, cultural, educational, scientific and technological spheres through the pooling of information, exchange of visits, conferences, seminars, periodicals, common research programmes, etc. It advocated the “formulation of a common approach with a view to evolving an international code on the functioning and use of satellite communications, transnational press agencies and a code on direct and objective dissemination and free flow of information among various countries.”³⁴ It pleaded for the co-ordination of the activities of the non-aligned countries at the United Nations and other international forums for the adoption of a “proper declaration of fundamental principles of the role of mass media in strengthening peace, promoting international understanding and co-operation, contributing to the early establishment of an international economic and social order based on equality and justice, and in combating racism, racial discrimination, *apartheid*, Zionism, neo-colonialism and all other forms of oppression.” These decisions and recommendations of the Delhi ‘mini-summit’ conference were fully endorsed subsequently by the Colombo Summit Conference.³⁶

Thus, instead of starting with an organizational infrastructure and then using it for the further development of the movement, the non-aligned states have allowed their movement to develop and proliferate across the globe more or less spontaneously, and have gradually established only such minimum institutional infrastructures as would be necessary for the stability and viability of the movement. The limitation of resources has undoubtedly been an important reason for the relatively slow institutionalization of the movement. So far, the expenses of all the conferences and meetings have been borne by all the non-aligned countries more or less equitably and through consensus. The setting up of a permanent international secretariat or other elaborate organizational apparatus may conceivably strain their limited resources beyond endurance. Yet, it would certainly be an exaggeration to say that the limitation of resources has been a compelling factor in this respect. The entire history of the non-aligned movement shows, on the contrary, that its leading decision-makers have followed from the beginning, as a matter of deliberate policy, the strategy of “incrementalism” (now advocated by neo-functionalists, communication theorists and integration theorists alike) with regard to the institutionalization of the movement.

A FUTURISTIC MODEL OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

All the non-aligned countries combined together would not be able to match either the military power or even the industrial and technological power and potential of even one Super Power. Even so, the very essence of the strategy of non-alignment is the avoidance of military alliances, although such alliances may have appeared to be necessary, in terms of the traditional approach to international relations, in the interest of national security, or for augmenting national power. In other words, the non-aligned countries, which constitute two-thirds of the membership of the United Nations and the majority of the human race, have rejected the fundamental assumption of conventional international theory which defines national interest in terms of national power. Obviously, the non-aligned countries have not rejected national interest as the goal of foreign policy. But they have made their debut in twentieth-century international relations by challenging the paradigm of power and defining their national interest (as well as that of all other states) in terms of communication and co-operation.

From the beginning, the non-aligned movement was based on the principle of communication—of exchange of information and ideas, their articulation, aggregation and ventilation. The member states refused to form military alliances not only with external Powers, but even among themselves. The regular holding of non-aligned summit and other conferences gave an institutional character to the process of multilateral communication and feedback represented by the non-aligned movement. The recent attempt to develop, in a planned manner, infrastructures of communication channels among the non-aligned countries, if successful, would further strengthen the process of communication and co-operation among them.

Admittedly, the non-aligned movement is not a non-political one. From the beginning of the movement, its major objective was the political unity of the new and developing states which were willing to follow an independent foreign policy. In fact, the movement gradually became a protective umbrella which not only provided a shelter and a sense of belonging to the new states, but also enabled many of them to follow an independent foreign policy to an extent that would perhaps have been impossible without it. The non-aligned states have individually and collectively expressed themselves in an essentially political idiom and style, not only against the global political realities of imperialism, neo-imperialism and racism, but also on a wide variety of specific as well as general political issues affecting themselves and other nations. They have effectively used the non-aligned conferences as well as the United Nations and other international forums for furthering their collective political objectives. The recent shift of emphasis to international economic issues, particularly to the demand for a new international economic order, does not indicate, as the Colombo Conference took pains to point out, that the non-aligned movement has lost its political character. But it remains equally true that the kind of politics in which

the non-aligned states are engaged is a new kind of politics which is based essentially on the futuristic paradigm of communication, rather than on the traditional paradigm of power. As the Colombo Conference rightly pointed out: "The non-aligned have always considered that world conflict is not inevitable. . . . They have rejected the view that international peace can be based on a balance of power or that security can be ensured by countries joining power blocs and military alliances with great Powers. The non-aligned have consistently upheld the principle of international co-operation as the basis for a secure world order and have opposed the notion that confrontation can be the only course for the comity of nations."³⁷

It is well-known that the big Powers were initially quite critical of non-alignment, some of them even going to the extent of regarding it as an opportunistic, immoral and even sinful policy. They believed that non-alignment could serve neither the interests of the non-aligned states themselves nor those of the world at large. Although, in recent years there has been a reappraisal and partial understanding of the non-aligned movement by the big Powers, some of them are yet to regard the non-aligned states as a recognizable reality and a benign force in international relations. Henry Kissinger's world view based on the "five poles of power", his fulminations against the non-aligned movement, and the attitude adopted by the United States and some other Western states at the United Nations towards the non-aligned states in recent years illustrate the point.

And yet the non-aligned movement has already made fundamental contributions to the theory and practice of international relations, and considerably modified the character of both. Among these contributions the following are perhaps the most important:

1. It has played a vital role in accelerating the process of de-colonization by politically and morally strengthening the freedom struggles in the colonies and by pressurizing the colonial Powers through the United Nations and other international forums, as well as through world public opinion.
2. It has become a potent international force against imperialism, neo-imperialism, racism and hegemonism as practised by the big states against the small ones, and for national self-determination and self-reliance of the new and developing states.
3. It has led to the virtual universalization of the international system. In spite of de-colonization and the emergence of the new states as formally independent international legal persons, and in spite of the United Nations, international relations would probably have remained characterized by a small centre consisting of the few militarily and industrially strong countries and a larger periphery structurally related to the former in a pattern of domination and dependency, but for the non-aligned movement. This movement has for the first time given the weak states the role of subjects rather

than only of objects of international relations, and thus laid the foundations of a universal international system which would be capable of incorporating the principle of international political equality both in theory and practice.

4. The solidarity of the non-aligned states and the initiative taken by them at the non-aligned summit conferences, the United Nations and the UNCTAD conferences have led to the general recognition of the need for a new international order based on both political and economic equality. The political vigour and dynamism of the non-aligned movement is a guarantee that the new international order will not remain a pious wish or a wholly unrealized dream like many past utopias.
5. The development and rapid proliferation of the non-aligned movement has prevented the threatened division of the world into two or more antagonistic power blocs and spheres of influence, and thus created the necessary global political environment for the de-escalation of conflict and reduction of international tensions.
6. By de-emphasizing the old paradigm of power in favour of the new paradigm of communication, the non-aligned movement has demonstrated the viability of a future world order, for, as is now generally recognized by scholars in the field, it is communication, rather than power, which can lead to international co-operation and eventual international integration.³⁸

Thus, although the non-aligned movement started with, and still retains, a fundamentally anti-imperialist and anti-West character, it has already proved to be a viable, futuristic, and potentially universal communication model of international relations and world order. For, there is nothing logically improbable in the further erosion of the slowly vanishing bipolarity of the international system and the further dilution, if not disappearance, of the system of military alliances. The limits of power, as revealed by nuclear deterrence, have undoubtedly conditioned the opening up of new dimensions of the theory and practice of international relations. But no less significant has been the obvious contribution of the non-aligned movement to this cause. And it is only the ethnocentric prejudice and intellectual myopia of the Western theorists which prevent them, with a few rare exceptions, from recognizing non-alignment as at least one of the major models of the international system and giving it some space in their textbooks on international relations.

March 1977

FOOTNOTES

- 1 Other examples of such negative Indian terms expressing positive values or actions are: non-dualism (*advaita*), non-violence (*ahimsa*), non-co-operation (*asahayoga*), non-possession (*aparigraha*), non-covetousness (*asteya*), non-reality (*asat*), etc.
- 2 Data for the Belgrade, Cairo and Lusaka Conferences have been compiled from

Conferences of Non-aligned States: Documents, Ministry of External Affairs (New Delhi, 1973). Hereinafter referred to as *Non-aligned Conference Documents*, this source contains the complete documents not only of the summit conferences but also of all preparatory conferences and other meetings of the non-aligned countries from the Cairo Preparatory Conference held in June 1961 to the Georgetown Conference of Foreign Ministers held in August 1972. Data for the Algiers Summit Conference have been taken from the full texts of the documents published in *Review of International Affairs* (Belgrade), Vol. XXIV, No. 563, 20 September 1973 (hereinafter referred to as *Algiers Summit Conference Documents*). The next number of this journal, dated 5 October 1973, contains summaries of all the major speeches made at this conference. Data for the Colombo Summit Conference have been taken from the documents of the conference published in *Review of International Affairs*, Vol. XXVII, No. 634, 5 September 1976 (hereinafter referred to as *Colombo Summit Conference Documents*).

- 3 For a detailed analysis of the factors which influence the making of foreign policy in developing states, with special reference to India, see J. Bandyopadhyaya, *The Making of India's Foreign Policy* (Bombay, 1970), Ch. 2; "Making of Foreign Policy: A Tentative Subsystemic Model for South Asia", *South Asian Studies*, (Jaipur) July 1968; "Economic Bases of Foreign Policy", *India Quarterly* (New Delhi), October-December 1969; "Nonalignment in India's Foreign Policy", *Indian and Foreign Review* (New Delhi), 1 February, 1973; and "Nehru and Nonalignment" in B.R. Nanda (ed.), *Indian Foreign Policy: the Nehru Years*, (New Delhi, 1976).
- 4 Lusaka Summit Conference, "Declaration", para. 3, *Nonaligned Conference Documents*, p. 60.
- 5 "Political Declaration", paras 24-25, *Algiers Summit Conference Documents*.
- 6 "Political Declaration", para. 7, *Colombo Summit Conference Documents*.
- 7 See J. Bandyopadhyaya, *Social and Political Thought of Gandhi*, (Bombay, 1969), pp. 58-59, 79, 93-96.
- 8 Belgrade Summit Conference, "Declaration", *Nonaligned Conference Documents*, pp. 9-14.
- 9 Ibid.
- 10 Ibid.
- 11 Cairo Summit Conference, "Declaration", *Nonaligned Conference Documents*, pp. 22-35.
- 12 Ibid.
- 13 Lusaka Summit Conference, "Declaration" and "Resolutions", *Nonaligned Conference Documents*, pp. 59-78.
- 14 Ibid.
- 15 "Political Declaration", "Declaration on the Struggle for National Liberation", and "Resolutions", *Algiers Summit Conference Documents*.
- 16 "Economic Declaration" and "Resolutions", *Algiers Summit Conference Documents*.
- 17 "Action Programme of Economic Co-operation", *Algiers Summit Conference Documents*.
- 18 Item XIV of "Economic Declaration", *Algiers Summit Conference Documents*.
- 19 "Political Declaration" and "Resolutions", *Colombo Summit Conference Documents*.
- 20 "Resolution on the Use of Veto", *Colombo Summit Conference Documents*.
- 21 "Economic Declaration", *Colombo Summit Conference Documents*.
- 22 "Action Programme for Economic Co-operation", *Colombo Summit Conference Documents*.
- 23 See Ronald Segal, *The Race War*, (London, 1967); Tilden J. Le Melle and George W. Shepherd, Jr., "Race Relations in the Future of International Relations", *Journal of International Affairs* (New York), Vol. XXV, No. 2, 1971; J. Bandyopadhyaya, "Racism and International Relations", *Alternatives* (Amsterdam), March 1977.
- 24 Item XX of "Political Declaration", *Colombo Summit Conference Documents*.

- 25 Cairo Preparatory Conference, "Criteria Adopted", *Nonaligned Conference Documents*, p. 8.
- 26 Item III, para 6 of "Political Declaration", *Colombo Summit Conference Documents*.
- 27 Georgetown Conference of Foreign Ministers of Nonaligned Countries, "Resolution on Coordination", *Nonaligned Conference Documents*, p. 150.
- 28 *Asian Recorder*, (New Delhi), 1974 (April), p. 11972.
- 29 "Decision Regarding the Composition and Mandate of the Co-ordinating Bureau", *Colombo Summit Conference Documents*.
- 30 Item XIII of "Action Programme for Economic Co-operation", *Algiers Summit Conference Documents*.
- 31 *Ministerial Conference of Nonaligned Countries on the Press Agencies Pool: Documents*, Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, 1976 (cyclostyled), p. 25.
- 32 *Ibid.*, p. 24.
- 33 *Ibid.*, p. 26.
- 34 *Ibid.*, pp. 26-27.
- 35 *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28.
- 36 "Resolution on the Press Agencies Pool", *Colombo Summit Conference Documents*.
- 37 Item III, para. 8 of "Political Declaration", *Colombo Summit Conference Documents*.
- 38 For a detailed analysis, see J. Bandyopadhyaya, "International Relations as a Communication System", *International Studies* (New Delhi), Vol. 14, No. 2, April-June 1975.