

gp

ON... NON- ALIGNMENT:



BY PRESIDENT
GAMAL ABDEL NASSER

*Bd
SA*

MINISTRY OF NATIONAL GUIDANCE

ON NON - ALIGNMENT

By

PRESIDENT GAMAL ABDEL NASSER

Information Administration
Cairo — U.A.R.

FROM THE CHARTER

« Their efforts for peace have armed our people with the slogan of non-alignment and positive neutrality.

« Today, the prevalence of this slogan in many continents of the world is a great tribute to the faith of our people in serving peace. The first call for convening the first conference of non-aligned states came from Cairo and met with wonderful approval by many people. It was, at the same time, a human tribute to the path we have followed in the service of peace, in which we firmly believe.

« Even those who try, now, to exploit the slogan of non-alignment and positive neutrality to conceal from their peoples their alignment to war camps and imperialism give indirect praise to our people. Our people were the pioneers in raising this slogan. Their sincere belief in, and their struggle for it, issues from a real need for it, in order to progress ».

FROM SPEECH DELIVERED AT TAHRA PALACE IN REPLY TO DR. KWAME NKRUMAH'S SPEECH (Cairo, June 21, 1958)

I agree with you that positive neutrality and non-alignment are the policy that will enable us to preserve our independence and to be free and unbound by any foreign policy, free to adopt our policy which aims at laying the foundation of world peace and co-existence in this world. Tying ourselves to the wheel of one of the camps while we are small nations, only renders us camp-followers with no weight or say in anything, whereas an independent policy of positive neutrality and non-alignment would make of our countries a great force which would have its say, and which would be entitled to respect, since we wouldn't then play second fiddle to anyone.

This is our path and these are our principles which we have declared, followed and struggled for. Today we feel happy that we have met on principles that help bring to an end world tension, consolidate world peace, and enhance the development of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

FROM THE SPEECH AT BENI SUEF

(November 14, 1958)

We made it clear that our policy was one of neutrality and non-alignment. We declared that we do not belong to any bloc whatsoever, but we are working for world peace. We do not align ourselves with either the Eastern or the Western blocs; meanwhile, we are willing to extend our hand to all, be friendly with those who want our friendship, and enemies to those who show us only enmity.

This is our policy — a policy which we have always pursued, a policy which emanates from our conscience, a policy which springs from the innermost depths of our soul, a policy of liquidating all spheres of influence. This is the policy of real independence for which our fathers and forefathers fought. Indeed it is due to our determination, resolution and unity that we were able to pursue this policy. We won because we were determined to win and adhered to this policy.



Our policy, which we pursued in the past and which we shall pursue in the future, is one of Arab Nationalism, non-alignment, positive neutrality, the liquidation of spheres of influence, setting up a socialist, democratic and co-operative system in this land based on unity and solidarity without any deviation to right or left.

FROM THE SPEECH TO THE GENERAL

CO-OPERATIVE CONFERENCE

(November 27, 1958)

We aim at disarmament. Our policy calls for the imposition of limitations on armament. This is why we are determined that our policy be one of neutrality and non-alignment, a policy that works for peace, prevention of war and disarmament for the sake of humanity at large.

**FROM THE SPEECH OF VICTORY DAY
AT PORT SAID
(December 23, 1958)**

We announce to the world at large that we adopt a policy of non-alignment, and that we have no faith in the use of atomic weapons.

We announce to the entire world from Port Said that for the sake of peace we do not believe in alliances, military blocs and alignment.

**FROM SPEECH OF DINNER GIVEN IN HONOUR
OF PRESIDENT JOSIP BROZ TITO
(February 20, 1959)**

You have proclaimed your attachment to the Bandung principles and we have — those principles that call for peace and international co-operation, for the right of peoples to self-determination, for the right of every country to adopt the political and social systems it chooses, those principles that call for peaceful coexistence among nations, respect for independence and non-interference in other countries' internal affairs, those principles that call for ending the policy of force, so that the small states may not become toys in the hands of the Great Powers, those principles that call for ending imperialism in all its different forms.

The people of the United Arab Republic have proclaimed their determination to adopt these principles. We have proclaimed that our policy is based on positive neutrality and non-alignment. We have been faced with great difficulties in our determination to follow this policy, but we have overcome all these difficulties.

FROM SPEECH AT END OF ANNUAL TRAINING
OF ARMY DIVISIONS
(March 30, 1959)

We resolved to become independent and to leave the zones of influence. We declared our attitude of neutrality and announced, to the entire world, that our policy is based on positive neutrality and non-alignment and that, on no account, would we become a tool in the hands of the large powers, or be used by them against any other powers.

We refused Western domination, Western imperialism, the Baghdad Pact, the Eisenhower Doctrine, bases and pacts. We refused to let our country be used as a base for atomic rockets and aircraft or as a base for aggression against any country.

As we insisted to liberate our country from Western influence, we also insist that there should be no foreign influence whether Communist or non-Communist in our country. We shall continue our drive armed by faith and unity and the same weapons we used in the previous battles in which we emerged victorious.

FROM SPEECH ON 7th ANNIVERSARY
OF THE REVOLUTION
(July 22, 1959)

We have declared our strict adherence to the policy of positive neutrality. We have even fought for it and declared our firm determination to observe it.

Positive neutrality means independence. In other words I do not yield to one bloc, nor to the influence of any power, and I avoid the zones of influence. Positive neutrality means that I should be independent and act according to my will and conscience.

Arab Nationalism, as we have formerly explained, is regarded as the means of restoring to us our glorious past.

Positive neutrality does not only safeguard our independence, but it also safeguards Arab Nationalism.

FROM SPEECH DELIVERED TO DELEGATION
OF ARABS FROM THE UNITED STATES
(August 10, 1959)

After the independence of the United States, the American people, adopted a policy based on neutrality and non-alignment. That was clear from President Washington's farewell message, wherein he called for safeguarding American independence and advised his people not to involve themselves in world problems in general and with European problems in particular.

It was also clear in the Monroe Doctrine, which advocated that America should keep aloof. This policy continued until America consolidated its strength, and managed to ensure its independence.

We have adopted the same policy. We declared our adherence to the policy of non-alignment and positive neutrality, after we go rid of British occupation here, and French occupation in Syria. We were influenced by the same psychological factors which influenced the American people after they obtained their independence.

We, therefore, rejected pacts and alliances, and insisted that our policy should be independent and should spring from this country. We decided not to side with any world blocs, and to raise a strong national army capable of defending our country.

As for our foreign policy, it is an unbiased policy based on positive neutrality. This means that our policy is decided according to our interests and according to our conscience. This is the difference between positive and passive neutrality. The latter does not care about what is going on in other parts of the world, but positive neutrality means that our policy is based on our interests.

This policy allows us to declare our opinion in support of the liberty of the people and in support of the right of various people for self-determination.

Our policy is based on another principle, that is that we make friendships with those who would seek our friendship and become enemies towards those who would prefer to act as our enemies of any nation. It is our interest to live in peace with all nations. This has always been our policy with the United States of America since the Revolution took place. We also seek the friendship of all other nations on an equal footing.

**FROM ADDRESS TO NATIONAL UNION
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**
(March 4, 1960)

This is our situation. In order to consolidate our Republic, we have to continue our march along the path we have chosen. We have to build up our nation and develop our strength. We have to strengthen the foundation of our country from within, in order to continue to adhere to our policy of positive neutralism and non-alignment.

FROM ADDRESS BEFORE THE INDIAN PARLIAMENT
(March 31, 1960)

The military pacts policy has also proved its futility, and the big powers have now begun to discover that through friendship and positive co-operation based on equality, they can build for themselves within the independent nations, bases more powerful and more lasting than those of aggressions. ... Our insistence on non-alignment, our refusal to join military pacts in our area, our resistance to these pacts on the understanding that they are a danger to our area and to our country, has infuriated the Powers calling for these pacts, as well as their satellites who adopt their policy in our area against us.

Our people who seek no domination of any kind should always constitute the conscience of free mankind and the safeguard of genuine peace.

If our people who have proclaimed non-alignment in the international field and have insisted on the policy on the understanding that it is the way to peace, have contributed to the prevention of war which on many occasions seemed on the verge of breaking out, our peoples today, after the realisation of some of their hopes, are asked to exert greater efforts so that the new picture of peace should be genuine, not spurious.

Our peoples welcome those repeated meetings among world leaders. Our people bless their efforts. Yet we always have to remember that ensuring and safeguarding peace is not attained by the number of conferences held, but rather by grasping the roots of problems.

FROM PRESS CONFERENCE GIVEN AT RAJ BHAVEN

(April 10, 1960)

**STATEMENT MADE BY
PRESIDENT GAMAL ABDEL NASSER**

India is adopting a policy of non-alignment. We are also adopting a policy of non-alignment and positive neutrality.

It is clear that this policy serves world peace because the policy of non-alignment represents the conscience of people who are not committed to any of the two world blocs. This has not been an easy policy. The policy of non-alignment which we are adopting does not mean exploitation of the differences between the two blocs. We feel that this policy is helping world justice, because we can decide our policy by ourselves without receiving orders from abroad or being allied to any country. We can express our opinions on world affairs as we believe them to be. This policy represents the world conscience, because it is based on principles declared on different occasions, mainly at the Bandung Conference.

**FROM SPEECH TO THE MASS RALLY ASSEMBLED
IN CAIRO ON THE PRESIDENT'S RETURN FROM
HIS 18-DAY TOUR OF INDIA AND PAKISTAN**

(April 16, 1960)

We announce today to the whole world that we want peace in this world, but it must be peace based on justice. The big powers are discussing disarmament. We support disarmament, but we also believe that we should uproot hatred, spite and fear so that peace may prevail all over the world — peace which rests on justice.

FROM SPEECH DELIVERED AT ALEXANDRIA

(June 24, 1960)

It is up to small nations which have not entered the cold war zone to try to maintain their independent status and abstain from voting at the U.N. at the bidding of big powers, and it is our task as exponents of positive neutrality and non-alignment to invite all countries outside the cold war to play the role of constructive states, to work for peace and justice as the fundamental basis for international relations, and to endeavour to secure a solution for the question of disarmament and of peace...

We have declared our policy of non-alignment and positive neutrality and made it plain that we are not influenced by any foreign power and that our attitude springs from within... In announcing this independent policy we meant that we had decided to put an end to zones of influence in our country.

**FROM SPEECH AT INAUGURAL SESSION
OF NATIONAL ASSEMBLY**
(July 9, 1960)

We find in our ideology of positive neutrality and non-alignment the reason for demanding peace after bitter battles with imperialism in its various shapes, whether in the form of open imperialism, unequal bilateral pacts, military alliances or spheres of influence.

This was our path and the path of our nationalist revolution after the war of independence and even during that war. That path was the path of non-alignment and positive neutrality. It was not the easiest path. It was the hardest because non-alignment is not a selfish outlook on the events of the world. In following positive neutrality and non-alignment we considered that we must have our own views, be free from any obligation on any problem facing our world, take a view that would bring peace, and make of the Charter of the U.N., by letter and spirit, the path leading to this peace.

This, brethren, made it necessary that we should extend our hand to all countries, great and small.

We extended our hand to the United States of America and the Soviet Union as the greatest powers today, and expressed to them our desire for co-operation.

It was a matter of gratification for us that the hand we extended to the Soviet Union for co-operation was received with a warm response, enabling us to establish firm, friendly relations based on equality between the Arab and Russian peoples.

This friendship was characterised by close economic co-operation that reached its climax with the Soviet Union's participation in the construction of the High Dam, and with the Soviet Union's firm stand on our side in our great battle against imperialism.

At the same time, it was a matter of great regret for us that the hand we extended to the United States of America for co-operation did not receive the desired response, due to the relationship between American policy and that of the imperialist powers from which we suffered.

**FROM SPEECH DELIVERED AT UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
(September 27, 1960)**

You are aware that the United Arab Republic believes in the policy of non-alignment, and strictly adheres to it. I do not think I need recall the story of the sacrifices made by our Arab nation to maintain this policy. Our nation made these sacrifices through its profound belief that this policy safeguards its independence and serves the cause of peace.

Despite all attempts, we refused to be used as instruments of the cold war. We have struggled and spared no effort in spreading this policy, for we believe that peace cannot be safeguarded by dividing the world into disconnected blocs and groups bound by nothing other than barbed wire and trenches hiding the instruments of aggression and destructive weapons.

Peace will prevail only through expansion of the bonds of fraternity and through collective, creative and constructive co-operation.

The Bandung Conference, attended by the Afro-Asian nations, represented one of the peaks of our national struggle in appealing for the positive principles of the United Nations.

Moreover, this particular hall, the hall of the General Assembly, witnessed the climax of our readiness to defend these principles. This was when the Arab Nation stood up to face the armed aggression against Egypt during the months of October and November, 1956.

Our struggle was honoured and its value was increased when civilised international society, represented in this United Nations General Assembly, sided with us in defending our principles and stood against the aggressive attempt.

This is our belief in the non-alignment policy as a road towards peace. Our belief in it is a true and a sincere one.

FROM SPEECH ON RETURN FROM THE
GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS
(Cairo, October 5, 1960)

The world is passing through a crisis today, an international crisis which could drag the world to destruction. It is our duty, we the States that have preferred to follow the policy of non-alignment and positive neutrality, to be sure that the world will have room not only for the Western and Eastern blocs but also for the States that have decided to be non-committed and not to be with any bloc against another. Those States have decided to safeguard peace, to build their countries and to catch up with the world after having missed the ages of steam and electricity, and to build and develop their countries and establish social justice in them.

When we work for peace, we work for ourselves, for building up our country, for raising our standard of living and for making good the loss we sustained against our will.

We could not in the past construct and develop our country to raise its living standard or ensure for it a reasonable measure of social equality, because of the presence of foreign influence among us.

We chose the policy of positive neutrality and non-alignment and announced that we are on the side of peace and right and that we are against war.

Brethren, I said all this in your name in the General Assembly of the United Nations. I announced the principles and the objectives we had previously adopted and declared, in the name of the people of the U.A.R., I announced that our policy is to support the peoples who want freedom, independence and self-determination. I announced that our policy is to maintain world peace.

I also stated our views about the intensification of world tension and the crisis confronting the world as a result of the

failure of the Paris Conference. I announced in the name of the people of the U.A.R. that peace is not only the concern of the big powers and the blocs, but also concerns all peoples and the whole world. If the big powers fight and quarrel, this threatens peace and affects us. It affects our development and our effort to develop our country.

Certain newspapers said that countries that follow a policy of non-alignment are interested in increasing world tension to be able to receive aid from both conflicting sides.

« This shows misunderstanding, because the countries that appeal for positive neutrality and non-alignment are against the expansion of the military blocs. We believe that such expansion would mean war, should the whole world be divided into two camps.

In the case of a war, one of the two opponents could impose its will unless there are independent countries following a non-aligned policy and positive neutrality.

The countries following a non-alignment policy can ease world tension instead of leaving the world divided into an Eastern and a Western bloc. The non-aligned countries will side always with the truth, even if it is against either of the two blocs. The attitude of those countries emanates from their conscience.

We are not of any particular bloc, be it the Eastern or the Western. We are only for our United Arab Republic and as I said before, for peace.

FROM SPEECH ON VICTORY DAY

PORT SAID

(December 23, 1960)

We advocate positive neutrality and non-alignment for the sake of world peace because we believe that dividing the world into two blocs will lead towards the outbreak of war. Since we want peace for the world, we declared our policy of positive neutrality and non-alignment.

We have declared this policy and applied it because we believe in it. We are not connected with any bloc and believe that thus we help the world to live in peace.

We have declared the policy of positive neutrality and non-alignment and sacrificed our blood to safeguard our liberty and independence.

We have declared and adopted the policy of positive neutrality and non-alignment although the imperialist powers are directing all their weapons against us.

We have declared the policy of positive neutrality and non-alignment although we were deprived of arms and Israel was supplied with arms by the West.

When we say we follow the policy of positive neutrality we mean that we are friends of our friends and the enemies of our enemies. If they think that because we adopt the policy of positive neutrality it means that they can attack us and the Arab Nation and support Israel and give her weapons, they are wrong, because positive neutrality does not mean we will not molest them and leave them free to destroy us.

Positive neutrality means that we are enemies of our enemies and the friends of our friends.

**FROM JOINT COMMUNIQUE ON TALKS
WITH PRESIDENT SEKOU TOURE**
(May 17, 1961)

« President Sekou Toure expressed his great satisfaction at the invitation to convene a conference of non-aligned countries. The President of the Republic of Guinea also expressed his full support for this conference.

« Expressing their deep concern about the regrettable developments in international relations due to latest world events, the two Presidents consider that contact and consultation between the non-aligned countries is indispensable for the consolidation of world peace and for enlarging the scope of non-aligned countries to include the greatest number of peoples

in the world which, by co-ordinating their efforts, could play an effective role in alleviating international tension and preventing the collapse of world peace due to the conflict between the two contending blocs.

« The two Presidents have decided to pursue the policy of non-alignment and co-operation on the basis of equality with all countries which respect the principles of sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries ».

**FROM JOINT COMMUNIQUE ON TALKS WITH
PRESIDENT MODIBO KEITA**

(June 17, 1961)

« The two countries affirm their faith in the policy of positive neutrality and non-alignment as well as their determination to pursue this policy in the international domain. The two Presidents expressed their satisfaction at the achievements of the Cairo Preparatory Conference for the Non-Aligned countries, prior to the convocation of the first Conference of Non-Aligned Heads of States and Governments on September 1, 1961, in Yugoslavia.

« In this connection, the two Presidents consider that continued consultation and contacts between the non-aligned countries to unify their efforts at this period in the history of the world, will contribute a great deal to alleviate international tension and solve world problems on the basis of right and justice ».

**FROM THE SPEECH ON THE 9th ANNIVERSARY
OF THE REVOLUTION**

(July 22, 1961)

We do not constitute a bloc. We are against the policy of blocs and against military alliances. But we represent the conscience of the world which resists colonialism, domination, nuclear weapons, and armament; the conscience which calls for disarmament.

I believe, that the non-aligned countries' conference — which represents the conscience of the world and its moral spirit — will manage to ease the tension between the two opposing blocs, will manage to help find solutions for complicated problems, will clearly express its viewpoints towards each issue on a basis of political independence and complete freedom to announce whatever the non-aligned countries feel convinced about.

**FROM INTERVIEW WITH HANZ FLEIG
OF HAMBURG TELEVISION**

While neutrality is an expression used only during wars, non-alignment means something else. It means that we ought to decide on our policy according to what we believe in and not according to what might satisfy any particular country. When there is a problem, we take our decision in connection with it, according to our understanding and awareness of its details and based on right and truth. This is the position which we ought to adopt towards various questions. We will not change this position at all to satisfy the United States, for example, or the U.S.S.R. We will insist on this position. This is non-alignment which means that our policy is not attached to the policy of any other country or the big powers.

**FROM SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE CONFERENCE
OF NON-ALIGNED NATIONS HELD IN BELGRADE
(September 1, 1961)**

The present meeting of Presidents of the Non-Aligned States was a thought which occurred to many of those who are preoccupied with the future of peace ; those who are perturbed at this violent strife between the blocs. They wish they could find the way to save the whole world — and not their peoples alone — the horrors of the destructive peril which can affect mankind if the violent strife between the blocs should reach its climax.

In April 1961, when I had the honour of meeting President Marshal Tito in Alexandria and Cairo, we were then convinced

that world peace for which we all share equal responsibility binds all those willing to serve it to work collectively in its defence.

Our appreciation of the situation shared by our friends who collaborated in the invitation of this conference and the friends who responded by attending this meeting, was that the non-aligned states are capable, by dint of their just and unbiased outlook on the problems facing world peace, to play a positive role in the service of that peace.

It is my conviction that this conference should and will succeed for several reasons :

First: There is no power able to serve peace like the community of states following the policy of non-alignment .

Second: In this way we are in a better position to act freely, with integrity, and without bias, between the two blocs to narrow the gap separating them and consolidate the possibilities of understanding, particularly since the policy of non-alignment has earned the respect of all world powers, including the states within the sphere of the great blocs.

Third: As a result of all this we, the non-aligned states, bear a special responsibility towards peace which is the cherished hope of our peoples and that of the peoples of the whole universe.

Fourth: In the atmosphere of peace alone can we develop life in our countries and augment its creative genius.

Fifth: In the atmosphere of peace we are able to help many other peoples still not free, and who ask us to lend them a helping hand so they can start anew to shape their destiny.

In short we should be the power of conscience in this world of ours.

If all mankind hails the power of science which managed to soar high into the world's space and go beyond the sphere of the earth's gravity, discovering new horizons, we are here and now called upon to make this power of conscience fulfil what the power of science has fulfilled in our time.

We are here and now called upon to set the power of conscience free from the bonds of egotism and break the bondage of its gravity ; discovering a new horizon needed by mankind more than any horizon in outer space. By this I mean the horizon of peace... peace based on justice.

I am aiming, urged by the wish to bring this new and bold attempt to a successful end to consider the issues from all angles :

First: We do not wish to insinuate directly or indirectly that the states following the policy of non-alignment aim to create a third world bloc. We live in a world suffering from the strife between two blocs and we cannot imagine that a third bloc should enter the arena and increase the tension of this strife instead of easing it.

The most outstanding factor that brings us together is freedom from all restrictions save those imposed by principles and the desire of everyone of us to serve these principles.

The urge that brought us here together today is that, without which no life can be afforded to any of these principles — by this I mean the urge for peace.

Our meeting here today is an endeavour to mobilize all efforts supporting peace and to co-ordinate them for increased effectiveness.

Second: We are not a « united nations » within the United Nations, the world organisation of free peoples, we are an indivisible part of it. Our work is not separated from it and is not beyond its framework.

Third: It is essential that principles should form the framework of our action, and be the spotlight we direct in search of truth. Yet in this search, we should secure our full liberty whether in reviewing the problems, in analysing their details or in finding logical solutions to them.

We should not bind our hands with what others have done, or impose on our minds unforeseen fetters.

We have to free our minds of all burdens and liberate them, as well as the crises themselves of all burdens ; we have to

place matters in their proper perspective, and not look at them, as they appear today, or else, we shall be following the same path which brought the crises to the peak of danger.

Fourth: This conference represents, in my opinion, the nearest picture to a « gathering for peace ». Therefore, it is important in my estimation, that the aims of peace should be peace based on justice. This is the highest object before this conference.

This means that we should dedicate the greatest part of our efforts to solve the major problems of peace, without exhausting our efforts on side issues, for in our opinion, such a dedication ensures two things of primary importance :

a — That this conference may concentrate as much attention as possible on the main question it met to discuss ;

b — and by foregoing the less important issues, it may agree on undertaking common action.

It seems useful to me, that we lay down specific priorities for the important problems now facing our world.

Having done this, we could come to study the ways and means enabling us to organise practical efforts in order to face such problems and find the right solutions in the light of our principles.

I shall begin with the priority of problems and then pass on to the way of facing them.

1. — International tension between the blocs reflected by the cold war is an obvious outcome of the lack of sufficient faith in the necessity of peaceful co-existence.

Peaceful co-existence cannot be an armed truce, it must be a creative and fruitful cooperation among all peoples and all social systems so that all may prove their efficiency in serving free men, and make room for a common reaction capable of promoting the political, economic and social development of all nations.

2. — As a result of the lack of faith in peaceful co-existence, the hopes for finding a solution to the problem of disarmament have not yet been realised. In fact, despite the efforts

exerted on disarmament and the banning of nuclear tests, an increase in armaments is the prevailing tendency today, while the only progress disarmament has attained is no more than a series of long and tiring talks which have yielded nothing fruitful or dependable.

Another cause for deep regret is that in this atmosphere filled with anxiety the Government of the Soviet Union found itself in a position which according to its own point of view, led it to the resumption of nuclear tests.

This decision shocked me just as it shocked world public opinion. Yet whatever the motive that prompted this decision, the most important thing about it is its clear bearing on the deterioration of the dangerous international position.

It is painful that the armament race was not confined to the United States and the Soviet Union alone, but we actually found other countries such as France which persist in provoking world public opinion by holding nuclear tests in the homeland of peoples who refuse to allow their land to be the field of such experiments. In the same way, aid and trade have been used as a veil to dominate the resources of nations and exhaust them for the benefit of the exploiters. The policy of economic and monopolistic blocs was equally directed to this end.

In this atmosphere in which peace depends on the frightening nuclear equilibrium, many forces attempt to exploit this situation to their advantage. At the head of those forces are the colonial powers and the reactionary elements hostile to progress.

There is no doubt in our estimation that the day marking the end of colonialism will also mark the end of racial discrimination.

The possibilities of danger increased with the progress of new science whereas, logically, they should have diminished. It is unfortunate that atomic energy which opened up its horizons to the human mind has not yet been directed to serve the peaceful progress of nations. Moreover, man's brilliant conquests in the world of space have opened up new horizons, but at the same time carry fearful menaces should space be used to

establish military bases, following the present feverish race for rearmament.

If I were to move on to an attempt to think of a solution in the light of our principles, I would find the following :

1. — It is now essential that sabre-rattling be silenced, and the opportunity be afforded for calm negotiations to be undertaken at the highest levels, for there is now no choice between two extremes, negotiations or war. It appears to us essential that there should be a meeting of leaders at the earliest possible time.

We should not be discouraged by the fact that our attempt in New York failed to bring about a summit conference at that time between the American President and the Soviet Premier, though more than forty nations supported this proposal.

We must also recall that the meeting held between Premier Nikita Khrushchev and President John Kennedy in Vienna last May was the realisation of this proposal. Nor must we be discouraged by the fact that the meeting held in the Austrian capital did not achieve the objective hoped for. Under the conditions facing the world today, none of us should despair ; negotiations are essential and if they do not succeed, we must try anew... Negotiations are the only means to peace based on justice. Peace cannot be established on the bases of missiles with nuclear warheads.

However, it is our duty here to seek to bring about an atmosphere where such a meeting would be to our greater benefit and use.

Before we end our meetings, we should have in hand a plan which can drive the negotiations between the two blocs to the domain of practical application.

Our urge for their meeting should not remain a mere appeal with the hope that it would reach their ears, but we must go beyond that and make sure that again we are not meeting just to address an appeal, but rather to enhance the chance of peace and lead them to a more confident and secure climate.

2. — It is now imperative that every effort be exerted to enable the United Nations to carry out its mission. With all

the changes that have taken place in the world since the founding of this international body in 1954, it is essential that this organisation adapt itself to the present dynamic nature of the world.

In this connection, the constructive changes should extend to the administrative machinery of the United Nations itself since it constitutes an instrument to implement its will.

The changes should also extend to the distribution of power in its various centres, I cannot conceive why certain parts of the world should remain without representation in the Security Council, nor can I imagine how a country like the Peoples' Republic of China should remain outside the United Nations, while a quarter of the world's population lives within its borders.

The United Nations must then fulfill the aspirations for which it was set up and must become a sphere of work for peace and for progress.

It is regrettable to see this international organisation representing the great hopes of humanity sometimes transformed into a field of conflict between the blocs, or that attempts are made to make of it a tool in the hands of colonialism. Matters have reached such a point that the very resolutions of this international organisation, in certain circumstances have no more life than that permitted them by the policies of the major powers. There can be no greater evidence of this than the United Nations resolutions concerning the rights of the people of Palestine which, after so many years, have remained mere scraps of paper, because the policy of certain major powers in our area wished to bolster Israel in defiance of every law and justice.

The tragedy appears in its real dimensions if we recall the acts of history, as recorded in 1948, which show that the United Nations and the truce it imposed on Palestine were the veil behind the aggression infiltrated to achieve its end and occupy the land usurped from the legitimate owners.

3. — It is essential now to afford the greatest possible chance of progress to the nations which have not completed their economic and social development.

We must bear in mind that there can be no stability in a world where such scandalous differences as we see today exist between the standards of living of nations.

The world we live in today is one world ; its fate, whether in peace or war, is one. We have all shared in the creation of Man's civilisation throughout history ; the centres of learning have moved from one continent to another.

Consequently, each of us has a share in the progress resulting from all human civilisation. We have all contributed to the creation of the prosperity of those privileged today, and although I do not wish to arouse ancient rancours, industrial progress in very many countries in Europe, for example, has been established on the wealth systematically dredged from Asia and Africa.

Hopes for progress would increase if the mad rush towards armament, particularly in the atomic field, were stopped and if the vast energies in this sphere were directed towards serving the realms of progress.

4. — It is essential that the non-aligned states which have taken upon themselves the responsibility of working for peace, should continue with what they have started, backing their objectives with co-ordinated efforts for their realisation. This can be attained through constant co-operation and consultation as well as through co-ordinated efforts both within and outside the United Nations. It is not sufficient to begin, it is important to continue until we attain our goal, which is at the same time that of mankind throughout history and all over the world.

5. — It is imperative that our efforts be firmly concentrated on all our objectives. In this regard I particularly mean the liquidation of colonialism as a basic source of evil and one of the reasons of tension and grave concern in our age.

6. — It is incumbent upon us, in our advance towards our objectives, that we mobilise all forces for good in the world. We should always remember that the goal we seek brings us together with all those who mean well throughout our vast world. If we were able to arouse an effective sense of positive action in all of those, as we meet for the sake of peace, we would at the same time be able to mobilise the forces of conscience in the world.

FROM SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE SUMMIT
CONFERENCE OF NON-ALIGNED NATIONS

(September 4, 1961)

It has become conspicuously clear through the addresses we have been listening to in this assembly hall that there is a unanimity of view amongst us that negotiations between the two blocs is the sole means of safeguarding peace and avoiding the outbreak of war.

We propose that this Conference arranges for the two blocs to start negotiations. To make the call bearing our idea in this respect effective, we suggest that we address a collective message on behalf of this conference to be signed by all the Heads of States present here, or their representatives, to both Premier Khrushchev and President John Kennedy and to be conveyed to them by Heads of States present here chosen by the Conference to emphasise the urgent view taken by our people and the peoples of the whole world on the future of peace and of their determination to maintain it.

FROM JOINT COMMUNIQUE ON TALKS
WITH MR. U NU, PRIME MINISTER OF BURMA

(December 29, 1961)

« During these talks, the two parties exchanged views on world problems and international events which occurred since the Belgrade Conference. Both sides reiterated their determination to exert their maximum efforts to maintain world peace ; to adhere to the policy of non-alignment which they believe will ease international tension ; and pledged their governments' intensified efforts to attain complete disarmament.

« The two sides hope that the efforts put forward since the Belgrade Conference will result in the peaceful solution of world problems.

« They also expressed confidence that the spirit of understanding which prevailed at the Bandung and Belgrade Conferences and continued adherence to the principles and resolutions proclaimed at these two meetings are among the factors leading to the establishment of peace, progress and welfare of mankind.

« The President and Prime Minister reiterated their faith in the policy of non-alignment and resolved to maintain friendly and co-operative relations with all countries ».

FROM INTERVIEW WITH REPRESENTATIVE OF THE « SUNDAY TIMES »

Our position in international affairs is, I believe, much more clearly understood now in the West. For many years both Britain and America were inclined to take the attitude that if you were not prepared to enter the Western bloc, then you must be a Communist sympathiser. For several years they found it difficult to believe there could be such a thing as a genuine neutral.

I believe that attitude has changed today, and the sincerity and genuine value of uncommitted nations in a world divided into two camps is appreciated. I believe that not only can we remain uncommitted to either East or West, but that it is essential that we should do so.

Genuine neutrality does not mean remaining neutral on every important issue that comes up. It is impossible to kill a nation's conscience. It does mean judging each issue on its merits and speaking our opinion without the restraints of commitments or pacts.

FROM ADDRESS AT THE BANQUET GIVEN BY THE
PRESIDENT IN HONOUR OF PRESIDENT AND MRS.
TITO IN YUGOSLAVIA
(May 4, 1963)

If no radical solution were found yet for the present international problems, and if the armament race between the great blocs is still continuing, this could only increase our determination to pursue our efforts for easing world tension and lays upon the non-aligned countries a double responsibility following their realisation of several positive and successful achievements for peace. The Belgrade Conference of the non-aligned countries gave an example of these achievements ; and I agree with you Mr. President, that together with the non-aligned countries who are increasing in number, we are required to exert greater common efforts in order to eliminate the remnants of imperialism which still holds certain African territories in its grip, either by the force of military occupation or hiding behind new masks and forms.

FROM JOINT COMMUNIQUE ON TALKS WITH
PRESIDENT JOSIP BROZ TITO OF YUGOSLAVIA
IN BELGRADE
(May 16, 1963)

« President Josip Broz Tito and President Gamal Abdel Nasser established beyond dispute with pleasure that the number of countries who lead the policy of non-alignment is constantly increasing and that their contribution to the general efforts for easing tension for peaceful coexistence among the peoples in the world is encouragingly increasing. The two Presidents express their conviction that in the present divided world the roles of these countries is indispensable. Within this framework they multilaterally discussed possible forms and directions of further actions of non-aligned countries ».

**FROM JOINT COMMUNIQUE ON TALKS
WITH PRESIDENT EL SALLAL OF YEMEN**

(June 17, 1963)

« The two sides declared the adherence of their two peoples to the policy of non-alignment and denounced attempts to draw the Arab people into foreign spheres of influence and the establishment of aggressive bases behind which some reactionary governments take shelter, thinking that the inevitable evolution of history will stop or that the Arab liberation drive will not catch up with them ».

**FROM PRESS CONFERENCE WITH THE THIRD
INTERNATIONAL JOURNALISTS CONFERENCE, CAIRO**

(October 1, 1963)

Peaceful co-existence is that nobody should stage aggression against us. Peaceful co-existence is our purpose but if Britain launches an aggression against us, how can we stand motionless and say that we want peaceful co-existence? In order to live in peace it should be peace based on justice.

As for the policy of positive neutrality it is based on our respect of our neutrality. If we are attacked by any bloc we have to repel the attack and use our legal right to defend our country.

We call for the policy of peaceful co-existence on condition that we should not be the target of any aggression. There is no peaceful co-existence between us and any country that attacks us.

— The signing of the partial nuclear test ban agreement is an important step towards easing world tension. We believe that the present world tension is due to the difference between the economic systems of the two camps. It is now asserted that

competition between the two blocs should be in the economic field and not in preparing for war. The step that should be taken in order to ease tension is to increase personal contacts will increase the understanding and recognition of their viewpoints, as a large measure of tension is attributable to misunderstanding and to lack of confidence. Misunderstanding and lack of confidence should first be removed. The neutral and non-aligned countries can play an outstanding role such as that played by the neutralists at the Geneva Disarmament Conference.

— I believe that the neutralist countries can play a main role as they did in the Geneva Disarmament Conference and participated in bringing about the partial nuclear test ban treaty. The neutral countries must consolidate their relations. But this does not imply that they have to form a new bloc because this would be against the policy of non-alignment. The continuous contact between the non-aligned countries and the leaders of the two blocs helps to bring their viewpoints nearer as happened in the Belgrade Conference in 1961, which resulted in taking certain resolutions and sending a delegation to Russia to meet Premer Khrushchev and a delegation to the U.S.A. to meet President Kennedy.

**FROM ADDRESS AT DINNER IN HONOUR
OF Mr. CHOU-EN-LAI, PRIME MINISTER OF CHINA
(December 14, 1963)**

A glance at what happened in this land, on the occasion of your visit which is the first reunion since our meeting in Bandung — illustrates the circumstances and dimensions of the revolutionary action.

I returned to Cairo from the meeting of Bandung to face a war that had been already started against the attempt to force us to join military pacts, which were being imposed on the peoples of the Arab Nation. The last means of pressure was the arms monopoly which aimed at exposing us to imperialist aggression through Israel, its base established as a menace to the unity and security of the Arab land.

This battle was part of the revolutionary stage for political freedom and was closely related to the battle for social freedom.

These people struggle for Afro-Asian solidarity which is a propelling force for liberation in the two continents which were the cradles of the earliest civilisation. They have exerted most sincere efforts for upholding the line of non-alignment as a means for relieving tensions and the violence of cold war storms. They have striven for peaceful co-existence as a means to a world in which the chances of peace tip the scales against the dangers of atomic war.

FROM JOINT COMMUNIQUE ON TALKS
WITH PRIME MINISTER CHOU-EN-LAI
(December 26, 1963)

« President Gamal Abdel Nasser and Prime Minister Chou-En-Lai reviewed the developments in world events in general and the events pertaining to Asia, Africa and the Middle East in general since their first meeting at the Afro-Asian Congress held at Bandung in April, 1955, which the two sides believe was the major turning point in the history of the peoples of Africa and Asia and through its ten principles was laid down the foundation of peaceful co-existence among these peoples and opened the door before the possibilities of organised cooperation among them in their struggle against imperialism and their efforts for the sake of world peace and the prosperity of other peoples.

« Prime Minister Chou-En-Lai has emphasised that China had always supported with sincerity the five principles of peaceful co-existence and the ten principles of the Bandung Conference.

« In pursuance of these principles, the China Government has adopted a stand from which it will not depart in its relations with the Arab countries namely that :

« It supports the Arab peoples in their struggle against imperialism and to secure their national independence.

« It supports the governments of the Arab countries in pursuing a policy of peace, neutrality and non-alignment.

« The Chinese side has reiterated its support for the policy of non-alignment pursued by the United Arab Republic and expressed its appreciation for the positive role played by the United Arab Republic in the international field ».

**SPEECH BY PRESIDENT GAMAL ABDEL NASSER
AT THE INAUGURAL SESSION OF THE ASSEMBLY
OF THE HEADS OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT
OF THE AFRICAN UNITY ORGANISATION**

(July 17, 1964)

We could share in building a world of peace. There is no doubt that we have devoted our greatest interest to the cause of peace. There is no doubt also, that the call for world peace has witnessed recently, sincere response from all parties, a response which appeared in the relaxation of tension following the Partial Nuclear test ban agreement and following the progress we shared in consolidating at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva.

**FROM ADDRESS TO THE INAUGURAL SESSION
OF THE CONFERENCE OF HEADS OF STATE
AND GOVERNMENT OF NON-ALIGNED COUNTRIES**

(October 5, 1964)

One of the outstanding accomplishments of Belgrade Conference was the fact that the non-aligned countries were party to the disarmament talks and increased their knowledge of the dimensions of the problem and so increased the ability to contribute to a solution.

Disarmament has long remained the hope of mankind which suffered from the horrors and tragedies of warfare. Yet the

development of armament today does not make of it mere wars and tragedies, but makes of it a gate to destruction in a manner never before conceived by the human mind.

The Great Bandung Conference marked the stand of many free peoples against the evils of imperialism.

The Great Belgrade Conference marked the stand of many free peoples against the peril of war.

This conference, in Cairo, pursuing the extended struggle which is getting deeper and greater day after day, is worthy of being the conference for the consolidation of peace through international cooperation.

From various parts, come those who tell me that the policy of non-alignment has exhausted its role, through the changes which occurred in the international situation, particularly with regard to the cold war and the blocs policy.

It is imperative for us first to define some of the meanings of the policy of non-alignment, thus, reaffirming the declarations everyone of us has made on various occasions in the past.

First : The policy of non-alignment is not a trade in the strife between the two blocs, aiming at securing the highest portion of privileges from each. The proof lies in the fact that we have devoted our main efforts to the dissipation of this strife, the warning against its dangers and positive action to evade it.

Second : The policy of non-alignment is not passive, wishing to remain aloof of problems of its world. The proof is that we have endeavoured to deal with all problems of our age and came out with solutions we set before the policy of blocs. We were bound solely by the obligation of adopting, in every situation, an attitude governed by no previous obligation except by the principles accepted by the peoples in the most cherished documents they have reached through their sacrifices, namely the Charter of the U.N. — the Charter of peace based on justice.

From those two meanings, the following facts emerge :

1. — The policy of non-alignment is not a cold war trade.
2. — The changes in the situation of world blocs have no bearing on the policy of non-alignment.

This policy retains its expression of humanity's conscience bound by the United Nations Charter, irrespective of the existence of two, three or four blocs.

3. — In its final form, the attitude of non-alignment is a policy for the sake of peace based on justice.

**FROM ADDRESS AT THE CLOSING SESSION
OF THE CONFERENCE OF NON-ALIGNED COUNTRIES
CAIRO**

(October 10, 1964)

Peace based on the balance of force equally failed. Two world wars broke out as a result of that inevitable failure. The world cannot become a booty, the powerful share with their swords.

In our days, a further balance exists with the intention that it should rest on nuclear terror. Yet the dangers of such balance are enormous and urge us all to move and rescue peace from the terrifying nuclear power which should serve and not use peace, should liberate and not enslave it.

Experience of the past and the present underlines the basic proof in history — namely that no peace can be established except on justice ; not by force, not with the balance of power, not with the measures of terror, but with justice and justice alone can peace be established and can last.

No lasting peace can prevail on earth with the shocking disparities in the living standards of peoples.

FROM THE JOINT COMMUNIQUE ON THE TALKS
WITH PRESIDENT JULIUS NYERERE OF TANZANIA
(Tanzania, September 28, 1966)

« The two Presidents re-affirmed their adherence to the policy of non-alignment in their firm belief in the positive constructive role played by the non-aligned states in easing international tension and protecting the gains of peace and freedom-loving peoples ».

Information Administration Press