

## **UNIT - II**

### **INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AFTER 1945**

- 1. Nature and Development**
- 2. International relations after (II world war , Cold war- post Cold War**
- 3. Non Alignment Movement (NAM)**
- 4. World Power**
- 5. North-South & South- South dialogue**

## **Cold War Post Cold War**

### **The Cold War, 1945-1990**

The United State and the Soviet Union became the two superpowers of the post-World War II era (See Figure 1.4). Each had its ideological mission (capitalist democracy versus communism), its networks of alliances and clients, and its deadly arsenal of nuclear weapons.

Europe was divided, with massive military forces of the United States and its North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies on one side and massive military forces of the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies on the other. Germany itself was split, with three-quarters of the country- and three quarters of the capital city of Berlin—occupied by the United States, Britain, and France.

The remainder, surrounding West Berlin, was occupied by the Soviet Union. Crises in Berlin in 1947–1948 and 1961 led to armed confrontations but not war. In 1961, East Germany built the Berlin Wall separating East from West Berlin. It symbolized the division of Europe by what Winston Churchill has called the “iron curtain.”

Gaddis, John Lewis. *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History*. Oxford, 1997. Zubok, Vladislav, and Constantine Pleshakov. *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War: From Stalin to Khrushchev*. Harvard, 1996. Garthoff, Raymond. *Détente and Confrontation; American Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan*. Brookings, 1985. Larson, Deborah Welch *Anatomy of Mistrust: U.S. Soviet Relations During the Cold War*. Cornell, 1997. Trachtenberg, march. *A Constructed Peace: The Making of the European Settlement, 1945–1963*. Princeton, 1999.

Despite the hostility of East- West relations during the Cold War, a relatively stable framework of relations emerged, and conflicts never escalated to all-out war between the largest states- At a U.S.-Soviet-British meeting at Yalta in 1945, when the defeat of Germany was imminent, the Western powers acknowledged the fact of the Soviet army's presence in Eastern Europe, allowing that area to remain under Soviet influence.

Although the Soviet bloc did not join Western economic institutions such as the IMF, all the world's major states joined the UN. The United Nations (unlike the ill-fated League of Nations) managed to maintain almost universal membership and adherence to basic structures and rules throughout the Cold War era.

The central concern of the West during the Cold War was that the Soviet Union might gain control of Western Europe—either through outright invasion or through communists' taking power in war-weary and impoverished countries of Western Europe. This could have put the entire industrial base of the Eurasian landmass (from Europe to Siberia) under one state. The Marshall Plan—U.S. financial aid to rebuild European economies—responded to these fears, as did the creation of the NATO alliance.

Half of the entire world's military spending was devoted to the European standoff. Much spending was also devoted to a superpower nuclear arms race, in which each superpower produced tens of thousands of nuclear weapons.

Through the policy of containment, adopted in the late 1940s, the United States sought to halt the expansion of Soviet influence globally on several levels at once—military, political, ideological, economic. The United States maintained an extensive network of military bases and alliances worldwide. Virtually all of U.S. foreign policy in subsequent decades, from foreign aid and technology transfer to military intervention and diplomacy, came to serve the goal of containment.

The Chinese communist revolution in 1949 led to a Sino-Soviet alliance (Sino means "Chinese"). But China became fiercely independent in the 1960s following the Sino-Soviet split, when China opposed Soviet moves toward peaceful coexistence with the United States. In the late 1960s, young radicals, opposed to both superpowers, ran China during the chaotic and destructive Cultural Revolution.

But feeling threatened by Soviet power, China's leaders developed a growing affiliation with the United States during the 1970s, starting with a dramatic visit to China by U.S. president Richard Nixon in 1972. This visit led to U.S.-Chinese

diplomatic relations in 1979. During the Cold War, China generally tried to play a balancer role against whichever superpower seemed most threatening at the time.

In 1950, the Korean War broke out when communist North Korea attacked and overran most of U.S.-allied South Korea. The United States and its allies (under UN authority obtained after the Soviets walked out of the Security Council in protest) counterattacked and overran most of North Korea. China sent masses of "volunteers" to help North Korea, and the war bogged down near the original border until a 1953 truce ended the fighting. The Korean War hardened U.S. attitudes toward communism and set a negative tone for future East-West relations, especially for U.S.-Chinese relations in the 1950s.

The Cold War thawed temporarily after Stalin died in 1953. The first **summit meeting** between superpower leaders took place in Geneva in 1955. This thaw in relations led both sides to agree to reconstitute Austria, which had been split into four pieces like Germany. But the Soviet Union sent tanks to crush a popular uprising in Hungary in 1956 (an action it repeated in 1968 in Czechoslovakia), and the Soviet missile program that orbited Sputnik in 1957 alarmed the United States. The shooting down of a U.S. spy plane (the U-2) over the Soviet Union in 1960 scuttled a summit meeting between superpower leaders Nikita Khrushchev and Dwight D. Eisenhower. Meanwhile in Cuba, after Fidel Castro's communist revolution in 1959, the United States attempted a counterrevolution in the botched 1961 Bay of Pigs invasion.

These hostilities culminated in the **Cuban Missile Crisis** of 1962, when the Soviet Union installed medium-range nuclear missiles in Cuba. The Soviet aims were to reduce the Soviet Union's strategic nuclear inferiority, to counter the deployment of U.S. missiles on Soviet borders in Turkey, and to deter another U.S. invasion of Cuba. U.S. leaders, however, considered the missiles threatening and provocative.

As historical documents revealed years later, nuclear war was quite possible. Some U.S. policy makers favored military strikes before the missiles became operational, when in fact some nuclear weapons in Cuba were already operational and commanders were authorized to use them in the event of a U.S. attack.<sup>25</sup> Instead, President John F. Kennedy imposed a naval blockade to force their removal.

The Soviet Union backed down on the missiles, and the United States promised not to invade Cuba in the future. Leaders on both sides were shaken, however, by the possibility of nuclear war. They signed the Limited Test ban Treaty in 1963, prohibiting atmospheric nuclear tests, and began to cooperate in cultural exchanges, space exploration, aviation, and other areas.

The two superpowers often jockeyed for position in the global South, supporting proxy wars in which they typically supplied and advised opposing factions in civil wars. The alignment, were often arbitrary. For instance, the United States backed the Ethiopian government and the Soviets backed next-door rival Somalia in the 1970s; however, when an Ethiopian revolution caused the new government to seek Soviet help, the United States switched its support to Somalia instead.

One flaw of U.S. policy in the Cold War period was to see all regional conflict through East-West lenses. Its preoccupation with communism led the United States to support unpopular pro-Western governments in a number of poor countries, nowhere more disastrously than during the Vietnam War in the 1960s. The war in Vietnam divided U.S. citizens and ultimately failed to prevent a communist takeover. The fall of South Vietnam in 1975 appeared to signal U.S. weakness, especially combined with U.S. setbacks in the Middle East—the 1973 Arab oil embargo against the United States and the 1979 overthrow of the U.S.-backed shah of Iran by Islamic fundamentalists.

In this period of apparent U.S. weakness, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in 1979. But, like the United States in Vietnam, the Soviet Union could not suppress rebel armies supplied by the opposing superpower. The Soviets ultimately withdrew after almost a decade of war that considerably weakened the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, President Ronald Reagan built up U.S. military forces to record levels and supported rebel armies in the Soviet-allied states of Nicaragua and Angola (and one faction in Cambodia) as well as Afghanistan. Superpower relations slowly improved after Mikhail Gorbachev, a reformer, took power in the Soviet Union in 1985. But some of the battlegrounds of the global South (notably Afghanistan and Angola) continued to suffer from brutal civil wars fought with leftover Cold War arms) into the new century.

In retrospect, it seems that both superpowers exaggerated Soviet strength. In the early years of the nuclear arms race, U.S. military superiority was absolute, especially in nuclear weapons. The Soviets managed to match the United States over time, from A-bombs to H-bombs to multiple-warhead missiles. By the 1970s the Soviets had achieved strategic parity, meaning that neither side could prevent its own destruction in a nuclear war.

But behind this military parity lay a Soviet Union lagging far behind the West in everything else—wealth, technology, infrastructure, and citizen/worker motivation. In June 1989, massive pro-democracy demonstrations in China's capital of Beijing (Tiananmen Square) were put down violently by the communist government. Hundreds were shot dead in the streets. Later that year, as the Soviet Union stood by, one Eastern European country after another replaced its communist government under pressure of mass demonstrations.

The toppling of the Berlin Wall in late 1989 symbolized the end of the Cold War division of Europe. Germany formally reunified in 1990. The Soviet leader, Gorbachev, allowed these losses of external power (and more) in hopes of concentrating on Soviet domestic restructuring under his policies of perestroika (economic reform) and glasnost (openness in political discussion). China remained a communist, authoritarian government but liberalized its economy and avoided military conflicts.

In contrast to the Cold War era, China developed close ties with both the United States and Russia and joined the world's liberal trading regime. Scholars do not agree on the important question of why the Cold War ended.<sup>26</sup> One view is that U.S. military strength under President Reagan forced the Soviet Union into bankruptcy as it tried to keep up in the arms race. A different position is that the Soviet Union suffered from internal stagnation over decades and ultimately imploded because of weaknesses that had little to do with external pressure.

Indeed, some scholars think the Soviet Union might have fallen apart earlier without the United States as a foreign enemy to bolster the Soviet government's legitimacy with its own people.

### **The Post-Cold War Era. 1990-2013**

The post-Cold War era began with a bang while the Soviet Union was still disintegrating. In 1990, perhaps believing that the end of the Cold War had left a power vacuum in its region, Iraq occupied its neighbor Kuwait in an aggressive grab for control of Middle East oil. Western powers were alarmed—both about the example that unpunished aggression could set in a new era and about the direct threat to energy supplies for the world economy.

The United States mobilized a coalition of the world's major countries (with almost no opposition) to counter Iraq. Working through the UN, the U.S.-led coalition applied escalating sanctions against Iraq. When Iraq did not withdraw from Kuwait by the UN's deadline, the United States and its allies easily smashed Iraq's military and evicted its army from Kuwait in the Gulf War.

But the coalition did not occupy Iraq or overthrow its government. The costs of the Gulf War were shared among the participants in the coalition, with Britain and France making armies supplied by the opposing superpower. The Soviets ultimately withdrew after almost a decade of war that considerably weakened the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, President Ronald Reagan built up U.S. military forces to record levels and supported rebel armies in soviet-allied states of Nicaragua and Angola (and one faction in Cambodia) as well as Afghanistan.

Superpower relations slowly improved after Mikhail Gorbachev, a reformer, took power in the Soviet union in 1985. But some of the battlegrounds of the global South (notably Afghanistan and Angola) continued to suffer from brutal civil wars (fought with leftover Cold War arms) into the new century.

In retrospect, it seems that both superpowers exaggerated Soviet strength. In the early years of the nuclear arms race, U.S. military superiority was absolute, especially in nuclear weapons. The Soviets managed missiles. By the 1970s the Soviets had achieved strategic parity, meaning that neither side could prevent its own destruction in nuclear war. But behind this military parity lay a Soviet Union

lagging far behind the West in everything else—wealth, technology, infrastructure, and citizen/worker motivation.

In June 1989, massive pro-democracy demonstrations in China's capital of Beijing (Tiananmen Square) were put down violently by the communist government. Hundreds were shot dead in the streets. Later that year, as the Soviet Union stood by, one Eastern European country after another replaced its communist government under pressure of mass demonstrations.

The toppling of the Berlin Wall in late 1989 symbolized the end of the Cold War division of Europe. Germany normally reunified in 1990. The Soviet leader, Gorbachev, allowed these losses of external power (and more) in hopes of concentrating on Soviet domestic restructuring under his policies of perestroika (economic reform) and glasnost (openness in political discussion). China remained a communist, authoritarian government but liberalized its economy and avoided military conflicts. In contrast to the Cold War era, China developed close ties with both the United States and Russia and joined the world's liberal trading regime.

Scholars do not agree on the important questions of why the Cold War ended.<sup>26</sup> One view is that U.S. military strength under President Reagan forced the Soviet Union into bankruptcy as it tried to keep up in the arms race. A different position is that the Soviet Union suffered from internal stagnation over decades and ultimately imploded because of weaknesses that has little to do with external pressure. Indeed, some scholars think the Soviet Union might have fallen apart earlier without the United States as a foreign enemy to bolster the Soviet government's legitimacy with its own people.

### **The Post-Cold War Era, 1990-2013**

The post-Cold War era began with a bang while the Soviet Union was still disintegrating.

In 1990, perhaps believing that the end of the Cold War had left a power vacuum in its region, Iraq occupied its neighbor Kuwait in an aggressive grab for control of Middle East oil. Western powers were alarmed—both about the example that unpunished aggression could set in a new era and about the direct threat to energy supplies for the world economy. The United States mobilized a coalition of the



world's major countries (with almost no opposition) to counter Iraq. Working through the UN, the U.S.-led coalition applied escalating sanctions against Iraq.

When Iraq did not withdraw from Kuwait by the UN's deadline, the United States and allies easily smashed Iraq's military and evicted its army from Kuwait in the Gulf War. But the coalition did not occupy Iraq or overthrow its government. The costs of the Gulf War were shared among the participants in the coalition, with Britain and France making military commitments while Japan and Germany made substantial financial contributions. The pass-the-hat financing for this war was an innovation, one that worked fairly well.<sup>27</sup>

The final collapse of the Soviet Union followed only months after the Gulf War.<sup>28</sup> The 15 republics of the Soviet Union—of which Russia was just one—had begun taking power from a weakened central government, declaring themselves sovereign states. This process raised complex problems ranging from issues of national self-determination to the reallocation of property. Russia and the other former republics struggled throughout the 1990s against economic and financial collapse, inflation, corruption, war, and military weakness, although they remained political democracies. A failed Russian military coup attempt in 1991—and the prominent role of Russian president Boris Yeltsin in opposing it—accelerated the collapse of the Soviet Union.<sup>29</sup> Soon both capitalism and democracy were adopted as the basis of the economies and formed the CIS. Of the former Soviet republics, only the three small Baltic states and Georgia are nonmembers.

Western relations with Russia and the other republics have been mixed since the 1990s. Because of their own economic problems, and because of a sense that Russia needed internal reform more than external aid, Western countries provided only limited aid for the region's harsh economic transition, which had drastically reduced living standards. Russia's brutal suppression of its secessionist province of Chechnya in 1995 and 1999 provoked Western fear of an expansionist, aggressive Russian nationalism. Russian leaders feared NATO expansion into Eastern Europe that placed threatening Western military forces on Russia's borders. Meanwhile, Japan and Russia could not resolve a lingering mostly symbolic territorial dispute.<sup>30</sup>

Despite these problems, the world's great powers overall increased their cooperation after the Cold War. Russia was accepted as the successor state to the Soviet Union and after the Cold War. Russia was accepted as the successor state to the Soviet Union and took its seat on the Security council. Russia and the United States agreed to major reductions in their nuclear weapons, and carried them out in the 1990s.

Just after the Gulf War in 1991, the former Yugoslavia broke apart, with several of its republics declaring independence. Ethnic Serbs, who were minorities in Croatia and Bosnia, seized territory to form a "Greater Serbia." With help from Serbia, which controlled the Yugoslav army, they killed hundreds of thousands of non-Serb Bosnians and Croats and expelled millions more, to create an ethnically pure state.

The international community recognized the independence of Croatia and Bosnia, admitting them to the UN and passing dozens of Security Council resolutions to protect their territorial integrity and their civilian populations. But in contrast to the Gulf War, the great powers showed no willingness to bear major costs to protect Bosnia. Instead they tried to contain the conflict by assuming a neutral role as peacekeeper and intermediary.<sup>31</sup> In 1995, Serbian forces overran two UN-designated "safe areas" in eastern Bosnia, expelling the women and slaughtering thousands of the men. Finally two weeks of NATO airstrikes (the alliance's first-ever military engagement), along with losses to Croatia on the ground, induced Serbian forces to come to terms. The treaty to end the war (authored by US. negotiators) formally held Bosnia together but granted Serbian forces autonomy on half of their territory, while placing about 60,000 heavily armed (mostly NATO) troops on the ground to maintain a cease-fire. Meanwhile, Serbian strongman Slobodan Milosevic was indicted for war crimes by the UN tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, was delivered to the tribunal in 2001, and died in 2006 near the end of a lengthy trial.

In contrast to their indecision early in the Bosnia crisis, the Western powers acted decisively in 1999 when Serbian forces carried out "ethnic cleansing" in the Serbian province of Kosovo, predominantly populated by ethnic Albanians. NATO launched an air war that escalated over ten weeks. NATO came under criticism from Russia and China for acting without explicit UN authorization and for interfering in

Serbia's internal affairs. (The international community and the UN considered Kosovo, unlike Bosnia, to be a part of Serbia.) In the end, Serbian forces withdrew from Kosovo and NATO has controlled the province ever since.<sup>32</sup> In 2008, with the UN Security Council still deadlocked over its status, Kosovo declared independence, bringing protest from Serbia and its allies. In 2010, the World Court declared Kosovo's declaration of independence legal, although its substantive status remains in dispute.

Other Western military intervention decisions since 1990 were less effective. In Somalia, a U.S.-led coalition sent tens of thousand of troops to suppress factional fighting and deliver relief supplies to a large population that was starving. However, when those forces were drawn into the fighting and sustained casualties, the United States abruptly pulled out.<sup>33</sup> In Rwanda in 1994, the genocide of more than half a million civilians in a matter of weeks was virtually ignored by the international community. The great powers, burned by failures in Somalia and Bosnia, decided that their vital interest were not at stake. In 1997, the Rwanda conflict spilled into neighboring Zaire (now Democratic Congo), where rebels overthrew a corrupt dictator. Neighboring countries were drawn into the fighting, but the international community steered clear even as millions of civilians died of hunger and disease. The U.S. military intervened in Haiti to restore the elected president, but Haiti remains mired in poverty.

New rifts opened in 2001 between the United States and both China and Europe—possibly signaling a realignment against U.S. predominance in world affairs—on issues ranging from global warming to the proposed International Criminal Court. Russia and China signed a treaty of friendship in 2001, and European countries helped vote the United States off two important UN commissions.

These divisive issues receded when the United States was attacked by terrorists on September 11, 2001. The attack destroyed the World Trade Center in New York and a wing of the Pentagon in Washington, D.C., killing thousand of American and citizens of about 60 other countries. The attacks mobilized support for the United States by a very broad coalition of states. President Bush declared a “war on terrorism” that lasted for years and spanned continents, employing both conventional and unconventional means. In late 2001, U.S. and British forces and their Afghan

allies ousted the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, which had harbored the al Qaeda network (led by Osama bin Laden).

The great power divisions reappeared, however, as the United States and Britain tried to assemble a coalition to oust Iraq's Saddam Hussein by force in early 2003. France and Germany (along with Russia and China) bitterly opposed the war, as did millions of protesters around the world. The dispute disrupted the Atlantic alliance for several years and weakened the UN's role as the U.S. led coalition went forward despite its failure to win Security Council authorization for war.

The invasion itself was brief and decisive. A U.S. military force of 250,000 troops with advanced technology overpowered the Iraqi army in three weeks. Many Iraqis welcomed the end of a dictatorial regime, as has most Afghans in late 2001, but the war inflamed anti-American sentiment, especially in Muslim countries. Insurgent forces in Iraq gained strength as the U.S. occupation stretched on for years, and within several years U.S. public opinion had turned against the protracted war. After a U.S. troop surge in 2007 and the arming of Sunni communities fed up with foreign Islamist radicals, violence in Iraq fell <sup>34</sup> U.S. forces withdrew from Iraq in 2009–2011, although some violence continued. Estimates of Iraqi death caused by the war range from tens of thousands to more than 600,000. Elections in 2010 were relatively peaceful, but left the country divided along ethnic lines.

In Afghanistan, fighting worsened beginning in 2007 as the Taliban ran an insurgency campaign from bases in Pakistan. Disputed elections, corruption, and “insider” attacks by members of Afghan security forces on NATO troops in 2009, but then began a withdrawal set to conclude in 2014. One goal of the Afghan intervention was accomplished in 2011, when U.S. special forces killed Osama bin Laden in Pakistan. U.S. drone attacks on other militants inside Pakistan and elsewhere weakened al Qaeda but raised thorny legal and political issues.

Meanwhile, nuclear weapons programs in North Korea and Iran raised alarms. North Korea produced possibly a half-dozen nuclear bombs and tested three in 2006, 2009, and 2013. In 2012, it successfully tested an advanced long-range missile in defiance of a UN Security Council ban. Starting in 2004, Iran made and broke several agreements to suspend the enrichment of uranium that could be used to build nuclear

weapons. In response, the UN Security Council passed a series of sanctions against Iran, demanding that it stop its enrichment program. In 2010, centrifuges key to its enrichment program began mysteriously destroying themselves, and investigation pinned the problem on the sophisticated Stuxnet computer virus, evidently a creation of Israeli and American defense scientists. It set back Iran's program by a year or more.

The Arab Spring uprisings in 2011-2012 began with nonviolent protests in Tunisia and Egypt, both resulting in the overthrow of dictators and the holding of free elections. Egypt elected a leader of the long-banned Muslim Brotherhood as president. In Libya and Syria violent repression against protesters sparked violent uprisings, leading to the bloody overthrow of Libya's dictator with NATO air support, and a prolonged and agonizing civil war in Syria with a divided international community unable to respond effectively. Yemen had its own revolution—a mix of peaceful protest, violent repression, ethnic conflict, and political compromise leading to a transitional government. And far away in Burma (Myanmar), a longstanding military regime finally made a concerted move toward democracy.

The post-Cold War era may seem a conflict-prone period in which savage wars flare up with unexpected intensity around the world, in places such as Rwanda and Syria—even New York City. Yet, the post-Cold War era has been more peaceful than the Cold War (see p. 85). Old wars have ended faster than new ones have begun.<sup>35</sup> Latin America and Russia/CIS have nearly extinguished wars in their regions, joining a zone of peace already encompassing North America, Europe, Japan/Pacific, and China.

Warfare is diminishing even in the arc of conflict from Africa through the Middle East to South Asia. Since 1990, long, bloody wars have ended in South Africa, Mozambique, Angola, southern Sudan, and Ethiopia-Eritrea, as did the various conflicts in Central America and the civil war in Sri Lanka. Wars in West Africa, Rwanda, and Indonesia have also wound down. After the Cold War, world order did not spiral out of control with rampant aggression and war.

However, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which saw rising expectations of peace in the 1990s, worsened after a proposed deal fell through in 2000. With the 2006

Palestinian election victory of the militant Islam- Ist party Hamas, responsible for many violent attacks on Israel, hopes for a durable peace faded. In 2006, Israel fought a brief but intense war with Hezbollah guerrillas in southern Lebanon, while violent clashes between Israel and Hamas continued from 2009 to 2012. Israel deployed a new "Iron Dome" missile defense system against Hamas missiles in a 2012 clash.<sup>36</sup>

In international economic relations, the post-Cold War era is one of globalization. New hubs of economic growth are emerging, notably in parts of Asia with remarkable economic growth. Globalization has created backlashes among people who are adversely affected or who believe their identities are threatened by foreign influences. The resurgence of nationalism and ethnic-religious conflict—occasionally in brutal form—results partly from that backlash. So does the significant protest movement against capitalist-led globalization.

With increasing globalization, transnational concerns such as environmental degradation and disease have become more prominent as well. Global warming looms as an ever more present danger, underscored in 2005 by the toll of Hurricane Katrina on New Orleans and the accelerating melting of arctic ice. In 2008-2009, a virulent swine flu (known as H1N1) spread worldwide, triggering efforts to control the virus through quarantines and a new vaccine. Major oil spills in the Gulf of Mexico and China in 2010 refocused international attention on the issue of pollution and the environment, especially in the context of the global race for natural resources.

China is becoming more central to world politics as the 21st century begins. Its size and rapid growth make China a rising power—a situation that some scholars liken to Germany's rise a century earlier. Historically, such shifts in power relations have caused instability in the international system. China is the only great power that is not a democracy. Its poor record on human rights makes it a frequent target of Western criticism from both governments and NGOs.

China holds (but seldom uses) veto power in the UN Security Council, and it has a credible nuclear arsenal. China adjoins several regional conflict areas and affects the global proliferation of missiles and nuclear weapons. It claims disputed territory in the resource-rich South China Sea and disputes ownership of islands with Japan in

the East China Sea, but it has not fought a military battle in 25 years. With the transfer of Hong Kong from Britain in 1997, China acquired a valuable asset and turned to hopes of some-day reintegrating Taiwan as well, under the Hong Kong formula of “one country , tow systems.” China is the only great power from the global South. Its population size and rapid industrialization from a low starting point make China a big factor in the future of global environmental trends such as global warming. All these elements make China an important actor in the coming decades.

It remains to be seen whether, in the coming years, the international system can provided China with appropriate status and respect to reflect its rising power and historical importance, and whether China in turn can come to conform with international rules and norms. So will the Chinese leadership’s decisions about whether to encourage or discourage the rising tide of nationalism among China’s young people as communist ideology loses its hold.

The transition into the post –Cold War ear has been a turbulent time, full of changes and new possibilities both good and bad. It is likely, however, that the basic rules and principles of IR–those that scholars have long struggled to understand–will continue to apply, though their contexts and outcomes may changes. Most central to those rules and principles is the concept of power, to which we now turn.

3.

## Non-Alignment Movement (NAM)

- Objectives
- Introduction
- Context and Imperatives
- The Concept of Non-Alignment
- Evolution of the Non-Aligned Movement
- Goals and Achievement of the Non-Aligned Movement
- Non-Aligned Movement Today
- The Debate
- The Relevance of Non-alignment
- Let Us Sum Up

Compiled by priyason@RLC



## **OBJECTIVE**

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

1. Explain the concept of non-alignment and analyse the factors that led to its emergence;
2. Trace the evolution and functioning of the Non-Aligned Movement; and
3. Examine the relevance of both non-alignment and the non-aligned movement in a Post Cold War as well as a post Soviet world.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The term 'non-alignment' is used to describe the foreign policies of those states that refused to align with either of the two blocs led by the two Superpowers i.e. the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., and instead, opted to pursue an independent course of action in international politics. The Non-Aligned Movement (N.A.M.) emerged when individual non-aligned states came together and coordinated their efforts on a common platform. It changed the nature of inter-state relations by enabling the newly independent developing countries to play a significant role in world affairs.

## **CONTEXT AND IMPERATIVES**

Non-alignment emerged within the context of two simultaneous global developments Afro-Asian resurgence and bipolar world politics. The reawakening of the nations of Africa and Asia kindled in them the urge for freedom from colonial rule and infused a determination to shape their destinies on their own.

This led to the development of a distinct idea of active and independent involvement 'in world affairs based on one's own perspectives of national and international interests. Therein evolved an independent stand on national and international issues amongst the newly emergent nations.

This Afro-Asian resurgence occurred at a time when the world was divided into two hostile camps, each representing two different ideologies and two socio-economic as well as political systems, and led by the U.S. and erstwhile U.S.S.R. respectively. Each aspired for greater spheres of influence through military alliances with other

states. In this context, the independent position of the newly emergent states came to be viewed as non-alignment, as they refused to be allied with either bloc.

Cold War Period : The impetus for the non-aligned approach stemmed from many sources. One of the foremost objectives of these states was economic development for which they needed resources in the form of economic assistance as well as increased trade. Non-alignment enabled them to have economic relations with all countries.

The second imperative was the need for peace without which there could not be real development. A third source was that their need be secure from global threat perceptions emanating from Cold war politics. Other domestic imperatives also existed which varied from country to country.

For example, in the case of India, its internal political plurality, its political processes, its historical role and geographical position were important contributing factors for the emergence of non-alignment.

### **THE CONCEPT OF NON-ALIGNMENT**

Non-alignment means the refusal of states to take sides with one or the other of the two principal opposed groups of powers such as existed at the time of the cold war. Nonalignment can be defined as not entering into military alliances with any country, either of the Western bloc led by the U.S. or the communist bloc led by the U.S.S.R. It is an assertion of independence in foreign policy.

Some Western scholars have persistently confused non-alignment "with isolationism, non commitment, neutrality, neutralism and non-involvement. Non-alignment is not neutrality. Non-alignment is a political concept, whereas, neutrality is a legal concept. Unlike neutrality, non-alignment is not a law written into the Constitution of the state.

Neutrality is a permanent feature of state policy, while non-alignment is not. Further, unlike neutrality, non-alignment is not negative, but is a positive concept. It stands for :

- (a) an active role in world affairs and
- (b) friendship and cooperation with all countries.

It consists of taking an independent position based on the merits of each issue, and, on the requirements of national interest. It is not directed against any ideology but seeks to promote peace and friendship in the world, irrespective of ideological differences. Non-aligned nations continuously opposed the politics of Cold War confrontations. They underlined the necessity of building peace and "peace areas" in a world of clear bipolarism. Non-alignment was also not a policy based on opportunism which tried to gain advantage by playing one power against another.

### **EVOLUTION OF THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT**

The non-aligned movement evolved out of the concerted efforts of individual nonaligned states to build a common front against the superpower and neo-imperialist domination. Jawaharlal Nehru from India, Gamal Abdal Nassar from Egypt and Josip Broz Tito from Yugoslavia took the first step in building this movement. Among the first architects Nehru would be specially remembered.

His early perception about the rise of neo-imperialism and the consequent insecurity that would be faced by the smaller states, made a major contribution towards building this movement. Nehru believed that the countries of Asia and Africa, should build up an alliance of solidarity to fight neo imperialism.

As a first step he tried to organise an Asian front in the forties. In 1947 he called an Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi. In the fifties as the states of Africa started gaining independence from colonial rule it became necessary to expand the base of this front.

In April 1955, therefore, Nehru together with leaders of Indonesia, Burma, Sri Lanka and Pakistan convened an Afro-Asian Conference at Bandung in Indonesia. Both these Conferences highlight the political and economic insecurity that was threatening the newly independent states at the time.

However, Bandung Conference failed to build a homogenous Asian and African front as a number of these States did not agree to conduct their foreign relations

under the banner of anti-imperialism. They had either already joined the various Western military alliances or had closely identified their interests with that of the Western Powers. The rift between the two groups was visible at Bandung itself. In the post-Bandung years, thus, it became necessary to build up an identity for the non-aligned states on the basis of principles and not on the basis of region.

The effort united these states with Yugoslavia which was similarly looking for a political identity in international affairs. The embryo of the later non-aligned conferences first came into being at Brioni, in Yugoslavia, in June 1956, where Tito conferred with Nehru and Nasser on the possibility of making real the unspoken alliance which bound them together.

The efforts finally resulted in the convening of the first non-aligned conference at Belgrade in 1961. Five basis were determined and applied, for countries to be members of the Non-aligned Movement. Only such countries as fulfilled these conditions were actually invited to the conference. There were :

- (a) independent foreign policy, particularly in the context of Cold War politics;
- (b) opposition to colonialism in all its forms and manifestations;
- (c) should not be a member of any of the military blocs; d) should not have concluded any bilateral treaty with any of the two superpowers;
- (e) should not have allowed military bases on its territory to a superpower, qualified for attendance at the Belgrade summit.

The NAM summit conferences from time to time, have discussed several issues and problems. At the first summit (Belgrade, 1961) 25 countries, who attended it, discussed the situation in Berlin, question of representation of People's Republic of China in the United Nations, the Congo Crisis, imperialism as potential threat to world peace, and Apartheid. The Conference expressed full faith in the policy of peaceful co-existence.

India was represented by Nehru. The Cairo summit, held in 1964 was attended by 46 countries. The Indian delegation was led by Lal Bahadur Shastri. The conference emphasised the urgent need for disarmament, pleaded for peaceful settlement of all international disputes, urged member-governments not to recognise the white

minority government in Rhodesia and reiterated the earlier stand of NAM against apartheid and colonialism. The demand for representation of People's China in the United Nations was also reiterated. Cold War Period The third summit at Lusaka in 1970 (attended by 52 countries) called for withdrawal of foreign forces from Vietnam and urged the member-states to boycott Israel which was in occupation of certain neighboring Arab countries territories.

It requested governments of member-nations to intensify their struggle against Apartheid and as a part of the struggle, not to allow the fly over facility to the South African aircrafts. The summit resolved to increase economic cooperation. It rejected the proposal to establish a permanent secretariat of the Movement.

The Indian delegation was led by Indira Gandhi. There were signs of detente in Cold War Politics by the time the next summit met at Algiers (1973 attended by 75 countries). It welcomed easing of international tensions, supported detente, and repeated NAM's known stand against imperialism and apartheid, and resolved to encourage economic, trade and technical cooperation amongst member states.

The conference demanded a change in the existing international economic order which violated the principle of equality and justice. In 1976, the Colombo summit was attended by 85 countries. The U.N General Assembly had given a call for a New International Economic Order In 1974. The NAM at Colombo not only gave whole-hearted support to this demand, but asked for a fundamental change in the world monetary system and form.

It was proposed that the Indian ocean be declared a zone of peace. As there was a caretaker government in India, the then Prime Minister Charan Singh decided to send his foreign minister to represent the country at the sixth summit at Havana (1979). The number of participant rose to 92. Pakistan was admitted to the Movement and Burma (a former member) left the NAM.

The Cuban President Fidel .a Castro described the former U.S.S.R. as a natural friend of the Movement The summit reiterated the well known position against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and apartheid. The summit resolved to support freedom struggle in South Africa and to stop oil supply to that country. As

Egypt had resolved her differences with Israel, some of the anti-Israel countries sought suspension of Egypt. The summit merely discussed the' proposal.

The Seventh Summit (due in 1982 at Baghdad) could not be held in time due to Iran-Iraq War. It was held at New Delhi in 1983 and attended by 101 countries. The New Delhi declaration sought to reiterate the known position of NAM on various issues. It hoped for any early end to the Iran-Iraq War and for liberation of Namibia.

However, the conference failed to take any stand on Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. The Soviet occupation was openly supported by Vietnam, Yemen, Syria and Ethiopia was strongly opposed by Singapore, Nepal, Pakistan. Egypt and Zaire. The Harare Conference (1986) adopted the Harare declaration and sought greater economic cooperation among its members and North-South cooperation for faster development in the South. The summit gave a call for new International Information and Communication Order to end the western monopoly over news disbursement.

In view of likely retaliation by the apartheid regime of South Africa against Frontline countries who were applying sanctions, the NAM decided to set up a fund called Action for Resistance against Imperialism, Colonialism and Apartheid. In abbreviated form it came to be known as the AFRICA Fund.

The 1989 Belgrade Summit was the last one to be held before Yugoslavia disintegrated and at a time when Cold War was just ending. It gave a call against international terrorism, smuggling and drug trafficking. The principle of self-determination was reiterated particularly in the context of South Africa and her continued rule over Namibia.

The tenth conference at Jakarta in 1992 was the first assembly of NAM after the end of Cold War. The summit was at pains to explain that even after the collapse of Soviet Union and end of Cold War, there was utility of the movement as a forum of developing countries struggling against neo-colonialism and all forms of big-power interference.

The main issue was preservation of NAM and strengthening its identity as an agency of rapid development for its members in a tension-free world. The eleventh NAM Summit was held at Cartagena (Colombia) in October, 1995. India was represented by a high-power delegation led by Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao.

The summit, second after the end of the Cold War, tried to find its role in the changed circumstances of a world without blocs. An effort was made by Pakistan, at the foreign ministers level, to persuade NAM to evolve a system in which bilateral disputes may be sought to be settled by the movement.

This was a clever way of bringing Kashmir on the agenda of NAM. Pakistan did not succeed in its design. An important decision taken by the 113-member NAM summit was to give a call for general and universal disarmament. India won a spectacular victory in its lone battle against the monopoly of the nuclear power countries over atomic weapons.

The NAM resolved to take the issue to the United Nations by moving a resolution for the complete elimination of all weapons of mass destruction. This endorsement of India's position gave encouragement to India's consistent stand against signing the discriminatory Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT). The endorsement of India's position on NPT by NAM was all the more significant because 111 out of 113 members of NAM have already signed the NPT.

They had earlier in 1995, voted at New York for indefinite extension of the NPT. Pakistan continued to favour a regional nuclear arrangement and did not share India's concern about discriminatory nature of the NPT. Pakistan's view was also accommodated in the final communiqué which urged states to conclude agreements for creation of nuclear weapon free zones, wherever they did not exist.

Pending creation of such zones, Israel was called upon to renounce possession of nuclear weapons, to accede to NPT, and to promptly place all its nuclear abilities under full scope of International Atomic Energy safeguards. This summit also called for total and complete prohibition of the transfer of all nuclear-related equipment, information, material and facilities.

## **GOALS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE NAM**

A major goal of the Non-aligned Movement was to end colonialism. The conferences of the NAM continuously supported the national liberation movements and the organisations that led those movements were given the status of full members in these conferences. This support greatly facilitated the Decolonization process in Asia and Africa.

It also condemned racial discrimination and injustice and lent full support to the antiapartheid movement in South Africa and Namibia. Today in both countries this obnoxious policy has ended with independence and majority rule. A third area in which the NAM made a significant contribution was towards the preservation of peace and disarmament.

Its espousal of peace, of peaceful co-existence and of human brotherhood, opposition to wars of any kind contributed to the lowering of Cold War tensions and expanded areas of peace in the world with less states joining military blocs. It also continuously strove for disarmament and for an end to the arms race stating that universal peace and security can be assumed only by general and complete disarmament, under effective international control.

It underlined that the arms Non-Aligned Movement Cold War Period race blocked scarce resources which ought to be used for socio-economic development. They first called for a permanent moratorium on nuclear testing and later for the conclusion of a treaty banning the development, production stockpiling and use of all chemical weapons.

Fourthly, the non-aligned states succeeded in altering the composition of the U.N. and consequently in changing the tenor of the interstate relation conducted through its organs. In the forties and fifties deliberations in the U.N. organs were entirely dominated by the super power and their associate states. The emergence of non-alignment has changed this situation.

It has created not only a new voting majority in the General Assembly but also common platform from where the third world can espouse its cause. It is no longer



possible to ignore this platform. Thus we see that non-alignment has facilitated third world's participation in world politics and in the process has democratized the international relations.

The fifty important contribution was with regard to economic equality. It was the NAM that called for the establishment of a New International Economic Order (NIEO). Despite their political sovereignty, the newly independent states remained economically unequal. They remained the same raw materials producing countries, which sold their commodities to the developed world at a lower price, and bought manufactured good from them at a higher price.

The tragedy was that they were and continue to be part of an oppressive economic system and that have to function within it. This makes them perpetually dependent on the developed North for capital goods, finance and technology. In order to end this economic exploitation, termed as neocolonialism, the NAM called for a restructuring of the international economic and monetary systems on the basis of equality, non-discrimination and cooperation.

Non-aligned Movement's struggle for economic justice has demonstrated how realistic I, is to divide the world between the North and the South rather than between the East and the West. It has proved that what concerns the majority of humanity is not the choice between capitalism and communism but a choice between poverty and prosperity.

Preaching's of non-alignment has made the developed world realize, to some extent, that deprivation of the third world would someday affect adversely their prosperity too. This has, to a large extent, forced them to come to the negotiating table. Besides the general success in making third world's economic demands negotiable, non-alignment has won its battle for some specific issues also.

For example, economic sovereignty over natural resources is now an accepted principle. Non-alignment has also succeeded in legitimizing the interventionist trade policy that the developing countries want to pursue.

It has successfully turned world attention to the problem created by the role as played by multinationals, specially in the context of transfer of technology. It has also succeeded in pursuing the IMF to establish system of compensatory finance which help the developing states in overcoming their balance of payments difficulties.

In the cultural field the establishment of the Pool of News Agencies needs to be considered as an achievement. This is the first time in history that politically and economically weaker nations have been able to gather information and communicate with the outside world without the aid of the western communication system.

The most significant achievement of non-aligned movement lies in the fact that it has taught the developing world how to pursue independent economic development in spite of being a part of the world capitalist economic order which makes them dependent on the developed states for capital and technology.

### **NAM IRRELEVANT AND INVAILED**

Some scholars mostly Western used to not only criticize, but also jeer at non-alignment movement. They under related it by calling it hypo-critic, in effective and worth less. However, in the last few years-nonwestern scholars and even leaders and representatives of few non-aligned countries have also started realizing the redundancy and irrelevance of this movement.

The circumstances that led to the creation of this movement have under gone a sea change .The following changes have rendered the utility of the NAM doubtful:

- i) Decolonization has become a fait accompli.
- ii) Cold war has ended and détente is again beginning with new vigor and vitality.
- iii) Military blocs have tumbled down.
- iv) Military bases have become a thing of the past owing to advance in science and technology and its use for military purposes.
- v) Bi-polar world is non-existent.

vi) Collapse of communism and communist blocs and resultant de-idealization of world politics.

vii) Irreversible trends towards peaceful co-existence and active economic cooperation.

viii) Trends towards disarmament have been gaining momentum since 1921. The aligned of the East and West have taken steps towards 20-30 percent reduction in defense forces.

ix) Since the US has emerged as the sole world power following the collapse of Soviet Union, many non-aligned countries went to leave the NAM. In September 1991, Argentina actually dropped out of the NAM. Where is the question of keeping aloof from rival blocs, some people ask, when there is only one effective power and the other is in ruins?

### **OUTDATED ECONOMIC STAND**

For years NAM has been trying to get rich nations to give aid to the poor nations. It wants that rich nations commit 0.7% of their GDP as aid. This figure has not been met, except by a few countries. The Foreign aid figure of \$850 billion has been declining at about 10% annually. Instead of relying on aid, NAM countries have to get more private investment into their countries.

### **LACK OF ECONOMIC PRAGMATISM**

Many of the economic ideas which were in vogue in the past are updated today. However, many NAM members are rooted in ideas of socialism and state control, ideas popular at the time of Nehru and Nassir. This has made them impossible to move forward. They continue complaining about the IMF and the WTO but lack the muscle to do anything. Rather than complain about the new trade regime, the countries must adjust to changing realities and learn to derive strength from them.

## **DUPLICACY**

NAM today competes with G-7, ASEAN and the Commonwealth, which are similar groups of nations. The other groups are more effective, as they deal with economic and trade issues. NAM does not do that, nor does it take up any diplomatic initiative. It has no position even on issues like human rights, child exploitation and gender issues. As a result, its members have to follow the Western dictates in this regard.

## **LEADERSHIP**

The statesmen who started NAM had a vision, today NAM has none. There is no leadership on global issues, and there are also disagreements among the members. As a result, the organization has no direction as to the path it should take.

## **LACK OF ISSUES**

Nor does NAM have real issues. It could have provided some leadership on things like nuclear non-proliferation, child labour, poverty and terrorism, besides other social and economic issues. NAM desperately needs new issues and themes to focus so that it can play a meaningful role in world politics in the future. Otherwise, it will be another meaningless meeting.

Even items on which there is a consensus, such as the drug trade, international terrorism and non-proliferation, NAM has not been able to achieve anything. This erodes the credibility of the movement as an instrument to further the political and economic interests of its members. Unless NAM redefines its terms of reference and chalks out a strategy to counter US influence on the world, it will remain marginalized and irrelevant.

It should have charted out its plans in the post-cold war period, but has failed to do so. After going over the history of non-alignment, Jagat S.Mehta, India's foreign secretary suggested, "That after the non-aligned nations come to command a safe majority in the United Nations". The non-aligned movement had become redundant. He further said, "We should remind ourselves and the world that the non-aligned started with the independent rights of nations to functionally determine international

cooperation and that is where the world has now arrived.... Why not the mission declares accomplished and discontinues the ritual continuation of NAM

G.Parthasarathy says about NAM, “While being non-aligned movement gives its countries the flexibility to choose partners and partnerships, the non-aligned movement is not a forum of any consequence, relevance in today’s world”. Great Historian Ram Chandra Guha has described Jawaharlal Nehru’s policy of Non-alignment as an attempt to place India “beyond and above the rivalries of Great powers”.

Some scholars believe that NAM remains to be redundant or impotent, as it could not solve the basic conflicts among its member states. “The non-aligned movement is not in a position to act even as a forum for displaying solidarity.” New Delhi-India on Friday (29June, 2007), the then U.S Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice in a statement questioned the relevance of Non-aligned movement. NAM in the post-cold war, and reiterated its “firm and abiding commitment” to those ideals.

In a speech made at the 32nd anniversary celebrations of the United States India Business Council in Washington Thursday (28 June, 2009), Rice called upon India to abandon NAM, as it has lost its relevance.

Rice had earlier exhorted India to move past old ways of thinking as NAM has lost its relevance and meaning. “I know that there are some who still talk about non-alignment in foreign policy but may be that made sense during the cold war when the world really was divided into rival camps”. She further added “it has lost its meaning. One is aligned not with the interests and power of one Bloc or another but with the values of a common humanity. Instead India should join fellow democracies in prompting common values of freedom and justice”. (*“The Earth Times” New York, 29june2007*) Prof. Hans Koechler, a leading expert on NAM says, “NAM is not relevant today, it was relevant only during cold war era Bi-polar world. Now there is only one dominant global power or player (U.S) and in this unipolar world, NAM has lost its relevance. NAM has emerged more of a moral influence” adds Koechler. “It is not about the specific measures. It is about the principles of Sovereignty,Independence,and non-interference, peaceful settlement of disputes and North-South Relations and economic relations between member states. Koechler

further adds that, "I am not optimistic that the NAM countries can make use of its structure, because of many of its member states are now heavily dependent on the United States, so they are not really, "non-aligned", according to their own philosophy".

There are no strict rules, whether NAM countries had to defend each other's actions. The NAM has no charter. It has no statue unlike other international organizations. It is without a secretariat, Koechler said". (*International Media Coverage Deutshce Welle, Bonn Germany-13 july2009*) On the surface it does seem logical that with the disappearance of bloc divisions and rivalry between the two nuclear super powers, there was no longer any reason for countries wishing to stay away from these divisions to remain together hence the relevance of NAM.

It may seem paradoxical that the first serious dilemmas concerning the future of the NAM were voices, both within and outside it, as détente evolved between United States and USSR. It was said in various quarters that the NAM has become superfluous. Now, it is alleged that during its decades of existence NAM has proved to be ineffective.

However, at the same time NAM maintained its regular schedule of periodic summit meetings, while increasing its number of member countries. The steadily growing memberships of NAM eliminate all doubts as to the relevance of the NAM. On the other hand, the phenomenal expansion that has occurred in the membership of the NAM gives rise to a situation of internal contradiction together with an apparent and potential tensions and reservations among its member states, leads to stalemate in the capacity of the Non-aligned to play a positive role in world affairs.

The NAM is turning into a club where one can discuss and debate international issues rather than resolve or influence them. One should note that the existing contradictions within the NAM itself- which could exacerbate discrepancy between theory and practice, between declared goals and behavior in practice-weaken the capacity of NAM to carry out more successfully its historical mission. This is obviously because NAM's position on many issues remains fairly generic. There is nothing quite specific in summit declarations that suggest that the movement is truly coming to grips with the issues arising out of a unipolar strategy aimed at

maintaining the hegemony of the North over the South. Most important, looking at the world economy and international economic relations, the NMA's progress in two central and consistent goals, development and eradication of poverty, continue to flounder.

This means that the NAM is far from its cherished goal of being constructive and effective force in the international politics in the new millennium. The fact is that the collapse of the bi-polar system and emergence of unipolarity in political, economic and military terms is leading to further inequality and injustice and, hence, the role of NAM becomes much more important as a counterforce to unilateral military and economic coercion.

### **NAM STILL RELEVANT AND VALID**

On the other hand many non-aligned countries claim that all the changes enumerated above are mainly the result of their long struggle and so they take credit of it. All these changes indicate the vindication of their stand and principles. Even in the changed context it has assumed a novel role.

If its political relevance has become absolute, its economic significance has increased manifold. The 22-page Declaration issued after the meeting of the NAM Foreign Ministers, held at Accra in September 1991, entitled, "A World in transition from Diminishing Confrontation Towards Increasing Cooperation" emphasized the NAM's new focus must be on eradicating poverty, hunger, malnutrition and illiteracy and called on the international community to help.

NAM supported the present efforts at strengthening the UN so as to render it, "more democratic, effective and efficient". There was a consensus among the Foreign Ministers for a bridging agreement between NAM and the Group of 77 and proposed that a study should be made immediately of the modalities for reaching agreement between the two bodies for the introduction of a new system of periodic meetings of the joint coordination committee.

The NAM has not out lived its utility in a post- cold war world, in fact the indications are that the movement is becoming more popular and its importance is being widely recognized. If that had not been so, why should more countries seek

the NAM membership? Mongolia was granted admission. Germany requested to be allowed to attend the sessions a quest along with the Netherlands.

To change its name to Third World Movement will alienate a large section who has long cherished NAM's ideology. In the growing multi-centric world order with the decline of prominent status of the Super powers, limiting NAM to a third world movement would prevent it from getting a fair hearing from some of the emerging centers of power. Finally to confine it in terms of geographical boundaries will act as reversal of its international role to that of a regional movement.

Though the bi-polar world was dead, that does not mean that Washington should become the political Mecca of those who had avoided being identified with either of the two blocs. It is evident that the impression conveyed by the slogan, "NAM is dead" is nothing short of a canard being deliberately spread by some Western Commentators.

The current unipolar world is an increasingly featureless international political landscape, regrettably Euro- Centre in nature. A replacement of the unipolar world by the multipolar world, NAM is perhaps even more relevant now to international relations and development than at any time in the history.

The massive attack by the NATO forces on Yugoslavia in the aftermath of resolving Kosovo problem in 1999 have wider ramifications on the world polity. The show of brute forces by the USA and its European allies on another sovereign country further confirms the boldness with which the thesis of pax Americana is being pushed through this increasingly unipolar world. Earlier Iraq has been the "rogue" country which suffered similar kind of combined US-Britain bombings for allegedly violating UN resolutions.

After the US military action in Iraq and Kosovo, any free country anywhere in the world which chooses to defy the US line, will ultimately have to face either sanctions or an armed subjugation. Moreover, The US preparations for developing a more deadly anti-missile system along with its unchallenged hegemony is bound to prompt others like Russia, China, India, Pakistan, North Korea to resort to their own



built up. All these developments of a unipolar world are bound to make the non-aligned movement once again relevant.

Non-alignment is fundamentally a political concept; Nehru, Tito, Sukarno and Nasser did not envisage full economic cooperation as part of NAM. But now the movement is shifting its emphasis from the political to the economic arena. The Accra meet, besides referring to political problems worldwide, also made references to the question of external debt as an obstacle to development of many countries.

Obviously, if NAM is to give priority to economic problems, it is perhaps because it has little role to play in the political arena. In the modern times, the NAM is struggling hard to prove its worth by striving to work for the following contemporary issues:

- I. Setting up a New International Order through UN
- II. Restructuring and Democratization of the UN.
- III. Strengthening of the UNCTAD and UNIDO.
- IV. Coordinating with the G-77 and stressing South-South Cooperation.
- V. Cooperating in areas of food cooperation, population, trade and investment.
- VI. Ensuring equitable international flow of trade and transfer of technology.
- VII. Working for non-proliferation and nuclear weapon free world.
- VIII. Combating terrorism, extremism and racism.
- IX. Fighting poverty, drug trafficking and environmental degradation.
- X. Opposing interventionism and imposition of economic conditions on developing countries.

It seems pointless for a person to question today the continuing relevance of this policy which has become integral to the functioning of sovereign nation states. The jaded question of the time is non-alignment with whom? The answer is non-alignment with the hegemony of great powers.

It may be difficult to practice in a unipolar world but the policy as such does not cease to be pertinent. The policy remains relevant despite periodical vagaries in the sovereign states system for more than three centuries. The traditional foreign policy

choices to small/ weak states (isolationism, neutrality) are no longer available in view of the increasing interdependence of states.

And the traditional foreign policy choices of the great powers (imperialism, nationalistic, universalism) will be resisted today by an overwhelming majority of the states. All that is likely to happen is that the 350 year old struggle of small/ weak nation states against the hegemony of the great powers will enter a new phase in which an overwhelming majority of small/ weak states would challenge the lone super power dominating the community of states.

The External Affairs Minister, Pranab Mukherjee, rightly remarked that NAM has contemporary relevance. NAM is still relevant even after the end of the cold war. India is founding member of the NAM. And since its birth NAM has been playing a very active role in fostering cooperation among nations particularly among developing countries.

The relevance of NAM lies in promoting North-South Dialogue, South-South cooperation and new international economic order. NAM members have a voice in almost all the international matters and NAM countries, which are mostly developing countries, have been playing a very active role in international bodies like United Nations.

Increased membership of the NAM over the years also signifies the increasing relevance of NAM even today. Still the factors are prevalent which were responsible for the emergence of NAM like corruption, transnational organized crime, hegemony of US, apartheid etc. So it is wrong to say NAM has become irrelevant today. US Secretary of the state Condoleezza Rice statement at the Indi-US business meet advising India to dump NAM is politically motivated. Government of India should be committed on its foreign policy of NAM, which has not only contributed in past in the struggle against colonialism and apartheid but has also done so today in prompting equitable world order and South-South Cooperation.

The cold war has ended but, as N.Krishan reminds us, “peace in the world is still threatened by forces of extremis, discord, aggressive nationalism and terrorism and large stocks of weapons of mass destruction”.

He further tells us that the “dynamics of globalization have produced a whole set of new problems which the Non-Alignment Movement must take not of.” (*Frontline, Vol 18, Issue24 Dated Nov.24-Dec.04, 2001*) Cuba’s Deputy Foreign Minister Abelardo Moreno, who was in New Delhi in the last week of January after participating in a high- level ministerial meeting to prepare for the NAM summit, told *Frontline* that the Kuala Lumpur meeting “is going to be one of the most important NAM summit in the history of the organization.

The summit will devote itself to the revitalization of the movement. He added that there was need for new impetus in order to play a meaningful role, which we think it should play in international affairs”. To accelerate the process of revitalization, NAM should devote, “more time and effort to promote cooperation among member countries both in the economic and political fields”.

Moreno is of the opinion that there is “renewed interest” among developing countries in NAM. “We should not have any misconceptions. The fact that we are living in a unipolar world and the increasing unilateralism being shown by certain countries in world affairs should make NAM countries more united.

There have been attempts by a group of countries to portray NAM as irrelevant and outdated. NAM is now even more relevant than it was a couple of decades ago,” Moreno said. (*Frontline Vol20, Issue4, Feb 15-28, 2003*) “Today, we can confidently assert that the NAM is more necessary than ever and its member countries are committed to its preservation, revitalization and strengthening as an essential forum to discuss our most pressing problems and continue fighting in order for our just demands to be headed in the unjust unequal world in which we are currently living, “Felipe Perez Roque, Cuba’s Foreign Minister told the conference opening session September 11, 2006. (*Frontline, Sep.2006*)

While going to Haryana to attend the 14th NAM summit in September 2006, Indian prime minister Manmohan Singh had underscored the relevance of NAM in the post-cold war world saying it was ,“state of mind “ and urged the grouping to play a reconciling role in a “highly uncertain, insecure world” New Delhi growing strategy partnership with the US, which includes a landmark civil nuclear deal and comprehensive defense co-operation, he evoked sharp criticism from the leftist

partners of India's ruling alliance who accused the government of succumbing to US "imperialist design".

(*"The Earth times"* 29 June 2007) As the world is engulfed by the economic crisis, developing countries, with strengthening consolidation and co-operation, can finally steal some limelight as they become one of the in-dispensable forces in the multipolar world. UN Secretary general Ban Ki-Moon said that 15th summit (2009) "it is abundantly clear that no country –regardless of the size or resources- can solve problems alone.

That raises the stakes and the space for the Non-alignment movement to shape a better world". To prove this, the group is endeavoring to exert influence on resolving major international mechanism to improve Egyptian-Iranian's interference in the Arab affairs. During a rare meeting on the sidelines of the summit, Prime Ministers of rival India and Pakistan vowed to co-operate in the fight against terror in the wake of the devastating Mumbai attacks.

In the final document adopted at the summit, NAM countries made clear their un-animus position on some hot-spot issues, including appealing for ending economic embargo against Cuba, stopping Israel settlement activities on Palestinian territories and immediate restoration of the ousted Honduran President "The Non-aligned movement is considered the biggest representative of the developing world, so it can and should impose pressure on the international society," said Dr Gamal Abdel Gawad, director of International Relations Department of Al Ahram Centre for strategic and political studies. (*Times of India*, 17July, 2009)

### **NAM more relevant than ever**

**Manmohan Singh** Prime Minister Manmohan Singh said on July 15, 2009, the relevance of the Non-aligned movement has "Never been greater than today" and called for greater solidarity among members in tackling challenges, including the financial crisis, energy security, climate change and the UN reforms". History has shown that non-alignment is an idea that evolved but does not fade. We must take it forward, harnessing it to meet the challenges of today," Manmohan Singh said on the opening day of the 15th NAM summit that is attended by 118 leaders from

developing countries Invoking the words of India's first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru at the first NAM conference in 1961, Manmohan Singh said: "The Power of nation assembled here is not military power or economic power, nevertheless it is power".

Underlining the importance of NAM in addressing contemporary global problems, Manmohan Singh said the 15th summit was being held amid the world's worst economic crisis in living memory. "The NAM has a great stake in ensuring that steps planned to revive the global economy take into account the concern of developing countries," he said.

"These include the challenges of food security, the environment and the reform of institutions of global governance," he said. Recently, in 16th summit of NAM held at Tehran (Iran) in August, 2012, in which NAM's membership raised upto 120:PM Dr Manmohan Singh said, "Our shared objectives of working together to preserve our strategic space, ensure social and economic development and strive for more just and equitable world order, remain as true and relevant today as they were in the past." (*The new Indian Express, 6th September, 2012*)

### **LET US SUM UP**

Non-alignment emerged in the context of two global developments: the national liberation struggles of colonies and the Cold War between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. leading to two military blocs and alliances. Despite political independence, the new states were economically underdeveloped and vulnerable to new imperialist pressures. The term non-alignment denotes the perspective of states that wanted to remain outside this system of alliances in order to follow an independent course of action in external policy and relations.

The imperatives for non-alignment sprang from economic, political, strategic and indigenous sources. These states came together on a common platform and formed the Non-aligned Movement. It provided an important forum for the discussion of common problems facing the developing countries of the South and for arriving at Concerted Action to achieve common aims.

It upholds principles which seek to promote political and economic justice in the international system. Its achievement were significant. There is debate about the relevance of non-alignment in a world without Cold War or bipolarism. But while the context of Cold War may have changed, the world remains divided into the rich and the poor nations.

The developing countries which constitute three-fourth of the world's population remain only on the periphery of the international system. The policy of non-aligned will remain valid until the system operates on the basis of genuine equality and reciprocity. There is an urgent need to reactivate the Non-aligned Movement in order to work concertedly for a more egalitarian world order.

### **North South Dialogue**

The Third World regards the securing of a Nieu a vital necessity for contemporary international relations, it feels that this is the only nor alternative for halting the fast deterioration of their economies in the present state of international economic order.

They strongly oppose the continuance of the economic squeeze that is currently being practised by the developed countries over the developing countries. They advocate the view that in this age of global interdependence any further squeeze and deterioration of their resources, markets, and economics is bound to be very harmful, counter-productive and even destructive of the economies of even the developed countries.

Nieu alone can end this era of neo-colonialism. It alone can end the prevailing anarchy of the existing economic order. On the basis of such logic, the Third World or the South strongly supports Nieu and advocates that the developed countries should come forward to negotiate the issue.

An immediate and serious North-south dialogue is the need of the hour. It is argued that neither the UN nor the existing international economic institutions can play any meaningful and fruitful role in restructuring the existing economic order as these stand dominated and controlled by the developed countries.

The developed countries on the other hand are not willing to accept the abandonment of their existing strong and dominant economic position and their key role in the international economic relation they feel that Nieu would be harmful there to interests and objectives. The existing system is helping them to maintain an economic and political control over the economics and policy of the underdeveloped countries. They do not want to part with their dominant position in the UN and other international economic institutions like World Bank, IMF etc.

They advocate that the existing economic institutions are capable of all actions in internal relations and these can be amended and used for, accommodating none of the demands of the Third world countries. They are therefore, neither serious nor keen to participate in a North South dialogue over the issue. They want to retain their neo-colonial control over the policy and economics of the third world countries and hence are not prepared to go in for Nieu.

This difference in approach of the two developed world's on the one hand and the third world on the other has made the issue of Nieu controversial issue. The developed countries are not willing to go in for it, whereas the underdeveloped countries are committed to secure it. The latter are strongly critical of such attempts of the former which are aimed at perpetuation and using the existing system for maintaining their controls over international economy and trade.

Faced with the continued opposition of developed countries to the demand for the creation of opposition of Nieu through North-South dialogue and cooperation, the Third World countries, have come up with concept of south-south cooperation and increased emphasis upon regional cooperation for development (RCD) among the developing countries.

Several better countries developed- developing countries like India and Brazil have decided to strengthen internal economic systems by finding domestic solutions of their economic problems. They have stepped up the drive towards attainment of economic and self reliance this together with increased South-South cooperation and meaningful RCD appear to constitute the best approach.

However all the developing countries which include poorest of the poor, cannot participate effectively in operationalising this approach. Their poverty, backwardness and near total dependence upon imports render them incapable of utilising fully this approach. They need developmental aid foreign aid without string capital resource transfer and teleological know how transfer for getting out there poverty and backwardness. This can be supplied by only developed countries.

Hence the ultimate and effective remedy can be New International Economic Order. Even South South cooperation and RCD among the better developed-developing counties can be moderately successful in actual practice. The heavy constraints and big weakness of their economic systems are bound to remain big hindrances in the path. The concerted opposition and protectionist policies of the developed countries are further destined to make their path towards development difficult and problematic. As such Neio alone constitute to be best solution for ending existing discriminatory, partial and unjust international economic order.

### **South-South Meet at New Delhi**

With a view to secure increased economic and trade cooperation among the developing countries, as well as for securing coordination in their policies over the issue of the approach to be pursued within the Group of 77. India took the initiative to hold meeting of the developing countries in New Delhi. The meeting took place on February 22-24, 1982 and was attended by the representatives of 44 developing countries, Mrs. Indira Gandhi in her opening speech expressed concern over what she described as 'visible deterioration in the global economy since the Cancun Summit', and she was especially critical of 'protectionism in industrialised countries' which she said had 'victimised the developing world'. Developing countries should close their ranks to withstand pressure from affluent nations.<sup>102</sup>

The South-South cooperation conference agreed to concentrate upon the following points for further consideration:

- (i) the formulation of programmes for agricultural self-reliance and food-self-sufficiency;
- (ii) the creation of a multilateral financing facility for joint ventures and technical cooperation among the developing countries.



The conference concluded with unanimous acceptance of the importance of cooperation for collective self-reliance, and with a renewed call for efforts to reach an agreement on the launching of the North-South global economic negotiations.

### **Global System of Trade Preference (GSTP)**

The idea of Global System of Trade Preference (GSTP) was mooted first in 1982 and took shape the two UNCATAD meetings in 1984 which did the spadework. This idea was mooted for securing increased trade cooperation and relations among the developing countries. Its objectives are following

- (a) expansion and diversification of trade among the developing countries;
- (b) development of industrial and other forms of economic cooperation among the developing countries with a view to accelerate their industrialisation and general economic growth; and
- (c) the system should also ensure trade advantage for the relatively less advanced countries.

The major guidelines for establishing this preferential trade system include:

- (a) Global System of Trade Preferences (GSTP) is exclusively reserved for member countries of the 'G-77';
- (b) it is to be negotiated step by step. And the preferences are to be introduced gradually;
- (c) it will be based on the principle of mutuality of advantages, recognising the needs of the least developed countries by preferential measures on a non-reciprocal basis;
- (d) all types of commodities should be included in the negotiations;
- (e) tariff and non-tariff barriers as well as other trade measures may form part of the preferential system and
- (f) it will supplement and not replace present and future sub-regional and intra-regional arrangements between LDCs.<sup>103</sup>

The two days ministerial level meeting of the developing countries was held on 25-26 July 1985 to consider GSTP as means for promoting South-South cooperation. The then Union Commerce Minister of India, Mr. V.P. Singh presided over the meeting which was inaugurated by the Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi. In his speech, the minister called upon the developing countries to work for collective self-reliance through boosting their trade. More than 70 countries which deliberated for two days on way of making South-South cooperation meaningful and mature agreed that the negotiating committee (for GSTP) should consider across the border tariff reduction of upto ten per cent in addition also identified sectors for particular social-economic importance for the developing countries such as processed tropical products, non-textile handicrafts, textiles and agricultural products for comprehensive and integrated treatment relating to tariff and non-tariff measures. Another important decision of meeting was to take up periodic reviews at political levels for monitoring and evaluation of the progress relating to GSTP, and that the next such meeting held in Brazil.

It made a breakthrough by approving to have a workable counterpart to the rich countries concept of the Global Scheme of Preferences. According to the time-table chalked out at the meeting, agreement incorporating ground rules were to be completed by October 31, 1985. The techniques and modalities were to be worked out by February 28, 1986. The first round of talks (negotiations) was to begin not later than Mat 1, 1986. This time-bound schedule was made to secure definite progress towards GSTP among the developing countries. In actual practice, however, no result were achieved. Talks were held but no agreement was made. The GSTP became effective in 1989.

### **Non-Aligned Foreign Ministers' Conference on South-South Cooperation**

The First Conference of Non-Aligned Foreign Ministers on South-South Cooperation was held on June 12-13, 1987 at Pyongyang (North Korea). It gave a call to give new impetus to cooperation among the Non-Aligned and other developing countries and adopt a new approach to make such cooperation among the Non-Aligned and other developing countries and

adopt a new approach to make such cooperation more dynamic. The ministers while adopting the Pyongyang declaration, listed a number of measures to develop and strengthen economic independence of those countries which would build collective self-reliance and increase their bargaining power in negotiations with the North.

Reaffirming the unwavering commitment of all Non-Aligned countries to economic cooperation among themselves the declaration noted the current world economic crisis and the economic policy of some rich countries had a negative impact on the economies of countries of the south:

“Referring to the indebtedness of developing countries, the declaration called for a political dialogue between the developed and the developing Countries to resolve the problem of unpaid debts.”<sup>104</sup>

Reiterating its demand for an international conference on money and finance for development at the earliest, the declaration expressed concern at the continuous decline in commodity price and regretted that certain developed countries did not show the required political will to remove trade imbalance at the last Uruguay meeting.

An action plan, incorporated in the declaration, called for measures for economic cooperation at the national, regional and international levels to promote South-South cooperation.

The plan said, ‘competent professional consultancy organisations available in developing countries must be tapped in a between way to implement various action-oriented programmes’,

It called for payments and clearing house arrangements to support expansion of trade among developing countries under the global system of trade preferences.

Commenting upon the Pyongyany declaration, The Tribune, a prestigious daily from Chandigarh ion one of its editorials has rightly observed:

“The declaration has rightly stressed the interrelationship between peace, disarmament and development because much of the Third World debt burden has been caused by avoidable purchase of weaponry from the developed countries. The high rate of obsolescence of sophisticated weaponry makes it imperative for them to go on allocating higher amounts for weapons purchases just to maintain ,what could be called the balance of terror in the world. A global disarmament arrangement is, thus, a necessary concomitant of a new international economic order. To the extent the deliberations at Pyongyang helped to expand mutual cooperation among the Third World Countries and encourage South-South trade and economic cooperation to reduce their dependence on the rich countries by building up regime of collective self-reliance, they will be playing a major role in saving the world from the gravest economic disaster it has faced since 1929.” <sup>105</sup>

#### **G– 77 and South-South Cooperation**

Another manifestation of South-South cooperation is the Group of 77. The proceedings of UNCTAD–I compelled the developing countries to realize that it was not possible to negotiate with developed countries unless the developing countries formed a pressure group of their own. <sup>106</sup>

The Group of 77 was set up mainly to highlight the problems of developing countries in their right perspective. The Group of 77 took up negotiations with the North on the behalf of the South and sought to use the strength of Collective action to pressurize and persuade North to change. <sup>107</sup>

#### **G–15 and South–South Cooperation**

G–15, a group of leading Third World countries was organised after the Ninth Non–Aligned Summit meeting Belgrade. The economic cooperation and South–South cooperation was the potential perspective of G–15. The member countries are: Algeria, Brazil India, Indonesia, Egypt, Jamaica, Argentina, Nigeria, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, Venezuela, Senegal, Yugoslavia and Zimbabwe.

At the G-15 meetings there has been continuous emphasis on South-South Cooperation. The perception in the G-15 is that, while South-South Cooperation has been talked about for years, very little has been achieved and that the group should work towards showing some success in this area. The joint communiqué issued after the G-15 meetings listed several agreements for increasing South-South cooperation and for adopting an agreed stand at the Uruguay round of trade talk under GATT. The communiqué declared:

“We affirm our commitment to a balanced and successful conclusion of the Uruguay round of multilateral trade negotiations which takes into account the concerns and needs of the developing countries. We shall closely consult each other and coordinate our efforts towards this end”.<sup>108</sup>

The Kuala Lumpur Summit had identified a dozen specific projects for South-South Cooperation. G-15 agreed to start a dozen projects for South-South cooperation. They immediately started three projects include the trade financing facility, Trade and Technology Data Exchange Centre and a Business and Investment Forum for the South. Besides this, G-15 sought North's cooperation for IMF and World Bank and other financial aids and North-South cooperation. Other South-South projects on the G-15 agenda relate to setting up of financial mechanisms for facilitating South-South trade, food, security, population control, trade and investment cooperation, stimulation of interregional cooperation among regional economic groups, evolving a common view on the external debt problem, and helping developing countries in dealing with multilateral financial institutions.

The Malaysian proposal for a South Investment Trade. Technology Data Exchange Centre (SITTDEC) has been approved at G-15 Caracas Summit. The Dakar Summit, 1992 of the G-15 also gave much importance to South-South Cooperation. It declared that greater global independence and prolonged economic recession in the North underlie the need for South to look towards itself to accelerate development and growth. Areas identified for South-South cooperation include the projects on bilateral payments arrangements, on population and family planning, self-propelling growth

schemes, technical personnel training, development of non-metallic mineral raw materials, environment mining, river and watershed recovery projects. The communiqué issued at New Delhi Summit emphasized the importance of South-South cooperation as a strategy for collective self-reliance.

The Fifth Summit of G-15 was held on November 6-7, 19975 in Buenos Aires (Argentina). In This Summit, the committee on investment, trade and technology (CITT) was set up to promote trans-regional arrangements and broaden the scope in intra G-15 cooperation. It is for the first time that governments and businessmen from G-15 countries have joined hands to provide impetus for cooperation in trade facilitation, promotion and liberalization, investment promotion and technology transfer.

The G-15 Summit of Kuala Lumpur also reiterated the G-15's catalytic role in fostering South-South Cooperation. It suggested the need for collective efforts to ensure that the rule of the game of global trade and commerce remained fair and open.

Financial and relevant trade issues emphasised the need for the discussion of these issues at an international conference with universal participation. It asserted that the commonwealth could play a useful role in this regard and set up a commonwealth consultative group for the purpose of promoting a consensus on the issue.

### **South Commission**

The South Commission (established by G-15) was originally proposed by the Malaysian Prime Minister, Mahathir Mohammad, came into being in 1987. The Commission was a product of the disillusionment of the South vis-à-vis the North and its inability to acquire any voice in decision-making at the global level. As the Chairman of the South Commission, Julius Nyerere said at the meeting of the Commission in New Delhi in November 1989:

“A state of dependency is incompatible with the reality of self-determination and freedom-both for nations and persons.”<sup>109</sup>

### **Meeting of South-South Commission**

The second meeting of South-South Commission for betterment of third World countries was held at Kuala Lumpur

