

# The Non-Aligned Movement Yesterday and Today - in the Process of Globalization: Critical View

Živojin Jazić\*

Original paper  
UDC 327.55  
Received in April 2005

*The paper: the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) yesterday and today tries to examine its achievements and failures - during the Cold War, and now in the process of globalization. Also, the main objectives were the decisions and events in the realities in both periods. Two aspects were highlighted: that NAM was primarily, and now almost totally, a grouping of developing countries, and that the NAM grew from 25 to 113 member - states in the time from 1961 (first summit in Belgrade) until 2003 (XIII summit in Malaysia). The main achievements: presentation of an alternative to block policy of Great Powers, during the bipolar structure of international relations, the constant support, primarily through its Conferences and in the United Nations for world peace, détente and disarmament, and prevention of dividing the world exclusively in block division (East and West). The failures: general trend towards confrontation instead for dialogue and compromise, especially with developed world. Ideological approach to main issues, accusing the USA and other Western powers for almost everything, and then, the USSR, for nothing (directly), although NAM has in substance preserved its non - block character.*

**Key words:** Non-Aligned Movement, globalization

## 1. Introduction

The Movement of Non-Alignment is today in its 44<sup>th</sup> year. Founded in Belgrade in 1961, its last summit was in Malaysia in 2003. Starting with Nehru-Tito-Nasser meeting in Brioni (Croatia) 1956, and afterwards with the convening of the first summit of twenty-five countries in 1961, the Non-alignment grew into a world movement. However, Non-alignment was primarily a grouping of developing and anticolonial countries. Today it encompasses the developing world, also named as the "Third World", or as "South", in relation to the more developed "North". The Non-Aligned had primarily developed its activity within the United Nations. Despite its ambitions, the Non-Aligned has remained through-

out the previous decades a moral-political force, with modest concrete effects in international relations. One should stress, that during the Cold war era, the Non-Aligned countries have constantly supported the world peace and global detente, the disarmament, and in particular the role of the UN. The advancement and social progress of developing countries was always at the heart of their programs. Also, their major achievement was the prevention of total division of the world in antagonistic blocks (led by the USA and, then the Soviet Union).

They have also advocated the solution of various crises and participation in peacekeeping operations. The results, especially regarding the crises, were rather disappointing. In the field of international economy, they have achieved little, due also to their often unrealistic proposals, and forcing, in reality, confrontation instead of dialogue, while the most

\* Živojin Jazić, Ph. D., Ambassador

developed countries had remained basically negative in their attitudes. The radical forces, then among the Non-aligned, are also to blame for insisting on confrontation and misusing anti-imperialist slogans.

After the end of Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the international scene has undergone radical changes and transformations, including the removal of many socialist and pro-Soviet governments. The result of the new constellation was also the collapse of the SFRY (due to internal factors) and the disappearance of that country from the non-aligned world. However, some of successor states are participating within the Movement: Croatia as observer, Slovenia and BIH as guests. The former FR of Yugoslavia was first suspended, but after the fall of Milošević regime, accepted as observer in 2003, now as Serbia and Montenegro.

Such international development has provoked significant changes in the Non-Aligned Movement, oriented now towards negotiations with the developed world, leaving aside confrontation and ideological battles - with the earlier opposing side.

Before entering in the complex of globalization and the present role of Non-alignment, let us remind about some basic features of that Movement. First, the definition. Faced with the outbreak of Cold War, the newly liberated countries in Asia were confronted with the dilemma what orientation they should take. As India achieved independence in 1947/48, it was up to Prime Minister Nehru to make a choice. He took the line, that India should remain non-engaged vis-à-vis power politics of Great Powers, and follow its own course of action. He has said that in the Parliament on March 8, 1948, advocating a freedom of choice, keeping away from power politics. This concept was rejected by both Mao Tse Tung and J. F. Dulles, of course separately, as neutral and even "immoral" (Dulles).<sup>1</sup> Even today, India has maintained an active posture at the Non-Aligned meetings, but as a rule has implemented only those decisions, corresponding to her national interests.

Later in 1955 the Conference of Asia and Africa was held in Bandung, including China, Japan, Egypt, etc. The Conference adopted the so-called Ten Principles, now considered as the basic principles of Non-Alignment (the commemorative session has been held recently, 50 years later, not mentioning the Non-Alignment at all). Although, the Brioni meeting in 1956, affirmed the Bandung principles, in reality it was the preparation of the Belgrade summit in 1961, where essential criteria were formulated (the draft was made by India).

They were: independent policy, based on co-existence, consistent support of the movements for national independence, the country should not be a

member of a military multilateral alliance, concluded in the context of Great Power conflict, and one of the most difficult criteria: if a country concedes military bases, it should not be made in the context of Great Powers conflicts.<sup>2</sup> In the course of the growing non-aligned membership, these two last criteria have lost their significance, and now, almost nobody is mentioning them, as well as the original criteria altogether.

Another aspect should be noted. Once asked, what would happen with the Non-Alignment if one day the blocs disappeared, Nehru replied that there would always be a division between small and big countries. Such an explanation should be topical even today, together with the basic distinction between the developing and the developed (in economic sense) nations and regions. One could add another important aspect. Namely, although the bipolar world has ceased to exist, the USA remained the only superpower, with NATO as its alliance, vis-à-vis new emerging powers and regional integrations, especially in Europe and Asia (some are also in Latin America and Africa).

Regarding various definitions of principles, one can conclude that each summit had its own definition, but at the VI Summit in Havana in 1978, it was possible to reach a compromise between the extremists and those who followed the original non-aligned concept (among them was the former Yugoslavia, which always insisted on the inclusion of the following: "against all forms of foreign domination"). So, at the VI Summit the definition was: opposition to imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, Zionism, apartheid, exploitation, foreign occupation, interference, intervention, domination and hegemony.<sup>3</sup> The result was that at the following summits this definition had been generally reaffirmed without elaboration, until it was quietly dropped or replaced by Bandung principles after the X Summit.

Here, we should briefly recall another dispute within the Movement, the attitude towards socialist countries, more precisely, the Soviet block. The USSR has tried, though without success, to establish the so-called "natural alliance" between their block and the non-aligned countries, especially during Brezhnev's regime in Moscow, using their close allies among the Non-Aligned (Cuba, etc.). That attempt was successful to some extent only within the UN since a number of resolutions in the General Assembly were adopted due to the joint majority of the Non-Aligned and socialist countries (the Western side called it "terror of majority"). Without entering into details, the responsibility lied with both sides. The Non-Aligned did not show enough readiness for compromise, and the Western side opposed the content of such resolutions, mainly, when deal-

ing with colonial issues and Middle East (Palestine), because they qualified them as one-sided. Economic matters were also the cause of disagreements, while the most developed countries rejected the demands of the underdeveloped, claiming them as unacceptable, although their diagnosis was right.

The most important events in the history of Non-alignment were their summits. So far, there have been thirteen of them. The first summit had 25 participants, 3 observers and 15 liberation movements. The second summit was in Cairo 1964 with 47 participants, 10 observers and 10 liberation movements. The third was in Lusaka 1970 with 54 participants, 9 observers and 9 guests (that category for the first time). The fourth summit was in Algiers 1973 with 75 participants, 9 observers and 25 guests. The sixth summit was in Havana 1979 with 93 participants, 12 observers and 8 guests (the previous was in Colombo 1976, with 86 participants, 10 observers and 7 guests). The seventh summit was in Delhi 1983, with 100 participants, 10 observers and 10 guests. Eighth summit was in Harare 1986 (101 members, 10 observers, 12 guests). The ninth summit was again in Belgrade 1989, with 100 participants, 16 observers, and 42 guests. The tenth summit was in Jakarta 1992, with 102 participants, 17 observers and 41 guests. The Tenth Summit represented a kind of continuity, the following three were held in different circumstances and contents, after the Cold War.

## 2. The UN have been a primary object of the Non-Aligned countries

We should also mention the position of the Non-Aligned Movement toward detente.

In principle it was defined as being positive, although restricted to the Great Powers and Europe, but the Movement repeatedly demanded for détente to be applied to all regions and to include all countries. This was a rather idealistic wish, which could not be fulfilled in the bipolar world, not even today when globalization requires cooperation in general, while big powers and countries, strong and influential, have a predominant role.

As to economic issues, the actions and proposals of the Non-Aligned were mostly visible in the UN. Apart from correct basic analysis of the unfavourable conditions of the developing world, almost exclusive responsibility was attributed to the most developed. Among many one-sided proposals and actions were the so-called New Economic Order and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, being pushed through the General Assembly of the UN by majority voting, despite the fact

that their implementation depended on the most developed (the Group of 77 developing countries, now over 100, had played an active role in this endeavour). At present, these demands have been almost forgotten. Instead, one other initiative, the Action Program of the South-South Cooperation, together with the North-South dialogue appears more realistic and promising.

The UN have been a primary object of the Non-Aligned countries, especially through the demand for a more equitable representation of the developing world in the UN, and by criticizing the use of veto in the Security Council. Apart from some unsuccessful demands to eliminate the veto (i.e. Libya), even nowadays the Non-Aligned have remained engaged in the reform of the UN, and in particular, in their attempt to restrict the use of veto.

In the contemporary era, three summits have been held. Although, the X summit in Jakarta introduced some novelties and more acceptable demands and proposals, the real changes came later at the following summits. Thus, the XI Summit was held in Colombia in 1995 (110 participants, 12 observers, 24 guests), the XII was held in South Africa in 1998 (102 participants, 14 observers, 27 guests - among them, Western powers, Russia, European Union, Group of 8), and the XIII Summit was held in Malaysia in 2003 (111 members, 17 observers, 31 guests).

The main document at the XI Summit<sup>1</sup> was entitled "The Call from Colombia". It criticises globalization because it had benefited only a few. Therefore, the expectations, following the end of the Cold War have "evaporated". The main problems became more apparent. The most developed countries have accumulated excessive amount of wealth and power, while unemployment and poverty have reached the alarming proportions.

Other negative elements were: hunger, debt crises, illiteracy, etc. It was also said that some old evils, like racial discrimination and xenophobia, as well as the threats against minorities and efforts for destabilization of developing countries were still present. The arms exporters have been directly accused of trafficking of arms to terrorists and common criminals. In addition, a concern has been expressed about the nuclear threats and other negative phenomena, coming to the conclusion that mostly industrialized countries benefited from the globalization and that it has broadened the gap between the rich and the poor countries.

The fact that this time the earlier practice of repeating all "isms" of what the NAM opposed to, has been left out was positive. However, the summit reaffirmed the fundamental principles of the NAM without enumerating them. The summit also promoted

the dialogue and search for the solutions based on mutual interests, which in the current circumstances was an adequate approach. The strengthening of democracy and the advancement of human rights were also included in the priorities of the NAM.

In order to achieve those goals, the NAM promised its engagement particularly in revitalization and democratization of the United Nations, and, which seems more difficult, in the restructuring of the Bretton Woods institutions (the IMF and the World Bank).

The "Call from Colombia" repeated an old demand of the Non-Aligned, i.e., general and complete disarmament, especially the elimination of the nuclear weapons, described by India as a demand for "the world without nuclear weapons", in reality a long-term prospect. India has become a nuclear power, although it has all the time argued in favour of general disarmament, without exception.

The eradication of colonialism, foreign occupation and interventionist trends - have all been taken from the earlier NAM documents, but now condemning those negative phenomena in stronger terms than the documents of the previous summits. Further, "The Call from Colombia" entrusted President Samper to convey to the Group of 7 the concern of the Movement regarding the economic problems of the developing countries, as well as to promote South-South cooperation. Also, Colombia encouraged the struggle against the illicit drug trafficking. It is interesting to note that on one occasion the USA denied the entry visa to President Samper.

Apart from the Call, the summit issued declarations containing various topics, conducing to the international relations - based on justice, equality and democracy (a new definition). While recognizing the important changes, the accents of the review of the international relations were mainly on their negative aspects, mostly blaming the great powers "for endangering the future of humankind".

The Non-Aligned, although noting that a number of conflicts in the regions of Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean have been settled through agreements, expressed "grave concern over the exacerbation of the existing and even new conflicts, and reappearance of old rivalries". But, the reason for that was interesting, they noted. The break-up of one of the superpowers (the Soviet Union, obviously) led to the disappearance "of the balance of power and to a latent instability worldwide".

According to them, the so-called balance of power was more positive for overall security than the present constellation - a rather dubious conclusion. However, to prove such assessment, the Non-Aligned Heads listed alleged violent conflicts, ag-

gression, foreign occupation, interference, hegemony, domination, nationalism, massive violations of human rights, even genocide in various regions (without specifying them).

However, the following paragraphs were quite different, describing the positive achievements with the exception of Europe (only a few months after the summit, the Dayton Accords were signed, which terminated the war in Bosnia).

Nevertheless, after recognizing some progress, the document was focused on the remaining demands which should be fulfilled, including those already mentioned in the previous NAM documents. An important part was devoted to the revitalization and reforms of the United Nations, containing most of the known proposals, i.e. insisting that the General Assembly should be the main organ for decision-making (which was overstated, having in mind the role of the Security Council). The restriction of the use of veto was also among those demands, as well as the support, with some criticism, of peace-keeping operations that concluded this part. Also interesting was the section devoted to the so-called new context of international economic cooperation, which substantially departed from the previous NAM documents. Instead of the insisting on the New Economic Order and deploring its non-implementation, a new approach was offered, for the first time, as a complete concept.

In this approach, the trust was put in dialogue and mutual cooperation of developed-developing countries, basically within the system of the UN mechanism. Naturally, the essential demands and proposals were retained, but given in more flexible and acceptable terms. Here a relatively stronger emphasis was put on the South-South cooperation, which should be the framework for the negotiations with the developed world, as well as for the mutual collaboration, recognizing also the responsibility for the progress of the world economy and markets, of course, starting from the substantial needs and requirements of developing countries.

Human rights, their promotion and the close ties with the social development were highlighted in a more comprehensive manner, including the right to development (an original Yugoslav proposal).

### **3. Colombian Summit has marked a fresh start of the Non-Aligned Movement**

As the conclusion, it could be stated that the Colombian summit substantially departed from the previous summits and has marked a fresh start. Nev-

ertheless, some old shortcomings were retained, like the length of the documents and the inclusion of all possible issues, general, regional and individual. Missing from this declaration was the usual vocabulary against imperialism, etc., and the constant attack on the USA (except in relation to Cuba and, indirectly to Puerto Rico). So, the trend initiated in Accra and later in Jakarta, has continued more decisively and encompassing the whole approach of Non-Alignment, now, clearly a grouping of developing countries.

Besides Cyprus only Bosnia and Herzegovina was mentioned as a European country. In addition, the evaluation of the Security in the Mediterranean was given, condemning the acts of aggression, genocide and ethnic cleansing, without naming the culprits. The summit in general terms expressed its support for the peace process and called the Security Council to implement its resolutions.

Regarding the crises in different areas, it is interesting to mention the two of them: Korea and Middle East (Palestine).<sup>5</sup> This time the Korean problem was presented in a different manner than before. Instead of demanding the withdrawal of the foreign troops (meaning American), from South Korea, a balanced proposal was given - to settle the crisis through negotiations and dialogue, based on the principles agreed at the North-South Joint Statement of July 4, 1972, and the Agreement from 1992. The essential provision was peaceful settlement among all parties concerned, especially North and South Korea and the USA.

The summit document regarding Palestine refrained from the old condemnations solely against Israel and the USA, but supported the peace process, on the basis of Madrid Peace Conference in 1991, the Declaration of Principles (Washington, 1993), The 1995 Interim Agreement, as well as the establishment of Palestinian Self Government Authority. Almost nothing was said about the role of the Non-Aligned countries! This showed that after mostly one-sided engagement of the non-aligned in supporting PLO and Arafat, they were now left aside in the peace process both as a factor or as participants! The XII Summit took place in Durban, South Africa, in 1998, after the minority apartheid regime had practically collapsed, due also to the international pressure (the United Nations, the Non-Aligned, etc.), and the government of the black majority under Nelson Mandela had been elected.

The Durban Declaration expressed the main goals and ambitions of the non-aligned countries in a quite different language and content from the earlier ones. The most important was the definition that the South-South cooperation was the essential preoccupation of the NAM, an institution of the South meaning in the first place the developing world. Although

the principles of the Movement were affirmed as valid, in fact, only colonialism, exploitation, dominance and marginalization have been explicitly highlighted.

The Cold War was over, as well as the rivalry of the superpowers and, it was stated, that a new era has started, with new possibilities, but, also, with new challenges and dangers for the peoples of the South. Therefore, the system of multilateralism was advocated, as well as an increasing role of the United Nations. Drugs, AIDS, transnational crime, hunger and terrorism, were listed among the main threats to humanity.

Globalization and economic liberalization were considered more from the aspect of the dangers they represented for the South. The process of globalization has not brought advantages to many developing countries, faced with poverty, degradation and marginalization. The role of the South-South cooperation should be seen as a bridge to the developed world, and as a sign of increased interdependence of the world economy, including the necessity for more attention to be drawn to economic and regional integrations. Comparing Bandung and Durban, it could be seen that poverty still exist and that it means that in the 21<sup>st</sup> century poverty should disappear (the United Nations at its Millennium Summit in 2000 determined that poverty should be halved by 2015).

The final Document, although very long, identified new and more acute priorities for the NAM, and, though to a lesser degree, the actions to realize them. Among the priorities for the NAM, being primarily a movement of developing countries, or the so-called South, there were two important functions - to increase the cooperation within this grouping and to be a principal instrument for the negotiations with the Group 7-8 of developed countries, because economic development and social situation are in the focus of the world and of the process of globalization.

The NAM included as its topic also the revitalization of the United Nations (emphasis was on the role of General Assembly, on the restriction of the use of veto and on the more equitable representation of developing countries in the organs of the UN), as well as on ecology, law of the sea, human rights, fight against drugs, terrorism and organized crime, etc. Nevertheless, hunger, poverty, AIDS, malnutrition were of the main importance for the Movement (also in accordance with the UN priorities).

Very important was the assessment that globalization and neoliberalism have not resulted in bringing the benefits to many non-aligned countries. Therefore, the common demand of the NAM was the substantial correction of these processes, but, beyond well expressed criticism, it did not enter into concrete proposals on how these objectives could be achieved!

The document has softened the condemnation of great powers, criticizing only the USA. One of its main conclusions was that the collapse of the Cold War and the disappearance of the Soviet bloc have not made the world more secure, rather the opposite was noted - instability, especially outside of Europe. The essential demands were stated - the disarmament and a progressive elimination of nuclear weapons from the arsenals of those powers in their possession (a very distant project).

Regarding the fundamental principles, the document has stressed the right to self determination, sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-interference and non-intervention, denying any use of force - unless permitted by the UN Security Council.

With the exception of Africa, the mention of crises areas has also been reduced, and not so much elaborated as before. Palestine was also treated in a reduced context, while as far as Europe was concerned, the war in Bosnia and the Yugoslav crisis were completely omitted. Other crises have been treated within a known framework, without new ideas or proposals.

Altogether, the documents from the XII Summit while promoting a more balanced approach have not contributed to a more active role of the NAM.

#### 4. Revitalization of the Non-Aligned Movement

The next, XIII Summit, was held after almost five years, in 2003, in Kuala Lumpur. The summit in Malaysia lasted two days (24-25 November 2003). As at the previous summit, two documents were issued: Kuala Lumpur Declaration on Continuing the Revitalization of the Non-Aligned Movement<sup>6</sup> and the Final document. The main concern was the revitalization of the Movement, based on the principles of Bandung and the Charter of the United Nations, without mentioning other principles and summits. This summit in Malaysia delivered a message that the Movement had been born in Bandung, which is not true historically (Bandung in 1955 was a predecessor of the NAM). In the Final Document, an attempt was made to bring the Movement in accordance with the priorities of the present world, (as defined at the Millennium Summit in 2000, at the UN) and to express the support for multilateralism through the strengthening of the UN, as the opposite to the unipolar world, as it has emerged after the end of Cold War.

In such a context, the Non-Aligned Heads have named decolonization, apartheid, Middle East, disarmament, poverty and socio-economic development as the issues of their concern. In order to overcome the challenges, which resulted also from the deficiencies of globalization, the Movement must remain strong, cohesive and resilient. Nevertheless, the relevance of the Movement largely depends on its abil-

ity to adapt to the changes in the world of today. It should promote the world peace through dialogue and diplomacy and the avoidance of the use of force. The actions and measures to be planned by the NAM should be: promoting the South-South cooperation and the North-South dialogue, including the Group 7-8 of industrialized countries. Within such framework, special attention should be given to Africa and the least developed countries.

The Final Document, again, as the previous ones, in as many as 375 paragraphs defined the position and the demands of the Non-Aligned Movement as regards global, regional and individual issues and cases. Beside some old or similar definitions, particularly some fresh or different approaches to a number of issues should be emphasized.

In addition, the rejection of unilateralism and of all unilateral military actions should be stressed, including those without a proper authorization from the UN Security Council (although the USA was not mentioned, this formulation was undoubtedly directed against its action in Iraq). To avoid any misunderstanding, the summit adopted a special resolution on Iraq in order to avert the war against it (in fact this resolution had been adopted just before the USA and the allies invaded this country).

A new approach was evident also in the paragraph 13 of the Final Document, supporting the Organization of African Unity (OAU), which, at its summit in Algiers in 1999, called for the restoration of the "constitutional legality" in the states whose governments had come to power through the "unconstitutional means" (obviously meaning various coup d'états). In the same way, the summit expressed the support for the member-states actively participating in the Conference, held in Mongolia, on New and Restored Democracies in 2003.

The NAM rejected the humanitarian interventions that were contrary to the principles of non-intervention, etc., as well as any labelling of countries as "good" or "evil" based on a unilateral and unjustified criteria (again, a criticism of the USA, without explicitly mentioning it).

Further, the summit recalled the previous documents of the NAM, supporting the North-South dialogue, as well as a dialogue between civilizations and, especially, criticizing the failures of globalization in respect to the developing world. The developed countries were asked to help them in the fields of market access preferential tariffs, debt reduction, transfer of technology and reforms in the international financial structure (a modest allusion on the MMF and the World Bank). The conclusion that the well known gap between rich and poor countries had not diminished was repeated. The Plan of Action, it was requested, should be elaborated by the Coordinating Bureau in the UN.

The problem of the sanctions imposed by the UN was also examined, with the conclusion that a sanction should be imposed only as a last resort and lifted when the objectives have been achieved. The so-called Post Conflict Peace Building Activities should be managed under the key role of General Assembly, while defining them and their implementation require the consent of the parties concerned and should be in accordance with the UN Charter.

As is known, in a number of the non-aligned countries the regimes are autocratic, including the former Yugoslavia (SFRY), or at least non-democratic in the classical sense, and there is a need to build up, in them, democratic, pluralistic and free political systems. Nevertheless, the new orientation of the NAM to promote democracy has been often simultaneously hampered by strict observance of the principle of non-interference in domestic affairs of a state. In the present political reality, this principle has been misused or has served as a shield to protect non-democratic regimes in some countries.

Today, the principles of human rights belong to the international law and the world order, so their violations in the internal practice of some countries can no longer be hidden behind sovereignty or regional integration in Europe. The case is similar with the humanitarian intervention, although one cannot sometimes overlook the use of an alleged protection of human rights - as an excuse for different political goals of outside powers.

As to disarmament, a considerable concern could be noted regarding the attempt to launch a new concept based on the retention of nuclear weapons, such as the concept of NATO "Alliance Strategic Concept", adopted in 1999, which opened the scope for a possible use of force, including the reliance on nuclear weapons, and consequently the prolongation of bloc policy, but now by NATO as the only remaining military alliance, and the sole superpower of today - the USA. Regarding such situation, the NAM supported the UN resolution on "Promotion of Multilateralism in the Area of Disarmament and Non-proliferation". Another aspect of the current international development, besides the original five nuclear-weapons powers, is the emergence of a number of the new ones, like India, Pakistan, North Korea, and, possibly, Iran, Israel, South Africa, Argentina, Brazil, etc.

A part of the non-aligned documents have always been devoted to the crises areas. This time, it appeared in a somewhat restricted content and in the number of cases. Beside the classic cases of Middle East and Korean problem, it mostly covered Africa, which in most instances, represented the examples of disputes among the non-aligned countries (like Congo, Rwanda, Burundi, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Somalia, Eritrea, Western Sahara, etc.) and the problems of internal orders and the fighting among different armed groups.

In this context, the summit welcomed the creation of an *ad hoc* Working Group on "Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa" by the UN Security Council in 2002. Surely, the long term solutions of those disputes depend on the implementation of the UN Millennium Declaration of 2000, as well as on the efforts of Africa, with the support of the UN, to achieve a sustainable development accompanied by the settlement of huge African debts, and the financing of its development.

The Final Document from Kuala Lumpur ends with the commitment of the Movement to strengthen the cooperation among the non-aligned countries in eradication of dangerous links between terrorist groups, drug traffickers and other criminal gangs, affecting the security and the economies of many states.

Although this document was adopted shortly before the war against Iraq, there was not a word about the regime of Saddam Hussein and his atrocities in domestic affairs, possibly because of the conception of non-interference that the non-aligned strictly observe.

## 5. Conclusions

At the end of this text,<sup>7</sup> there is a need to draw some resume, without the ambition to present an all-round analysis.

1. During the period, of the Cold War and the bipolar structure of international relations, the Non-Aligned Movement was created, as an independent, non-bloc factor of mostly newly liberated countries, mainly from Asia, Africa and Latin America (the SFRY was then the member from Europe, beside Cyprus). As such, the NAM has been constantly growing through that period. Its character, in essence, never changed, but in time it has become more radical and sometimes even extremist in its demands in economic field as well. Being always a primarily political and moral force, its practical effects remained rather limited.

However, the greatest achievement of the NAM is that it has become an alternative policy, promoting coexistence, peace, disarmament, especially nuclear, equal relationship among states and opposition to bloc division and policy. Its negative characteristics were, in substance, the attitude of confrontation, instead of dialogue with great powers and developed world. The NAM dominated the UN General Assembly. Towards the end of the Cold War (which the NAM did not really foresee), it became softer and more flexible, but it was too late to have some effect.

In the relations with great powers, the USA was always, while the Soviet Union was never criticized, which was a one-sided approach, even when the greater responsibility of the West (colonialism,

gap between developed and developing countries) was taken into account.

Contrary to its behaviour in the Cold War era, the NAM has taken a much more positive attitude now - in the era of globalization, trying to become its partner, but also a corrector of negative trends. The NAM grew from 25, in the beginning to 113 members. This growth also created new problems. The consensus has become more difficult to be achieved, and the NAM is forced to satisfy regional and individual aims, not only to devote its activity to global objectives. Even more negative is the practice to put together major decisions and individual desires almost on the same level or in the same line in relevant documents. Another negative habit has been that the documents are too long and detailed.

As to the treatment of Great Powers, we have stressed that it appeared rather unbalanced. The USA was mostly and often criticized, while the Soviet Union was never, or only indirectly, even when intervening in some countries. On the other hand, the NAM was never in the position to create a valid mechanism for implementation, although it has created too many working groups and specialized conferences. One reason might be that the NAM never really became an organization, which is not bad, because it remained a movement.

The NAM has also not paid enough attention to promote democracy and human rights. Recently this

situation has improved, maybe not sufficiently. Tolerance towards a number of autocratic and openly dictatorial regimes has been another failure, perhaps due to a rigid concept of non-interference in internal affairs of the member countries. In an increasing manner, the NAM has also neglected conflicts and even wars among the Non-Aligned countries. The Iran-Iraq war lasted for eight years! This has damaged the reputation of the NAM as an instrument advocating the peaceful settlement of all disputes.

Within the NAM and the Group of 77, there are now a number of big member-states (India, Brazil, South Africa, Nigeria, Egypt, as well as Arab oil producing countries) which have reached a higher degree of development and technological advancement. They could significantly contribute to a more balanced globalization and the enhancement of South-South cooperation.

Now, there is a question<sup>8</sup> about the so-called irrelevance of Non-Alignment in the era of globalization. The answer is negative, for various reasons. If this was true, why should over a hundred countries and all major powers belong to it, or observe its activity? Further, there are many negative aspects or events in international relations, including the use of force or unilateral interventions. A fight for multilateralism, the central role of the UN and its Millennium programs, including need for their reforms, make the existence of the NAM no less necessary than before.

## NOTES

1 See: K. Subramanyam, *New Challenges, New Goals*, in the *World Focus*, *New Goals*, in "World Focus", New Delhi, Vol.X, no.6, 1989, p.3.

2 Text of five criteria: Documents of the gatherings of the Non-Aligned countries, Vol: I, ed. *Medjunarodna politika* Belgrade 1989, p.14. Also, the text of Brioni meeting in: Documents, *ibid* p.9. On the Bandung Conference see: R. Jaipal, *Non-alignment*, Allied Publishers Private Ltd., New Delhi 1987, p.25-28.

3 The review of I-X summits: G.N. Srivastava, *Policy of NAM*, Institute for Non-aligned Studies, New Delhi, 1995, p.135-190.

4 The XI summit in: NAC 11 (doc.L, rev.2) p.1-2, (the Call...). Full text in: NAC 11, *ibid*.p.2-102 (on global issues p.2-31). The XII summit: The Final Declaration, <http://www.nam.aov.zalmaninaua.html>, <http://www.nam.aov.za/manclose.html>, (also in: A.D. Lakicevic, *Cooperation South-South*, Belgrade 2000, 47-210. The XIII summit: Draft Final Doc. Rev.1, p.1-76.

5 Korea and Palestine, Doc. NAC 11, *ibid*.p.44, 32-33.

6 On revitalization..., see: NAM XIII, p.1-6.

7 At the Ministerial Conference in New Delhi 1997, it was adopted

among others - the Cartagena Document on Methodology (from the meeting in Cartagena, May 16, 1996). This Document consists also of a new definition of criteria for admission into NAM. An aspiring member should adopt an independent policy, based on coexistence of states with different social systems and on policy of non-alignment, in accordance with Ten Bandung Principles, which are "the foundation of NAM". Regarding the dialogue with the group 8, the NAM has presented its topic as: external debt, development assistance, trade foreign investment, illegal drugs, environment, reform of international monetary and financial system, and now also tight against terrorism and organized crime. As a result, a Consultative mechanism of NAM and Group 8 was established. (Selected documents, XII Ministerial Conference of NAM, New Delhi 1997, *ibid*. p. 119-120, 149-150

8 Such doubts exists in many countries, including Croatia (see *Vjesnik* 17.8.2004, Croatia and the Non-Aligned by B. Lopandic). The arguments are known, they are most around dilemma, is non-alignment only relevant in Cold War: certainly not, the relevance of NAM remains today.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- R. Jackson, *Non-aligned, the UN and Superpowers*, Praeger Publisher New York, 1283, p. 97-185 and 189-252  
 N. Srivastava, *Selected Documents, NAM and Global Problems*, New Delhi, 1988, p.15-258  
 NAM and struggle For Peace and Disarmament (compiled by Dr. Sahni and Srivastava) New Delhi 1989, p. 9-93  
 Irene Reuter-Hendrichs, *Jugoslaviens Ringen um die Blockfreiheit, Aussenpolitik*, no. 1.1980, p. 70-83  
 Attar Chanda, *Challenges of the Eighties*, 1989, New Delhi  
 S. Bajpai, *Non-alignment, Perspectives and Prospects*, New Delhi, 1983

- R. Bilgrami, *Relevance of Non-alignment, Non-Aligned World*, no. 14, 28.1.2003, New Delhi, p.1-3  
 R. Jaipal, *Non-alignment....Allied Publishers Private Ltd.*, New Delhi 1987  
 NAM, the issues of priority and methodology, ed. Institute for Non-Aligned studies, New Delhi 1997  
 Future of NAM, Jakarta 1992, ed. Institute for Non-aligned studies, New Delhi  
 The Asian African Summit - Declaration of the New Asian - African Strategic Partnership, Jakarta Indonesia 22-23. IV. 2005