

Havana

to



Kabul



A Sri Lanka Non Aligned View

by

S. P. Amarasingam

327.11  
AMA

A TRIBUNE PUBLICATION



# HAVANA TO KABUL



*A Sri Lankan Non-Aligned View*

by  
S. P. AMARASINGAM  
Editor, Tribune,  
Ceylon News Review.

A TRIBUNE PUBLICATION  
1980

32711  
A104

FIRST EDITION AUGUST, 1980



**Sri Lanka Rs. 12-50**

**Foreign US Dollar 1-50**

Published by  
TRIBUNE PUBLICATIONS  
43, Dawson Street,  
Colombo 2.  
Sri Lanka,

Printed by Vat Print, 96, Justice Akbar Mawatha, Colombo 2.  
for Tribune Publications, 43, Dawson Street, Colombo 2,

## INTRODUCTION

## EXPLANTORY

This is not intended to be an apologia.

No apology is needed for what I want to say. Some people abroad may not agree with the way I look at world affairs, but I feel very strongly that my Sri Lankan nonaligned view has great validity even if there are countrymen of mine who may think differently.

My views on international affairs and world problems are well known to readers of the weekly *Tribune* (*Ceylon News Review*) -- even though they may have often been buried in the anonymity of editorial comment.

The first issue of *Tribune* appeared shortly after the Asian Prime Minister's Meeting in Colombo in 1954. Bandung had come a year later. From that time until now, *Tribune* has published a great deal about international affairs and the problems of the contemporary era with special emphasis on Nonalignment and the Nonaligned Movement. Though *Tribune* has provided a forum for a wide range of views, comments

and opinions on international matters, my personal evaluation, especially of the nonaligned approach to world problems, have at all times been reflected in the pages of the paper.

This booklet is not an academic exercise in the form, style and content that gentlemen from the campuses of Europe and the USA have endeavoured to popularise. There are no footnotes or high falutin references to the numerous learned and well-funded studies published in recent times and which have wittingly or unwittingly tended to push interested and concerned Third World people into a state of permanent confusion. But the sources on which I have relied are understandably those which support my outlook on global matters. They are really the only silver linings in the perennially dark and gloomy horizon of the present global information (or misinformation) order.

I am a product of Sri Lanka in an Asian Third World setting. I have spent a total of less than 40 days of my entire life -- in European or Super-Power countries. My travels have been mainly in Asia, with short hops through the Middle East. I have been twice to Cuba, once in 1965 on a voyage of curiosity and later in 1979 to cover the Sixth Summit of the Nonaligned Movement. Cuba has always fascinated me because it is a small island like Sri Lanka and which had been under colonial rule for over 450 years. They are perhaps two countries that have endured foreign domination longest.

I grew up in the era of anti-imperialist struggles and even today I am unrepentant anti-imperialist. I am not one of those who has been persuaded that imperialism has disappeared simply because political independence has come to all but a few of the former colonies. In spite of this, it is an undisputed fact that imperialist exploitation in matters economic continues in many new, sophisticated and camouflaged forms so that even respectable bourgeois circles now speak of it as "neocolonialism". Only the hardened imperialists, who parade as the champions of freedom, regard it as a dirty

word. It is tragic therefore to hear some Third World leaders say that imperialism has disappeared or that it is fast fading away.

But, I am not so obsessed with the jargon of imperialist domination to find comfort in easy over-simplified explanations for all the world's ills by repeating the magic formula "open sesame it's all imperialism..... imperialism....." This does not mean, however, that one must swing to the other end of the pendulum and ignore or gloss over the existence of imperialism in any effort to understand current problems. Imperialism moreover has purposely created many bogeys -- once it was the Yellow Peril, now it is the Russian Commie, the Arab Terrorist, the Black Guerilla and a host of other diversionary red herrings to make people forget the real cause of much of mankind's troubles -- imperialism. And, it is, therefore, not easy to find one's way through the labyrinthian popagande maze that imperialism has created to protect itself from those who seek to emancipate themselves from economic exploitation.

In the period from the Sixth Summit (September 1979) in Cuba to the events that erupted at end of December 1979 in Afghanistan, imperialism has through the grip it has on the global information system spread even greater confusion than before through misinformation based on half and quarter truths. But unlike a decade ago imperialism is not able to have its own way everywhere everytime. People cannot be fooled all the time, in fact, they refuse to be fooled. This booklet is really an attempt to portray the realities of the contemporary world in a way that will make sense to honest and sane-minded people not only in the Third World but also in developed countries.

The views I have expressed are my own although there are good reasons to think that a very large number of people in this country feel the same way. The UNP Government in power in Sri Lanka from July 1977 has adopted a low profile posture to world problems, unlike other governments in the past. Though Sri Lanka, as Chairman of the Nonali-

igned Movement had come out very strongly against any attempt to destabilise the Sixth Summit at Havana, it maintained a peculiar silence on the Khomeini Revolution in Iran. But on the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan the Sri Lanka Government issued an official statement on January 3, 1980 to read: "The government of Sri Lanka is strongly opposed to the interference by the Soviet Union or any other country in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, a member of the Nonaligned Movement. Consistent with our commitment to the principle of nonalignment, we support the sovereign right of the people of Afghanistan to determine their own destiny free from foreign interference. Outside interference or aggression cannot be condoned under any circumstances. Therefore the government and people of Sri Lanka call upon the Soviet Union to withdraw its military contingent from the territory of Afghanistan immediately."

It was a correct and unexceptional statement within the strict bounds of the concept of "genuine nonalignment" as defined by Morarji Desai, the Indian Prime Minister who hovered over the Indian firmament for a brief period. The same statement was incorporated into the joint communiques issued after the visit of the Bangladesh, Nepali and Indonesian Heads of State. More recently on July 1, after the Soviet Government announced a partial troop withdrawal from Afghanistan, "Sri Lanka's Foreign Minister, A. C. S. Hameed, told the visiting Nepalese Foreign Secretary, Jagdish S. J. B. Rana, that the Soviet Union's recent announcement that it was withdrawing some of its troops from Afghanistan should be welcomed by the international community..... Mr. Hameed said the Soviet Union's announcement should be regarded as a breakthrough and all those interested in peace and stability in the region should make use of it to find ways and means of promoting a complete withdrawal, according to the sources. Explaining Sri Lanka's views on the matter, Mr. Hameed told Mr. Rana it served no useful purpose to analyse figures or assess possible motives. 'What is required is a solution leading to the restoration of the non-aligned status of Afghanistan!. The Foreign Minister also said it was equally important for permanent stability in the region that Afghanistan should be



free from all foreign intervention. Any other form of foreign intervention in the affairs of Afghanistan cannot in any way be justified on the ground that there are already foreign troops in Afghanistan soil. Mr. Hameed stressed that foreign intervention could be widely interpreted and should not be used as an excuse by anybody. He reiterated that Sri Lanka deplored any form of intervention whether it was open or concealed....." (*Ceylon Daily News*, July 2, 1980)

To go back: in an editorial on January 12, 1980, *Tribune* had also said: "...No doubt events in Afghanistan have caused considerable concern in Sri Lanka and in other parts of South Asia and the world. Apprehension has naturally and understandably been voiced over the danger of 'foreign intervention in Afghanistan' and about destabilisation gaining further momentum following the recent coup in the whole region. Some of these apprehensions are no doubt well founded. With all the complexities and dangers of the situation in Iran and the Gulf, the events in Afghanistan undoubtedly add to the uncertainties in the South Asian scene.

"But it is necessary and appropriate to view the situation calmly in the perspectives of Sri Lanka's national interests. And one must not be blackmailed or intimidated by coldwar cries that one was taking a pro-Soviet or pro-China or pro-US or pro-India or pro-Timbucktoo line—if one analyses, the situation in an objective manner from a Sri Lankan angle. What is important is that one must not get carried away by sudden moral indignation over the 'introduction of foreign troops' in a nearby country. One must study all the factors relevant to the situation and make a proper assessment before one ventures on an opinion. It is interesting to note that the circles making the most noise and which are uttering the most self-righteous moralistic platitudes over the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan have nothing to say over the continued presence of American troops as military advisers and otherwise in many countries of West Asia. The number of American personnel in Saudi Arabia is estimated to be nearly 30,000 and another 25,000 are known to be in various other parts of West Asia. There were at one time over 40,000

American military advisers in Iran. American troops, like Russian troops, are stationed in European countries, but Americans also have troops in South Korea, Philippines—and even in Guantanamo in Cuba.

“It is also significant that persons who are expressing such righteous anger over Soviet presence in Afghanistan have been brazenly endorsing the open involvement of Pakistan and Iran in the insurgency in Afghanistan after the April 1978 revolution. If one is a participant in the cold war such vociferous outbursts are understandable. Is Sri Lanka to be drawn into this cold war? One must examine all the available facts, allegations, comments and opinions before one can arrive at a conclusion—in the national interest. It is an empty platitude to talk of international morality—none exists, only the cold war is real. It is even more difficult to separate the wheat from the chaff in international politics. One has to sift a great deal to learn even little of the truth.

“In the case of Afghanistan one version that is currently held in many responsible circles in India is that ‘in August–September the Afghan government forces successfully ended a series of operations to stop the activities of rebellious elements. As a result of this offensive the rebels were smashed and their remnants had to seek refuge in Pakistan, Iran and other neighbouring countries and the conditions for normalisation of political and economic life in Afghanistan were created. It was at this time that Taraki went to Havana. However, such a turn of events didn’t suit the US and China because they had hoped for the success of the antigovernment movement. It is alleged that Zia ul-Huq, prompted by US and China, had organised on Pakistan territory special training centres to send rebel groups, formed from refugees, to Afghanistan. The training, it is said, was with the help of Chinese experts on mountain warfare. It is also said that the US, Britain and China brought pressure on Pakistan through their representatives including intelligence services in order to make Pakistan to take active and energetic measures

to unify various rebellious groupings of the Afghan emigrants hostile to each other and to set up any kind of an 'Afghan government in exile'. The existence of such government would have given the US, China and fanatically Islamic countries 'lawful grounds' to openly render various assistance to the insurgents in Afghanistan. This is one of the many reasons, it is said, for the events that led up to the Babrak coup in Kabul. We have published other articles elsewhere in this issue on the current developments in Afghanistan—to enable our readers to get a more comprehensive picture of the situation. What is true is not easy to find, but the stories put out by the media of the cold war participants is certainly not the truth. There is no doubt that Soviet troops would leave Afghanistan no sooner the Afghan government wants them to go. The sooner the Babrak government could ask them to go the better. But this should apply equally to the governments of Saudi Arabia and other West Asian states where there are US troops.

Sri Lanka has always endeavoured to keep out of the cold war and it would be a pity to be drawn into it now. How far do Russian troops in Afghanistan or American troops in Saudi Arabia or South Korea, affect our national interests? However, it must be said that Sri Lankan reaction to Soviet intervention in Afghanistan has been on predictable lines. The fact that a large section of Sri Lankan opinion — much more than the customary anti-Soviet chorus — have urged the withdrawal of Soviet troops must be seen as the instant response of a country which has rejected the presence on its soil of foreign troops or bases, friendly or unfriendly. It is not the official government statement alone, but leader-writers and commentators in the daily papers have asked for withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan. In neighbouring India, Charan Singh as well as Indira Gandhi have asked for the same. It would be wrong to conclude that all those who have disapproved of the Soviet forces in Afghanistan today have *ipso facto* turned anti-Soviet. Rather, there is confusion mixed with disappointment that the Soviet Union has had to take recourse to such step. Spontaneous emotional reaction, nevertheless, does not lead one to a clear and

indepth understanding of the situation and the implications involved in such specific developments as in Afghanistan. An effort must be made to understand what happened inside Afghanistan that led to the Soviet involvement in it."

The Sri Lanka Freedom Party (SLFP) on January 14, 1980 issued a statement which said: "It is an internationally accepted principle that no country should interfere in the internal affairs of another country, more so by despatching troops. This is also a cardinal principle of the Nonaligned Movement. The Sri Lanka Freedom Party notes that that the situation in Iran and Afghanistan and strengthening the Diego Garcia base by the US have led to the two power blocs straining to increase their military presence and to enhance fighting potential in the South Asian region, in particular in the littoral states of the Indian Ocean. We fear that this situation may result in nullifying the UN resolution to make the Indian Ocean a peace zone. It is the view of the Sri Lanka Freedom Party that the only way to diffuse the situation and maintain peace, stability and security in this region is for both power blocs to desist from military expansion. In this context the earliest withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan and the dismantling of bases like Diego Garcia will contribute to ease the tension and assist in maintaining peace and security in this region."

The Lanka Sama Samaja Party (LSSP), the Communist Party of Sri Lanka (CPSL) and most of the Leftwing parties supported the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan - only the pro-Peking Communist party (Marxist-Leninist) condemned the Soviet action.

The *Tribune* in an editorial comment on January 19, 1980 had said: "Sri Lanka's national interests are much less complex than those of India, but we can learn from the Indian policy formulations to help us evolve a line of our own -- the most important aspect of which is to keep out of the cold war of big power geo-strategic power politics. The Sri Lanka Government statement of January 3 is an eminently correct one which does not drag the country into the international cold war

the UNP has taken umbrage because the CPSL has called the Government statement an echo of the 'Carter Chorus, and replied by saying that the government statement was 'non-aligned' and was neither 'Carter Chorus' nor 'Brzezhev Barkies'. Polemical exchanges of this kind do nobody any harm – as long as Sri Lanka is not pushed into the fast growing cold war that is threatening to become hot in some areas. One thing to which Mrs. Gandhi is understandably opposed is the growing possibility of a Sino-US axis. Even if the axis has not yet taken concrete shape, Carter seems to have adopted the Hua-Deng strategy of 'teaching a lesson' to any country that refuses to 'play the game' according to the rules laid down by one side....."

Carter thereupon set about "teaching a lesson" to the Soviet Union. He cancelled the US grain contracts with the USSR, placed a trade embargo on a large number of items and decided to organise a world-wide boycott of the Olympic Games scheduled to be held in Moscow in July 1980. He also stepped up US naval and military deployment in the Indian Ocean.

Reference must be also made to one more editorial comment in *Tribune* dated May 24. It was entitled IS THE WORLD HEADING FOR WAR?. It is quoted in *extenso* below: "There is still a tendency among some people, suffering from a hangover of cold war logic, to regard anything said about the role played by several American administrations in countries like Iran as being the outcome of bias or leftwing political mental aberration. They do not seem to realise that the continued attempts to dismiss true historical realities, or to ignore valid explanations by conjuring MacCarthyian red bogey fears, will ultimately do more harm than good to American prestige. There is much in the USA to be proud about. It is a country which has evolved a worthwhile civilisation in less than two hundred years, and which has contributed much to the progress of mankind. But, the USA has to undergo a further revolution, similar to 1776 one, in order to purge itself of the exploitative and aggressive greed that dominates the oligarchic dynasties that now control the destinies of the country.

"The Romans had succeeded in maintaining their empire, based on tyranny, by making a bogey of Christianity, by throwing many Christians to the lions. And history once again repeats itself when the present day masters of the world--Anglo-Saxons, Europeans and their allies - want to save privilege and wealth based on exploitation by raising alarms about Communism and Communists. It is well to remember that Christianity and Christians ultimately took over the empire of the Romans and called it the Holy Roman Empire: and if history does repeat itself, as it does, the future of the twenty-first century may well be with sophisticated and streamlined versions of Communism and Communists.

"The current relapse by Carter and Brzezinski into the cold war devilry of Dulles bodes no good for the world or even the USA. One happy feature, however is that in the USA there are honest people who speak their minds freely and are permitted to do so--although the bigtime media does its best to bury such expressions of truth and consign them to oblivion. A Catholic Priest, Fr. James Cooke, OMI, from St. Joseph's OMI Seminary in Nugegoda, whose comments and contributions have appeared often in the *Tribune* has sent us this note: 'Enclosed is an article on Iran by a priest of our Congregation, Fr. Darrel Rupiper OMI. Fr. Rupiper spent ten days in Iran from the 6th - 16th February this year (1980). He was also one of the three American clergymen who went to Iran to celebrate Easter with the hostages. He was chosen or this probably because of his work for peace and justice. in the Diocese of Omaha'. "Below, we publish in full the fstatement of Fr. Darrel Rupiper, OMI entitled FROM THE BLOOD OF MARTYRS:

*'Iran, under the great leadership of the Shah is an island of stability in one of the most troubled areas of the world. This a great tribute to you, your Majesty, and to your leadership, and to the respect, admiration and love which your people give to you.*

This was Carter's New Year's Eve (1978) toast to the Shah. On September 8 that same year, millions of

demonstrators peacefully took to the streets shouting: 'Fire, shoot, these lives are our only weapons'. Six thousand people were gunned down, their bodies bull-dozed from the streets. The next month the C. I. A. filed a report stating the Shah's regime would be stable for another ten years. Shortly after the bloody massacre, President Carter reassured the Shah of American support. The verbal reassurance was followed by an emergency shipment of anti-riot gear in November. Within 2 months the Shah was forced to leave Iran promising to return after a much-needed rest. His future and the millions of dollars he took with him remains to be determined. The Shah's ousting was accompanied by a popular uprising perhaps unprecedented in history. Twenty three millions of Iran's thirty-five million people took to the streets. The Iranian revolution was and is an Islamic revolution. Dedicated to Allah, guided by the Koran, whose aim is to end the exploitation of man by man and under the leadership of Khomeini, the Moslem people of Iran fully intend to bring justice and peace to the world. This sounds Idealistic, but also familiar. God promised Abraham that he would be the father of many nations which would walk in justice and truth.

'As a member of a 50-person delegation chosen by members of The Committee for American-Iranian Crisis Resolution and under the sponsorship of Nebraskan For Peace and Pax Christi, I spent 19 days in Iran at the invitation of the students who were holding hostages at the former American Embassy. Intensive dialogue with an eye toward eventual reconciliation between the American and Iranian people was the purpose of our trip. We visited cemeteries, factories, torture chambers, slums, palaces and hospitals. We spoke with Ayatollahs, slum-dwellers, members of the Revolutionary Council and Revolutionary Guard, hostages, persons who were tortured, Khomeini's sons, former SAVAK agents, parents who witnessed the torture and death of their children, workers and the unemployed.

'We learned that Khomeini is not a mad man, but was chosen as the Imam by popular acclaim based on his personal holiness. We learned that the students are in fact students from several universities whose presence was a constant inspiration to myself. We were able to move freely in Teheran without fear of being mistreated. We were always greeted with smiles and assurance that they love Americans, but hate American government policy. The Iranian people insist that the American people must come to understand the crimes that our government has committed in Iran during the past 25 years. The imposition of the Shah (replacing a democratic government) on the Iranian people by the CIA in 1953 is not disputed. That the Shah was a regional policeman for the US in the Persian Gulf and a ruthless tyrant in his own country is common knowledge in Iran. Setting up the SAVAK (the dreadfully efficient secret police of the Shah) by the CIA as well as teaching them torture technique is well documented. The manufacture and export of torture equipment by the US to Iran is also well documented.

'Such behaviour is outrageous and certainly needs to be uncovered. The Shah spent millions on public relations in the US. A lengthy list of reporters, recipients of cases of champagne and caviar was read to us, Barbara Walters, Walker Cronkite, Peter Jennings, David Brinkley, Mike Wallace etc. Arrangements between the US Embassy and Washington to bring the Shah to the Iran is also well documented. This was five months prior to any mention of the Shah's illness. So it goes. Everywhere we went we bore gifts of tulips. It seemed appropriate as Khomeini has said: 'From the blood of martyrs tulips grow'. When we visited the home of Ayatollah Montazeri in Qom, we were visited by Khomeini's son. He graciously returned the bouquet of tulips to us asking that we return to the States and become martyrs in our own country in the struggle for world justice. The challenge symbolized by the blood-red tulip becomes less frightening when placed in the shade of the white Easter lily.'



Such is Fr. Rupiper's testimony.

"History's verdict will be undoubtedly that the recent US administrations have played an infamous role in Iran (as in many other countries) and that the retribution that will be exacted from the American oligarchs will be heavy. The USA could easily have made amends *vis a vis* Iran by sending the Shah back to Teheran and also by returning the billions of stolen money the Shah had hashed in American banks. Instead Carter irritated the Iranians by parading the Shah in the USA under the cover of an illness and thereby provoked the seizure of the US embassy in Teheran together with 50 odd diplomats as hostages. Verbal cajolery, threats and blackmail having failed to secure the release of the hostages, Carter introduced economic sanctions with a partial naval blockade. But worse still, he seized Iranian deposits in US banks amounting to several billions of dollars and has disbursed the funds so seized the way he wanted - even to pay for US military operations in the Indian Ocean and the Gulf.

"Carter seems to think he is teaching the Iranians a lesson, but what he has done is to undermine confidence in the sanctity of international banking. Which country will want to bank in the USA in future? The funds of every country in deposit in US banks stand in the perpetual danger of being seized by US Presidents. The seizure of Iranian deposits is a warning to other countries not to question any action the US takes. The lesson will not be lost on the rest of the world that the US will commit highway robbery of deposits in US banks if it wants to.

"Right from the word go, the US used Dullesian anti-Communist cries to intimidate the new Iranian government to bring it under its control, but Washington failed. After Afghanistan the cry was pitched at an even higher note, but this has also boomeranged. It was only after all those anti-red cries had failed, military operations were launched, especially after it was found that the Fifth Column elements inside Iran were unable to subvert or topple the Khomeini regime.

“This way of looking at recent developments in Iran will be dismissed by some US and European publicists and their counterparts in other countries as left-wing ideological intransigence, but sooner or later the USA will discover that the overwhelming bulk of thinking people in the Third World see things this way and more of them are now refusing to be frightened or intimidated by anti-communist shibboleths and war cries. It is difficult to know when American administrators and publicists will learn to use a language, idiom and logic based on mutual understanding and a desire for equality in human relations. “There are, and there must be, millions of people in the USA who see truth the way Fr. Darrel Rupiper OMI does. He is on the same wavelength as the millions in the Third World. But such voices in the US are buried in the hysteric outpourings of the big media which only reflects the interests of the oligarchic vested interests which have made hundreds of billions from the oil of Iran and want to recapture the goose that had laid golden eggs inlaid with diamonds .....

“To cry, *Bear! Bear! Communist! Communist!* will not held the Carter administration very much at this juncture. Only the powerful groups of American rich, a smaller number of European oligarchs and also their partners-in-exploitation in other countries, will adopt this cry in the hope of frightening the weak and the poor. This cry will also cause confusion for a little while longer among some in the Third World who depend on rich countries for largesse and aid. It will be difficult to hide the truth much longer. But unless the cold war is ended soon, it will mean war and this is just what Brzezinski wants. And Carter seems willing to go to war alone.

“The Nonaligned Movement, unfortunately, beset with divisive forces, is not able to meet fully the challenge of the times. Sri Lanka is to day generally silent about the burning problems that confront the world. And so are many other nonaligned countries. But silence will not ensure peace either. Equidistance between the super-powers has meaning only in the context of detente and the gradual elimination

of the cold war. Moralistic guilt-finding and rhetorical platitudes to justify tough, political, economic and military measures and operations to teach lessons to other sovereign nations are no substitute for patient negotiations and conciliatory strategy. And the latter is what the world needs.”

That is what I wrote on May 24. I have no reason to change or vary my views since then. If anything I am more than ever convinced that the cold war must be ended.

Events are moving fast. I started putting this book together at the beginning of April and I concluded the last Chapter on July 25, and the Postscript a few days later. As I kept writing, one event overtook another. And they will continue to do so in the future.

But the verities remain.

Colombo,  
July 31, 1980.

**S. P. Amarasingam**



**WHY ?**

**WHY DID PRESIDENT CARTER**, on April 25, 1980, five years to a day after the fall of Saigon and the hasty and humiliating withdrawal from Vietnam, make the American Administration the laughing stock of the world with the abortive attempt to rescue the US hostages held in Teheran? It is hard to believe that the mighty and powerful US with its advanced technology and expert organisational and management skills blundered as it did with helicopter breakdowns and colliding planes in the vast expanses of an Iranian desert – and thereafter run away leaving behind eight Americans dead and a whole heap of classified material.

The hostages were taken on November 4, 1979 and since then some of the open retaliatory steps taken by Carter were: deportation of Iranian students (November 10), halt to oil imports (7 to 8 lakh barrels a day) from Iran (November 12), freeze Iranian assets in USA (November 14), expulsion of Iranian diplomats (December 12), break of diplomatic relations and imposition of economic sanctions (April 7) and imposition of more economic sanctions against Iran (April 17). Carter had then warned that military action would be the next step. And that took place on April 25.

The question that is asked is whether President Carter really sent US troops and commando units to Iran just to rescue and take away the 50+3 American hostages ! Indications are that this was just a ploy. The real intention, it now transpires, was to seize Iranian religious leader Ayatollah Khomeini, which according to US calculations, would have totally disrupted Iranian national unity against imperialism. This would have then paved the way for the US return to Iran and once again control its oil resources as well as its strategic military installations. The spot where US men landed was close to Qum where the Ayatollah resides. Experts in military airlift feel that one does not need six C 130 Hercules aircraft (the heaviest military personnel transport now in operation and capable of carrying some 180 fully equipped men) as well as eight Sea Stallions 30 D model heavy duty Sikorsky helicopters (each capable of carrying 55 persons) to rescue 53 hostages even taking into account the time needed to load them into the aircraft. The talk of sending only 90 US commando troops is obviously false.

Iran has hinted that more US troops were roaming in the desert where the US plan was aborted and that Iranian armed forces were searching for them. The *New York Times* (April 20) disclosed that Carter had tried to organise a coup in Iran in February last year. He had sent US airforce general Robert E. Huyser, his close confidant, to Iran to organise a coup with the help of some Iranian military officers. But they refused to oblige and the general returned empty handed. After the hostages were taken by the Iranian students demanding the return of the Shah to Iran for trial, the US administration had been planning to use various measures including force to release them and to reverse what has happened in Iran. But it was not the rescue of the hostages that perhaps was uppermost in Carter's mind. After all, what is the loss of lives of some 50-60 Americans if Khomeini could be captured or even killed? It may also be added that this was a massive operation in which planes

from Egypt, Oman and Pakistan as well as from aircraft carrier Nimitz took part. No one launches such an operation to free just 53 hostages.

And what were the reactions to President Carter's gamble in the rest of the world?

A few among US allies, notably Thatcher's Britain, mumbled a few sympathetic sentiments, but the majority expressed disappointment, if not criticism, about Carter's decision to rush into military operation which could easily have erupted into a war. A quick and humiliating withdrawal prevented that. Most Muslim and Arab countries -- except a few client states and satellites -- have condemned Carter's dangerous gamble. People in Third World and Non-aligned countries have reacted strongly against Carter's provocative strategies -- but most of them have maintained a discreet, but resentful silence because of their economic dependence on the rich industrialised countries of the West. The Soviet Union and the Socialist countries, not restrained by any such inhibitions, have condemned Carter's adventurism in no uncertain terms. Iran has said that this intrusion into their territory was only a further manifestation of US Imperialism. "I am warning Carter", said Khomeini in a broadcast, "that if he commits another stupid act, I will be not able to control the youth now holding the nest of espionage and the spies and he will be responsible for their lives". The hostages' student captors had declared that "if the US wants to commit such stupidities, Carter will have the bodies of his spies and all his satanic agents in Iran buried in Iran." *Reuter* also reported that "the Iranian leadership seemed indifferent that the US might take tough military action to secure the hostages' release."

Nearly all West European countries, including Britain have urged President Carter not to resort to force again to rescue the hostages. But he continued to keep up pretenses that he would act tough. On May 8, *AP* reported from Washington: "US President Jimmy Carter ordered the Pentagon to begin developing plans for a second attempt at rescuing the

American hostages in Iran within a week of the first failed US effort, Coupled with threats of further and increased military actions, Washington also threatened other "dire consequences" if Iran did not accede to US demands. A *Reuter* report from Washington datelined April 27 stated: ".....In another attempt to end the five-month old Teheran hostage crisis, Carter administration officials have begun warning Iran that continued upheaval there could destroy the Islamic Revolution and lead to partition of the country..... National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brezezinski first alluded to the dangers of partition in a television interview last week, and senior White House and State Department officials elaborated on US thinking on these lines." The report hinted that Iran could be easily partitioned between the USA, USSR and Iraq which has claimed the oil-producing province of Khuzestan. It will be recalled that the US had done everything it could to set Iran on a collision course against the Soviet Union right from the beginning of Khomeini's Islamic Revolution, and more especially after the Afghan crisis. After the US broke diplomatic ties with Iran and imposed economic sanctions, Teheran understandably sought the support from the Socialist bloc. America's European allies have frequently warned Carter not to push Iran into the hands of the USSR. China, too, has done everything to bring Iran into the jihad against the Soviet Union but again without much success. It is also of some significance that certain elements among the Islamic fundamentalists (allegedly with US connections) had started a campaign against the left-wing organisations and supporters about a week before the US abortive raid on April 25. This was no doubt to push Iran in to a state of turmoil and confusion whilst military operations were triggered on the Iraq border and also in the Kurdistan areas.

The US did not stop at threatening Iran alone. The entire non-aligned camp was under threat. Typical was the threat contained in a *Reuter* report from United Nations Hqs. datelined, April 18 and published on the front page of *Ceylon Daily News* of April 19, 1980 under headline **INDIFFERENCE TO HOSTAGES: US SLATES NON-ALIGNED:** "The



United States today accused most UN members of being inactive in the Iran hostage crisis and said Third World countries had failed in their responsibilities. William Wanden Hauvel, the Deputy Chief US delegate at the United Nations said: 'No spokesman for a Third World country or any other member state in any of the endless meetings that take place in this building has stood up to suggest that the outrage against the American diplomats in Teheran is an insult to every nation that is member of this organisation.....' In what some observers said was the harshest criticism of UN members by a US delegate in memory, he went on: 'Is it too much to hope or expect the overwhelming majority of the members of the United Nations would find the ways and means to support that peaceful process and bring to an end the crisis that could clearly threaten world peace? Iran caused the Secretary General of this organisation to be in physical jeopardy. Iran flouted the United Nations Commission of Inquiry that was deliberately and specifically sent to explore whatever grievances it might have had and to give them a voice and a forum.' He stated that future of US support to UN aid programmes for Third World countries would depend on their role and specially that future of the Non-aligned group and its current Chairman, Cuba, on the hostage issue.....'

Why this attack on the Non-aligned?

Does it mean that the USA expects Third World countries, especially the Non-aligned group, to help the USA to pull its chestnuts out of the fire in Iran; and that, if they did not, the US would cut off its support for UN programmes to assist Third World countries.

Why have the Non-aligned group and other Third World countries not done what the USA expects of them? Why have they not rushed to the rescue of the US although the general reaction in all these countries has been one of wholesale disapproval of the course of the Iranian revolution and its current leadership?

The answers are not difficult to find.

There is no doubt that all are agreed that diplomatic

personnel should not be held hostage by an accredited country. In the case of the USA and its diplomatic personnel taken hostage in Iran, however, there is an universal under-current of feeling that the American government needed to be shown its place for its openly blatant interference in the internal affairs of other countries over the years and for this reason nearly all thinking and patriotic elements in under-privileged countries find secret sadistic delight in what Khomeini has done. The US administration still seems to rely on flatterers who for selfish reasons tell Washington what it likes to hear and is therefore ignorant of what peoples in the Third World think of its arrogant and selfish policies. It turns a deaf ear to truth and dismisses it as bias.

Over the decades American Administrations have earned a notoriety for equivocation and not for circumspection, over the question of human rights, if only to protect and promote the malodorous philosophy of "private enterprise". In Iran, successive American administrations have not exactly helped the cause of democracy. On the other hand, by helping the Shah and training his savage SAVAK, which alone was responsible for the death of several thousand young University students within the country and outside, the USA has earned the eternal hatred of the overwhelming majority of the Iranians. And the Americans also shared the hatred for the Shah. And, what did the Shah finally do? He fled the country after ensuring that the billions of dollars he had stolen from the Treasury and the Iranian banks were safe in foreign banks.

One question that must be asked in this connection is whether America, its ruling Establishment as well as the great citizenry of that country, respect the patriots of other nations? Does the American press cherish the recognized values upheld by civilisation? This question is relevant because the Ayatollah is correct when he says that the American Establishment has played a nefarious role in all that the Shah had done, even in looting the country, The Americans sold their arms to Iran and rewarded the Shah with kickbacks to swell his private

fortunes. One can respect international law only if countries, in conducting their relations, bilaterally and otherwise, do not degrade human rights and values. Have the Americans paid any regard to the agony and anguish of those killed during the reign of the Shah merely because they questioned his kind of democracy, his democratic credentials and his integrity? Should the Americans not make amends, at least in self-criticism in appropriate rhetoric, for all the horrors, tortures, poverty and hardships suffered by the Iranians on account of the Shah, before talking about the niceties of diplomatic immunity? Even at this stage why does the US not talk about human rights in Pakistan or in China? How can the US ask for democratic elections in any country when it upholds the Zia regime which refuses to hold elections and has unleashed the most brutal repression to suppress democracy? Why is Carter quiet when Peking repealed the short-lived post-Mao laws granting civil liberties, freedom of expression and assembly?

In the Iranian crisis, and other similar crises in the last three decades, the American press and media have played a negative and sometimes dangerous role. They have whipped up mass hysteria with belligerency and bellicosity to support jingoistic action for the glory of US imperialism. Barring notable exceptions like Tom Wicker and Antony Lewis, other greats in the American journalism have evidently been guided by the worn-out principle "my country, right or wrong". There is no contribution to honest journalism which is expected to respect facts and free comment. Why did the American press and media not play a positive and democratic role in the Iranian or any other contemporary crises? If they had, there would not have been the kind of tragedies that took place in Cambodia, South Vietnam and in many Latin American countries which were condemned to be ruled, under American auspices, by military dictators who had no respect for law and order and who observed no democracy. In this game, the US with its agencies like the CIA broke every rule in International Law to promote American policies and

business interests – and even promote sedition, subversion and rebellion in Chile and other countries.

In the seventies, at the height of the Vietnam war, US installed heads of Cambodia and South Vietnam (its Vice-President too) fled their respective countries with tons of gold and got asylum in the USA. More recently, the Somoza family took every cent out of the State coffers of Nicaragua and found a safe home in America. Did the American media point out to the American public that under cover of “fighting communism” their government had helped tyrants, (the US had created) to leave the people of “poor and friendly countries completely impoverished”? All these questions may be dismissed by the American Establishment and the American media as “anti-Americanism” but such ostrich-like attitudes will not help them to understand why Non-aligned and Third World countries have shown unmistakable reluctance to press Iran to release the US hostages. Undoubtedly, these countries could have in all conscience pressed for this only if Carter had agreed to extradict the Shah (or return him to Iran) when he was in the USA under whatever pretext.

In his statement on the Non-aligned, the US representative William Vanden Hauvel also betrayed an attitude to “the non-aligned group” which is detrimental to a proper understanding between the US and sovereign nations and the establishment of healthy international relations. Rich and powerful countries must pay more heed than they have in the past to the feelings and sentiments of poor countries, especially those in the Non-aligned group, if they are to understand the conduct and policies of the large community of young nations which can no longer be ignored. It will be also useless and futile for US spokesmen to complain about the “inactivity” of the non-aligned countries in matters like securing the release of US hostages until the US decides to step down from the heights of self-righteous moralistic posturing.

This study by a Sri Lankan, who has closely watched the origins, development and growth of the non-aligned movement

from the end of the Second World war through the Asian Prime Ministers' Meeting in Colombo (1954), Bandung (1955) Belgrade (1961), Algiers (1973), Colombo (1976) and Havana (1979), is an attempt not only to examine the logic of non-alignment in the contemporary era but also to analyse some of the stirring events of recent times in the light of the principles of non-alignment. Such an examination and analysis has become necessary in view of the current campaign by certain interested countries to denigrate the Non-aligned Movement either to smash it completely or transform it into a pliable tool of those who still dominate the world and continue to make unconscionable and excessive profits by exploiting poorer and weaker nations.

There is also not the slightest doubt that this campaign against the Non-aligned Movement has been mounted with special ferocity and ruthless dishonesty in the second half of the seventies.

Why?

Why is the Non-aligned Movement under such heavy and sustained attack?

Why is there such feverish activity to make the Non-Aligned Movement appear to be what it is not?

Why have the governments of certain countries today, notably the U S A and China, taken it upon themselves to wage what is much more than a cold war against the Non-aligned Movement? Why are members of the Non-aligned Movement, who still stand loyally by its basic principles, depicted as caricature-like stereotypes led up the garden path to perdition by wily red devils?

Why have these rich nations adopted the strategy of the "political lie" to wipe out, if possible, the Non-aligned Movement? What is a "political lie"? Walter Cronkite has said: "The political lie has become a way of bureaucratic life. It has been called by the more genteel name of

'news management'. I say here, now, let's call it what it is — lying'.

Why have successive US administrations manipulated public opinion and controlled and governed the flow of information in such a way as to paint the Non-aligned Movement as an organisation that must be saved from Satanic influences?

Why do the American and Western print and electronic media publish wrong, misleading and incorrect information about the Non-aligned Movement, its principles and its basic objectives? Why have they thought it necessary to create a kind of global hate psychosis to damn the Non-aligned movement not by its deeds but by "intentions" ascribed to some of its members?

It is necessary to understand the atmosphere of fear and misunderstanding being built up by the USA and China principally about the Non-aligned Movement to explain and evaluate some of the current trends in world affairs. Some of the actions of President Carter no doubt arise because of the imperatives of the US Presidential election struggle soon to reach a climax. Many recall Senator Vandenberg's advice to Truman in the late 1940s as to how to win the election. The Senator had cynically suggested that he scare the hell out of the public and then do what he liked with it. Truman did exactly that. He won the election, but his victory cost the Americans a lot, triggering off McCarthyism and the cold war. Jimmy Carter has been following in Truman's footsteps, ever since he came to power, and the Non-aligned Movement has been the principal target of his attack.

To answer these questions, it is necessary to ask why the Non-aligned Movement came into being and why it grew into a movement of nearly one hundred under-privileged countries and what it is that has brought it under such savage attack?

## THE NON-ALIGNED

When, how, and why, did the Non-aligned Movement come into being?

In my view, it did not begin with the first summit in Belgrade in 1961. Nor at Bandung in 1955, nor at the Asian Prime Ministers' Meeting in Colombo in 1954. It can be said to have begun with Jawaharlal Nehru's first broadcast to the nation within weeks of his joining the Interim Government even before the formal transfer of power. He had then declared: "We believe peace and freedom are indivisible, and the denial of freedom anywhere must endanger freedom elsewhere and lead to conflict and war. We are particularly interested in the emancipation of colonial and dependent countries." The declaration of India's Independence was, indeed, the first act of non-alignment for with it India broke the alignments it had inherited from her British rulers. And the first step towards giving non-alignment the form of a world-wide movement was taken when Nehru convened an international meeting for the defence of Indonesian independence against Dutch imperialist intervention.

Then came the Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi in 1947 which led to the Colombo and Bandung meetings.

The Non-aligned Movement really had its roots in Asian and African countries emerging into political independence especially when they realized that they had to fight a second war of Independence for economic emancipation. Romesh Chandra, President of the World Peace Council, in a speech in Jamaica early in 1979 said: "It is more difficult in many ways than the struggle for political independence; for the enemy of our economic independence disguises himself, acts sometimes like the old fox by putting on his lamb's clothing. Therefore it is sometimes difficult to recognize him, for we are blinded by the lies of mass media which are controlled by the old fox in new ways. The old fox makes super profits from armaments. He is the same fox that makes the hunger and poverty of our people, and in order that we may continue to live with our hunger and our poverty, the old fox also pours out lies. The manufacturer of lies is the manufacturer of hunger and poverty.....the manufacturer of super profits from armaments. Out of this great independence struggle — the struggle for political independence — grew the Non-aligned Movement. I remember the day when India became independent. Many of our neighbouring countries in Asia also became independent. We wanted to take the wealth of our country, our natural resources, and use them in the interest of our own peoples."

Then he went on to explain: "Thus our struggle for independence took another form in the period that followed, and the Non aligned Movement was born and grew. Why did this Movement come into existence? Because, when we won our political independence the same forces of imperialism which had drained the blood from the bodies of children were still not prepared to allow us and our children to yield and say yes to political independence. But they demanded a share in the loot of our riches; and the way to do this — there was only one way which they knew—was the way of military might. And so they exercised all the pressures they could on all the countries to join their imperialist military pacts. I remember the days when the United States sent delegation after delegation to Jawaharlal Nehru, first Prime Minister of Independent India, and asked



him to join the the USA in a military pact to 'protect' India. But Nehru knew, as did all the founders of the Non-aligned Movement, that imperialism was not asking us to join a military pact for our 'protection', but in order to enable the imperialists to continue the domination of our countries and particularly to rob us of our natural resources. The imperialists wanted their armies stationed on the soil to be able to prevent our children from taking the fruits of our soil for themselves. So Non-alignment meant, and Nehru said this a hundred times, first and foremost our refusal to join imperialist military pacts. Because imperialist military pacts mean the continuation of our oppression, the continuation of colonialism in new forms, Non-alignment was a refusal to join those who had ruled us for so long and wished to continue to rule us through new forms of colonialism and neo-colonialism. Imperialist military pacts were the instruments of neo-colonialism, and our refusal to join the military pacts was not only an assertion of our independence but the expression of our determination to fight till the end, until neo-colonialism in all its forms will be defeated.'

Romesh Chandra, in a reminiscent mood, gives an insight into the original intentions of the founding fathers: "There are people who want to forget how the Non-aligned Movement was founded. I had the privilege in those founding days of the Non-aligned Movement of meeting not only with the Prime Minister of my country but also with other founders of the Non-aligned Movement. I had occasion to meet with Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt, a man who stood not for surrender to imperialism, but who stood for fighting against imperialism in all its forms. Many were the occasions in those years when I had the privilege of talking to the founders of the Non-aligned Movement about this Movement. Never did any of them say: 'we shall not align with imperialism, that is why we shall not align with anti-imperialism either!' They were not fools, they were not taken in by the lies of the media directed by imperialism and reaction. Nobody was asking them to join military pacts, except the imperialists. At that time, just as we were about to win our independence,

Nehru called the Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi. This was indeed the foundation, the starting point of the great Non-aligned Movement of later years. That was in 1947; and at that time this is what Nehru said: 'For too long have we of Asia -- and you could add to that: Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean -- been petitioners in Western courts and chancelleries.' And he proclaimed, 'that story must now belong to the past. We propose to stand on our own feet and to cooperate with all others who are prepared to cooperate with us. We do not intend to be the plaything of others.' Many other leaders from many other countries then and later said the same thing.'

Romesh Chandra then explained: "And that is why throughout its history, the Non-aligned Movement has not been a movement which is non-aligned between imperialism and anti-imperialism. The Non-aligned Movement has been against imperialism -- working together with all who are against imperialism wherever in the world. Read the resolutions of every Summit Conference of the Non-aligned Movement, and particularly read the documents of the last Summit Conference held in Algiers and Colombo. On what basis did the Movement grow? Did it grow by being neutral between war and peace -- being neutral between the liberation movements in Southern Africa and the racist regimes? Some would like us to say that we are 'non-aligned' between the African National Congress of South Africa and South African racist regime. Today some people would want us to be non-aligned with regard to the Pinochet regime and those who are fighting against the fascist regime in Chile. What a distortion of the whole concept of non-alignment! These lies are being spread to make out that Non-alignment means neutrality between good and evil. We tell those manufacturers of lies -- gentlemen, we know the Non-aligned Movement. It is in the first place -- and every page of the resolutions of the Non-aligned Movement bears this out -- a great and powerful anti-imperialist movement, a movement against colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and racial discrimination everywhere in the world. In recent years, another strange formula has been invented by some people. They say that Non-alignment

means 'alignment with all'. They argue that the non-aligned countries are really aligned with every other force in the world, with all other governments. Who stands to gain from this strange formula? The imperialists cannot succeed in turning the Non-aligned Movement away from its anti-imperialist path. And so they argue: all right, you are against us, but do not concentrate all your energy against us. Your enemies are everywhere. In other words, this formula means that we should be non-aligned with good and non-aligned with evil, aligned with good, aligned with evil and that Non-alignment means alignment with all: Imperialism thus desperately seeks to distort the entire meaning of non-alignment, to blunt the anti-imperialist edge of the Non-aligned Movement. A great deal of money is being passed. Sometimes when the imperialists want somebody to betray the anti-imperialist struggle of his people, they assure him that if he signs a particular agreement or treaty, they will provide him with so many billions in 'assistance' and 'aid'.....;

I have quoted at length from Romesh Chandra because he has set out simply and succinctly the most salient features of the Non-aligned Movement, namely the anti-colonial struggle merging into the anti-imperialist. Though the anti-colonialist struggle which was mainly concerned with the liberation of all dependent and colonial countries naturally took precedence all other objectives of the Non-aligned Movement in its first decade, attention was also paid to other matters of international significance -- racism, war and peace, disarmament, economic independence and the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism. Special attention was focussed on all aspects essential for the emancipation of mankind from the trnaldom of oppression, exploitation, poverty — made worse by war. At the first Non-aligned Summit in 1961, when the world was poised on the brink of another great war, Jawaharlal Nehru passionately pleaded with the two Super Powers to enter into a dialogue. The message which the Belgrade Summit addressed to Kennedy and Khrushchev, at the insistence of Nehru, constitutes the first chapter in any dispassionate history of the process which resulted in SALT - I, European detente and relaxation of tensions in the world.

This objective of achieving world peace through detente between the Super Powers was only an adjunct of the Non-aligned Movement's fight for the peace and freedom, but this has been used lately to create a false dichotomy in the Movement between "non-blocism" and "anti-imperialism". An Indian commentator whilst pointing out that Morarji Desai's government, in its anxiety to be "genuinely" non-aligned had emphasised the so-called non-blocism of the Belgrade Summit as a cover to shed itself of anti-imperialism, and stated: "While juxtaposing what is described as non-blocism against anti-imperialism, it is forgotten that the two are, as Nehru had said, 'indivisible'. In fact they are not merely identical, they are two faces of the same coin. At Belgrade, Nehru emphasised the non-bloc face of non-alignment only because of the peculiar international situation in which the Summit was held. Developments during two or three months preceding it had raised fears about the imminence of the Third World War. The very criteria laid down for participation in the Belgrade Summit emphasised, however, the anti-imperialist character of Non-alignment. The first of these laid down opposition to imperialism and the second that they 'should be consistently supporting movements for national independence.' And the Belgrade Declaration, itself, pointed out: 'To eradicate basically the source of conflict is to end colonialism'." The Government of Sri Lanka under J. R. Jayewardene, too, at times seems to slip into this error without realising that such "genuine non-alignment" could easily become an instrument for the promotion of imperialist and neo-colonialist interests.

There has been, and there is, no dispute about the basic objectives of Non-alignment all the way from Belgrade to Havana. The different emphasis placed by different countries on certain aspects of Non-alignment stemmed from their special interests and perceptions. Those who wanted the Movement emasculated have so far not succeeded in breaking it up by seizing on these "differences" to cause dissensions. It is agreed by all members of the Non-aligned Movement that the main tasks of the movement at the moment are as follows: (i) CONSOLIDATION of the non-aligned movement's unity and solidarity: (ii) STRUGGLE against Imperialism, colonialism,

apartheid, racism and Zionism; (iii) OPPOSITION to exploitation, positions of strength policy, and all forms of foreign domination and hegemony; (iv) ASSISTANCE to liberation movements; (v) PROMOTION of world peace and detente and the support for disarmament measures; (vi) NON-INTERFERENCE in the internal affairs of other States, inviolability of frontiers, and settlement of all disputes by peaceful means; (vii) ESTABLISHMENT of a new world economic order.

Much has recently been made of the great "differences" inside the Movement by those who do not even bother to know what these differences are. To clarify the position to readers in Sri Lanka, I had in articles in the *Tribune* and the *Ceylon Daily News* (on October 6, 1979, on my return from the Havana Summit) endeavoured to explain this matter. I said that on the basis of anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism and the fight for peace and economic emancipation), right from the beginning of the Non-aligned movement in Belgrade in 1961, there were *three fundamental tendencies*. It must be realised that the *first* and foremost fact about the Non-aligned Movement is that the majority of the member countries are products of the African Revolution especially in the 1960s (fifty of ninety-five members now are from Africa). Most of these African countries and also many from Asia and Latin America feel that it is no longer a struggle for political independence alone — not merely anti-colonial, but anti-imperialist as well. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, anti-colonialism was the main objective; it was part of the Bandung period. Anti-colonialism simply meant the right of oppressed peoples to have their nation state. Anti-imperialism meant the fight for economic independence.

But from a very early stage national liberation movements began to say that it was not enough to be independent politically; that they want to reconstruct the economies of the societies that have produced political independence. So the national liberation movements have introduced the concept of anti-imperialist liberation into the movement. This anti-imperialism was only an idea, a slogan in 1961, in Belgrade.

Now it has assumed meaningful proportions and has become a major trend in the Non-aligned Movement. Another group has argued that Non-alignment was a product of the cold war and therefore suggested that Non-alignment was based on a theory that developed out of the concept of *Equidistance*. By *Equidistance*, they meant distance between the two Super Powers. This concept of the world was geographical — a world divided in two large blocs. This theory is based on the geo-politics of the cold war. The third theory was called the *Independence* theory adumbrated by countries that regarded Non-alignment as the assertion of their individuality, their collective individuality as nations in the politics of the world, of independent economies in the economy of the world and with the right to self-determination in world politics.

These three trends exist within the Non-aligned Movement: (i) those who emphasise total liberation from Imperialism and neo-colonialism; (ii) those who are satisfied with political independence alone -- and (iii) those who argue that equidistance from the super-powers and blocs is the essence of Non-alignment. This has led certain Western analysts to divide the members also into (i) Radicals — anti-imperialists; (ii) Moderates -- Independence alone and (iii) Rightists -- up-holders of the equidistance theory. But these commentators fail to see that in the Non-aligned Movement these three trends are not water-tight but that there was a great deal of over-lapping between them.

But the most significant development since Belgrade was the concretisation of the demand for a New International Economic Order. It is because such concretisation was expected to go further than before that Havana attracted more attention than any previous Summit. On the question of the need for a New International Economic Order there have been and there are no differences between members of the non-aligned movement, though there are differences as to how it can or should be secured and established.

At Havana a concrete Action Programme was drawn up and there are good reasons to think that the political will to

implement Summit decisions had begun to surface—and that is why the Movement came under a savage attack. Since the Algiers and Colombo Summits, the Non-aligned movement has paid more and more attention to the grave economic problems facing the Third World. It was on Non-aligned initiatives that the group of 77 came into being and has not only pushed international agencies like UNCTAD to play a more positive role to cope with the problems of under developed countries and to enter into the so-called North-South dialogue to bridge the gap between rich and poor nations. The economic declarations at the Algiers and the Colombo Summits had sounded the clarion call for a New International Economic Order and the Non-aligned Movement had also prevailed upon the United Nations to support this demand in a Special Resolution.

Since the Fifth Summit in Colombo, the world economic situation has worsened. The old order has been unable to solve the twin problems of inflation and unemployment. The decline in Western economics has meant that the rich countries were unwilling or unable to invest in the developing countries. The Crisis Programme of the World Bank to develop what they called a Basic Needs strategy has collapsed. The oil producing countries which had enjoyed the flush of profits have dwindled because of world inflation. The world is now in the grip of a monetary crisis. Gold has topped 600/700 dollar mark – something financial experts of the West had thought an impossibility even a year ago. The 200 dollar mark was thought bad enough as an index of inflation. The world's leading lending agencies have made the conditions on which loans are made available extremely stringent and also have become more insistent in their demands about developing countries repaying their debts. The growing economic crisis has also had a most severe and deleterious effect on the level of the standard of living of majority of countries in the Non-aligned Movement. Furthermore, the economic crisis has had dire political consequences for all non-aligned countries. The political structure in these countries are weak and they have become the object of destabilisation. In the West the economic crisis has brought a revival of conservatism.

Even the major social democratic countries like the USA and West Germany have conservative foreign economic policies that have led to sharp confrontations with poor Third World and Non-aligned countries in the UNCTAD and in the North South dialogues.

From the time of the Colombo Summit the heterogeneous grouping of countries that make the Non-aligned movement have tended to act as a coalition and as a major unifying force in world politics around one issue; they all want to reject the old economic order. What is now in the forefront is not only the call for a new economic order, but the rejection of the old economic order which is admittedly a product of colonialism and imperialism. The majority of these countries by rejecting the old economic order are rejecting the traditional path of development, the capitalist path of development. This does not mean they have all chosen socialism, but they have certainly rejected capitalism or at least its present institutional arrangements. Here too there are many schools of thought and in the Non-aligned Movement there are several trends. Some argue that the path of development is through tampering and restructuring the old order. They believe that the old order can be reformed. Those beliefs and theories are to a large extent a product of World Bank and IMF thinking. They say that for these countries to break out of their present stagnation and dilemma, international social welfare must be increased.

The other argument, stemming out of the nationalism of emergent liberation movements, is that Third World countries should not continue to be beneficiaries of international welfare or charity. Such countries want a restructuring of the entire apparatus and want a redistribution of resources both internally and externally. This naturally creates major problems for some of the countries within the Non-aligned Movement itself which have in an economic sense opted for what is known as the UNCTAD package which is no more than a technocratic device to resolve a fundamental economic and political problem. These countries have been attracted by the idea that it is possible to create global international economic



institutions that can counter-weight the World Bank and IMF on the one hand and on the other develop institutions that will service the developing countries.

This strategy has now virtually come to a dead end, At UNCTAD V in Manila it became obvious that a choice had to be made between these two strategies. The rich countries of the West, long before UNCTAD V, had realised that even the UNCTAD package, such as envisaged by developing countries, will not get off the ground, and that the non-aligned countries in Havana will have either to continue toying with the old UNCTAD formulation or develop new strategies to deal with the problems of development. With the rich industrialised countries completely against the New International Economic Order, the Non-aligned Movement and all Third World countries have no alternative but to adopt what the rich countries might regard as "radical" measures to establish the New Order.

This will give the clue to many of the happenings in Havana and in the world in the period after the sixth Summit.

## ATTACK ON HAVANA

The sharp attack on the Non-aligned Movement had begun long before the Havana Summit, but a careful and detailed study of the hostility shown by certain countries to the Havana Summit will show that the pointed attack on Cuba was only a cover to carry on a campaign to prevent, disrupt or eliminate the growing radicalisation of an increasing number of Non-aligned countries especially in the demand for a New International Economic Order.

In the early days of the Non-aligned Movement the Western countries especially the former colonial powers and the neo-imperialist USA did not take the Non-aligned Movement seriously. They regarded it as a noise-making forum where demagogic leaders of the Third World let off steam. From 1961 to 1973 the Non-aligned Movement was mainly concerned with political independence and the fight against colonialism. The old colonial powers, however, had by this time decided that the shadow of political independence could be granted as long as the substance of economic power and control was retained. This was de-colonisation from their point of view. There was therefore a proliferation of a large number of politically independent states in territories that were dependent colonies. Their economic problems were many and grave. All of them joined the Non-aligned Movement.

The economic crises of the 1970s compelled the Non-aligned countries to take upon themselves the responsibility of solving the politico-economic problems of poverty, unemployment and inflation. This was reflected in the Algiers and Colombo Summit resolution on the world economic situation and the demand for a New International Economic Order. The failure of the North-South dialogue, the collapse of the much-boosted UNCTAD package, and the inability of the World Bank-IMF basic needs strategy to get any under-developed country off the ground, had made it increasingly clear that, at Havana, radical alternatives and strategies would be sought.

Moreover, the geo-political situation had also changed drastically since the first Belgrade Summit in 1961. The powerful and rich nations like the USA, UK, France, West Germany, Japan and their allies began to realise that the Non-aligned Movement was a force to contend with and that it could no longer be ignored, ridiculed or laughed away. The West has a vested interest in preserving, protecting and ensuring that the old economic order was not tampered with. World capitalism had no alternative but to resist the demand of the Non-aligned countries. The basic strategy of the West was to ensure at least the maintenance of the *status quo*.

There is also another factor which has an important bearing on the attitude of rich western countries towards the Non-aligned nations. Five areas, economically vital to the West, had in the 1970s and more especially after the Colombo Summit of 1979, become virtual war zones: South-east Asia, the Middle East, South Africa, Central America and now the Persian Gulf, Iran and parts of South Asia.

In Southeast Asia geopolitics has developed in the most bizarre fashion. Events have zig-zagged in the most unpredictable manner. The USA lost the war in Vietnam, but has won the friendship of China. And China has the distinction of militarily attacking two non-aligned countries, India in 1962 and Vietnam in 1979. The recent developments in Indo-China have made the whole Southeast Asian region an area of war and tension. In the Middle East, Israel has in this period dismembered a number of

Arab states. Lebanon is fast ceasing to be a state. Syria and Jordan are under ceaseless attack. And the Camp David agreement, with Egypt collaborating with Israel, has given imperialism a new position of strength in the area. Most of the Non-aligned Arab nations have been thrown on the defensive. In South Africa there is not only a continuous endeavour to destabilize the frontline African states but also a total determination to institutionalise racism. The consolidation of a racist state is the most dangerous manifestation of the era. South Africa is a danger in two ways, one it is a military threat in the frontline states, and second, more importantly, it is seeking to economically penetrate the remaining African states to make them clients of the world capitalist system. The continent of Africa is now under total siege being attacked from all angles. That is how nearly all Non-aligned African countries understand the situation. In Central America (and the Caribbean especially), the revolution in Nicaragua is only the first of the vast upheaval going on in the region -- in El Salvador, Costa Rica, Surinam, Panama, Grenada and all other countries in the region. More recently Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, the Indian Ocean and the entire South Asia region have come into the arena of a dangerous zone where a major war could erupt any time. The main targets of attack are non-aligned countries which demand a New International Economic Order.

The non-aligned countries are thus under attack in Asia, Africa and America. Their attempts to liberate themselves politically and emancipate themselves economically is being fiercely resisted by the rich nations of the West which continue to exploit them. It would therefore be useful to examine how some of the fundamental principles and objectives of Non-alignment have fared in the context of current historical developments. There are a number of factors that must be taken into consideration. First, the entry of China as an independent political force in world politics and her willingness to align herself with some of the leading capitalist powers has produced a new situation. It is no longer possible to talk of equidistance between two Super-Powers. Now, there are four or five points of power in global geopolitics: the USA, China, the Soviet Union and the junior partners of the capitalist system France, UK, Japan, Australia, South Africa etc. It is today impossible to be equidistant in the former geostrategic

“non-aligned” way between two super-powers because if one tries to be equidistant between four or five Super-power states, one must take a position. *Second*, the right to independence and self-determination has lost its old meaning. We see many independent states disappearing because they are unable to exist economically as states. They are therefore becoming client states of the world capitalist system. *Third*, Non-alignment is anti-racist. Racism is now more rampant than ever on a global scale. Racism is winning in South Africa, in Israel and even in Western Europe. The ideology of racism is fast becoming internationalised. Racial violence has erupted in many Non-aligned countries, Separatism and secessionist insurgencies based on racism are the order of the day today. *Fourth*, the main task of the Non-aligned Movement today is the restructuring of the old economic order and the establishing of a New International Economic Order. Unfortunately, the old order is not crumbling but is in fact strengthening and regrouping.

The campaign against Cuba, Vietnam and the Havana Summit is really part of a massive assault on the right of non-aligned countries and peoples to exist and to refashion the world in the way they desire. If one does not see the Non-aligned Movement in this perspective, one will tend to talk of it under the miasma of romanticism or worry about disunity as a distraught psychopath or talk about the virtues of moderate non-radical policies. One cannot sit on the fence in the matter of the New International Economic Order. Moderation is taken for weakness and surrender.

The real position is that the whole Non-aligned movement is today under attack on all fronts—because of its determination to implement its objectives. The attack on the Havana Summit was really to weaken the Non-aligned movement as a whole. The attack on Cuba was to ensure that the unity of the movement fell into disarray and this would help the major capitalist countries to pick up the pieces and create client states of the weak nations. This, to many observers, is the major problem confronting the Non-aligned Movement in this period. Many have already fallen victim to the economic power of the capitalist system. The attack on the Non-aligned reached a high water mark in Havana and it continues to this day right down the line with ever increasing fury.

The second significant feature of the attack on Havana was the attempts to divide the movement into geographic units, into continental blocs i. e., Asia, Africa, Latin America and smaller regional groupings. Even if geography may have produced some similarities between countries there are great dissimilarities at different levels within each geographic or regional area. For example, Jamaica has much more in common with Sri Lanka than with the massive economy of Brazil. And the same is true of Sri Lanka compared with India. Thirdly, an attack on the Havana Summit paid special attention on the national liberation movements with a view to isolating them and countries supporting liberation movements from the rest of the non-aligned. They were branded as the tools of designing radicals and reds. It was made out that they were part of the Soviet bloc and that they could not be regarded as "truly" Non-aligned.

Concretely, the first issue in the strategy to break up the Sixth Summit was the Kampuchean question. The second was Egypt. The third was the charge that Cuba was seeking to re-orientate the movement to make it an appendage of the Soviet Union. But none of these either broke up the Summit or even held up its work. But the onslaught did succeed in causing fissures in the Movement especially through Non-aligned states that had become client states of the major capitalist powers. But the Havana Summit did not collapse.

But so convinced were the majority of Western journalists at Havana that they were willing to lay bets that the squabble over Kampuchea would prevent the Summit from getting off the ground; and that with the sharp division over the Egyptian question they were certain that the Summit would be split horizontally as well as vertically. Assertions from Third World journalists, at Havana, like myself, that in spite of all these "differences" the Summit would not crack up and that it would be a success were regarded as wishful thinking.

The attempt to break up the Sixth Summit on the Kampuchean issue did not meet with the success some countries had hoped for. At the Summit, finally, even supporters

of Pol Pot were anxious to have the matter frozen on a no-seat basis because there were fears that the Summit might decide in favour of the Heng Samrin Government. These countries wanted to keep the matter open because they felt that the Western Powers had more pull in the UN to keep Pol Pot going (like they did Chiang Kai-shek) for a little while longer. This calculation proved to be correct. By keeping this matter open, at Havana, the USA, China and the West were able to carry the attack on the Non-aligned movement in the UN in the period after Havana. The Egyptian issue too did not cause a breakdown at Havana. The Summit adopted a declaration which roundly condemned the Camp David Agreements mentioning the US and Egypt by name. The Arab demand for suspending Egypt was resolved with a consensus compromise that the question of suspension, like the problem of Kampuchean representation, should be referred to an *ad hoc* committee of the Co-Ordination Bureau to present a report to the 1981 Ministerial Meeting. Finally, the hopes placed on causing a split in the Movement because of Cuba's communism and its "alignment" with the Soviet Union vanished into thin air in spite of the hullabaloo raised by Washington about the 3000 Russian "combat troops".

Only Singapore's Rajaratnam openly peddled the old cold war line against the "commies" and "fellow travellers", brought up to date by Brzezinski's theory of "proxy wars"; to indict the USSR, Cuba and Vietnam. The red menace bogey proved to be damper squib than the Kampuchean and Egyptian issues. Even cynics have had to admit that though the possibilities of divisions and quarrels exploding and shattering the non-aligned movement still exist in theory, in actual practice a common set of interests prevailed to hold the movement together — interests which made all members to close their ranks on the basis of compromises against a common enemy, namely, imperialism which stood in the way of a new order, especially a New International Economic Order.

The Summit reaffirmed in its Final Declaration that the essence of the policy of the Non-aligned was the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, racism, apartheid and Zionism,

opposition to all forms of foreign occupation and domination, and hegemony: the struggle for peaceful co-existence among states and non-interference and non-intervention in the affairs of other countries: for the establishment of a New International Economic Order on the basis of equality, respect for the inviolability of frontiers, opposition to the use of force and for the peaceful resolution of controversies.

The paragraph on the controversial formulation that the socialist bloc were the "natural allies" of the non-aligned had been defined to read: "The Conference stated that the policy of non-alignment constitutes an important and indispensable factor in the struggle for the freedom and independence of all the peoples and countries of the world, and expressed its thanks to the peace-loving forces for their support, declaring its wish to continue collaborating with these forces." Many had expected Cuba to insist on the inclusion of the "natural allies" theory in some form in the Declaration and this, they hoped, would bring disaster to the Summit. Cuba made no such mistake.

Western journalists at Havana had predicted a serious Tito-Castro confrontation. They had expected a bombshell in Tito's speech that would shatter Castro and blow up the Summit. This did not happen. Tito's speech was a cause of grave disappointment to the US and West. They had expected a head-on clash between Tito and Castro--and there was none. They had expected walk-outs and splits after Tito's speech--and there were none. The confrontation between Tito's and Castro which the West and the Chinese had wanted and wishfully predicted did not take place. But their disappointment really stemmed from the ignorance of Non-aligned ideology and their wishful desire that the Movement should be wrecked on the excuse that a communist country had become its Chairman. They had hoped that pre-Havana controversy within the movement about certain formulations and strategies would prove to be a time-bomb to blast everything.

In the past, it would be relevant to recall once again that the West had not paid much attention to the Non-aligned



Movement in the belief that it had no sting and that it consisted of mealy-mouthed orators, romantic idealists and demagogues. Now, after the non-aligned movement had grown, after the part it has played in organising the group of 77 and the pressure it has brought on UNCTAD, IMF, IBRD and the United Nations for a New International Economic Order, the world of Western bankerdom sat up to take notice—and to smash it, if possible, by raising the anti-communist (anti-Castro) slogans.

It is unfortunate that most of the studies, papers and books, so far produced by Western professors and researchers on the Non-aligned Movement, are no more than vulgar diatribes based on half-truths and total falsehoods. Commentators and observers writing for western papers and news agencies are even worse. They often base their comments and conclusions on concoctions and fabrications. Instance after instance of such dishonesty can be shown. These pundits and their tribe, for example, have still not woken up to the fact that Tito in his speech took a different position from that of Castro in the analysis of certain aspects of world problems — economic and political—but that there was total unity in objectives. They were disappointed that Tito did not brand Castro as a Soviet stooge and characterise him as a political pick-pocket.

Though the US and its allies failed to smash the Havana Summit, their campaign to divide and destroy the movement continued and continues. The name John Foster Dulles may not mean much to many people today, but he was the one who tried to push the Truman-started cold war in the late forties into a Third World War. When the Non-aligned Movement had emerged, Dulles had called it an “immoral movement”. There are many powerful people in the US and the West who still feel that the Non-aligned Movement is “immoral”. To the any movement that questions the validity and virtues of the capitalist system is “immoral”. They do not seem to be able to sense that millions of people in the Third World of under-privileged countries feel very differently.

What people in these countries feel was well described by Norman Manley, Prime Minister of Jamaica, when he said: “I am increasingly conscious of the meaning and the significance of

the work of some of the great founding fathers of the Non-aligned Movement..... I could feel almost a sense of their presence in this room. One thought of the immense contributions, not only to India but to the whole of mankind, the enormous intellectual contributions, the enormous spiritual contributions of Nehru and India, One was very conscious of Nasser and we were, of course, particularly conscious of the life and work of Kwame Nkrumah.”. Manley spoke about the invaluable contribution of the Non-aligned Movement to uplifting the position of the member countries and went on to stress the need for the New International Economic Order: “The struggle for the New International Economic Order to us is the most critical single struggle facing mankind today. In support of that we are determined and unrepentant. But, in particular, I do not think that I have ever seen in my experience, anything that seemed to symbolize more the methods by which the forces of imperialism seek to dominate the world and dominate the course of events.....”

Manley, in this speech, referred to the pressures applied on Non-aligned countries like Jamaica when they refused to toe the Western line: “We know well the price that can be exacted from those who stand up for principles in the world. We remember the sudden tightening of the economic noose, the sudden suspension of normal intercourse, the sudden cacophony of the press. We will never forget, how all of a sudden, our beaches which are the most beautiful in the world, our people, who are remarkably the most hospitable and friendly in the world in spite of all the tragedy of their experience, how all of a sudden, these facilities that were important to an enormous industry—our vacation industry (we do not call it a tourist industry – we call it a vacation industry) to which all of goodwill are invited, and all are welcome if they behave themselves—all of a sudden, this jewel of the Caribbean was tainted, not by an oil-spill in the Caribbean that might have blackened the beaches, but it was tainted with the principle of a commitment to liberation in Southern Africa.....” Then Manley pointed out: “We have had a very interesting experience in this little country of ours. We represent one of the longest continuous exposure to direct colonialism—over 300 years. I do not suppose there can

have been many parts of the world in which the imperialis process was able to bear in more ways upon the life of the people than was the case in Jamaica. Three hundred years is a long time. It is a long time in which to exploit an economy not merely exploit raw material but that is a long time in which to create an entire structure that is dedicated to exploitation. Three hundred years is not some brief interregnum in which a conquering power obtrudes upon the social continuum of a people's experience -- 300 years is long enough to try literally to fashion a people in the image of colonialism. And, therefore, when one looks at the struggle of the Jamaican people one sees something, I suggest, more profound than the spirit of resistance. One sees rather that depth in the soul of man, there are qualities that cannot be suppressed indefinitely..... We look at our heroes and heroines with a special reverence because their qualities of resistance were not born out of an assembly of social structures which somebody had suddenly come and interferred with. Their quality of resistance was born out of the raw need, the raw imperative of the human spirit to be free and to work for dignity. It was fascinating to observe how, when we came to independence... I do not believe there could be many countries in the world that would be a more perfect living demonstration and proof of the *nature of neo-colonialism than Jamaica* ... this expressed itself in all the problems of lack of confidence, all the problems that are associated with the classic difficulty of the psychology of dependence."

Manley drew attention to the extraordinary significance of the Non-aligned Movement at this juncture and went on to speak about the attack on the Havana Summit: "when we approach the Sixth Summit in Havana, we are aware of the factors and forces which seek to shroud history in a mysterious cloud of misdirected recollection. We notice the subtle attempts to divide and isolate; one does not care to lay charges of intention to divide and rule. I would not be so crude; but certainly, there is the more subtle attempt to sow the seeds of dissension within the Movement. Then you have the voices that say: Is there a continuing relevance to the Movement? To the ones who question the relevance of the Movement, my reply is: As you look at today's crisis,

whether you look at the struggle in Southern Africa, whether you look at the economic crisis of countries of the Third World, wherever you look, there is a greater relevance today than ever before to the Non-aligned Movement. In a curious way I think that it might have been easier to divert the Non-aligned Movement from its path, say, ten years ago than now. Because there were those who were simpler, less, shall I say, penetrating in their understanding of the nature of imperialism, who believed that as soon as the last flag of the occupying powers was hauled down and the proud new flags of independence were free to flutter in the wind -- there was the belief that somehow in this critical and remarkable experience, this winning of the first war -- that our problems would be over.....”

“I know there were many in this country who believed that somehow 300 years of misdirected economics, 300 years of brainwashing, 300 years of relentless entanglement in the dependency syndrome, would magically vanish the minute the flag flew. There were those who believed that. Nobody believes that anymore; though some still pretend to believe it because they do not really wish to have anything changed. But we have all learnt in their experience that these were outer manifestations and that the real problem lies in the whole of that vast, interlocking set of economic arrangements — transnational corporations, holding companies, patent and royalty arrangements, manipulation of world trade, domination of world shipping and above all, the control of mass media; that is in all of that interlocking series of elements that we find the true nature of imperialism; and it is important, I believe, to realize that imperialism has reached a point in the world where it now acts independently of the political systems within which it has its roots.....”

To those who had illusions about establishing the New International Economic Order easily, he pointed out, “Imperialism will not yield to words. Nobody would even contemplate recourse to any violent methodology because ours is mission of peace and of justice through peace, except where we are literally put to the sword by tyranny, as in Southern

Africa. These things are well understood. What then is vital? What is vital is that we learn how to base our just economic demands on the development of the internal means of self-reliance. This means, that first of all, that the Movement, if it is to offer new challenges more effectively, it must keep intact its sense of unity: because we who are distracted by the danger of disunity, have a little time for practical opportunity. Obviously, there are those who will seek constantly to distract, constantly to have the Movement questioning itself; what are we really for?.....”

If one examine the ways imperialism and the other enemies of the Nonaligned Movement have sought to weaken it, one will detect several identifiable strategies. *First*, there is the policy of destabilisation where the most reactionary, fascist and neo-fascist elements are mobilised, encouraged and financed to topple governments that seek to achieve sovereignty over their national resources. Chile was a classic example of such destabilisation where the forces of reaction succeeded in smashing the Allende government which had, according to an observer, only attempted to ensure, ‘a glass of milk for every child’. Afghanistan is another instance where such destabilisation was attempted and the Afghan government was compelled to seek the assistance of the Soviet Union to safeguard the Revolution.

The *second* way of weakening the Nonaligned Movement was to divide it, to put one Nonaligned country against another -- the old ‘divide and rule’ policy. Numerous examples of the way imperialism has implemented this ‘divide et impera’ policy can be cited, and reference will be made to them in the course of this study. The *third* way in which imperialism has sought to weaken the Non-aligned Movement is to try and separate the Non-aligned Movement from those who support it, those who fight together with it. Throughout the history of the Non-aligned Movement, the Soviet Union and the Socialist countries have supported the Non-aligned Movement, and because they support the Non-aligned, the

Nonaligned regard them as friends. Manley explained this when he said: "We are strong, when all the anti-imperialist forces, all the forces which stand for peace, which stand for every child having a handful of rice every day are together and united. With its lies, imperialism seeks to make us believe that it would be much better if we were not united. It makes out that the Non-aligned Movement does not recognize who are its friends and who are its enemies....."

R. K. Mishra, writing in the New Delhi magazine, *Link*, at the conclusion of the Havana Summit summed up the position thus: "The Summit was preceded by feverish activities to prevent it from being held at Havana. The US was afraid of the consequences in Latin America of the success of a stridently anti imperialist conference in Cuba. The Chinese rulers were anxious to sabotage the Summit in order to cheat Cuba of the tremendous boost in its position and prestige..... The Havana Summit was held in the wake of significant events in Asia, Africa and Latin America: the breakdown of CENTO, the revolution in Afghanistan, the overthrow of the Shah of Iran and the success of peoples movements in other parts of the world. But quite disturbing were the negative trends, the most important of which were the Chinese attack on Vietnam and Peking's collusion with American imperialism.

"Havana revealed the strength as well as the weaknesses of the Non-aligned Movement, its numerical growth and also its diversity. It brought into sharp focus the big changes that have taken place in the movement and in the world. However, it also revealed that many problems of mankind remain the same; poverty, squalor and illiteracy, imperialism colonialism, racism, Zionism and various forms of foreign domination. Havana was a powerful reminder that the Non-aligned movement must grow and strengthen itself to meet the new and complex challenges. It reiterated that the basic impulses of the movement continue to remain valid....."

The most significant thing about the Havana Summit was that it took place at all inspite of the efforts of the US, China and Western countries doing everything to prevent it. And it did not break up. It did not collapse. A Final Declaration was adopted with consensus. If there were reservations on political issues, there was total unanimty on the imperative need for a New International Economic Order.

## U. S., CHINA & THE NONALIGNED

From the time the Non-aligned Movement had first come into being and for some years after that the USA had regarded it as "immoral" and generally tended to dismiss it as something of little consequence. But the USA began to regard the Movement differently in more recent years. China, which claims to be part of the Third World, has always paid very serious attention to the Non-aligned Movement and has always waged a determined and persistent campaign to separate the mainstream of the Non-aligned from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. At the Colombo Summit, both the USA and China had endeavoured to destabilise the Movement by seeking to isolate the so-called radicals who stood for a dynamic New International Economic Order from the rest mainly by raising the red bogey.

Daniel Sneider (NSIPS) writing to the *New Solidarity* in New York on September 11, 1979, from Havana, said: "In August of 1976, the Colombo Summit passed a program of instituting a new world economic order outside the World Bank-IMF framework. But this program was never implemented because the Non-aligned lacked the political unity and leadership to carry it through when Henry Kissinger responded to



Colombo with a series of murders (Pakistan's Prime Minister Bhutto), destabilisations and coups. A key factor bolstering Castro's predominance at the 1979 Non-aligned Summit was heavy-handed attempts at intervention by the United States current misgovernment in Washington, on behalf of the IMF and the genocidal Camp David and Pol Pot factions. The Prime Minister of one small Caribbean country, Grenada, told reporters at a press conference in Havana that the US Ambassador visited him one week ago with a personal message from Secretary of State, Cyrus Vance, warning him not to attend the Non-aligned meeting, or at least, not to ally on any issues with Cuba."

At one time, the USA had taken up the position that it had no interest in interfering in the Non-aligned Movement or in the internal affairs of its member states. There is no doubt that from the mid-sixties to the mid-seventies, the USA had maintained a low profile *vis a vis* the Non-aligned Movement. But, as observed earlier, there was a dramatic change after the Algiers Summit where the demand for the New International Economic Order was first raised in concrete form. Those who were present at the Colombo Summit in 1976 will recall the interest the USA took in the deliberations and how it betrayed an unmistakable desire to make certain countries amenable to its persuasion to help fashion the outcome of the Summit in line with US policy objectives. China was so obsessed with its desire to denigrate the Soviet Union at every turn that it directed its propaganda in fire at a number of Non-aligned countries which refused to adopt an anti-Soviet stance.

After Colombo, the next Summit was scheduled to take place in Havana, but Cuba was not the reason for the growing demand from nearly all members of the movement for radical strategies to achieve a New International Economic Order. The failure of the North-South dialogue, the fact that UNCTAD was dragging its feet — all contributed to this demand for pragmatic, radical and effective measures to establish the New Economic Order. To meet this challenge the USA did not hesitate to raise the bogey of a red Cuba to secure, if

possible, the cancellation of the Havana Summit altogether or to have it postponed until another venue was found. A suggestion was mooted that Cuba should be sacked or suspended from the Movement for extending military assistance to certain countries in Africa like Angola and Ethiopia. Such a campaign, it was hoped, would at least act as a check on the further radicalisation of the economic programme.

A despatch from New Delhi by G. K. Reddy dated June 28, 1979 for the Madras *Hiudu* stated: "At the forthcoming mid-summit conference of Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned nations in Belgrade, an attempt will be made by some countries to censure Cuba, or even expel it from the community, for its armed intervention in African conflicts as a surrogate of the Soviet Union..... A number of non-aligned countries which include both Asian and African States with known pro-Western leanings want to raise the Cuban issue to draw a distinction between what has come to be known as 'genuine' and 'pseudo' Non-alignment. The issue was raised in a moderate form, with no implied threats of censure or expulsion, at the meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau in Havana last month. But it has come to acquire a sharper edge after the recent happenings in Zaire in the wake of the Somali-Ethiopian conflict."

Reddy went on to say: the "big powers" (meaning the US, China and the West) were out to sow discord in the Movement: "Though Cuba itself has made no secret of its intervention on the Ethiopian side in this conflict, there is no conclusive evidence yet to substantiate the Western accusation that Cuban military advisers had clandestinely trained the Katangan insurgents in Angola who recently marched into Zaire's Shaba province. But the very accusation of Cuban complicity in this invasion, in the wake of the worsening East-West relations, is adding to the prevailing fears and suspicions of several non-aligned African nations that the big powers are out to exploit their discords by openly taking sides in their dispute. It is this aspect of the African situation that is causing concern to the more important members

of the non-aligned community on the eve of the Belgrade conference."

This campaign against Cuba reached the first of many climaxes at the Belgrade meeting of Non-aligned Foreign Ministers at the end of July 1978. According to a DPA report from Belgrade on July 30: "Cuban Foreign Minister Condora Malmierca described as 'imperialist vassals' Somalia, Oman, Egypt and Cambodia some of which had attacked Cuba because of its military engagements in Africa and its pro-Soviet stand in the Non-aligned movement. The countries critical of Cuba had also urged the conference to hold next year's Non-aligned Summit meeting in a city other than Havana, the Cuban capital scheduled for the gathering. Malmierca said 15 Non-aligned nations had been instructed by the US State Department to use the present Belgrade meeting to split the Non-aligned movement."

This campaign did not succeed. There was no change of venue. The Movement did not split, The splitters were numerically so few that they did not want to get out themselves. They wanted to stay inside the Movement and carry on the insidious campaign against the "radicals" rather than isolate themselves by quitting the Movement. But the campaign to disrupt was carried on with ever increasing tempo right through until the Havana Summit when it proliferated into a multi-pronged attack. And this campaign has gone on after Havana with added fury. Daniel Sneider referred to the Jamaican Prime Minister's comment on the anti-Soviet bogey flung at the Havana Summit. ".....'Mr. President (addressing Fidel Castro) they are trying to use your courage to divide our movement.....'Manley said in his speech -- referring to efforts to split the Non-aligned between 'pro-Soviet' and 'anti-Soviet' factions. If the West is really worried about the convergence of the Non-aligned views with those of the socialist countries, Manley observed, there is a simple solution -- the West can agree with the Non-aligned on the crucial development issues."

Delegates, observers and journalists at the Havana Conference were aware of the US and Western presence at the

Summit. In a report to the *International Herald Tribune* from Havana dated September 5, Karen De Young had said: "...at least five European countries and the United States have sent their Non-aligned specialists here to observe the summit and try to make their influence felt on issues they are concerned about....." The aim and purpose of this group was secret. They directed the operations of the pro-West lobby inside the Movement and this lobby was extremely active there (at the Summit) although it did not meet with much success.

According to Sneider: "A particularly touchy issue in Havana and one which the US government was keen to confine to diplomatic do-nothingism was that of Egypt's entry into a military pact with Israel in violation of the principles of the Non-aligned. Yesterday, it had appeared that only a vague rebuke against unnamed 'separate treaties' would be endorsed by the Non-aligned. The dramatic reversal occurred last night during a closed-door meeting. Egypt had put together a bloc of French-speaking African countries and Nigeria to stop the condemnation of Camp David and claimed 24 signatories, including Tanzania and Zambia for its position. But when the Foreign Minister of Senegal rose to escalate this 'compromise' into a fullscale attack on Fidel Castro and accusations that other Africans were 'taking orders from the Cubans, the meeting outrage against Egypt exploded. In a surprise intervention, Kenneth Kaunda, the President of Zambia, who is generally known as a 'moderate', blasted the Senegalese Minister. He stated that the Heads of State of Zambia, Tanzania and Mozambique, while they did not support an Arab-backed motion for immediate suspension of Egypt from the Non-aligned, 'absolutely condemn' Egypt for its alliance with Israel."

There is not the slightest doubt that the Carter has shed the US cloak of neutrality and non-interference *vis a vis* the Non-aligned and openly declared a war of slow attrition against those who wanted a really new and dynamic International Economic Order - led by the radicals. Mary Goldstein, writing in August 18, 1979 in the *New Solidarity*, New York, stated: "US State Department special envoy Philip Habib has privately told the government of Guyana that the

US is suspending everything but food aid because Guyana and Jamaica have contributed to what Habib called 'advancing Cuban influence' in the Caribbean. Habib, in Guyana as part of a high-level diplomatic tour of the Caribbean, told the Guyanese government that US will withhold further economic aid because Guyana has not been 'faithful to the Western Concord.' A former Under-Secretary of State for political affairs and one of the department's most senior diplomats, Habib was dispatched to the Caribbean early this month to blackmail regional governments—many newly independent from British colonial rule -- into alignment with Washington's policy of maintaining the hegemony of International Monetary Fund austerity. In his back pocket, no doubt, were the plans to disrupt next month's Non-aligned meeting in Havana. To the 'faithful' Habib promised greater expanded US aid....."

While there is no doubt that the New International Economic Order was the main target of attack for the Western lobby, Carter raised a whole series of red herrings during the Summit Conference to scare the weak and pliable members among the Non-aligned. How did the Carter set about this campaign of political intimidation? It was first built around the story of Soviet combat troops in Cuba—although such "advisers" or "specialists" (now called "troops") had been stationed in Cuba from 1962 with USA's tacit approval. A few excerpts from one of Carter's many televised speeches during this period on the situation in the Caribbean will reveal the Carter strategy. After the customary rhetoric about the US defence system and its capacity to safeguard national security in the context of a mutually acceptable SALT II, he went on to say: "This evening I also want to report to you about the highly publicised Soviet brigade in Cuba and about its bearing on the important relationship between our nation and the Soviet Union". Then came the usual blah-blah about the balance of deterrence between the USA and the USSR: "Our fundamental philosophies conflict, and quite often our national interests conflict as well. But as two great nations, we do have common interests and share an overwhelming mutual concern in preventing a nuclear war. We must recognize therefore that nuclear arms control agreements are vital to both our count-

ries. And we must also exercise self-restraint in our relations and be sensitive to each other's concerns." After this, he went on to the crucial part of his speech: "Recently we have obtained evidence that a Soviet combat brigade has been in Cuba for several years. The presence of Soviet combat troops in Cuba is of serious concern to us. I want to reassure you at the outset that we do not face any immediate concrete threat that could escalate into war or major confrontation..... but we do face a challenge. It is a challenge to our wisdom — a challenge to our ability to act in a firm, decisive way without destroying the basis for co-operation which helps to maintain world peace and control nuclear weapons. It is a challenge to our determination to give a measured and effective response to Soviet competition and to Cuban military activities around the world..."

Carter then went on to explain: "Now let me explain the specific problem of the Soviet brigade and describe the more general problem of Soviet-Cuban military activism in the Third World. Here is the background on Soviet forces in Cuba. As most of you know, 17 years ago in the era of the cold war, the Soviet Union attempted to introduce offensive nuclear missiles and bombers into Cuba. This direct threat to the United States ended with the Soviet agreement to withdraw those nuclear weapons and a commitment not to introduce offensive weapons into Cuba thereafter. At the time of that 1962 missile crisis, there were more than 20,000 Soviet military personnel in Cuba. Most of them were also withdrawn and we monitored their departure. It was believed that those who stayed behind were not combat forces but were there to advise and train Cubans and to perform intelligence functions. Just recently American Intelligence obtained persuasive evidence that some of these Soviet forces had been organised into a combat unit. Our attention was then focussed on a careful review of past intelligence data. It was possible for our experts to conclude that this unit had existed for several years, probably since the mid-1970s and possibly even longer. This unit appears to be a brigade of two to three thousand men. It is armed with about forty tanks and other modern military equipment. It has been organised as a combat

unit, and its training exercises have been those of a combat unit. This is not a large force, nor an assault force. It presents no direct threat to us. It has no airborne or seaborne capability. In contrast to the 1962 crisis, no nuclear threat to the US is involved.'

After stressing that this Soviet unit in Cuba was really no threat to the US, Carter insisted on extracting the maximum "scare" value out of this imaginary Soviet "threat" which the US had artificially blown up into a mighty bogey: "Nevertheless this Soviet brigade in Cuba is a serious matter. It contributes to tension in the Caribbean and Central American region. The delivery of modern arms to Cuba and the presence of Soviet naval forces in Cuban waters have strengthened the Soviet-Cuban military relationship. They have added to the fears of some countries that they may come under Soviet or Cuban pressure. During the last few years the Soviets have been increasing the delivery of military supplies to Cuba. The result is that Cuba now has one of the largest, best equipped arms forces in this region. These military forces are used to introduce them into other countries in Africa and the Middle East. There is a special relationship between Cuba and the Soviet Union. The Cubans get their weapons free. Other Soviet satellite countries have to pay for their military supplies. The Communist regime in Cuba is an economic failure. It cannot sustain itself. The Soviet Union must send to Cuba several millions of dollars in economic aid everyday. Fidel Castro does not pay money for Russian arms; the Cuban people pay a much higher price, in every international dispute, on every international issue. Cuba automatically follows the Soviet line. The Soviet brigade is a manifestation of Moscow's dominance of Cuba. It raises the level of that dominance - and it raises the level of responsibility that the Soviet Union must take for escalating Cuban military actions abroad."

What Carter wanted to "prove" to the Non-aligned and the rest of the world was that Cuba was a willing tool, satellite and stooge of the USSR—not a small socialist country that was fraternally helped by the USSR—for the mutual benefit of both.

Thereafter Carter described the discussion his Administration had started with the Soviets and with a patronising arrogance stated; "Although we have persuasive evidence that the unit is a combat brigade, the Soviet statements about the non-combat status of the unit are significant. However, we shall not rest on these Soviet statements alone. First, we will monitor the status of the Soviet forces by increased surveillance of Cuba. Second, we will assure that no Soviet unit in Cuba can be used as a combat force to threaten the security of the United States or any other nation in this hemisphere. Those nations can be confident that the United States will act in response to a request for assistance in meeting any such threat from Soviet or Cuban forces. This policy is consistent with our responsibilities as a member of the Organisation of American States and a party to the Rio Treaty. It is a reaffirmation in new circumstance of John F. Kennedy's declaration in 1963: 'That we would not permit any troops from Cuba to move off the Island of Cuba in any offensive action against any neighbouring countries.' Third, I am establishing a permanent full-time Caribbean Joint Task Force headquarters at Key West, Florida. I will assign to this headquarters unit specially designated forces for action if required. This will substantially improve our capability to monitor and respond rapidly to any attempted military encroachment in the region. Fourth, we will expand military manoeuvres in the region and we will conduct these regularly from now on. In accordance with existing Treaty rights, the United States will, of course, keep our forces in Guantanamo. Fifth, we will increase our economic assistance to alleviate the unmet economic and human needs in the Caribbean region and further to ensure the ability of troubled peoples to rout social turmoil and possible communist domination."

This US carrot and big stick policy for the Caribbean was really intended to intimidate Central and South American countries and to tell them that if they played ball (or banana) with the US they would get a few carrots, but if they were tempted to go the Cuba way, the big stick of punitive action would descend on them. Carter further disclosed that the Havana Summit (and the refusal of the majority of members to discard Cuba



and the New International Economic Order) had compelled the US to take world-wide measures to protect its security: "The United States has a worldwide interest in peace and stability. Accordingly, I have directed the Secretary of Defence to enhance further the capacity of our rapid deployment forces to protect our own interests and to act in response for help from our allies and friends. We must be able to move our ground, sea and air units to distant areas—rapidly and with adequate supplies. We have reinforced our naval presence in the Indian Ocean, These steps reflect my determination to preserve peace, to strengthen our alliances and to defend the interests of the United States....."

Then, no doubt, to assuage the no-war sentiments of large sections of the American people, he said: "I have concluded that the brigade issue is certainly no invitation to the cold war. A confrontation might be emotionally satisfying for a few days or weeks for some people, but it would be destructive to the national interests and security of the United States We must continue the basic policy that the United States has followed for 20 years, under six administrations of both Parties—a policy that recognises that we are in competition with the Soviet Union in some fields and that we seek cooperation in others notably maintaining the peace and controlling nuclear arms. My fellow Americans, the greatest danger to American security tonight is certainly not the two or three thousand Soviet troops in Cuba. The greatest danger to all the nations of the world – including the United States and the Soviet Union—is the breakdown of a common effort to preserve the peace, and the ultimate threat of a nuclear war.'

What is this "breakdown of a common effort to preserve the peace" Carter speaks about? It simply means that the demand for the New International Economic Order, if pushed too seriously, would lead to a "breakdown of peace" so far as rich countries like the US were concerned. Then he made a plea for SALT II and mentioned for the benefit of his American audience that the allies of the US would lose faith

in US capacity to negotiate with the USSR and promote that cause of peace--if the US faltered on SALT II.

All this verbiage was used by Carter to convey a camouflaged but a pointed message to the Non-aligned that it was in their interests to tail behind the US--and not succumb to Cuban plans or follow radical policies.

It must be noted that even as early as the first quarter of 1979 the US had decided to increase and upgrade its military capabilities in the Caribbean. Mary Goldstein, in the article of August 18, referred to earlier, analysed the situation thus: "Administration officials and US media seized on the presence of a Soviet Naval group in the Caribbean to help build up the bogeyman of Cuba-Soviet 'expansionism' in the region. State Department officials, for the first time in a decade of regular Soviet exercises in the Western Atlantic and Caribbean, expressed American official 'concern' about the Soviet naval presence, citing Cuba's more assertive foreign policy' as the specific reason. US press is now trying to blow up the Soviet exercises occurring for the 20th time since 1969 into a Cuban Missile Crisis style showdown; columnists Evans and Novak a pipeline for former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's confrontation policies, termed the Soviet navy group 'the most provocative yet to cross the Atlantic' and demanded that President Carter make a 'strong demonstration' that the United States will not tolerate free-wheeling political aggression in the US backyard." She also examined Carter's statement about Russian "political aggression" and said: "The 21st annual Soviet navy maneuvers held with full knowledge of and surveillance by the US government can hardly be construed as 'political aggression' despite the unconfirmed claims that the naval group will make port-of-call stops in Nicaragua and the small island of Grenada, whose leftist government has opened full diplomatic relations with Cuba. Nor is there any basis in fact to the allegations that Cuba is actively 'exporting revolution' Western hemisphere nations. Washington's attempts to construct a red scare crisis around the 'Cuba question' signals a confrontationist turn in US foreign policy, and is in large part, aimed immediately at wrecking the upcoming

conference of Non-aligned nations that convene in Havana, Cuba, Sept. 2-12. US policy-makers want to make sure that Cuba is the subject of factional debate at the Non-aligned meeting to split the Third World movement."

She however, drew attention to the crux of the US-Cuba problem: "There is little doubt that in good measure because Cuba is hosting the conference, this year's Non-aligned meeting will concentrate on the issue of economic growth and technological development versus International Monetary Fund genocide for the developing sector. Icaragua, whose new Reconstruction Government has challenged the IMF and Washington with a Mexico-style modernisation and development program, will participate in the conference. The fight over representation of Kampuchea (Cambodia) — between the ousted dictator Pol Pot who murdered millions through genocidal IMF-type economic policies, and the new government of Kampuchea—gets right at the heart of the issue of development or death for the Third World....."

Every red herring that was raised by the US and the Western powers turned out to be a manoeuvre directed at disrupting the demand for the New International Economic Order. Even at the Summit, though Kampuchea, Egypt and certain other matters were made to appear as the all-important issues of the Summit by a small minority of pro-West Non-aligned members who "thought along lines that received US approval", the real fear among the rich Western countries was the economic question: "against the possibility that the conference would re-urrect and take action on the 1976 Colombo Action Program for Third World debt moratorium and development. Washington and London are trying to split the movement and polarise the meeting on the bogus issue of Cuba and its 'alignment' with the Soviet Union" Mary Goldstein finally pointed out that the US hysteria about Cuban-Soviet "threat" was phoney, and that it was only a "convenient cover" for US to pressurise the leaders of Caribbean, Central and South American countries to help preserve the old economic order under the auspices of the

IMF: "Top US policy-makers do not believe their own rhetoric about the supposed Cuban and Soviet 'threat' to the Western Hemisphere. Rather, the Administration and press hype is merely a convenient cover for wielding US political and military might against Washington's real enemy, viz any government that dares challenge the IMF..... Washington's Cuba confrontation policy is an attempt to contain and destroy the brewing revolt against IMF genocide in the Caribbean region, as expressed in the ouster of IMF puppet Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua, and in the refusal of many newly independent Caribbean isles to accept IMF austerity under US tutelage. The Nicaraguan revolution has already had an impact on neighbouring Guatemala, EL Salvador, and Honduras where popular rebellion against decades-long rule by repressive austerity regimes is intensifying almost daily".

There is also no doubt that Carter used the bogey of the Soviet-Cuban "threat" as a launching pad for his campaign for re-election in 1980 US Presidential Stakes. He had kept on extracting the maximum out of this situation -- until crisis situations broke out in Iran and Afghanistan (situations which were triggered by the cold-war policies of Carter's National Security Adviser Brzezinski who was intent on staging confrontations with the Soviet for the greater glory of Carter and the USA). But until the Iran hostage problem (in early November 1979) and the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan (end December 1979) erupted into a global crisis, Carter was flogging the "Cuban threat" issue mercilessly until people began to tire. Brzezinski and the US armament manufacturers then grabbed the Iran and Afghanistan issues to mount a campaign to scare the wits out of the American voters to make them re-elect Carter. How the Iran and Afghanistan crises based on Brzezinski's theories and hopes that Islamic fundamentalism would set ablaze an arc of crisis round the Soviet Union have backfired on the US is another story. It is enough for the moment to mention that until Iran and Afghanistan came on the scene, Carter had got tougher and tougher about Cuba.

One of the most provocative gimmicks Carter had ordered in the post Summit period was a symbolic Invasion Cuba. A *Reuter*

report from the US base in Cuba, Guantanamo, datelined October 18 had stated: ".....marines in full battledress landed at the US military base here in a demonstration of the Carter Administration's resolve to protect US interests in the Caribbean. Watched by a Cuban spy ship, 1800 marines went ashore in torrential rain at the only US military base on Communist soil. An incident involving the Cuban ship provided the only confrontation as US Navy Task Force made a show of force ordered by President Carter 17 days ago. Reporters invited to watch the landing saw the US Frigate Thomas Hart, which was not part of the Task Force, veer towards the Cuban ship forcing it to make a 180-degree turn from the American formation. Rear Admiral William Replogie, commanding the Task Force which planned the reinforcement exercise, said the Cuban vessel was just observing. He said its movements did not bother the three US amphibious landing ships which unloaded marines and weapons across the beach and by air at the Naval Base, which has been used by the United States since the last century."

How far the American public were fooled by this gimmickry is not clear. But the US no longer makes any attempt to hide its interference in the affairs of the Non-aligned Movement.

The United States now speaks of its concern for Non-alignment, but the US concept of Non-alignment is, according to its own understanding, to suit its own national and global geo-strategic interests. The White House tells Third World countries, especially those beholden to it for aid and assistance, just what kind of "Non-alignment" they should uphold. What the United States and other Powers, interested in maintaining the system of economic privilege and domination based on the capitalist, imperialist and neocolonialist exploitation of developing countries, rich in natural resources, want is Non-alignment that will accept the *status quo* of the extant political and economic order.

China, on the other hand, which claims to have transformed itself in the fires of a communist revolution and which also

protests far too much about being part of the Third World, wants a Non-alignment which will accept the circumlocutory zig-zags of China's quick-changing policies — always in its national and geo-political interests. Over the years, China has always been interested in the Non-aligned Movement and has sermonised all and sundry on the virtues of *Pancha Sila*. But China's attitude has vacillated and varied reflecting the personal and ideological power struggles within the ruling hierarchy after the 1949 revolution.

It is not necessary to go into the details of the many changes that have characterised China's attitude to the Non-aligned Movement from Bandung to Havana, but at the moment, China has reached the point of wanting a split in the Non-aligned Movement and its total denigration. China's anxiety to mould the Non-aligned Movement to accept its own policies stems from premises different from that of the United States. China's policies towards the Non-aligned and the Third World of developing countries, have been enigmatic and a puzzle and have undergone so many changes in recent times that it is almost impossible to comprehend China's attitudes at any moment of time. For a long time, after an initial period of enthusiasm for Bandung *Pancha Sila*, China adopted a somewhat patronising and distant attitude to the Non-aligned Movement—no doubt because certain countries like India and Yugoslavia had begun to play a very important role in it — and had confined its attention to the wider circle of Third World of developing countries especially in Asia and Africa. It is significant that though China claimed to be part of the Third World, she has never, so far, sought to be included among the Non-aligned—even after she abrogated the pact with the USSR.

It will be recalled that in the early fifties, starting from 1950-52, China had wanted to bring the Third World into a global United Front against Imperialism, mainly US imperialism. But in the early sixties, China's concept of the international united front and "imperialism" underwent significant changes. China, having broken with the Soviet Union, decided see to bring its opposition to the Soviet Union within its new definition of Imperialism under the term "social imperialism". China had then argued that,

without the mobilisation of the Third World into a revolutionary mass of frenzied activists, world revolution could not be achieved; that, in fact, the Third World countries constituted the real storm centres of the revolution. Right up to the time of China's current pre-occupation to normalise relations with the United States, Japan and Western European countries, the main emphasis was on revolutionary wars in Third World countries. But today, there has been a shift of China's tactical line to place increasing reliance on the co-existence policies of the Non-aligned countries which Peking in its heyday of Maoism had derided and ridiculed. In the early fifties China had also stressed that it was possible to have a workable relationship between Chinese communism and Asian and African nationalism, that this synthesis was a necessary precondition for any effort directed towards weakening the position of the West in the international economic system. For many years China had based its geo-political calculations on the assumption that radical and revolutionary potentialities of the Third World would blossom out into world revolution in the image of Maoist ideology. All these assumptions have proved to be wrong.

Confronted with the problems of development, the Third World countries were compelled to turn to Western as well as Socialist countries for assistance and were willing to accept the existing *status quo* on the basis of co-existence, thus once again proving China's former premises of permanent revolution as unrealistic and wrong. China has obviously learnt an important lesson from this: that although Third World countries, in Maoist logic, still constitute a potent force for destabilising its vision of a bi-polar world (of the USA and USSR), subjective factors of a short-term character had made the realisation of Peking's objective impossible. Therefore China turned to the long term strategy of cultivating Third World countries on the basis of co-existence, co-operation and friendship (and not on instigating revolutionary guerilla movements). She now woos them step by step to achieve her goal. China now wishfully seems to think that her present strategy would yield dividends. Furthermore, the oil crisis and the dramatic (though temporary) embargo on the export of all oil imposed by the Arabs and their unity *vis-a-vis* the West after the Arab-Israeli war of

1973, had demonstrated to the Chinese what the united action of the Third World countries could achieve; that much could be done without bloody revolution and war. The oil crisis also marked an important turning point in the efforts of the Third World countries to safeguard sovereignty over their natural resources. It further helped to accelerate the initiatives of the Third World nations to secure a better economic deal from the industrialized nations. In short, it was the economic nationalism in the Third World which has gained momentum and effected a significant break-through in recent times. These developments, perhaps, suggested to Peking that the time had arrived for fresh initiatives in regard to the Third World.

Apart from wooing the Third World countries with aid and gifts, China had, after 1975, proclaimed that it was a friend of the Third World countries: that it was a consistent defender of the liberation movements of subject people and that it stood for economic independence through self-reliance (and through "selfless" Chinese aid). It will be recalled that Chou en-Lai in 1963, when asked why China was not interested in participating in the Non-aligned Movement, had replied that China was a "committed" country. He had not set out what this "commitment" meant. But, it was generally understood that China was "committed" to a particular ideology and the policies flowing therefrom, and that this did not permit it to be in the Non-aligned Movement. But today China seems to be adopting a new approach towards this so-called "commitment". At a seminar held in Colombo on July 7, 1976, under the auspices of the Sri Lanka-China Friendship Association it was stated that the Sino-Soviet treaty signed in 1950 was holding up Chinese admission to the non-aligned group: that though the treaty in itself was then a dead letter, the Chinese did not wish to make unilateral abrogation of it. The Chinese have now abrogated the Treaty in the fullness of time.

Whilst China has expressed deep sympathy and support for the Non-aligned Movement, a close analysis of what Peking means by this "support" will show that there is a great gulf between China and the non-aligned world. It will



be useful in this connection, to consider how far China's policy professions are in accord with the declared aims and objects of the Non-aligned Movement. The question is whether China's current policies coincide or run counter to the Declarations of the Fourth Conference of Heads of States and Governments of Non-aligned countries in Algiers in September 1973 and that the Conference of Foreign Ministers of those countries in Lima in August 1977 as well as a number of Resolutions adopted by the Organisation of African Unity, the League of Arab Countries and the like.

Perceptive observers are agreed that China's policies run completely counter to what the Non-aligned Movement has set out to achieve on a large number of issues. One of the fundamental and basic tenets of the Non-aligned Movement is that all military bases of imperialist states on the territories of other countries should be liquidated. But China has come out strongly against the elimination of US military bases especially in Asia. It will be recalled that during US President Mr Gerald Ford's visit to Peking, in December 1975, the Chinese leaders, according to reports at that time in the *New York Times*, had indicated that the USA should continue to play the role it had so far done in South and South-east Asia even more actively than before; that China did not object to the USA maintaining its military bases in the Philippines, Japan, Thailand, and Diego Garcia. Chinese leaders, in particular the former Foreign Minister Chi Peng-Fei during his visit to Europe in June 1973, had repeatedly stressed that China supported the continued existence of NATO, SEATO and CENTO. What was even more surprising, China did not condemn the US intention to set up a major military complex on Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. In fact, according to the *Newsweek*, Washington, prior to taking a decision on the construction of the Diego Garcia complex, had obtained the tacit approval of the People's Republic of China.

A *UNI* report from Tokyo on October 25, 1975 had stated that the US Secretary of State had said that China had no interest in seeing an end to the American presence

in Asia. Dr. Kissinger had said, "The Chinese have a basic understanding of United States world policy and the need for the US role in Asia and they showed no interest in seeing it come to an end." He reaffirmed that the main point of his latest visit to Peking was to pave the way for President Gerald Ford's trip to China expected sometime towards the end of November. Another aim of his talks, he said, was to maintain relations between the two nations "at the level preferred by both." Of the Chinese estimate of America, he said: "China's interest in the US depends on its perception of how effectively we perform internationally and how able we are to carry out our policies and to get domestic support for our policies. I would guess that since I first went there in 1971, the series of upheavals we have gone through have not greatly strengthened that perception."

The only time China nowadays attacks the United States is when it condemns the US detente with the USSR. China has carried its cold war with the Soviet Union to the point of supporting imperialist war blocs and bases quite contrary to the declared policies of the Non-aligned Movement. This is further illustrated by the fact China has on several occasions made it clear and she wants US - JAPAN defence ties to be maintained and if possible extended. China supports the United States' naval presence in the Indian Ocean and is very much in favour of Washington building up its fleet in those waters as a check against the growing Soviet naval armada there and thereby also endorses the expansion of American naval facilities on the Island of Diego Garcia.

One of the cherished objectives of the Non-aligned Movement is to achieve co-existence and detente so as to ensure lasting world peace. It is an article of faith with the Non-aligned that universal world peace is possible in this era; and that world war was not "inevitable". Further the Non-aligned believe that peace is essential for development and that in spite of local and regional wars it was possible to extend the areas of detente and peace to reach out to global peace. This, however, was not the view of the ruling elite in China for many years. The Maoists have for years

sought to preach to the peoples of the developing countries the thesis that a world war was inevitable and unavoidable in the immediate future and that such a war would be in the interest of mankind because it would help to eliminate all kinds of exploitation and that for this reason it would be foolish to prevent an arms' race among the big powers and superpowers. What the present hierarchy thinks about the inevitability of a Third World War is not known, but it acts as if a World War would benefit China.

The logic behind the Chinese attitude to be Non-aligned can be easily understood by all Non-aligned countries. It is clear that the Maoists want to isolate and separate the Non-aligned from the other forces in the anti-imperialist struggle and most of all from the socialist countries and the international working class movement. China also wants to neutralise the radical content in the Non-aligned Movement and to isolate the Non-aligned in a way that it would be possible for China to mobilise them in its attempt to weaken the Soviet Union. It will thus be seen that the policies of even the most "moderate" of the Non-aligned countries run completely counter to the policy of the Maoists (and now the Huaists) who see the Non-aligned Movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America as a something to be harnessed to Peking's side to defeat and destroy its main enemy, the Soviet Union. For this purpose China has also joined hands with the USA and Japan. It can be shown that China has not, in any concrete way, helped the national liberation struggle in Palestine, in Cyprus, in Chile, or anywhere else for that matter. In fact, in Chile, China opposed President Allende's government and avoided taking part in voting on a draft resolution for the 29th session of the UN General Assembly (in November 1974) which condemned the Pinochet regime of terror in Chile. It is also known that, during the war in Vietnam, Peking had put many obstacles in the way of transporting through Chinese territory Vietnam-bound cargo from the USSR, in particular Soviet-made anti-aircraft hardware especially during the time of escalated air raids against North Vietnam. Many other instances can be cited where China's actions were contrary to the interests of the

national liberation movements on which the Non-aligned Movement places many hopes for the eventual emancipation of mankind. China has not, furthermore, supported the struggle against the racist regimes in South Africa and Rhodesia and in many matters has co-operated with them in the economic field. In Angola, China was on the same side as South Africa and some western countries against the MPLA. It is also reported that China has cooperated on uranium enrichment technology with South Africa. It has bought over 70,000 tons of Chromium ore annually, from Rhodesia and has also purchased anti-aircraft rockets and armoured carriers from South Africa. China has favoured a Vorster-style "dialogue" between South Africa and the Black African States.

China has undoubtedly paid lip service to Non-alignment. But it has raised a hue and cry that hegemonistic super-powers were seeking to dominate the Non-aligned Movement to intimidate members into following policies that suit the current geopolitical imperatives of Peking and/or Washington. Even the blind will realise that China's real purpose is to isolate the developing countries of the non-aligned world from the socialist countries which have always supported the struggle for national freedom and economic emancipation. There is really nothing in common between Maoism (or now Huaism or Dengism) and Non-alignment. This is something which the people in Sri Lanka and the rest of the Non-aligned world must take into consideration. It is necessary to be aware of these basic realities not to be misled by propaganda from Peking or anywhere else. All that China, the USA and certain countries want is that the Non-aligned Movement should be persuaded attack the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in the way the imperialists have always done.

Though there has been sweeping hierarchial, ideological and policy changes in China since the death of Mao, there has been no change in regard to Peking's attitude to Non-alignment. At a banquet in honour of King Birendra of Nepal in Beijing on August 27, 1979, Premier Hua had stated according to a Xinhua report: "We highly evaluate the Non-aligned Movement for upholding the principles of independence

and of not joining any bloc and firmly support the just struggles waged by the Non-aligned countries in all parts of the world. It is our hope that the coming Sixth Non-aligned Summit conference will eliminate interference and work in concert so that the Movement may forge ahead victoriously along the course already chartered. The development of the movement is by no means all plain sailing. Some countries have brought the dictates of a Superpower into the movement in violation of the wishes and interests of the numerous non-aligned countries. Naturally, this line of action has met with the latter's opposition." The only way China looks at any matter is in the context of its anti-Soviet inhibitions.

A Xinhua special correspondent analysed the perspectives of the Sixth Non-aligned Summit on August 19, 1979, Excerpts from this special commentary will show how the Chinese approached the Non-aligned and characterised the minor differences within the Movement as the dominant factor: "Reports from various parts of the world revealed that there are sharp differences between member states of the movement and the drafter (i. e. Cuba) of the Declaration on a series of important questions such as how to uphold the aims and principles of the movement; how to preserve unity of the movement and how to analyse the world situation..... According to observers of some member states, though 'anti-hegemonism' is written into the draft, actually it is spearheaded at the Western powers. The term 'natural ally' is not to be found in the draft. However, it is emphasized in the draft that non-aligned countries should be linked with 'progressive countries and forces.' 'Non-alignment' is defined in the draft to mean non-participation in military alliances set up as a result of big power rivalry as well as regional military arrangements or alliances having relevance to the rivalry. This is to provide cover for Cuba and Vietnam which have actually entered into military alliance with the Soviet Union. The Egyptian weekly *Rose El Youssef* said pointedly that the draft declaration prepared for the movement is a 'prejudiced declaration' in essence, it is a 'declaration of alignment....." The commentary paid special attention to the objections raised by certain member states especially from ASEAN countries about the role of Cuba and Vietnam and their alignment

with the Soviet Union. The commentary also wanted further "democratisation" by effecting major organisational changes. From this *Xinhua* commentary, it was clear that China was confident that, at Havana, the Cuban draft would be rejected and that the Summit would end up in an unseemly squabble. China concretely wanted the Pol Pot regime to be seated as the representative of Kampuchea, but did not succeed in this. But she did succeed, however, in keeping the Heng Samrin government out — resulting in a consensus compromise that the seat would be kept vacant until the Ministerial Meeting of 1981 when a report by a Special Committee on Kampuchean representation would be considered.

Burma which has in recent times followed the Peking line in the Non-aligned Movement most cautiously went the furthest in Havana by wanting the whole Non-aligned Movement "reorganised" — not satisfied with the Yugoslav proposals to effect few organisational changes — and threatened to quit if the Resolution she had tabled was not given effect to. The Burmese proposal was one among the hundreds of "resolutions" which the Summit did not have time to discuss or debate. Burma did not quit the Movement at Havana, but did so later at the UN where the US and its allies decided to perpetuate the Pol Pot regime as representative of Kampuchea. Though China with US help was able to retain Pol Pot at the UN, the Pol Pot mirage will disappear sooner than the Chiang Kai Shek claim to represent mainland China at the UN.

China, like the US, had expected Yugoslavia to lead the campaign to break up the Movement. President Tito expressed his point of view on many matters forcefully, and helped to fashion the Final Declaration, but he at no time wanted a split. He only wanted the Non-aligned Movement not to be dominated by the USSR or any other power. He wanted Nonaligned unity and the Movement to grow. He did not want an anti-Soviet barrage. That is why the Summit at its conclusion unanimously adopted a resolution on President Tito: "The Sixth Summit Conference of the Heads of State

or Government of the Non-aligned countries, held in Havana, Cuba, warmly welcome the presence of His Excellency Josip Broz Tito, President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, one of the father-founders of our movement and its first President, the Conference voices its profound gratitude to President Tito for his contribution to the formulation of principles and aims of non-alignment, for his tireless efforts in the preservation and consolidation of unity and solidarity of the non-aligned countries, and for his personal contribution to the establishment of a more equal, juster and peaceable order in the world. In token of merit for the above-mentioned, the Conference expresses special recognition to President Tito.’

Whilst the US and China kept exaggerating a few differences within the Movement and made them into big issues, President Tito like the overwhelming majority of leaders at the Summit stressed the factors that united them. This is what President Tito said in his speech at the Havana Summit: “Our movement is turned towards the key problems of the present day world — to peace, security, development and general progress. It expresses the essential interests of all mankind, and not only of one part of it. Its historical responsibility is therefore so much the greater. It is the responsibility of all of us. We must always bear in mind all that we have in common, all that unifies us. We must strive against everything that divides us and resist all attempts to insinuate alien interests into our ranks. It is in our lasting interest and our strategic objective at this moment further to affirm the authentic principles of non-aligned policy and, on this basis, to strengthen the solidarity, unity and action capability of the non-aligned movement. These are reliable guidelines for our future course of action. Only thus can we successfully contribute to the creation of the world we envision.”

The Havana Summit did not disintegrate in spite of the vigorous attempts by the USA and China to utilise some differences within the Movement to achieve this result. A radical forward-looking Final Declaration was adopted with

near total unanimity with a few reservations mainly by the client states of the USA, UK, France and China. But the anti-aligned activities and propaganda barrages carried on by the USA and China in the period after Havana and the cold war onslaughts launched about Kampuchea and Afghanistan have slowed down and delayed the implementation of the Havana Summit Action Programme especially in regard to the New International Economic Order.



## ATTACK ON DETENTE

Having failed to break the unity of the Non-aligned Movement at Havana and having even failed to prevent a further radicalisation of the demand for a New international Economic Order, the Carter-Brezhezinski combine stepped up the all-out attack on detente they had launched earlier. This was intended to weaken the Nonaligned Movement which had undoubtedly derived increasing strength from an expanding detente. It is only in an era of peace that the demand for a just economic order can gather strength and momentum. The attack was also deliberately directed at dividing the Nonaligned by triggering regional and zonal confrontations that would tend to divide the radicals from the others. The main purpose of this exercise was, no doubt, to create a gulf between the socialist bloc led by the Soviet Union on the one hand and the Non-aligned Movement on the other.

By the time the Havana Summit ended on September 9, 1979, with its Final Declaration accepted with total unanimity on economic questions, the Carter administration faced a major dilemma. The entire array of programmes so laboriously put

into operation by Carter had collapsed. The *Camp David Strategy* of creating a joint Israeli-Egyptian military policing force for the purpose of containing the Arab resistance to imperialism and also to keep continental Western Europe out of the Middle East and Africa finally collapsed when the Israeli Government of Menachem Begin appointed to the post of Foreign Minister, Mr. Yitzah Shamur, the outspoken Speaker of the Knesset who had tirelessly campaigned against Camp David from 1978 onwards. The non-aligned at Havana had overwhelmingly rejected Camp David (only four countries had extended support to the Egyptian-Israeli Agreement as a possible framework for Middle East peace). And now, with Palestinian autonomy in the dustbin and the Jewish settlements in occupied lands on the West Bank an Israeli *fait accompli*, the Camp David Accord is in total and complete shambles, Ail attempts to rescue Camp David -- at least to keep it going until the US Presidential election -- have failed.

Secondly, the bottom has been knocked out of the *Islamic Fundamentalist* policy of the Carter Administration by Khomeini's numerous statements in regard to the US (including the hostages in Teheran). In a recent statement (in the form of a letter to the American people) Khomeini had said: "Your esteemed nation has fought through and endured many wars and struggles to attain independence, liberty and to become a new nation. Your society also produced men of the calibre of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln and yours is the only nation which uses the Statue of Liberty as a national symbol. How has it come about that your government now denies such God-given rights to other peoples and seeks to silence any voice for independence and justice elsewhere..... Can you not see that your government's readiness to continue to support this murderer, the ex-Shah, who ordered the killings of some 100,000 of our people shows that your government sanctions such brutal crimes? Can giving shelter to such a person and refusing to return the wealth stolen from our tortured and deprived nation be the act of other than an accomplice in such criminality? In using such pretences that the ex-Shah is either a political refugee or a former good friend in order to shelter

him from justice, the United States Government makes a mockery of both humanity and fundamental morality. When Rudolf Hess, the Nazi, fled to Britain, did you hesitate to try him? And had Hitler or Mussolini fled to some neutral country would you have not nonetheless demanded their extraditions for trial? Certainly, the crimes of dictators are sufficient grounds for bringing them to trial. This man, Mr. Pahlavi, is worse than even Hitler or Mussolini for at least those men were patriots whereas Mr. Pahlavi robbed the wealth of his own people and destroyed his own and their country. Lest this sound like exaggeration, please consider the following summary of Mohammed Reza Pahlavi's achievements .....” And then follows a summary of the Shah's crimes committed with help of the US. The full list of the Shah's crimes was presented at the four-day International Conference on “United States Intervention In Iran during the past 27 Years” in the first week of June 1980 in Teheran.

Brzezinski had placed great hopes on using Islamic Fundamentalism to weaken the Soviet Union along an artificial arc of crisis to encircle the USSR from Turkey to Afghanistan. The Arab, Iranian, Afghan — and in fact the Islamic — fight against imperialism, however, could not be diverted against the Soviet Union under cover of fighting “un-Islamic godless communists” by Islamic Fundamentalist slogans. Moreover, Moscow has shown a hitherto “unsuspected ability to turn around and direct religious fundamentalist movements which were originally organised and deployed as pawns against Soviet policies against the imperialists.....” and thus demonstrate “an ability to cope with religious fundamentalist weapon..... to make Washington's entire strategy of the arc of crisis no longer operative.”

Thirdly, Brzezinski's *China Card* policy had also collapsed when the clever mandarins around Deng Xiaoping took complete control over China's affairs at the last meticulously prepared Central Committee meeting where long-term policies were put into shape and place — policies which will be pursued for a long time on the basis of Peking playing both its “American Card” and its “Russian Card”. The essence of

this policy is clear: China has decided to play the *China Card* herself and not in the way the US wants to play it. Deng will also play Peking's "American Card" at every opportunity, but he has made it clear that under no circumstances will China allow the fantasy-ridden geopoliticians of the White House, particularly Brzezinski, to play the "China Card" as a means of bluffing the Soviets. The Chinese now talk of "safeguarding world peace" and not so much of the much-predicted world war but to gain the time they want to make China real world power. Any move proposed by Brzezinski, whether in Pakistan or in South East Asia, which places China, rather than the United States in the risk of direct confrontation with the mighty Soviet Union has been and will be carefully and masterfully avoided. Carter is not able to play the "China Card" the way he wants to teach the Russians a lesson, but Deng Xiaoping seems able to play Peking's "American Card" much to the embarrassment of many in Washington.

Although Sino-Soviet rapprochement seems unlikely in the foreseeable future, there is no doubt that China will milk the West for everything possible in the way of technology, military and non-military, by shouting anti-Soviet slogans. But for all practical purposes the notorious "China Card" of Brzezinski is over and a new era has begun - almost from the time of Havana when USA's client states in the Non-aligned Movement could not salvage Peking's face from its failure to teach Vietnam a lesson or rescue Kampuchea for China. Whether the geopoliticians in Washington have fully realised this reality is not clear, but observers of current affairs in Western Europe, the Middle East and the rest of the world have taken note of it. China wants to be a world power in her own right and Peking will endeavour to use the American "barbarians" to attain this end. Carter and Brzezinski, in their mad desire to denigrate detente and weaken the Soviet Union, had hoped that their China Card will do the trick. But the plans have gone awry. They have begun to backfire in the most unexpected fashion inspite of Carter's pleas to China to join a world front to "contain" the Soviet Union.

All this has happened in the one year before the 1980 American Presidential Election. The success of the Havana Summit had shown that the foreign policies the Carter Administration had followed for three years had proved to be a miserable failure. The Carter-Brzezinski combine, therefore, has had to compensate for the obvious setbacks of suffering one failure after another. And this they could do only by creating an atmosphere of a "state of emergency", a war of psychosis, chauvinism and militarism, anti-Soviet hysteria and the threat of a World War,

This plan for the rehabilitation of Carter began in the second half of 1979. The Gallup poll taken on June 24, 1979, showed that only 24 percent of the Democratic voters supported Carter while 62 percent wanted Kennedy. The Administration's economic policies had also proved a failure; inflation continued unimpeded; prices went up by more than 200 per cent; unemployment remained at a high level; the promises to balance out the budget, reduce its chronic deficit, solve the energy problems and cut taxes and military expenditure - all remained on paper. Scandals undermined the Administration's authority; five members of the Carter 12-men Cabinet retired, some of them following disclosure of their involvement in large-scale financial misdeeds. The "human rights campaign" had miserably flopped.

As a result many Americans began to speak of the need "to change the horse", accusing the Administration of a lack of "leadership". They felt that the President was incompetent and unable to cope with problems of national importance. It was because of this that the Administration's "think tank" decided to fall back on the old adage: "You don't change horses in mid-stream," and to convince people that it would be unwise to change Carter with on-going crises; and such crises had therefore to be created and sustained. Artificial fomenting of international crises became the order of the day. Two aims were pursued in this; first, to distract public attention from domestic problems and second, to regain the trust of influential reactionary forces, and above all, the military-industrial complex. The "Soviet military

brigade in Cuba" story, invented from beginning to end was the first try out in creating such an artificial crisis. The scheme flopped. No one believed in this "crisis", as it was concocted too awkwardly and falsely. But from the enthusiasm with which reactionary circles took up this idea the Administration realised that this was just the move expected of it.

The next, the "Iranian crisis", was also actually engineered by Washington. This time more artfully, The White House, it can be said, provoked events in the Iranian capital, knowing that warm hospitality toward the former Shah of Iran in New York would result in serious repercussions in Teheran. Nevertheless, Washington took the risk. The Carter Administration knew that the US Embassy in Teheran and the hostages would be seized - if the Shah was permitted in the US. The Iranians acted predictably and a full-scale crisis was created. The chauvinistic wave of "patriotism" thus caused swept over many Americans and for a while distracted the attention of the people from vital internal issues. This encouraged the Washington strategists to further adventures in foreign policy. But the costly Carter gimmick of the Iran hostage crisis has boomeranged in a way that has put the US Administration in a cleft stick. An official publication of Iran's Ministry of Information in one statement demanding a revision of international laws raised a question that the US will find difficult to answer: "If the seizure of 50 so-called personnel of the American embassy is considered to transgress human rights, what does holding 35 million Iranian people hostage and plundering their resources by means of violence, torture, imprisonment, harshness and cruelty mean? Western governments and the press media condemn the seizure of the so-called US embassy or den of espionage and the office of CIA agents like Richard Helms as being a transgression of accepted international law. They argue that according to the Vienna agreements, embassies, diplomats, political personnel and those who hold political passports, all have political immunity and that this is one of the foundations of international relationships .....When the super-powers were writing and approving

these international diplomatic regulations, the world was divided between the colonizers and the colonized. The embassies of the colonizers and the super-powers were used not only as centers for studying and adjusting the political, economic and social and cultural affairs of the colonized countries, not only did the diplomats and political personnel have political immunity, not only to protect their own interests but to apply military pressure and not only did they directly interfere in the internal and external affairs of the captured, colonized countries but even their citizens, according to the imposed agreement of "capitulation" were immune from arrest and trial in a colonized country. In summary, all political and diplomatic international laws which were issued by the colonizing countries as agreements or conventions, were used as a means towards strengthening their colonizing influence in oppressing and plundering the oppressed, weak and abused countries. Due to their constancy to the continuation of these laws, the culture and social understanding of Western people grew to the point that they believed these laws to be unchangeable principles or accepted traditions and any deviation in their logic was considered to be a transgression of approved principles. Even in the 20th century, in 1960, the corrupt Pahlavi regime, approved of 'capitulation' and the immunity of American agents, both military and social advisors. They agreed to the immunity of US agents and their not being arrested or tried in Iran, thus, overlooking and destroying the political independence of this country.....It has not as yet been forgotten, when President Johnson intended to bomb North Vietnam. he first planned a thoroughly false scheme, with the help of the CIA and the Pentagon which they injected into the public thoughts of the American people. They said that they had to start bombing Vietnam because the Vietnamese Army had attacked the US navy in Tunekan Gulf. Afterwards, press reports and questions of members of Congress proved that it had been a false claim and that the Vietnam Army had never attacked the US Navy in Tunekan Gulf. Taking the problems into consideration, when speaking about international laws and regulations, a plundered and oppressed nation like Iran, has the right to ask for the issuance and

approval of new international political and legal standards and regulations to be effective and honoured between the nations....." Carter can find little or no comfort in the way the Islamic fundamentalists have turned on the US.

The "Afghan crisis" did not come with the Soviet intervention as American propaganda has made it out. It had been prepared before-hand and most carefully. There was worked out a conception of a "threat to the national security of the USA," on the plea of which the Administration embarked on the militarisation of the country and the sharpening of relations with the USSR and the international situation as a whole. Today the White House is trying to prove that the events in Afghanistan were the reason that forced Washington to take "retaliatory measures" and, in particular, to put forward the so-called "Carter Doctrine" of open interference in the Indian Ocean area. But the fact is that the Carter Administration had intended long before the events in Afghanistan to allocate the Pentagon an extra trillion dollars for its war machine which lays a material basis for an aggressive policy. The US administration needed the Afghan crisis, said Arthur Schlesinger, a prominent historian, because the country's attention could be switched from the American hostages in Teheran and also from the real problems on the home front. The new crisis made it possible for the white House to extend the "emergency situation" for some more time and demagogically use it in its own interests during the primaries, while refusing to debate substantive domestic problems.

This is precisely the tactic used by Carter in the primary phase of the election campaign. At first he did not appear personally in the States that were preparing for the primaries; his wife and mother as well as Vice President Walter Mondale deputised for him. Carter stayed away from nation wide debates because they could lay bare the vulnerable spots in his policy. Tension was artificially and deliberately whipped up in the international arena in order to avoid broad debate of the domestic situation. Americans were told that with war being near their doors there was simply no



room for debate. One cannot fail to note that the creation of an atmosphere of war hysteria in the country laid its imprint on the current presidential election race. Republican contenders like Ronald Reagan and George Bush began vying with Democrats in demonstrating their bellicose attitudes and parading the cold war rhetorics in the drive to keep pace with Carter. Carter's Democratic rival, Senator Kennedy, has adopted, on the whole, rather pragmatic and realistic attitudes to current problems. But he too, has been in some way caught up in the prevailing sentiment and failed to raise the "banner of liberalism" - to use an American cliché - to meet the Carter onslaught. As a result the primaries have been virtually made a test of the contender's and constituents' "loyalty" and patriotism" which was precisely what Carter and Brzezinski want.

How long can this go on? American observers ask this question and answer the question themselves. They say that there is only one option - the creation of a new "crisis" every month or even every fortnight. This was necessary for the Administration to maintain the artificially inflated situation of tension, for otherwise, everything will burst as a soap bubble sooner rather than later. It was in pursuance of this that the new Cuban crisis involving refugees and dissidents was created with the assistance of a new pro-US Latin American countries, but Castro outmanoeuvred Carter by permitting all the lumpen dissatisfied with the austere socialism in Cuba to quit the country freely. And now Carter and the US have a problem of a 100,000 dissident, "anti-social" elements from Cuba in their lands. To compound the complicated situation, Carter initiated the *Shield 80* operation in the Caribbean to occupy, if necessary, countries like Cuba and Nicaragua. But even this failed.

To sustain this policy of creating one crisis after another, Carter had to bludgeon Western European countries to adopt warlike postures and measures. In spite of their reluctance, Carter compelled European countries to agree at the NATO summit on December 12, 1979 to instal 600 new sophisticated nuclear missile weapons in Europe. Zbigniew Brzezinski

hailed that development as "the most important event since the Peace of Westphalia of 1648". What did he mean? Dr. Brzezinski's evocation of the Peace of Westphalia on the occasion of the Dec. 12 NATO resolution was meant to indicate, as he explained, that just as the Peace of Westphalia had relegated the Hapsburg claims to the "Holy Roman Empire" to the junkheap of history and had introduced into the arena of history the Richelieu-Mazarin concept of the sovereign nation-state, so also, according to Dr. Brzezinski's reckoning, the NATO resolution would in turn relegate the notion of the sovereign nation-state to the museum, and replace it with what he affectionately calls the "just and equitable new world order," or "One World government" for the unsophisticated. Dr Brzezinski knew what he was after - after all, the West European governments, with their decision to have the Pershing II missiles deployed on their soil, had in fact capitulated to a military policy that no sovereign nation-state ever allows itself to entertain: the policy that their national territory can be used for tactical nuclear warfare fought by third powers. In this instance, the NATO resolution was tantamount to West Germany, Italy, Denmark and so forth allowing the United States and the Soviet Union to fight proxy nuclear wars on their national territory. In this sense, the historical principles of the Peace of Westphalia was violated by the NATO. What happened after the NATO decision on December 12? The Soviet action in Afghanistan was the first tangible result. The Brzezinski arc of crisis around the Soviet Union had thus been extended from Turkey to West Germany. Before this NATO decision to place these missiles in Western Europe, Moscow had 30 minutes time to deal with missiles from the USA and so did the USA have with regard to Soviet missiles. Now with missiles in Western Europe, the Soviet Union has only 6 minutes to deal with them whilst the USA still had the 30 minutes. Brzezinski had, it is now admitted, taken steps to mount a campaign from Pakistan against the post-April 1978 regime in Afghanistan. Every mistake by the Taraki and Amin regimes (they unfortunately made many) was exploited to organise guerilla

subversion. There are also good reasons to believe that Hafizulla Amin had been won over by Carter and that an anti-Saur Revolution was scheduled for December 27/28, 1979. Part of Amin's strategy was to invite the Soviet Army earlier (he did on December 9) to help him contain the guerrillas—no doubt to place the Soviets in a most embarrassing position when the Kabul coup to establish the Islamic Revolution was staged with Amin's help. But the Babrak Karmal faction, which had been at the receiving end of Amin's ruthlessness for a long time, moved in, and the Soviet intervention to save the socialist Saur Revolution of 1978 became real.

It will thus be seen that Brzezinski's Islamic arc of crisis and the Brzezinski arc of NATO nuclear missiles heightened the tensions from 1978/79 and they reached bursting point in the early part of 1980. This was what Brzezinski had wanted. All this must be seen in the perspective of a new Ideology that certain Anglo-American interests have been quietly promoting since the end of the first world war and which is still very much in the shadows so far as the general public is concerned. Brzezinski's reference to the Peace of Westphalia, though precise in terms of the world historical issues involved, is exceptional. Another even more unique public statement is a major essay, published in a recent issue of Lord Rothschild's London *Economist*, authored by Mr. Peter Jay, former UK Ambassador to Washington, son-in-law of former British Prime Minister Jim Callaghan and a British policy insider. Peter Jay's policy paper, "*Europe's Ostrich and America's Eagle*", is an exceptionally candid and exceptionally desperate revelation, as unveiling of some of the less sordid mental processes now racing inside the heads of Western European policy-makers who have brought the world to its present crisis.

Ambassador Jay argued first, the cohesion of the "West" is in jeopardy as a result of the recent resurgence of European nationalism; second, if "continental European nationalism" is not reversed, the "cohesion of the West" will collapse, and that a cohesive and integrated continental

Western Europe and USA was essential to deal with the Soviet Union to be "red and dead"; third, if the offensive of "European nationalism" is not reversed, the decade of the 1980's will witness the emergence of a "European (France-German) Reich" based on the European monetary System, dominated by economic nationalism, political centralism, military self-assertion, "eroding and in the end destroying the bonds and so the benefits of the West"; fourth, if this new "European Reich" emerges out of the EMS, it will cause the re-emergence in the United States of nationalist forces (which he calls "the isolationists") for the first time since they lost their battle to "Roosevelt and Churchill in 1941", referring to the Atlantic Charter conference off the coast of Newfoundland,

These eventualities, according to Ambassador Jay, must be prevented if what he calls "the West" is to survive. Peter Jay wants a world government to dominate all mankind and said: "These lessons implied a new international philosophy; based on the principles of the role of International law and the sovereignty of the nation state under it, of the conciliation of disputes, of collective security, of liberal trade and payments, of cooperative global management of a flexible and stable currency system and of capital aid for postwar reconstruction and for new development..... these new principles were embodied in the characteristic institutions which defined the postwar political and economic order; the United Nations and its agencies; the World Court; the Bretton Woods twins — The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank; the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; the Marshall Plan and the Organisation for European Cooperation and Development; and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation,"

For the first time do we see in a prestigious publication the formal admission of a former senior British official that all the postwar institutions of "the West" from NATO to the IMF, were designed for the purpose of taming and emasculating the historical institution of the nation-state. The liberal, viciously antinationalist post-Atlantic Charter world

of the IMF, the World Bank, the United Nations, NATO, the "bridges" of the nation state will come apart, no doubt, if the half dormant forces of American nationalism—those forces that Ambassador Jay scornfully slanders as "isolationist"—break through in this election year. And if these forces have the good sense of joining with, and leading "Europe's genius for nationalism" the EMS, nothing will be left standing of this corrupt, liberal world to which Ambassador Jay is accustomed. But his world will not collapse because of the imminent erupting of the forces of nationalism. On the contrary, these recent stirrings of what Peter Jay calls "nationalism" are only reactions, hasty responses to the fact that his "western order, liberal and universal" has been coming apart at the seams since at least 1967.

A 20th century peace of Westphalia will no doubt end this mad dream of an Anglo-American one world government—a Westphalia that will cement a concord of sovereign nations, a world system of humanist republics devoted to the task of developing the Third World through a New International Economic Order by means of science and technology. Will France or Germany submit to the Brzezinski-Carter-Thatcher blackmail to create a world government dominated by the US and UK?

Before these speculations are answered, the aggressive and provocative policies of Carter and Brzezinski have already brought the world to the brink of war. The Kissinger techniques to make the USA supreme have also superseded the amenable policies of men like Cyrus Vance. And Carter has also publicly criticised the policies of his former Secretary of State. Carter also succeeded in brow-beating western European countries to support his economic sanctions against Iran by stating that this was the only way of stopping pressure at home to compel him to use force against Iran. On April 17, 1979 Carter had announced that he would opt for a war confrontation on Iran if Europe refused to capitulate to his demands for active endorsement of his sanctions policy against Iran.

The meeting of the European Community Foreign Ministers on April 21-22, 1980, presented a spectacle not seen throughout the past decade. The British, the allies of Washington, were allowed the role of "mediators" between the hardliners who wanted the adoption of full economic sanctions (reportedly West Germany) and those others (France) who opposed sanctions altogether. The proposal finally adopted was that put forward by British Foreign Minister Lord Carrington for a two-tier approach in the first place, the EC immediately reduced the size of its embassy personnel in Teheran, makes visas harder to come by for Iranian nationals and ensures a complete arms embargo against Iran. The second phase, scheduled for adoption May 17, would be full scale sanctions if the hostages are still being held at that time.

It must be noted that each step taken by the Europeans to try and appease Carter, thinking it would head off a worse disaster thereby, only limited their independence and room for manoeuvre in foreign policy. An influential mouthpiece of the British elite stated its case in its editorial ".....regarding the unhappy diplomats as the equivalent of prisoners of war. A great power does not shape its strategy around the release of 50 POWS in a minor theatre of war, .....the containment of dangerous big Russia is the item that; should be at the top of the western agenda..... Perhaps giving support to America on Iran will not after all, become a way of dodging support for America or Afghanistan..... and thus encouraged, the West will apply itself with new heart to the business of containing Russia."

The Venice Summit, although it had a superficial veneer of Atlantic and NATO unity, revealed fissures in the alliance that are hard to patch. The Indian daily *Patriot* in an editorial summed up as follows: "Seven chiefs of the capitalist world went to the salubrious island of San Giorgio to do some cool and collective thinking about the problems of their own creation. They seemed to have returned to their capitals exasperated, without having agreed on the solution of any vital problem concerning them. The chiefs are said to have

been annoyed, gloomy and alarmed and dissatisfied with one another, notwithstanding the joint statements they produced. The differences of approach on the question of Afghanistan was made evident by what President Jimmy Carter told Journalists and what President Valery Giscard d'Estaing said. Obviously, Mr. Carter wants the Soviet Union and Kabul to surrender all their positions and settle the issues on his terms, while Mr. Giscard d'Estaing would prefer negotiations. Like many other European leaders Mr. Giscard is worried over the American drive to destroy East-West links and perpetuate confrontation between the divided world. The West European countries have established peaceful commercial relations with the Soviet Union and are unwilling to become American dependencies once again. They are also unhappy about the US attempts to dictate terms to West Asia and deal on their behalf with the oilproducing Arab countries..... The differences among the leading capitalist countries reveal the failure of the US policy to reverse the process of multilateral cooperation and to create a solid bloc under its dominating leadership. But there is not yet any clear sign of rebellion among the West European countries. The main reason for this is that the Europeans have not given up the obsolete concept of exploiting the developing world as a closed European community, marching from success to success. Above all, they depend more upon US military support than the prospect of expanding cooperation with the Socialist countries. They have yet to realise that we are living in a small, highly integrated world, calling for a better organisation of mutual relations. The alternative is increasing conflicts and misery, ending in self-destruction.

The *Pravda* on April 16 had warned: "Some people regard US attempts to whip up the atmosphere in the Persian Gulf region as an integral part of the general American plan to provoke a level of confrontation whereby economic self-sufficiency and political independence would become impossible for West Europe. If Washington succeeds in causing a quarrel between West European countries and Iran, and consequently the entire Muslim world then the main fuel supply channels will be closed and West Europe will suffer a serious reverse in its economic development....."

the American ultimatum is to be examined at the conference of the Common Market Foreign Ministers..... whether or not they manage to find a reasonable way out at this meeting, one thing is clear; the policy of confrontations which Washington is trying to revive severely restricts East Europe's freedom of action in foreign policy and its economic independence.'

Europe's war avoidance strategy over particularly the past year has consisted of buttressing detente by strengthening economic relations with Moscow and through the instrument of the European Monetary System created last summer, set up the mechanism to broaden this cooperation into a Third World development perspective with Arab cooperation. This war avoidance strategy has now nearly collapsed. The irony is that in their progressive capitulation to the United States, under Carter's threats of triggering international war, the Europeans are in fact bringing the world that much closer to facing the superpower nuclear confrontation they fear.

Detente has thus been made a shadow of what it was or what it should be. Having obtained the support of the European Community to support his economic sanctions against Iran on April 21-22 by saying that it was the only way to stop the USA from going to war, two days later he ordered the commando invasion of Iran not only to free the hostages, but also to capture Khomeini and indulge in other acts of war.

This invasion, as the world knows, ended in a fiasco!



**ON TO KABUL**

President Carter does not seem to have learnt anything from his Iranian fiasco of April 24 or the other setbacks he has suffered. What the United States had planned in Iran on April 24 was not a limited action to rescue 53 hostages, but a far-reaching military intervention to crush the Iranian revolution. The huge arsenal of armaments prepared for the operation is an indication of its magnitude. This aggressive adventurism of the Carter administration is not limited to the Persian Gulf region alone. It clearly sets the course a hegemonism on a global scale with confrontations in other areas of the world, at present mainly in the Indian Ocean region. There is frenzied build up of arms. The excuse is Afghanistan. Cuba and Vietnam have been temporarily pushed into the background whilst Carter and the Western media concentrate their fire on Kabul.

Even the resignation of Cyrus Vance did not teach Carter a lesson. On April 28, *United Press International* reported that US State Secretary, Cyrus Vance had resigned in protest against Carter's operation in Iran. It was also reported that

a number of other senior State Department officials had left with him. Vance had entered the Carter Administration right after the 1976 elections, in the course of which the President championed cuts in the military budget, disarmament, and greater international cooperation. Vance supported this policy. Soon, however, Carter forgot his pledges and began vigorously reversing America's policies—to start another cold war. Vance had to play the unseemly role of implementing this new policy, although he did not agree with it, as is shown by numerous incidents reported in the press. Now after Carter, in violation of the law, undertook an armed intervention in Iran which outraged the world, Vance found himself in an enviable position. Reports from Washington indicate that, on Carter's insistence, Vance had given his word of honour to representatives of Western Europe that, if they agreed to organise anti-Iranian political and economic sanctions, the United States would not resort to armed actions. However, when representatives of Western European countries, taking Vance's words at their face value, agreed to enforce the prescribed sanctions, and Vance went away on a holiday, preparations were conducted for an invasion of Iran. Having learned about the preparation for the attack Vance returned immediately to Washington and demanded that the preparations be stopped. The President refused to listen to him. As a result, Vance resigned.

Even the British became a little jittery after Carter's Iranian fiasco and his buccaneering bluster in the Caribbean. A *Reuter* report from Washington datelined May 5, stated: "The United States should emphasise on peaceful means rather than military force to free the US hostages in Iran, British Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington said yesterday in a television interview. Lord Carrington was interviewed on ABC television a day after his arrival in the US for talks with President Carter and other US officials..... Asked if Britain would support another US military raid to free the 53 hostages in Iran in view of the unsuccessful mission on April, 24 Lord Carrington replied: 'I think we would have to be convinced that it was likely to release the hostages. And I would think as of now it would be rather unlikely that should happen.

I don't think we've by any means exhausted the diplomatic pressures to put upon the Iranians' .....

Disclosures in the American press about Carter's double-dealing and duplicity, too, do not seem to have deterred him. *Reuter* on May 5 had drawn attention to a *Newsweek* report: "Meanwhile, *Newsweek* magazine has reported that a US C-130 transport plane landed in the Iranian desert two weeks before the aborted mission to rescue the American hostages. *Newsweek* which did not quote any sources, said yesterday that the Pentagon sent the plane to plan trailblazing markers and take soil samples to verify that the landing zone was firm enough to support fuel laden planes. The magazine also reported that Secretary State Cyrus Vance had six fundamental objections to the plan which ultimately forced him to resign his post. According to *Newsweek* Mr. Vance believed the mission would jeopardise US interests in the Gulf, drive Iran closer to the Soviet Union, increase the likelihood that the hostages would be hurt and endanger 200 other Americans in Iran. He also felt that the US was deliberately misleading its allies and that the mission was too difficult to pull off,"

One the same day, May, 5, the *AFP* said: "*Washington Post* reported yesterday the US was prepared to bomb Teheran airport and the Iranian oil-fields to create a diversion during the planned rescue of the American embassy hostages. Quoting sources close to the Pentagon, the paper said that a certain proportion of deaths and inquiries among the hostages as well as the rescuing forces was expected if the mission had gone ahead. The *Post* also said that President Carter had been warned last December that a rescue operation should be attempted before the end of March because of the risk of sandstorms later. It was a sandstorm which put one helicopter out of action and was an indirect factor in causing the operation last month to be called off prior to the accident which killed eight Americans."

A week or ten days before Carter's Iranian raid, Iran's ruling hierarchy unleashed the full force of Muslim Brotherhood gangs against moderate and leftist students on virtually every

university and college campus in Iran simultaneously. Over 1000 people were injured and many killed in bloody battles in Teheran, Tabriz and other urban centres throughout the country. President Carter had announced his intention to use this Iranian "fighting" as a pretext and justification for direct US military intervention into Iran and the Persian Gulf. "I don't know how much longer we can sit here and see them held captive while the situation around them does deteriorate" said Carter, that "the government, the social structure and the economic structure" of Iran is collapsing. And in Israel the leading General Shamron, who led the Israeli attack on Entebbe, Uganda, suggested that the prevailing chaos in Iran could very well facilitate the possibility of a lightning commando raid on the embassy. It has been suggested that the campaign against the leftist and liberal students was spearheaded by pro-US elements in Iran.

Exiled Prime Minister, Shahpur Bakhtiar, in a Paris news conference revealed April 19 that he had paid a secret visit to Iraq to meet with other Iranian political exiles and former military commanders to map strategy to topple the Khomeini regime. In his statement Bakhtiar endorsed sabotage and paramilitary actions, from bases in Iraq, but opposed the use of direct outside military force against Iran. He warned the United States, in particular, not to take military action in the Gulf because it would have "catastrophic consequences for world peace." The July (1980) coup to overthrow the Khomeini regime which was discovered in time is believed to have been organised by Shahpur Bakhtiar and other pro-US loyalists of the Shah.

Now, 14 months after the coming to power of the Iranian Islamic regime, the Carter administration is still determined to play its "Islamic Card" in the area. From the beginning, Zbigniew Brzezinski the President's National Security Adviser, intended to use the Khomeini regime as a device to blackmail not merely the Soviet Union and the Arabs but also USA's Western allies.

Now what is this Islamic Card of Brzezinski?

The overthrow of the Shah in Iran had taken place in January 1978 and the Revolution in Afghanistan had erupted in April 1978. Both took place in Islamic countries. In Iran the revolution had come as a result of national upheaval spread out over a long period of time, in Afghanistan it had come overnight almost as a freak accident with nobody prepared for it. In Iran, it was led by the religious Mullahs and Ayatollahs in coalition with Left-wing parties and trade unions whilst in Afghanistan a left coalition between the Parcham and Khalq parties had seized the opportunity which had been thrust on them. In Iran, the Ayatollahs and Mullahs had succeeded in giving the revolution an imprint of a fundamental Islamic upheaval. In Afghanistan, the Taraki and Amin governments had done everything to show that it was a proletarian revolution in which religion and Islam were downgraded to a backstage position. Iran had quit the CENTO after the overthrow of the Shah and joined the Non-aligned Movement. Afghanistan had been a founder member of the Movement from the days of the monarchy which was abolished in 1973.

But in these two countries, history has followed a zig-zag course which has also created a serious dilemma in the Non-aligned Movement. Islamic fundamentalism had arisen because of the frustration among Muslim peoples in countries where the governments had not been able to resolve basic problems of poverty and hunger through economic emancipation. Those who ruled the country and Machiavellis from the West, anxious to preserve the *status quo* in the existing economic order, sought to divert this discontent to rapid and fanatic religious revivalism. Such attempts among other religious groups has led to Hindu cults in the East and the West and esoterism among the Christians. In all such cases of religious revivalism, a mixture of pseudo left-wing Marxist motivation for economic reform was also thrown in. Iran is perhaps the first country where this religious Ayatollah revivalism had succeeded in combining with the radical parties and trade unions to end the Pahlavi regime. Strangely enough it was also used in Pakistan to overthrow a populist Bhutto

regime and instal a military dictatorship under Zia ul-Haq who withdrew from CENTO to join the Non-aligned. US strategists expected those who believed in the fundamentalist tenets of Islam would be automatically anti-communist, anti-Soviet, anti-Russian and therefore pro-US. In Iran, this expectation proved to be wrong. In Pakistan, too, Islamic fundamentalism turned anti-American as evidenced by the fact that the revolt in Mecca had led to anti-American riots in Islamabad and Lahore.

But there is no doubt that some of the current problems of the Non-aligned Movement have sprung from the recent developments in Iran and Afghanistan, and their impact on neighbouring Pakistan. The Islamic Conference Organisation (one of the manifestations of the Islamic Fundamentalism) which Pakistan has actively sponsored with Saudi Arabia has now emerged as an institution opposed to some of the basic principles of the Non-aligned Movement and especially the anti-imperialist unity of the developing countries of Asia and Africa.

The first Conference of Islamic States which was held in Rabat, Morocco in 1969 laid the foundations of the Organisation. At that time there still existed a sort of united front of the Arab States against Israel, and Egypt was regarded as a front-line State. The Shah firmly ruled in Iran with the aid of his repressive regime. The Saudis did not know of any internal anti-Government movements. No signs of any imminent changes in Afghanistan were seen.

The resolutions adopted at the Rabat Conference were anti-Israeli and to some extent anti-imperialist. But even then it could be seen that the Islamic Conference Organisation had become a danger to the unity of the Non-aligned Movement. A sign of that was the initial invitation to India, where there are over 60 million Muslims, to take part in the Rabat Conference which was later on demonstratively cancelled under pressure of Pakistan and Egypt, both of whom had been displeased with India's policies in the Non-aligned Movement.

The Second Islamic Conference attended by a galaxy of monarchs, Heads of State and Governments of Muslim countries was held in February 1974 in Pakistan in the city of Lahore. In fact it was in Lahore that the Islamic Conference Organisation was created as a functioning international institution. This was largely due to the dynamic personality of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto who was then the Prime Minister of Pakistan and was engaged in making frantic efforts to restore Pakistan's international prestige. For obvious reasons Indian representatives were not even invited to Lahore. On the whole, the Second Islamic Conference demonstrated a degree of unity of the Muslim countries in condemning Israeli aggression and support for the just cause of the Arab people.

The hastily convened emergency conference of Foreign Ministers of the Islamic Conference Organisation in Islamabad in January 1980 had very different objectives from those of the previous meetings. Actually the sponsors of the Conference were Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, although the formal proposal was made by Bangladesh. The Islamabad Conference was convened only to condemn the regime of Babrak Karmal in Kabul and the intervention of the Soviet troops in Afghanistan. Such a condemnation was thought to be the first step to collective action against the new regime in Afghanistan which did not subscribe to Islamic fundamentalism. In reality the Conference was meant to provide an excuse and a smokescreen for the acts of the Pakistani military regime against the socialist government of Afghanistan with encouragement, if not with active participation, from both Washington and Peking.

But the Islamabad session, it is significant, ripped off the facade of unity in the Conference and brought out sharp differences among the participants which did not permit the session to turn exclusively into an anti-Afghan exercise. The sponsors were forced into discussing the Palestinian question and problems of eliminating the consequences of the Israeli aggression, and appropriate resolutions were adopted. It is however to be conceded that the Islamabad session marked

a step towards undermining the Islamic Conference Organisation from within (the Organisation which was set up with a view to activating the struggle for the liberation of the occupied Arab lands, and above all Jerusalem). Instead it got involved in sitting in judgement over the affairs of one Islamic country, refusing to recognize the Government in power there. Ironically, this concern for the Muslim "brothers" in Afghanistan and refusal to recognize the Karmal Government in Kabul were registered at a session hosted by a Government which was itself the off-spring of a coup and had never dared to seek legitimacy through the mandate of an election. Apart from Afghanistan, member countries that were absent in Lahore were Guinea Bissau, Syria, South Yemen, Upper Volta and Uganda.

The Pakistani military regime which received little support for its hectoring stand from most of the Muslim States regarded the January session a "reconnaissance flight". On its initiative it was decided to convene a fresh session of the Islamic Conference Organisation again in Islamabad in April. This was postponed to Mid-May. The Saudis and Pakistanis Intended to put up a major fight at the session. In the period of preparation they were at pains to impress upon the other Muslim countries the need for unreserved condemnation of the Karmal regime as anti-Islamic, while plans for toppling the regime were constantly being worked out and approved in Washington and also in Peking. According to the plan a more or less firm unification of all groups of Afghan rebels into one organisation to be achieved. Leaders of the organisation were expected to form an "Islamic Government of Afghanistan". It was also planned that in the area east of Jalalabad a so-called "free territory" should be established where this so-called Islamic Government would function.

The problem that faces the Pak-Saudi axis to dominate the Islamic Conference Organisation is the growing antagonism between Washington and the Islamic countries. The manner in which the Carter Administration has been backing Israel to the hilt — nullifying within 48 hours the US stand in the



UN with regard to the Israeli-occupied territories on Palestinian soil—has further undermined the position of the most loyal camp-follower of Washington in the Arab world, namely President Sadat of Egypt. More dangerous is the latest US gamble to blockade Iran, even threatening armed action against it, thereby making a total mockery of Carter and Brzezinski's role only three months ago as the defenders of Islam. The Islamic fundamentalists like those in Iran and Libya do not at all share the pro-US stance of Presidents Zia of Pakistan or Bangladesh or the Royal family of Saudi Arabia now in a state of shock after realisation of the dimension of the revolt in Mecca.

In these circumstances, it is understandable why the Non-aligned Co-ordinating Bureau, at the United Nations on May 7 decided by consensus against Cuba accepting a Pakistani invitation to be present at the Islamic conference in Islamabad. India was not in favour of Cuba, current chairman of the Non-aligned Movement, accepting the invitation as a matter of principle. This view was endorsed by a number of countries. But Mauritania, Burundi, Senegal and Iraq, on the other hand, saw no impropriety in the Cuban chairman proceeding to the conference. Yugoslavia reportedly said that there was no precedent by which the Non-aligned chairman had attended any international conference even as an observer or special invitee. Cyprus, Madagascar, Vietnam, Ethiopia and Afghanistan were among other countries opposed to Cuba accepting the invitation. At the end, the Cuban President told the meeting he found no consensus in favour of accepting the Pakistani invitation.

Pakistan's military junta however did not get the pay-off it had expected from the May meeting of Islamic Foreign Ministers' Conference. Knowledgeable observers (IPA) have pointed out that what the Zia regime had hoped for from this two-stage Islamic foreign ministers' meet was a concerted 'jihad' against the Babrak Karmal regime and an underwriting, in terms of resources and Islamic fervour, of the campaign directed from Pakistani territory against the Kabul regime..... The mood in the conference, held during the third week of May after a

delay of a month was actually in marked contrast to the earlier meeting of the Islamic foreign ministers.

"In January, there was a wide-ranging consensus against the Soviet Union's intervention in Afghanistan, and so the second Islamic foreign ministers' conference was to take the consensus against the Soviet Union's intervention in Afghanistan, further by proposing active steps to redeem the Islamic commitments pertaining to Afghanistan, on which rested much of the hopes of the Zia regime. But when the second-phase Islamic foreign ministers' gathering assembled at Islamabad on May 19, the mood in the conference was different.

"Instead of the Islamic foreign ministers directing their concerted blows at the Soviet Union and the Karmal regime in Kabul, a moderate resolution was adopted, notwithstanding disapproval by Pakistan and its allies, which sought a negotiated settlement of the Afghanistan issue. A ministerial panel was set up which spoke of settling the issue through negotiations between the Kabul regime, Iran, Pakistan and the Soviet Union. Although the form was somewhat different from the proposal which the Kabul government had put out on the eve of the Islamic foreign ministers' conference, its contents were a great deal similar. And while the Pakistan government had just rejected the Kabul proposal out of hand, it had to become a party to the resolution adopted in the Islamabad session of the Islamic meet. This hardly added to the prestige of the Islamabad military regime.

"As against this approach towards the Soviet Union, the resolution adopted by the conference on the United States' 'aggression in Iran' was far more stiff. This was in marked contrast to the atmosphere prevailing in the January meeting, when the Iranian attacks on American policies received little support from the bulk of the Islamic foreign ministers. Similarly, on the Palestine issue, Washington was pilloried sharply, and there was none to provide even the semblance of support for American policies, even though a sizeable section was known to be not happy about the new contours which the Islamabad conference had developed.

“What brought about the change in the Islamic conference was no reshuffle in the composition of the conference, nor a shift in the regimes in the 39 Islamic countries — including the Palestine Liberation Organisation — which joined the gathering. What had happened was the wave of anti-Americanism that swept the Islamic countries in the wake of the abortive Washington bid to rescue the American hostages in Teheran. The Palestine deadlock and America’s veto of the Security Council resolution on the question added depth to this fury. The focus was shifted, to a large extent, from Afghanistan to Iran, and from the Soviet Union to United States. As the PLO representative, whose smart sallies in the conference engendered much heat and served to isolate countries like Pakistan, put it, the Afghan question had been blown out of all proportions. The PLO representative was not alone; he received backing from a strong group of modern and progressive Arab States — Syria, Libya and South Yemen. This four-member group, in fact, carried the day largely because the overall mood of the common man in the Islamic countries had changed. The opponents of this view, the conservative bloc in the Islamic conference in which Saudi Arabia was pre-eminent, were reticent in coming to the forefront with their standpoint, as this could not be popular in their own countries. No doubt, the final outcome of the conference tabulated in the resolutions adopted was the result of a compromise between the two opposing approaches and trends in the Islamic countries.”

This Islamic Foreign Ministers’ Conference also showed that the campaign Carter had launched against Afghanistan and the Soviet Union from the time Babrak Karmal came to power and Soviet troops had entered the country had already begun to weaken. The grain embargo had lost its sting with countries like Argentina stepping into the breach to sell the wheat the USSR wanted. Even the partial trade embargo had hurt American exports more than Carter had imagined. And the boycott of the Olympic Games in Moscow in July did not make Brezhnev go on bended knees to Carter to ask for pardon for sending his troops to Afghanistan. On the other hand, in spite of all that western media could concoct and fabricate, in spite of all sabotage, petty insurgencies and guerilla attacks from mercenaries and

fanatic Islamic rebels, the Babrak Karmal government has become strong enough to offer to negotiate with Iran and Pakistan.

Both Pakistan and Iran have so far refused to negotiate with Babrak Kamal, and this is why apprehensions exist that the Islamic Conference Organisation might endeavour to bring fresh divisions into the Non-aligned Movement. However, there is no doubt that most of the Islamic countries have now come under the threat of direct nuclear war with the Indian Ocean being made a war zone by the US. Ever since the downfall of the Shah, the US Navy has been increasing its naval strength in the Indian Ocean. The excuse that it is to meet the Soviet challenge has worn so thin that nobody believes this any more. It is no doubt true that the Soviet Union has kept increasing its own naval strength in the Indian Ocean, but this is understandable in the super-power cold war that Carter and Brzezinski have forced upon the world.

Inspired and other leaks in US press indicate that US has drawn up plans for the invasion of Iran and the Gulf oil countries if the anti-imperialist upsurge in these countries threaten oil supplies to the US and the West. This propaganda excuse has already been used thread-bare before - i.e., "the Russians are coming." The fact is that well informed Western sources have made it clear that the US is ready to invade Iran should an opportunity and excuse present itself - and situation after situation had been created for this purpose but so far the Carter regime has hesitated on the brink to indulge in an all-out invasion.

It is not difficult to understand why Carter and the American oilgarchy are so desperately anxious to retain control of the oil rich region in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East. Statistics released in prestigious Wall Street Journals show the profits of the 10 biggest companies in the US in the 3rd quarter of 1979 pinpointing the huge increase of profit compared with that of the 3rd quarter of 1978.

A.R.C.O.	320.4 million dollars	plus 40%
A.M.O.C.O.	433.8 million dollars	plus 40%
SHELL	393.4 million dollars	plus 63%
S.O.C.A.L.	575.0 million dollars	plus 73%
G.U.L.F.	416.0 million dollars	plus 97%
E.X.X.O.N.	1,145.0 million dollars	plus 118%
MOBIL	595.0 million dollars	plus 131%
CONOCO	247.1 million dollars	plus 125%
SOHIO	366.2 million dollars	plus 190%
TEXACO	612.2 million dollars	plus 211%

Thomas O'Neill, Speaker of the US House of Representatives, considers these profits "the shame of the nation". Senator John Durkin called for an extensive inquiry to reveal the machinations leading to such profits which he compared to the Watergate scandal. James Archutela from the Trade Union of Workers in the Oil, Chemical and Nuclear products industry believes that this is just "a pure and simple pornography".

The reasons why the USA has come in a big way into the Indian Ocean is very clear. The Shah is no longer there to play the policeman's role. And France which has a very powerful naval presence in the Indian Ocean has indicated that it will play a lone ranger role in Asia as in Europe. A *Reuters* message from Paris dated July 13, 1980 stated: "France is keeping a close vigil on the oil route through the Gulf and Indian Ocean, but there is no question of sharing naval tasks with the United States in the region in peace-time, according to French staff officers. They were commenting on US plans calling on America's allies to share efforts in meeting Soviet challenges in the Indian Ocean.

"US Defence Secretary Harold Brown recently briefed French President Valery Giscard D'Estaing on American plans to improve rapid deployment forces and to acquire facilities in Kenya, Oman and possibly Somalia. In a French television interview, Mr. Brown said there was need for a western alliance strategy, sharing the effort both in West Europe and in the Indian Ocean and South-West Asia. The West faces additional challenges in the Gulf and South-west Asia, an area

even more vital to the United States because Europe gets much of its oil from that region now under political pressure from Soviet expansionism.....In the face of the Soviet naval build up in the Indian Ocean, the United States is developing its presence there with its main base on Diego Garcia Island, leased from Britain. In order to preserve that area from political subversion and military attack, all the allies have to work together Mr. Brown said. "So my policy there is for an alliance strategy, sharing the efforts both in Europe and in the Indian Ocean and South-west Asia area where the US has to take the great bulk of the burden.

"French naval officers quoted Rear-Admiral Phillippe Lejeune, Commander-in-Chief of French forces in the Indian Ocean, as having ruled out sharing an effort with the United States in that region at present. During an inspection tour of Reunion island, Admiral Lejeune said, 'France has common interest with its allies, including the United States. But France left the NATO military command structure 14 years ago. That means that France had an international policy of its own, particularly a defence policy independent from that of the United States. Should there be a threat to maritime traffic, 'it is possible that at that moment our governments will agree on a co-ordinated action. French naval chief of staff Admiral Jean Lonnuzel said last year that in the event of aggression beyond a certain level the over-increasing inter-dependence of shipping to Europe would necessarily lead the allies to join forces. The French have been strengthening their garrisons in the Indian Ocean and on the horn of Africa following the 1973 international oil crisis and the Soviet and US naval build up in the area.

"France has secured steady oil supplies from Saudi Arabia, Iraq and other Gulf States in exchange for combat aircraft and missiles. 'These supplies go through the Mediterranean as well as the Indian Ocean round the Cape, and we have to protect our tanker's, a senior French naval officer said. The airstrip on the strategic French island of Juan De Nova between Mozambique and Madagascar, has been extended and reinforced to allow the landing of military transport aircraft from Djibouti. Weather stations and listening posts have been set up on the nearby Bassas da India, Europa, Tromelin and Glorieuses Islands."

It is not the French alone who are in the Indian Ocean besides the USA and the USSR. FRG's *Bundesmarine* sent a small fleet of missile cruisers too on a goodwill mission to the Indian Ocean in April and May 1980 and three ships had called at Colombo also.

This build-up of naval strength by Western Powers in the Indian Ocean began after the 1973 oil crisis and the Iranian Revolution of 1978 which threw out the Shah. It increased significantly after Soviet troops moved into Afghanistan. Sri Lanka and other Non-aligned nations believe that if Soviet troops withdrew from Afghanistan, the excuse for the US and other western powers to escalate the military and naval build up in the Indian Ocean area would be removed. And that is why most non-aligned nations want a Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan—the difficulty however is to secure a guarantee from Pakistan, Iran and the US and China that the *status quo* in Afghanistan would be respected and all interference to help rebels to oust the Babrak Karmal government would cease.

India has worked hard to achieve such a solution. But unfortunately, owing to the intransigent position taken by Pakistan no progress has been made even after the Soviet Union withdrew a division as a symbolic gesture. India, it would appear, does not seem to think that the time is ripe for coming forward with any specific proposals to resolve the Afghan problem. But there are indications that New Delhi seems to think that the time was opportune to get the regional countries together to cry a halt to growing Big Power involvement in the area—which was posing a threat to all of them.

G. K. Reddy writing from New Delhi to the *Hindu* on July 23, "The Indian view is that the massive Soviet military presence in Afghanistan and the increasing US naval build up in the Indian Ocean were generating the kind of tensions that were bound to erupt into a series of local conflicts endangering the entire region. The past experience of the non-aligned world in similar situations had been that, whenever

there was a regional consensus on what the countries of the area should do to discourage such outside involvement in their disputes the rest of the community automatically rallied behind them. It is only when the concerned countries themselves were divided that the non-aligned nations found it difficult to speak with one voice."

The developments of Afghanistan and before that in Kampuchea have no doubt created major difficulties in the Non-aligned Movement. The first time that socialist countries have militarily intervened in Non-aligned countries since the second world war have been in Kampuchea and Afghanistan. Both of these interventions had come in order to help the Kampuchean and Afghan peoples and the socialist revolutions that had taken place in the countries. Imperialist powers naturally thought this an excellent opportunity to brand the socialist powers, especially the Soviet Union, as aggressors. And non-aligned countries, even those friendly to socialist countries, have been thrown into confusion. Even the most perceptive among them have been on the defensive since the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan.

In the three decades after 1950, all other armed military subversions and intervention had come from the imperialist powers. To mention a few: Iran (1953), Guatemala (1954), Egypt (Suez 1956), Vietnam (1954-1975), West Asia (1967 and 1973), Chile (1973) and also a host of other interventions against emancipatory movements particularly in Central and South America and in Africa. It is also significant that after 1950, there were socialist revolutions only in three countries --Cuba (1960)), Vietnam (1975) and Afghanistan (1978). A number of countries have since 1950 gained political independence through national liberation and guerilla wars and a few among them are reaching out to socialism, particularly in Africa and West Asia.

In the case of Kampuchea and Afghanistan, Vietnam and the Soviet Union had to render assistance militarily -- in the same way Cuba had helped Angola and Ethiopia. These interventions have been seized up by the Western Powers to



launch an onslaught on the radical content in the Non-aligned Movement at a time when they were spearheading a drive for a New International Economic Order. Both Vietnam and the Soviet Union have publicly proclaimed that they would withdraw from Kampuchea and Afghanistan once other outside intervention ceased. But Israel and South Africa which persist in their occupation of Arab and African lands have not only refused to withdraw from lands they have illegally occupied but have also annexed much of such conquered territory.

G.K. Reddy analysing the situation on July 23, 1980 pointed out that "As long as the Arab countries remained united in their support for the Palestinian cause, the Non-aligned community automatically lent its full support to it. Similarly, there was no difficulty at all in lining up the whole of the Third World behind the African people's struggle against racism. The non-aligned community was unable to speak with one voice only when the countries concerned were divided in such situations. "The absence of unanimity among South and South-East Asian countries on what could be done to resolve the present crisis in Afghanistan or restore peace in Kampuchea need not deter them from getting together at least to discourage further Big Power involvement in these local conflicts. If the regional countries were able to take such an initiative, it should not be difficult to persuade the rest of the non-aligned community to throw its weight fully behind the effort....."

According to Reddy, the Indian Government felt that: "there was enough scope for initiating moves to get them together to focus world attention on this primary problem. The best way of mobilising the non-aligned countries in support of any cause was to choose issues that emotionally appealed to all of them. It was in this context that the External Affairs Minister Mr. P. V. Narasimha Rao, observed during the recent debate on foreign affairs in Parliament that the initial success of the non-aligned movement lay in the uncanny genius that Nehru, Tito and Nasser displayed in choosing issues of momentous importance like decolonisation to provide the necessary impetus for it. The biggest threat facing the

Third World today, in India's view, was the increasing danger of Big Power rivalries for reimposing their dominance on them.

"It was against this general background that India was making a conscious effort to evolve some sort of consensus among South and South Asian countries for insulating the two regions from Big Power rivalries to the extent possible, before any positive steps could be taken for resolving specific problems like Afghanistan. The concerned regional countries were being sounded through diplomatic channels and the more important members of the non-aligned community kept informed of the progress made in this direction."

The coming months will be a critical and crucial period for the Non-aligned Movement. In 1981, the first Ministerial level meeting of the entire Movement after Havana will take place in New Delhi in January. And in June Colombo will host the conference of the UN Ad Hoc Committee set up to implement the proposal to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace.

A great many things can happen before January 1981, but many countries in the Non-aligned Movement are striving hard to re-establish the unity and dynamism in the Movement needed to cope with the challenges of the day.

POSTSCRIPT

## ON TEACHING A LESSON

Jimmy Carter was installed as President of the United States in January 1977. He was elected on a programme of increased disarmament and expanded detente with promises to eliminate all traces of the cold war. But within a short time of his assuming office, Carter reversed his policies and launched a policy to make the United States the supreme World Power whose *diktat* would be followed unquestioningly by all other States, big and small. To achieve this he relied on a new fervour of nationalistic chauvinism among many Americans who do not seem to think deeply on international problems. They were persuaded to believe that the security of their country was under threat and that the US should therefore embark on a massive re-armament programme (for the greater glory and profit of powerful US arms manufacturers). Carter thereafter proceeded to adopt aggressive policies (far removed from the tenets of the champions of freedom and emancipation like Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln or even the liberal traditions of Franklin Delano Roosevelt) to re-furbish *Pax Americana* to wield, once again, the authority the USA had flamboyantly flourished for nearly a decade when she was the sole atomic power.

But times have changed.

And Carter has had to resort to dangerous gimmicks to bolster American power which had been badly shaken with the weakening of the dollar and the collapse of the Bretton Woods world monetary system early in the seventies. The Third World was on the move and there was a persistent demand for a New International Economic Order to end the monopoly and exploitative greed of the handful of rich Western industrialised nations led by the US. OPEC (with its oil price hikes) hung ominously like a Sword of Damocles over the continued enrichment of the advanced industrial nations-- (but their oil companies made billions because of OPEC price increases whilst developing Third World countries suffered additional hardships).

Carter and the ruling oligarchy in the USA realised that the survival of the system of exploitation depended on sustaining the existing economic order (with a few minor changes) and that the thrust for the establishment of the non-aligned-led demand for a New International Economic Order had to be blunted. It was therefore essential for Carter to denigrate the Nonaligned Movement and to split it from the socialist countries which supported the demand for a new economic order.

How did he set about this?

Unfortunately, (for him and the USA), Carter picked on a double-edged weapon which the new mandarins in Peking had inveigled the Carter Administration into adopting, viz., "to teach a lesson" to countries and governments that refused to follow the behests of the paramount power. China had tried to demonstrate this new strategy in its relations with Vietnam and burnt its fingers badly. But this did not restrain Carter. He had become too enamoured of it--without realising that Peking was only playing its own *American Card* for China's benefit.

Carter thereafter plunged headlong into "teaching lessons" to various countries and governments - Cuba, Iran, the Soviet

Union were the main targets with a host of other countries (e. g., India, Vietnam, Nicaragua, Grenada etc.) on the periphery.

Carter's failure to "teach lessons" even to small countries like Cuba is now part of history. He wanted to "teach a lesson" to Khomeini for overthrowing the Shah's regime primarily in order to re-establish American control over Iranian oil, but so far he has failed. The US may yet succeed in Iran, not because of Carter's "teach them a lesson" policy but because of the inherent inability of the Islamic Fundamentalism there to stabilise state power.

Carter had also wanted "to teach the Soviet Union a lesson" for saving the Saur Revolution in Afghanistan from the machinations of rebel and mercenary groups based in Pakistan (but armed and financed by US, China, Israel, Egypt and Saudi Arabia). But every lesson Carter sought to teach the Soviets has failed. :grains embargo had demonstrated that even countries like the Argentine refused to follow his lead. And Carter could not afford to teach Argentine a lesson for selling grain to the USSR in defiance of his embargo. And now the US has begun to sell grain to the Soviet Union.

Carter's *diktat* to the world to boycott the Olympic Games in Moscow did not cause anything more than mild embarrassment to the Soviet Union. The Games have turned out to be an even greater success than the Montreal Games of 1976. Carter tried to teach India a lesson by playing hide and seek with its contractual undertaking to supply enriched uranium to the Tarapur atomic reactor. And, it is not necessary to detail the full list of Carter's failures "to teach a lesson" to other countries. This would be an exercise for a campus researcher.

The failure of Carter's policy has already brought disillusionment to many in the United States. Carter's popularity rating, just three months before the Presidential election, has dropped so low that a majority of Democratic leaders in the Congress have demanded that he step down in favour of a more acceptable candidate.

The USA's troubles as a result of Carter's "teach them a lesson" policy have only just begun. The Shah's death will only complicate still further Washington's difficulties in its dealings with Iran. There are also signs that the US Administration has begun to weaken in the pursuit of "teach them a lesson" policy. A suggestion has been made about talks for the resumption of SALT 2 with a follow up into SALT 3. Washington has also hinted that it was prepared for a political settlement in Afghanistan — earlier Carter had insisted that US would enter into discussions only after the total and complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. The Islamic Conference too now seems willing to negotiate with Babrak Karmal under some facesaving formula.

The Indian proposal for a settlement of the Afghan crisis (and thereby secure the withdrawal of the Soviet troops) seems to have gained ground and acceptance. India's recognition of the Heng Samrin Government in Kampuchea has been accepted and Carter did not speak of "teaching a lesson" to India doing this.

In this situation the Nonaligned Movement has an important and crucial role to play to bring sanity to a world thrown into the dangerous vortex of cold war confrontations and a limitless arms race by Carter's policy of "teaching a lesson".

*Pax Americana* must be for World Peace, not American dictatorial supremacy. There is so much good in American history, literature, culture, civilisation and humanism that the world needs a resurgence of the true spirit of America.





