

HOMEWORK: THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT

Directions: Answer the questions in complete sentences on a separate sheet of loose leaf paper.

- Q1: Why was the Non-Aligned Movement formed in 1955?
 Q2: Who were the founding leaders of the movement?
 Q3: What were the key principles of the movement?
 Q4: How was NAM similar to NATO and the Warsaw Pact?
 Q5: How was NAM different from the NATO and the Warsaw Pact?
 Q6: Why would some critics say that “Non-Aligned” is a misnomer? (look up ‘misnomer’ if needed!)
 Q7: Why do you think so many nations joined the Non-Aligned movement?
 Q8: Some skillful leaders were able to successfully manipulate both the US and USSR for military and economic advantage. In your opinion, were they wrong for doing so? Explain.
 Q9: How did Jawaharlal Nehru explain India’s policy of non-alignment? (use document on reverse).

The Non-Aligned Movement

The **Non-Aligned Movement** is an international organization of states considering themselves not formally aligned with or against any major power bloc. In 1955, leaders of 29 African and Asian countries met at Bandung, Indonesia. The nations at the **Bandung Conference** declared their desire not to become involved in the Cold War, and to gain more influence in world affairs by banding together. The founding leaders of the Non-Aligned states were Nehru of India, Nkrumah of Ghana, Nasser of Egypt, Sukarno of Indonesia and Tito of Yugoslavia.



Indian Prime Minister Nehru put forth five principles that were to serve as a basis for the Non-Aligned Movement. They were: 1) mutual respect for each other’s territorial integrity and sovereignty; 2) mutual non-aggression; 3) mutual non-interference in domestic affairs; 4) equality and mutual benefit; 5) peaceful co-existence.

The Non-Aligned Movement was intended to be as close an alliance as NATO or the Warsaw Pact. However, it had little cohesion and many of its members were actually quite closely aligned with one or another of the great powers. For example, India was aligned with the Soviet Union against China for many years. Additionally, some members were involved in serious conflicts with other members (India and Pakistan, Iran and Iraq). From the 1960s onwards, critics came to see the movement as dominated by states allied to the Soviet Union. Many questioned how countries in close alliance with the Soviet Union, such as Cuba, could claim to be non-aligned.

For the movement’s leaders, nonalignment was primarily a way to gain money and support from one or both superpowers. By flirting with the U.S. or the Soviet Union, a country could get cheap or free weapons, training, and barter agreements, grants and loans, cheap or free surplus grain, and investment in industry and infrastructure. Skillful nonaligned countries could play the two sides against each other and profit from both. In this way, leaders tried to develop their nation’s economy and assert their nation’s interest. Manipulating the superpowers was a means toward those ends and implied very little about true ideological orientation.

Document 1

“...India came into the family of nations with no prejudices or enmities, ready to welcome and be welcomed. Inevitably, she had to consider her foreign policy in terms of enlightened self-interest but at the same time she brought to it a touch of her idealism. Thus, she tried to combine idealism with national interest. The main objectives of that policy are: The pursuit of peace, not through alignment with any major power or group of powers but through an independent approach to each controversial or disputed issue, the liberation of subject peoples, the maintenance of freedom, both national and individual, the elimination of racial discrimination and the elimination of want, disease and ignorance, which afflict the greater part of the world’s population. I am asked frequently why India does not align herself with a particular nation or a group of nations and told that because we have refrained from doing so we are sitting on the fence. The question and the comment are easily understood, because in times of crisis it is not unnatural for those who are involved in it deeply to regard calm objectivity in others as irrational, short-sighted, negative, unreal or even unmanly. But I should like to make it clear that the policy India has sought to pursue is not a negative and neutral policy. It is a positive and vital policy that flows from our struggle for freedom and from the teaching of Mahatma Gandhi.”

-- Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India (1947-1964)