

32015

"NON-ALIGNMENT AS A VIABLE ALTERNATIVE
FOR REGIONAL COOPERATION"

by

DR. CHEDDI JAGAN, General Secretary
People's Progressive Party, Guyana.

For

CEESTEEM SEMINAR
"GEOPOLITICAL CHANGE IN THE
CARIBBEAN IN THE 1980's,
HELD IN MEXICO."
MARCH 15-19, 1982.

Non-Alignment:

**A FORCE FOR PEACE
AND SOCIAL PROGRESS**



by
Cheddi Jagan

Some speech printed in 2 different booklets

NON-ALIGNMENT AS A VIABLE ALTERNATIVE FOR REGIONAL COOPERATION

Cheddi Jagan

The non-aligned movement (NAM) has proved to be a constructive force in the cause of liberation, peace and social progress. During the past 20 years, it has helped to focus attention on the most burning issues and to contribute significantly to the unity and extension of the front of peoples' struggle for decolonisation and the elimination of the vestiges of colonialism, neo-colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination, in defense of independence and freedom of all peoples, for a new and just political and economic order, the transfer of technology, the ending of exploitation, the strengthening of the role of the United Nations, the establishment of international economic norms of inter-state relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence and respect for national sovereignty, equality and mutual respect, democratisation of information and culture, detente and disarmament and the security of nations.

Can the non-aligned movement now be a viable alternative for regional cooperation in a very aggravated world situation, particularly in the Caribbean and Central America, and in the context of the US reinvocation of the Monroe Doctrine and the Roosevelt Corollary "big stick" and cold war methods? The answer to this question depends on the extent to which firstly the NAM's unity cohesiveness and solidarity is maintained and its principles and goals are adhered to; secondly, the political will displayed by NAM leaders to stand up to the threats and pressures of imperialism at this time of grave economic and social crisis caused by the recession in the capitalist world, burdensome debt, and budget and balance of payments deficits in non-aligned countries; and thirdly, the NAM seeing the necessity to work with other progressive, peace and revolutionary movements for the achievement of unity of the 3 world revolutionary streams — the socialist community, the national liberation movement and the working class and democratic forces in the developed capitalist countries.

Antecedents of the NAM

The Non-Aligned Movement emerged under special circumstances. It has its roots in World War II, the Asian People's Conference in New Delhi

in 1947, the Conference of the Colombo Powers in 1954 and the Conference of 29 Asian and African states in Bandung, Indonesia in 1955.

The Second World War, fought for the preservation of freedom and democracy, gave a big impetus to the anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist revolution. It ended with the defeat of fascism, the liberation of the Eastern European states, the independence of India (Dismembered by the creation of Pakistan), Burma and Ceylon (now Sri Lanka), and a decisive shift in the world balance of forces against imperialism. From one socialist state after the 1917 Great October Socialist Revolution, there emerged a world socialist system. And the struggle for national and social liberation sharpened.

A counter-offensive was launched against the powerful wave for liberation and emancipation of peoples in order to restore the old mode of international relations based on privilege, oppression and exploitation. In the Far East, the colonialist powers returned to resume control: The French in Indochina, the Dutch in Indonesia, and the British in Malaya (now Malaysia) in a barbaric war with Gurkha troops and Dyak hunters, and prices on the heads of communist patriots who had helped to expel the Japanese fascist invaders.

Emerging from the war as the most powerful capitalist state, the USA abandoned the "Good Neighbour" policy of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The close relationship and cooperation which had been developed in the fight against fascism was changed after the death of Roosevelt in 1944 into an anti-communist crusade and cold war. The USA embarked on a course, to prevent by whatever means at its disposal national and social revolutions, and became the international policeman in defence of the old order and the maintenance of the status quo.

At Baylor University on March 6, 1947, President Harry Truman made a speech on foreign economic policy which clearly stated that governments which conducted planned economies and controlled foreign trade were dangers to freedom, that freedom of speech and worship were dependent on the free enterprise system. He declared that controlled economies were "not the American way" and "not the way of peace". He urged that "the whole world should adopt the American system" and that "the American system could survive in America only if it became a World System". Calling for Action, he implored: "Unless we act and act decisively, it [government-controlled economy and government-controlled foreign trade] will be the pattern of the next century . . . if this trend is not reversed, the Government of the United States will be under pressure, sooner or later, to use these same devices to fight for markets and for raw materials."¹

Wartime cooperation was abruptly brought to a halt. During World War II, the Soviet Union, USA, Britain and France together fought successfully against Germany, Italy and Japan. In the fight for freedom and democracy, the equation was liberal capitalism and communism against fascism (decadent and terroristic state-monopoly capitalism). In the subsequent cold war period, the equation changes. Fascism was no longer the enemy for the West; it became an ally. Communism became the common enemy; it was regarded as a "disease" which had to be "contained", and if possible eradicated. John Foster Dulles² equated fascism and communism, and some in a more refined condemned "dictatorships of the right and the left."

The instruments created were the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in 1948 for overt and covert action, and, under treaties with US client states, a world-wide "iron ring" of military bases for the encirclement of the Soviet Union and other socialist states — the Rio Pact in 1947; the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in April 1949; The Baghdad Pact on February 24, 1955 (later the Central Treaty Organisation after the revolution of 1958 led to Iraq's withdrawal); the South East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO) on September 8, 1954, after the communist victory in China in 1949, the US fiasco in Korea in 1950-51, and the disastrous French defeat at Dien Bien Phu in Vietnam in 1954. The "big stick" once again became a decisive factor in US foreign policy.

Under successive administrations, the cold-war policy of "containment of communism" took on new interpretations — preventive war, liberation, brinkmanship and massive retaliation. The resultant effects were manifold — the sabotage and the emasculation of the United Nations; aid with strings; a gigantic arms race and the arming of West Germany; McCarthyism and red witch-hunting in the United States and elsewhere; the support of reactionary regimes; and the use of force and fraud against genuine national liberation movements.

On the fiction that the Soviet Union was preparing to launch a war and that Latin America was threatened by communist aggression from within and without. President Truman, in the ensuing hysteria, called in May 1946 for the military unification of the continent.

At the February 1945 Conference of the American States in Mexico City, the Act of Chapultepec was adopted which declared that an attack on any American state would be considered as an attack against all and that collective measures would be taken to repel the aggression. The Conference decided that the Inter-American [redacted] board, established in 1942, should be made a permanent organisation; [redacted] also recommended a permanent unified military command of the twenty-one republics including

the standardisation of equipment, training and organisation. This resulted on September 2, 1947 in a military pact, the "International Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance" known as the Rio Pact which would provide for "collective self-defence" and would "tend to serve as a guarantee to peace in the Americas."

In March-May 1948, the Ninth International Conference of American States at Bogota drew up the Charter of the Organisation of American States (OAS), highlighting the necessity for increasing hemispheric solidarity in political, economic and military matters.

The Caracas Declaration of 1954 stated that:

The domination or control of the political institution of any American state by the international Communist movement extending to this Hemisphere the political system of an extra-continental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American states, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties.³

Military aid was stepped up for the oligarchy in the Caribbean and Latin America on the argument that every country should co-operate in meeting the so-called communist threat. It was argued that it was the responsibility of all the states to protect the strategic areas of the hemisphere and the Inter-American lines of communication as these were vital for the security of every American Republic.

Bilateral military treaties were signed with several Latin American and Caribbean States reducing them virtually to client-states of the USA. Such was their vassal status that US laws — the Law of Reciprocal Aid of 1949 and the Law of Mutual Security of 1951 — were also applicable to them. Under the first Mutual Defense Association (MDA) agreement between Ecuador and the USA in January 1952, Ecuador agreed "to facilitate the production and transfer . . . of . . . strategic materials required by the United States" and to cooperate in the blocking of trade with the socialist world, and the United States" and cooperate in the blocking of trade with the socialist world, and the United States government agreed "to make available . . . equipment, material, services and other military assistance designed to promote the defense and maintain the peace of the Western Hemisphere."⁴

In return for military aid, the United States obtained military bases. Apart from those previously established at Guantanamo in Cuba and the Canal Zone in Panama, missile-tracking stations were set up in the Dominican Republic and Fernando de Noronha Island. In 1958, the United

States established its Military Forces Southern Command in the Panama Canal Zone to monitor the situation in Latin America. Also located in this zone was the Special Action Force in Latin America designed for emergency situations.

The military build-up could not be justified on any ground except to maintain and strengthen the triarchy — the military, the landlords and the high clergy — a tiny privileged group, traditionally associated with feudalism and backwardness. It led to the ouster of several popular democratic regimes. Before the mutual security play was launched in 1947 at the Rio Conference, only 3 nations — Argentina, Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic — were dictatorships. But by 1953 military men, who had taken the anti-Communist pledge, had been given arms and equipment and had ousted the legal governments in seven other republics. From 1948 to 1958, there were 14 major coups d'etat.

The Venezuelan government of Romulo Gallegos, the renowned patriot and novelist was overthrown in 1948 by 3 colonels headed by Colonel Marcos Perez Jimenez. In 1949, Laureano Gomes established a Franco-type dictatorship in Colombia. In 1954, the Arbenz government in Guatemala was overthrown by Colonel Armas with the help of the Central Intelligence Agency. In 1953, the British Government forcibly removed the popularly elected government of the People's Progressive Party (PPP) in British Guiana.

The Principles and Goals of N.A.M.

Against the background of the cold war, and based on their own experience with colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism and racism, India, Indonesia, Burma and Egypt were not willing to become members of the Western Multilateral military pacts, and to be associated with the policy of atomic bomb rattling which could lead from a limited nuclear war to a global holocaust endangering world peace and security. *They saw the need for a non-aligned position for the purpose of improving the world political climate and utilising manpower and other resources for development, economic emancipation and social progress.*

The concept of non-alignment originated in India, and "took root in the halls of United Nations in 1946 and 1947."⁵ Jawaharlal Nehru, regarded as the father of non-alignment, played a decisive moral/political role in the post-war period, filling the vacuum created by the death of President F. D. Roosevelt and the failure of his successor President Harry Truman to

continue his predecessor's "New Deal" policy at home, "Good Neighbour" policy in Latin America and mediator role between Winston Churchill and Josef Stalin during World War II. As the then leader of the Interim National Government, he declared on December 7, 1946:

We propose, as far as possible, to keep away from the power politics of groups, aligned against one another, which have led in the past to world wars and which may again lead to disasters on an even vaster scale . . . we shall take full part in international conferences as a free nation with our own policy and not as a satellite of another nation.⁶

Nehru made it clear that non-alignment did not mean neutrality; that it had a negative as well as a positive aspect — negative, in the sense of not being aligned with any military blocs, but as he put it, "this in itself is not a policy, it is only part of a policy"; positive, in the sense of concern for peace and socio-economic development. This was spelt out by him in a speech at Columbia University on October 17, 1949 when he described the totality of India's foreign policy:

The pursuit of peace, not through alignment with any major power or groups 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, elimination of want, disease and ignorance which afflict the greater part of the world's population.⁷

The Colombo Powers (India, Ceylon, Pakistan, Burma and Indonesia) took the initiative in convening the Afro-Asian Conference at Bandung, Indonesia in April 1955. The 29 states, though holding different positions (8 - non-aligned; 2 - socialist; 19 - pro-West) unanimously adopted a Declaration on the Promotion of World Peace and Cooperation, a set of ten basic principles. These included the five principles of peace for *Panch Shila*, which had been inserted in the preamble of the Tibet Agreement of June 24, 1954 between India and People's China:⁸

- a) Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty;
- b) Non-aggression;
- c) Non-interference in each other's internal affairs;
- d) equality and mutual benefit;
- e) peaceful co-existence.

The other five points included a stand for national freedom and against colonialism and racial discrimination; for the prohibition of

nuclear and thermonuclear weapons; for economic and cultural co-operation of the nations of Asia and Africa; and on specific questions affecting West Asian, Palestinian, Aden and the North African nations. These became the guiding principles of and provided the framework for, the first Non-Aligned Summit Conference in Belgrade in 1961 and subsequent meetings.

The Bandung conference, representing the majority of mankind, and asserting the spirit of independence and anti-imperialist struggle, and advancing friendly relations and cooperation between the newly-liberated countries of Asia and Africa and the socialist states, was a slap in the face of imperialism. It became an important factor in world politics, and this facilitated the cause of peace and the growth and success of the national liberation movement.

In the context of the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba organised by the Central Intelligence Agency, the threat of a nuclear conflict and the calling-off of the 2nd Summit Conference of the Big Powers as a result of the U.S. U2 spy plane incident over Soviet Territory, the first Non-aligned Conference in Belgrade in 1961 sought to play a mediatory role in defusing the conflict. In keeping with the spirit of Bandung, it considered that "the principles of peaceful co-existence are the only alternative to the 'cold war' and to a possible general nuclear catastrophe"; further, "that peoples and governments shall refrain from the use of ideologies for the purpose of waging the cold war, exercising pressure of imposing their will."⁹

The Conference proclaimed that the non-aligned countries did not wish to form a new bloc and could not be a bloc. The participants solemnly reaffirmed their support to the "Declaration on the granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples," adopted at the 15th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, which recommended "the immediate, unconditional, total and final abolition of colonialism" and resolved "to make a concerted effort to put an end to all types of new colonialism and imperialist domination in all its forms and manifestations."¹⁰ The Belgrade Summit also condemned the policy of apartheid practised by the Union of South Africa, demanded the immediate abandonment of this policy, and declared that the policy of racial discrimination anywhere in the world constituted a grave violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The participants reaffirmed their conviction that:

- a) All nations have the rights of unity, self determination, and independence by virtue of which rights they can determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and

- cultural development without intimidation or hindrance.
- b) All peoples may, for their own ends, freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources without prejudice to any obligations arising out of international economic co-operation, based upon the principle of mutual benefit and international law. In no case may a people be deprived of its own means of subsistence.

The Conference pointed out that the presence of a military base at Guantanamo, Cuba, against the wishes of the Government and people of Cuba, affected the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country. It also called on those countries which recognised the People's Republic of China to recommend that the General Assembly should accept the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China as the only legitimate representatives of that country in the United Nations.

In the wake of developments in the then Belgian Congo and the intrigues against the government led by Patrice Lumumba, his incarceration and subsequent murder, the Cairo Summit in 1964 was mainly concerned with the problems of colonisation. It met at a time when the Moscow Treaty on the Prohibition of above-ground testing of nuclear weapons was being signed. Its Declaration proposed a Programme for Peace and International Co-operation and concerted action for the liberation of the countries still dependent through the elimination of colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism. It called for the codification of the Principles for Peaceful Co-Existence by the United Nations, the settlement of disputes without threat or use of force in accordance with the Principles of the United Nations Charter, respect for the sovereignty of states and their territorial integrity, general and complete disarmament, peaceful use of atomic energy, prohibition of all nuclear weapons test, establishment of nuclear free zones, prevention of dissemination of nuclear weapons, abolition of all nuclear weapons and for the diversion of resources then employed on armaments to the development of under-developed parts of the world and to the promotion of the prosperity of mankind.¹¹

The Conference welcomed the establishment of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) as an important contribution to the strengthening of world peace and called for the coordination of the efforts of the Non-Aligned Movement and the OAU with a view to safeguarding their joint interest in economic, social and cultural development and in international co-operation.

The Lusaka Conference in 1970 issued a Declaration on Peace, Independence, Development, Co-operation and Democratisation of International Relations. Held in the context of sharpening liberation struggles in Africa and Vietnam, economic deterioration and the failure of the UN First Development Decade to narrow the ever-widening gap between the developed capitalist states and the imperialist-dominated underdeveloped countries, it concentrated on liberation questions and economic issues. The participants pledged:

- (i) to cultivate the spirit of self-reliance and to this end to adopt a firm policy of organising their own socio-economic progress and to raise it to the level of a priority action programme.
- (ii) to exercise fully their right and fulfil their duty so as to secure optimal utilisation of the natural resources in their territories and in adjacent seas for the development and welfare of their peoples.

The Conference made a forceful statement about the right of the Indochinese peoples to self-determination, and called for effective material aid for national liberation movements. Calling for firmness and action, it noted: "What is needed is not redefinition of non-alignment but a rededication by all non-aligned nations to its central aims and objectives."¹³

The Non-Aligned Meeting of Foreign Ministers in Guyana in 1972 took decisions which were an important landmark in the history of the Movement. The Royal Government of the National Union of Cambodia in exile and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam were seated. This caused Indonesia, Laos and Malaysia to walk out of the Conference in protest. In a decisive way, the NAM gave notice that, standing firm on fundamental principles, it would act forthrightly on behalf of national liberation, and would not submit to the whims and fancies of puppet regimes which had been put in power with the help and connivance of imperialism.

The Algiers Summit in 1973 was held under more favourable international conditions: sections of the ruling class in the United States had accepted the policy of peaceful co-existence, which ushered in a period of detente, the weakening of anti-communist hysteria and relaxation of tensions. Against the background of recession in the capitalist world and growing difficulties in the developing countries, the Algiers Conference put special emphasis on economic questions, which led to the demand for a New International Economic Order and just and equitable economic relations.

The Colombo Summit Conference in 1976 was attended by over 80 nations in the context of a fluid international situation. The Helsinki Accords of 1975 ushered in a period of political detente in Europe and confrontation in Angola. Reactionary regimes had been removed in Greece, Ethiopia, Portugal and its colonies in Africa. This was paralleled by the establishment of fascist regimes in Chile and elsewhere in Latin America. The Conference placed special emphasis on collective self-reliance, namely, economic co-operation among non-aligned and other developing countries; and special attention to the question of non-interference in internal affairs of states.

Concerned with the worsening international situation, the decision by the NATO powers to increase their military expenditures, and the formidable, particularly mounting debt, problems facing the underdeveloped countries, the Havana Summit in 1979 laid special stress on the related problems of peace, disarmament and development — political detente to lead to military detente; disarmament to lead to the substantial transfer of resources for the solution of the problems of underdevelopment, hunger, malnutrition, illiteracy and disease.

USSR, USA and the NAM

As a national liberation, and thus objectively a profoundly anti-imperialist movement, the main goals of non-alignment received the understanding and support of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The 1947 Conference in New Delhi of representations of 27 Asian countries called by Jawaharlal Nehru, the first attempt at collective action, included public figures from the Soviet Central Asian and Caucasian republics, the Mongolian People's Republic and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam; and the Bandung Conference included the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the People's Republic of China.

*The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union welcomed the Bandung Conference as representing "the best formula for relations between countries with different social systems under present circumstances and would serve as the basis for stable peaceful relations between all countries of the world."*¹⁴

After the Algiers Summit Conference (1973) emphasised that the Non-aligned countries should fight together with other peace-loving progressive forces for democratisation of international relations, world peace

and equality between states, President Leonid Brezhnev of the USSR pointed out that "there is no doubt that such a position and its consistent implementation will be conducive to the further growth of the non-aligned countries; influence in the world arena. For our part, we have every respect for the anti-imperialist programme drawn up in Algiers, and we wish the participants of the movement of nonaligned countries success in putting it into effect."¹⁵

The USA, particularly furious that its allies, chiefly Malaysia and Ceylon, did not succeed in their orations about "communist imperialism" and "communist aggression" to turn Bandung from a anti-imperialist into an anti-communist Conference, denounced the concept of non-alignment. John Forster Dulles, US Secretary of State, on June 9, 1955, stated that US mutual assistance treaties:

with forty-two countries of America, Europe and Asia . . . abolish as between the parties, the principle of neutrality, which pretends that a nation can best gain safety for itself by being indifferent to the fate of others. This has increasingly become an obsolete conception and, except under very exceptional circumstances, it is an immoral and shortsighted conception.¹⁶

Vice President Richard Nixon on July 5 also condemned it and warned against the "brand of neutralism that makes no moral distinction between the Communist world and free world. With this viewpoint, we have no sympathy."¹⁷ In other words, the US government's position was blunt: if you are not with us, you are against us. Non-aligned states were thus treated as enemies, at best semi-enemies. The United States, not only did not take part in the Geneva Conference on Vietnam in the summer of 1954, but also did not respect the decisions of the Conference for a non-aligned Laos and Cambodia (now Kampuchea) and for elections in 1956 to unite North and South Vietnam. In fact, the CIA engineered the overthrow of the Sihanouk non-aligned government of Cambodia and escalated the war in Indochina.

With the Cuban revolution and other revolutionary successes in Asia and Africa, imperialism reacted with a carrot-and-club policy, and more flexible and subtle tactics. John F. Kennedy, as Senator, "had come to object to the Dulles doctrine both as morally self-righteous and as politically self-defeating."¹⁸ *His reformist Alliance for Progress, introduced as a counter to the Cuban Revolution, replaced the Puerto Rican model of development (Operation Bootstrap) and "Point Four" Aid Programme for an "intermediary way of development" and a US-style neutralism, democratic in form but pro-imperialist in intent.* He was prepared to support

India's first five-year plan. "We want India to win that race with China," he said, ". . . If China succeeds and India fails, the economic-development balance of power will shift against us."¹⁹ He supported change, but provided it was kept within the bounds of the West's capitalist-imperialist system.

After the failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba in 1961, US imperialism resorted to brinkmanship and diktat during the 1962 missile crisis. Anti-communist and anti-Soviet hysteria again became a big factor of international life, particularly after the assassination of President Kennedy.

President Lyndon Johnson, calling for the replacement of "geographical frontiers," by "ideological frontiers" for the preservation of freedom and democracy, the euphemism for capitalism/imperialism, proposed the grouping of third world and non-aligned countries into regional alliances (Free Trade Areas and Common Markets) under the control of imperialism and the transnational monopolies. After US military intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965, the Johnson doctrine (President Lyndon Johnson) reserved to the United States the right to intervene in any country perceived to be "threatened by communism." Under the doctrine, later supplemented by Richard Nixon's Guam doctrine and Gerald Ford's concept of maintaining an American intervention. And with a policy of "no more Cubas in the Western Hemisphere," several non-aligned countries were destabilised.

President Jimmy Carter, like president John Kennedy, adopted a more flexible approach. With his "ideological pluralism,"²⁰ he attempted to influence some of the non-aligned countries, like India and Jamaica under social-democratic Michael Manley, away from their anti-imperialist orientation. Soon after his inauguration, his wife Rosalyn Carter and later his Ambassador to the United Nations Andrew Young included Jamaica in their Latin American and Caribbean goodwill tours, shortly after Prime Minister Michael Manley had survived a CIA destabilisation attempt on his government in 1976.

According to Dr. Z. Brzezinski, Carter's National Security Adviser, in the context of "a rising crescendo of political and social demands" in the developing countries, "the Carter doctrine is based on the perceived need to try to get along with these forces rather than collide with them — and to channel them in a positive direction if possible."²¹ What this meant was spelt out in U.S. News and World Report on January 9, 1978, when it stated that in India President Carter's objective "was to reinforce the Government's shift away from heavy reliance on the Soviet Union toward a more pro-US style of neutrality."

During the last days of the Carter administration and moreso under the Reagan administration, Washington shifted its position towards the non-aligned movement back to the days of John Foster Dulles.

Attempts to Disrupt the NAM

The Imperialist and their clients have consistently tried to disrupt the Movement. At the very beginning at the Bandung Conference in 1965, President Romulo of the Phillipines charged that "communist imperialism is worse than capitalist imperialism." Some have charged that, with decolonisation almost complete, "excessive radicalism" should be avoided in order to prevent disruption and even the crippling of the movement.

The charge is spurious: Political independence is meaningless without economic emancipation and progress toward a New International Economic Order. Neo-colonialism, which has supplanted colonialism, "is a great impediment to independent action," said former Foreign Minister of India, Swaran Singh in 1972, "and one of the principal tasks before non-aligned countries today must be to reinforce their efforts to arrest and eliminate its cancerous growth."²²

At the 1970 Lusaka Non-Aligned Summit, which made a forceful statement about the right of the Indochinese peoples to self-determination and called on Third World governments to provide effective material aid for national liberation movements, the then Cuban Foreign minister Raul Roa declared:

Our concept of non-alignment is established in these words. For Cuba, the keystone of non-alignment is the attitude to be adopted in the face of imperialism, the real and sole source of the poverty, injustice, discrimination, scorn, backwardness, brutality and aggression we denounce and combat.²³

Maoist China, which objectively aids imperialism, also sought to divide the non-aligned movement and to isolate it from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. After creating border incidents with non-aligned India and a branch of relations with the Soviet Union, it attempted at the second Intergovernmental Conference of Asian and African countries (Bandung II) to create a pro-Chinese and anti-Soviet bloc of Afro-Asian states. Later, it called the 1966 Delhi Meeting of the three top non-aligned leaders — the Presidents of Egypt and Yugoslavia and the Prime Minister of India — a "new Munich of the East," a "big dirty deal on Vietnam," part of the American-Soviet conspiracy.²⁴ During the same period, it attacked the Soviet Union for its adherence to the policy of

peaceful co-existence, deeming it a betrayal of the national liberation revolution. Later, after the failure of the cultural revolution, and its brazen attempts to make headway in the developing countries, it changed its tactics, once again accepting peaceful coexistence in order to influence the non-aligned countries to a position of anti-Sovietism. With the Maoist concept of "three worlds," Peking advised the non-aligned and developing countries ("the third world") to join with the "second world" — the imperialist countries of the West, excluding the United States — in order to fight the two super-powers ("the first world"). However, since Peking is at the same time urging 'the second world' to strengthen its ties with the United States within NATO, quite obviously, the whole affair takes on an exclusively anti-Soviet appearance.²⁵

Debunking the Maoist line, President Fidel Castro told the 1973 Algiers Non-Aligned Summit:

There has been talk at this Conference of the different ways of dividing the world. To our way of thinking, the world is divided into capitalist and socialist countries, imperialist and neocolonialised countries, colonialist and colonialised countries, reactionary and progressive countries — governments, in a word, that back imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism and racism, and governments that oppose imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism and racism.²⁶

Answering the Maoist propaganda about Soviet "great power hegemony" and "Soviet Social-imperialism," he went on to say: "How can the Soviet Union be labeled Imperialist? Where are its monopoly corporations? Where is its participation in the multinational companies? What factories, what mines, what oilfields does it own in the underdeveloped world? What worker is exploited in any country of Asia, Africa or Latin America by Soviet capital?" He proceeded to point out that the Soviet people from the days of the Great October Socialist Revolution have been rendering valiant service to the cause of anti-imperialism and liberation; "Not for a moment can we forget that the guns with which Cuba crushed the Playa Giron mercenaries and defended itself from the United States; the arms in the hands of the Arab peoples, with which they withstand imperialist aggression; those used by the African patriots against Portuguese colonialism; and those taken up by the Vietnamese in their heroic, extraordinary and victorious struggle came from the socialist countries, especially from the Soviet Union."²⁷ Hitting out at the splitters, he pointed out that the quality and not the number of members was what was most important if the movement was to wield moral and political power before the peoples of the world.

Attempts have been made to expel Cuba and Vietnam from the NAM on the ground that they were not non-aligned. Cuba was accused of interfering in Africa by sending military forces to Ethiopia and Angola. Said Barre of Somalia told an OAU meeting that "serious collective measures" should be considered to contain the "Cuban threat" in Africa.²⁸ Barre's Somalia, like Egypt and Sudan, had broken their friendship treaties with the Soviet Union and were being used by imperialism to disrupt the NAM.

Cuba answered these attacks by stating categorically that in so far as being a member of a multilateral military alliance, she was non-aligned; but, in so far as fighting for the key issues for independence, justice, progress and development which are of decisive importance for the entire struggle for world peace and the consolidation of detente, she was definitely aligned.

Actually, the criterion for membership to the movement is that a non-aligned state is not part of a multilateral military alliance, and that its territory is not used as a military base by a foreign power. This does not mean, however, that a sovereign non-aligned country, loses its inherent right of individual and collective defence, the right of defending its own territory either alone or with the assistance of other states when its own security and territorial integrity are endangered. Actually, the Non-Aligned Summit at Belgrade in 1961 in its Declaration had stated *inter alia* that support must be given to the "people fighting for their right to self-determination and concerted effort to end all varieties of neo-colonialist and imperialist domination."²⁹

In recognition of this principle of lending support for the purpose of national liberation, President Fidel Castro, with reference to economic emancipation told the Non-Aligned Summit in 1973 in Algeria that "the true strength and profundity of the movement of non-aligned nations will be measured by the firmness of our actions regarding these problems. Cuba will back with the greatest determination the agreements adopted to that effect even if to do so calls for contribution of our blood."³⁰

Later an attempt was made to shift the venue of the Sixth Non-Aligned Summit from Havana, Cuba, but it also failed. Thereafter, the United States sought to strengthen the hands of the rightists during the course of the Conference by declaring that there was a Soviet Combat Brigade in Cuba. This was intended to denigrate Cuba, to move the non-aligned movement to a US type of neutrality and a position of "equidistance" — keeping an equal distance from the super-powers, — thus isolating the non-aligned movement from the socialist world. Cuba

and the Soviet Union denounced the alleged Soviet Combat Brigade as a lie. The Conference reaffirmed commitment of the participants to the principles and goals of the non-aligned movement.

The NAM and Reactivation of the Cold War

As in the post-World War II period and in the late 1950's, the latter part of the 1970-80 decade saw a decisive shift in the world balance of forces against imperialism. With the defeat of the United States and its allies in Indo-China, Vietnam was re-united and socialist states emerged in Laos, Kampuchea and Vietnam. The fascists and reactionaries were defeated in Guinea Bissau, Cape Verde, Mozambique and Angola. Dictatorial regimes were ousted in Iran and Afghanistan. A political settlement led to the removal of the fascist Ian Smith in Zimbabwe. In the Caribbean Basin, progressive forces won electoral victories in St. Lucia, Curacao and Aruba. A mass upsurge brought down the hated Patrick John regime in Dominica. The Dictators in Grenada and Nicaragua were overthrown. And in Suriname, Progressive non-commissioned military personnel seized power.

The "hawks" became furious; they went on the warpath. A month after the Saur Revolution in Afghanistan in April 1978, the NATO Council Meeting in Washington agreed on increasing military budgets of all member-states by 3 per cent per year until the end of the century.

Like her arch-conservative predecessor Winston Churchill, the "Iron Lady" Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, visited the United States and called for a "get tough" policy. Her conservative government severely reduced spending and increased defense expenditure to counter the supposedly increasing "Soviet threat." She argued that Britain and the West must talk from a "position of strength."

President Jimmy Carter, whose electoral fortunes had reached an all-time low, fell in line with the "hawks" and the military-industrial complex. To induce the reluctant senators to ratify SALT II, he promised billions for the modernisation of US nuclear forces and a general programme for strengthening the "Rapid Deployment Force"³¹ — a crack well-equipped 200,000-man contingency "quick reaction" corps — for the purpose of "protecting American interests and ensuring an uninterrupted flow of Arab oil." Forecasting "storms of conflict" in the 1980's and a growth of "political instability" he proposed, contrary to past electoral promises to cut military spending, an increase of 5% above the inflation rate for 1980 and 4.5% for each of the next five years.

The first excuse for undermining and sabotaging detente was the announcement of the so-called Soviet military combat unit in Cuba. However, it failed to divert the Non-Aligned Movement at its Summit Conference in Havana from its true goals after the Soviet and Cuban governments' terse reply that it was a training unit which had been stationed in Cuba for the previous 17 years, and President Carter's admission that the unit posed no threat to the security of the United States. Soviet assistance to non-aligned Afghanistan then became the ground for wielding the "big stick" and resorting to "gunboat diplomacy." SALT II was derailed, the Moscow Olympics was boycotted and shipment of grain to the Soviet Union was halted.

But the main reason for re-activating the cold war was neither the Soviet unit in Cuba nor the events in Afghanistan. A long time before the Afghan crisis, Hugh Sidey in his article, "The Shape of Things to Come", in TIME (December 17, 1979) wrote:

... the Iranian crisis shocked today's Washington into a new sense of reality . . . Pentagon spirit is on the rise . . . the military-industrial complex is in subterranean motion. Within hours of the start of the crisis, men from Lockheed, makers of the giant C-54 troop and equipment airlifter, were in Secretary of Defense Harold Brown's office, reviewing the American capacity to move military forces around the world. And engineers and technicians from Boeing and McDonnell Douglas scurried to the Pentagon with the announcement of plans for a Marine Rapid Deployment Force. The current official vocabulary has to do with American bases abroad, overflight rights with friendly countries, aerial refuelling capacity. The adrenaline is flowing . . . There is a body of opinion that the world worked better before men took to mineral water.

In the Caribbean, about 2,000 marines equipped with combat aircraft and submarines stormed into the US base at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba; military manoeuvres were carried out in the Caribbean Sea; arms were promised to Barbados and for a Caribbean security force; a Caribbean Joint Task Force was established at Key West, Florida, to improve US "capability to monitor and respond rapidly to any attempted military encroachment in the region;" there was increased surveillance of Cuba; increased economic assistance was promised to thwart "social turmoil."

There was also an escalation around the world. According to TIME (October 29, 1979):

At Grafenwohr, West Germany, a US tank battalion roared into combat exercises after having been flown in from Fort Hood, Texas, on a "no notice" emergency drill. At Florida's Eglin Air

Force Base, 20,000 soldiers, sailors and airmen prepared to launch "bold Eagle 80," a 9-day manoeuvre to practice coming to the aid of an invaded ally. In the Indian Ocean, a US Navy 7-ship carrier task force joined up with a 5-ship Middle East force to show the flag."

On December 10, 1979, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) decided to deploy in Western Europe nuclear delivery vehicles and about 600 medium-range Pershing-2 and Tomahawk cruise missiles. The excuse for upsetting the balance of military forces in Europe was "Soviet military superiority," a "Soviet menace." But this was denied by President Leonid Brezhnev. He pointed out that there had been no increase in military (nuclear) hardware in the previous ten years, that the Soviet Union was not planning an attack on the West.

The Carter administration had two major policy objectives; to improve the over-all US military posture, and to influence patterns of GLOBAL CHANGE. To influence the course of socio-political transformations and to shape "a rapidly changing world in ways that would be congenial to our interests and responsive to our values." US Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski³² urged not a regional but a differentiated country to country approach, "where they demonstrate independence from Moscow and willingness to contribute to overall regional stability, we should encourage them. Where they do not, we should isolate them."

This is similar to Henry Kissinger's directive³³ in January 1976 when he had told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

The hostility of some of the Third World spokesmen and bloc voting have made constructive discussions in the UN forums between the industrial and developing world almost impossible. I have instructed each US Embassy that the factors by which we will measure the value which that government attaches to its relations with us will be its statements and its votes on that fairly limited number of issues which we indicate are of importance to us in international forums."

At that time, the USA was complaining about "bloc voting" and "automatic majority" at the United Nations, what Kissinger called "the tyranny of the majority," meaning the socialist countries and the progressive newly-emergent non-aligned states.

As regards "our interests," Abelardo L. Valdez, AID's Assistant Administrator for Latin America and the Caribbean, told the Inter-American Affairs Sub-Committee of the US House Foreign Affairs Committee on February 1971:

Our concern for Latin America and the Caribbean begins with our strong traditional ties of trade and investment. The region provides many of the resources most vital to our economy. It is our third largest market after Western Europe and Japan, purchasing \$20 billion in US exports. Our direct private investment exceeds \$27 billion, 82% of our investment in the entire developing world. It earns \$4 billion a year.

Actually, the outflow of capital from Latin America and the Caribbean in the form of profits, interest, depreciation and other payments increased from \$5.8 billion in 1975 to \$17.9 billion in 1980. In that period, the total drain was \$60 billion, far more than the amount of foreign investments.

The Caribbean is also strategically important for materials such as oil (Venezuela, Trinidad and Tobago) and bauxite (Jamaica, Guyana, Suriname, Haiti and Dominican Republic), and as a sea lane. As such, it has been deemed the "fourth border" the political and strategic "soft underbelly" or "Achilles Heel" of the USA.

"Our values" were spelt out in November 1979 at the Miami Conference on the Caribbean by former US Under-Secretary of State and US Ambassador-at-Large, Philip C. Habib as five principles — significant support for economic development; firm commitment to democratic practices and human rights; clear acceptance of ideological pluralism; unequivocal respect for national sovereignty; strong encouragement of regional cooperation and of an active Caribbean role in world affairs.

The Reagan administration has shifted US policy back to the worst days of the cold war. Its main ideologues and advisers have accused the Carter administration of being too soft with the socialist world, working for an "anxious accommodation" as "if we would prevent the political coloration of Latin America to red crimson by an American-prescribed tint of pale pink,"³⁴ giving encouragement to socialism and change in the non-aligned countries and of alienating traditional "friends"³⁵ with its human rights fervour, thus sacrificing US "vital interests."

It had adopted a "get tough" and "no appeasement" position of the Dulles era, and is toying with Dulles' ideas of "preventive war", "limited nuclear war", "brinkmanship" and "selective retaliation". It whipped up the so called Soviet threat rearmament, including the manufacture of the Neutron Bomb, the B1 bomber and the MX missile system. Ostensibly, this was done to overcome "Soviet superiority" and to catch up with the Soviet Union. It is also vigorously pursuing the policy of "selective militarisation" of client states. US arms sales abroad increased from \$8,300

million (US) in 1974 to over \$10,000 million in 1978, and to nearly \$25,000 million in 1981. And the CIA has been unleashed.³⁶

Actually, what is unfolding is a global strategy of "containment" and "liberation" by the western powers, spearheaded by the USA. The aim is to enlarge areas of conflict in various parts of the world — South East Asia, the Middle East, Southern Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean — with the objective of undermining the independence, particularly of non-aligned countries which are pursuing an anti-imperialist, socialist-oriented course, and "of crushing liberation movements, which threaten to dislodge feudal or reactionary regimes and culminating in open confrontation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries which might come to their aid. The US aim is to escalate conflict on all fronts and to bring about a situation where the power of the socialist world will be stretched to the limit and the Soviet Union, in particular, will be unable to match the concentration of weaponry which the imperialist powers are assembling against her."³⁷

In the Far East, the United States has concluded a strategic tripartite USA—China-Japan alliance directed against non-aligned Kampuchea, Laos and Vietnam; Pakistan, a former member of SEATO, will get \$3,500 million US military aid to harass non-aligned Afghanistan and India; Israel also in a "strategic alliance" with the United States is attacking Syria, Iraq and Lebanon; Saudi Arabia, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates and Egypt, organised in the Arab War Industrial Organisation, are being supplied with sophisticated weapons, including advanced radar planes (AWACS) to Saudi Arabia, to keep progressive Arab States like Libya in line; Somalia has been compromised for attacks against Ethiopia. In Southern Africa, South Africa is again emboldened to attack Angola; Namibia is to be granted independence but not under the South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO).³⁸

Cuba is regarded as an agent of "Soviet expansionism"³⁹ and is deemed an exporter of terrorism in the Western hemisphere. The Caribbean, "America's crossroad and petroleum refining center, is becoming a Marxist-Leninist lake," according to the Committee of Santa Fe.⁴⁰ Non-aligned Nicaragua and Grenada are considered tools of the Soviet Union and Cuba. Using the harshest anti-communist rhetoric reminiscent of the inflammatory speeches by Winston Churchill at Fulton, Missouri in 1946 and President Harry Truman at Baylor University in 1947, President Reagan in his address to the Organisation of American States (OAS) in February 1981, declared that democratic governments were being threatened by "a new kind of colonialism" which "stalks the world today and

threatens our independence. It is brutal and totalitarian." Invoking the Monroe Doctrine,⁴¹ he continued: "it is not of our hemisphere, but it threatens our hemisphere and has established footholds on American soil for the expansion of its colonialist ambitions."

The old fallacious "falling dominoes" theory used in South East Asia has been revived: if El Salvador goes, Guatemala and Central America will go; and if Central America goes, US security will be threatened. *Using the sabre-rattling language of the Johnson Doctrine, he said: "If we do not act promptly and decisively in defense of freedom, new Cubas will arise from the ruins of today's conflicts." He warned: "that we will do whatever is prudent and necessary to ensure the peace and security of the Caribbean area." He explicitly invoked the Rio Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of 1947 and promised increased security assistance.*

The US government has increased spending to \$92.6 million in outright military aid for 21 Latin American countries in the October 1981-October 1982 period: a 60 percent increase on the \$58 million allocated by the Carter administration. Of this \$28 million will be going to the junta in El Salvador, in addition to \$25 million supplementary appropriation already granted to it. Now, additional military aid will be given to El Salvador to keep an oppressive and repressive military clique in power and to oppose the struggle for national liberation.

The United States is also giving what it calls "Foreign Military Sales" (FMS) credits, and "International Military Education and Training" (IMET) funds: the Bahamas will be getting more than \$1 million, Barbados more than \$2 million, Jamaica over \$1 million, with smaller sums to Guyana, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Surinam. In addition, \$20 million is being made available to the Eastern Caribbean from what has been called an "Economic Support Fund" (ESF).⁴²

Because of the explosive economic, social and political situation in the Caribbean and Central America, the United States brought forward the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI). Prime Minister Edward Seaga of Jamaica had first mooted the idea by calling for a mini-Marshall plan; it was taken up by Chancellor Schmidt of West Germany. The main components, designed "to make use of the magic of the market of the Americas," are: US trade preference for products such as sugar and duty free importation into the USA for the next 12 years of labour-intensive manufactured goods, except textiles and apparel products, from the Caribbean countries; incentives to US companies to invest in the Caribbean; an "aid" package of about \$350 million (US); technical assistance and training and security ties. To qualify, the recipient countries will have to accept the basic

philosophy behind the plan, must create an investment climate, pursue a capitalist course, and become integrated into the geo-political and strategic system and objectives of US imperialism.

The Basic philosophy behind the CBI is that the Caribbean, like other third world countries, must look to the private sector for economic, development and create a climate attractive to investment and trade. In this regard, it is similar to the basic foreign economic tenets of the Truman Doctrine for the "containment of communism" — Marshall Plan and "Point Four" aid programmes; the Puerto Rican "Operation Bootstrap" model of economic development based on private foreign capital and the creation of an investment climate within the country; bilateral MDA agreements.

The Reagan administration has shifted emphasis from aid to trade and private investment and from multi-lateral to bi-lateral cooperation; and it has reduced financial allocation even to the international lending institutions like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Inter-American Bank, etc. under its control. President Reagan told the World Affairs Council that "free people build free markets that ignite dynamic development for everyone." Investment, he declared, "is the life blood of development, and improving the climate for private investment" was one of his administration's major priorities.

The CBI has earmarked a sum of \$350 million for economic aid⁴³ mostly concentrated on the private sector; also about \$166 million for military aid to El Salvador next year. Of the economic aid package, \$100 million and \$120 million will go to bankrupt El Salvador and Costa Rica respectively, and most of the rest to Jamaica. Nicaragua and Grenada, deemed to be under "the tightening grip of the totalitarian left," along with Cuba are excluded. This is similar to aid⁴⁴ with political strings under the Marshall Plan (1947), organised for United States "economic-political intervention in Western Europe as a preliminary to its military organisation NATO [constituted in 1949] under United States control.⁴⁵

According to President Reagan, "before granting duty-free treatment, we will discuss with each country its own self-help resources," and "bilateral investment treaties will be negotiated."⁴⁶ This, like the old MDA agreements, will mean more "conditionality" (pressures) in addition to those already applied by US-controlled institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, which have wreaked havoc in countries like Peru, Jamaica and Guyana with respect to the economy and people's welfare. The aim is to create a pro-imperialist axis of Caribbean States armed to the teeth, possibly organised in a Regional Defense Force,

to coordinate with the US Caribbean Joint Task Force, now upgraded to a Caribbean Command, for "mutual defense." And to continue the programme of psychological warfare, intimidation and harassment, the biggest-ever NATO exercises will be carried out in March 1982 in the Caribbean.

Washington is implementing President Nixon's "Vietnamisation" policy — reviving the idea of a so-called Inter-American Peace Force and a Caribbean Defense Force, instigating and utilising some Caribbean and Latin American countries to fight others, and supplying the arms. With Cuba principally in mind, Venezuela is purchasing twenty-four F16 supersonic fighters; she has also suspended diplomatic relations with Cuba. With the same objective of isolating Cuba, Columbia and Costa Rica, like Venezuela with NAM observer status, have been pressured to break off diplomatic relations. Although Cuba is the current Chairman of the Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement, and was its spokesman through her President Fidel Castro at the 1979 UN General Assembly meeting, she was not permitted to take part at the Cancun Summit Meeting in Mexico;⁴⁷ President Reagan insisted that United States will attend only if Cuba was excluded. Also excluded were Nicaragua and Grenada.

Costa Rica has also been forced to join with Honduras and El Salvador in the Central American Democratic Community⁴⁸ to isolate Nicaragua — the same Costa Rica which had previously given sanctuary to the liberation fighters of Nicaragua, was actually a base for one of the sections of the Sandinista Front, and had joined with seven other Central and South American countries to oppose at an OAS meeting in 1979 US intervention in Nicaragua. The Reagan administration also suspended assistance to Nicaragua, on the pretext that it was supplying arms to the revolutionary forces in El Salvador. And Argentina is being pressured to play the role of US gendarme in El Salvador — a role previously played in the mid-1960's by Brazil as in the Dominican Republic in 1965.

Pressures put on the three signatories — Grenada, Dominica and St. Lucia — of the Grenada Declaration led to the split of the St. Lucia Labour Party (SLP) and finally the fall of the SLP government, the replacement of the progressive Seraphine government of Dominica by the Eugenia Charles' conservative Freedom Party government, and a well-orchestrated local and foreign campaign of destabilisation against Grenada. Washington also applied pressure on the IMF not to grant extended fund facility and compensatory financing facility of \$19 million to Grenada, a non-aligned state, and on the EEC not to support her application for aid for its airport, blocked hurricane relief specifically to her and not to her

neighbours in the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States; and demanded that no part of a US loan to the Caribbean Development Bank should be disbursed to her.⁴⁹ The British Government also, while supplying armoured trawlers to Barbados and St. Vincent, reneged on a promise to sell 2 armoured cars to Grenada.

*In the Western Caribbean, the United States has also concluded bilateral agreements with Haiti and the Dominican Republic. The two Caribbean countries agreed to render military assistance to each other in case of a serious revolutionary mass upsurge. The Pentagon has announced plans for spending \$21 million in fiscal 1983 starting in October 1982 for the purpose of airfield improvements in the Caribbean region, which will guarantee "access to the airfields by US aircraft."*⁵⁰

The countries, which are likely to become members of the pro-imperialist axis for the isolation of genuinely non-aligned Cuba, Nicaragua and Grenada, are Honduras, Guatemala and El Salvador in Central America; Jamaica, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Antigua, Colombia, Venezuela, Barbados, Dominica, St. Vincent and Guyana in the Caribbean. The Prime Minister of Antigua recently remarked that the United States had the right and the duty to defend the Caribbean!

The Role of the NAM

The Non-Aligned Movement has taken numerous initiatives internationally and regionally and made substantial gains. While it has not attained all its objectives, it has helped to bring down the political temperature, to reduce tensions which were likely to lead to confrontations among the Big Powers. By its "efforts to soothe, to convey nuances and impressions, to act in the interstices of great power relations,"⁵² it has served to preserve world peace, and thereby to become an indispensable political force. Its voice has been heard on important questions — the Korean war, the Suez crisis in 1956 and the Congo incidents in 1960-61, decolonisation, disarmament and a New International Economic and Information Order. Recognising political detente as "a detente based on mutual fear,"⁵³ it has struggled for military detente — disarmament and the creation of Peace Zones in the Indian Ocean and elsewhere. Its efforts in this direction led to the UN General Assembly adopting a resolution in favour of the suspension of nuclear tests in 1959,⁵⁴ and subsequently to the calling of a Special Session of the UN General Assembly devoted to Disarmament. The initiative of Algeria, the then coordinating chairman of the NAM, led to the calling of the Sixth and Seventh Special Sessions of the UN General

Assembly, which adopted the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and a Programme of Action.

Regionally, the Non-Alignment Movement and in particular Cuba and Mexico have made an invaluable contribution. The overthrow of the Batista dictatorship, in the context of other revolutionary, progressive and democratic developments in Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, was an important landmark in the history of Hemispheric affairs. The Cuban Revolution exploded the "theory of geographic fatalism" and became an inspiration for the exploited and oppressed. Faced with threats and pressures, Cuba's socialist direction and participation as a member in the first Non-Aligned Conference in Belgrade in 1961 with 3 observers from national-democratic Latin American States (Brazil, Bolivia and Ecuador) was the first serious challenge to US imperialist hegemonism in the Western Hemisphere.

With the growth of the Movement from 25 members at the 1961 Belgrade Conference to over 100 members at the Havana Summit in 1979, Latin America and Caribbean participation steadily increased. At the Cairo Conference in 1964, the number of observers increased to nine. While the number of observers remained at nine, three other Caribbean countries joined Cuba to become full members at the Lusaka 1970 Summit Meeting; by 1979, there were 11 full members and 12 observers at the Havana Summit. This growth in membership and participation was a recognition of several factors:

1. The importance of the Non-Aligned Movement in world affairs;
2. The realisation by the progressive and revolutionary Latin American and Caribbean states, which came under all kinds of attacks and pressures — invasion, blockade and attempted isolation of Cuba, trade discrimination, conditional aid, etc. — that there was a convergence between the Afro-Asian countries and themselves as to objectives and goals (the fight for peace and the struggle against a common enemy, imperialism), the attainment of which demanded united action on a world-wide scale.

This confluence was mutually advantageous and reciprocally influential — the participants from the region, long under the suffocating domination of foreign capital, the transnational corporations and the tyrannical local oligarchies, influenced the NAM positively; the NAM in turn acted as a shield against "the colossus of the North" and from time to time took up vital issues pertaining to the welfare and security of the Caribbean and Latin American peoples.

The Belgrade Conference expressed the belief of the participating countries "that the right of Cuba as that of any other country to freely choose their political and social system in accordance with their own conditions, needs and possibilities should be respected."⁵⁵ The 1964 Conference in Cairo deplored the delay in the granting of independence to the Caribbean Territories, including Puerto Rico in the light of Resolution 1514 (XV) of the United Nations. Section VIII of the Declaration adopted by the Conference urged the United States Government to negotiate with the Cuban Government for the evacuation of its military base at Guantanamo.

The Non-Aligned Foreign Ministers Conference held for the first time in the Western hemisphere in Guyana in 1972 reiterated the demand for a dismantling of all foreign military bases in different regions of the world, including Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, particularly those established or maintained against the expressed wishes of the countries concerned. It expressed "full support" for the Chilean Government of President Salvadore Allende, which it said, "is bent on consolidating its national independence and building a new society." Support was also pledged to the "nationalistic measures taken by the Peruvian Government and its efforts to safeguard the nation's sovereignty and to promote social progress." The participants commended the efforts of the people and government of Panama to "consolidate their territorial integrity," and generally welcomed the growth of the efforts being made by the Latin American peoples to recover their natural resources, re-assert their sovereignty and defend the interests of their countries. *The conference further expressed full support for all governments which, "in the exercise of their sovereign rights over the natural resources of their countries have nationalised the interests of powerful foreign monopolies and restored them to their peoples in the interest of their welfare and national development."*⁵⁵ It also adopted an Action Programme for Economic Cooperation, the Preamble of which stated *inter alia*:

The Ministers analysed in detail the results of UNCTAD III recently held in Santiago, Chile. While these showed once again the crisis international co-operation was experiencing, it was felt essential to continue to press for each of the proposals made by the Group of 77 in the Declaration of Lima. Accordingly, it was agreed to encourage its purposes. Attainment of the aims and objectives of the International Development strategy will depend on the concerted and consistent action of that Group...

The Non-Aligned Summit in Colombo in 1976, which accused imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, Zionism and racism of hindering world development, detente and human progress, produced a Programme of Solidarity and Mutual Aid; denounced threats and new aggressions against Cuba made by United States imperialism; called on the members of the non-aligned movement to make every effort to speed up the Puerto Rican people's decolonisation process and to offer them their solidarity and support in achieving self-determination and independence; welcomed the participation of Belize, whose aspirations for independence continue to be frustrated by territorial claims; reiterated its firm solidarity with the government and people of Panama in their fair struggle for their effective sovereignty with the Peruvian people and with the government of the armed forces of Peru in their valiant and just effort to consolidate and deepen the gains of the Peruvian revolution, to affirm their sovereignty and promote economic, political and social transformation for the benefit of their people; *paid homage to the Latin American leader, Salvadore Allende, and expressed its deep concern over the aggression and presence of imperialism in Chile, which is reflected in the reversal of the process of recuperating natural resources and making economic and social transformations in the country, in the flagrant violations of human rights there and the fact that the military Junta has not allowed the United Nations Human Rights Commission to visit Chile; stated that the presence of United States military bases in Latin America, such as those existing in Cuba and Panama represents a threat to the peace and security of the region and renewed its demand that the government of the United States of America immediately restore to these countries the inalienable parts of their territories occupied against the will of their governments and also demands dismantling of the military bases that exist in Puerto Rico; backed and encouraged the nationalist and independent measure adopted during the period since the Fourth Summit Conference by Ecuador, Venezuela and Colombia, Panama, Mexico and other countries toward recuperating their natural resources and condemns every attempt at coercion or aggression such as the United States trade law passed by the United States Congress which particularly affects the Latin American countries, among others.*⁵⁶

The decision to hold the Sixth Non-Aligned Summit in Havana in 1979 was a means not only of lending support to the struggling peoples of the Caribbean and Latin America but also of paying tribute to Cuba for the achievements and historic role of its revolution: this socialist revolutionary base in the Americas has steadfastly adhered to the principles and

objectives of the non-aligned movement. The successful outcome of the Havana Summit was also a great blow to the imperialists and their supporters within the movement. Recognising the necessity for unity, solidarity and action, Cuba, in 1966 hosted the Tri-Continental (Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean) Conference and a year later the Conference of Latin American Solidarity; it also set up in Havana the Tricontinental Organisation, OSPAL.

Mexico, with NAM observer status, has played a progressive role in Caribbean affairs. It refused to join with 5 other Latin American countries, under pressure from the USA and the OAS to sever diplomatic relations with Cuba. Non-aligned Chile and Peru took a strong stand at the UNCTAD meeting in Santiago in 1971 against the transnational monopolies. This led firstly to the Economic Declaration against Transnationals at the Algiers Summit in 1973, which in turn led to a special UN conference on raw material resources in economic development; and secondly, to the formation of the Andean Pact — a regional economic grouping different from the previous imperialist-controlled Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA), Central American Common Market (CACM), and Caribbean Common Market (CARICOM) — which recognising that foreign capital and the transnational Corporation were the roots of the problems in Latin America, imposed certain restrictions.

In 1972, four non-aligned Caribbean countries jointly broke the OAS blockade and recognised Cuba. Non-aligned Grenada took the initiative in 1979 for a tripartite (Grenada, St. Lucia and Dominica) Caribbean unity, different from CARICOM, democratic and anti-imperialist in content. She also called for the Caribbean region to be declared a Zone of Peace. In the same year, 8 states — the 5 Andean countries and Costa Rica, Mexico and Panama — blocked at an OAS meeting the United States from sending an interventionist force into Nicaragua.⁵⁷ This was a decisive victory, an historic turning point in hemispheric affairs.

New institutions and organisations have also been created to break out of the *status quo*. These include the Latin American Economic System (SELA), a regional Shipping Association (NAMUCAR), a regional Latin American and Caribbean Trade Union (CPUSTAL) to counter the CIA-controlled ORIT and AIFLD, a regional Trade Union Conference, first convened by the Central Council of Cuban Trade Unions, the Guyana Trades Union Congress and the Guyana Agricultural and General Workers Union in Guyana in 1977, the Latin American Federation of Journalists with headquarters in Mexico as a counter to the imperialist-controlled Inter-American Press Association, and a students' organisation, OCLAE.

In the field of energy, Trinidad, Venezuela and Mexico came forward with their "oil facility" schemes, intended to assist the region's energy problems. This came about particularly after Fidel Castro, had criticised some of the OPEC countries for putting their surplus funds at the service of the imperialist nations and thus creating not only problems but divisions in the underdeveloped countries. On September 28, 1974 he had stated:

If all the underdeveloped countries are to make the battle of petroleum theirs, it is imperative that the oil-producing countries make the battle of the underdeveloped countries theirs.⁵⁸

In the context of the world capitalist recession, the worsening socio-economic situation in the Caribbean and Latin America, the aggravated situation in the Caribbean and Central America and the conditionality linked to the IMF, World Bank, Inter-American Bank and the Caribbean Basin Initiative, the Non-Aligned Movement is likely to suffer a setback in the immediate short-term period. Not all countries are willing to attune their foreign policies with the NAM principles and goals which they subscribe to. Some in desperate need for budget and balance of payment support and with vacillating petty-bourgeois leadership, lack the political will to stand up to imperialist pressure and dictat.

Guyana is a classic example. During the past 17 years, the Burham-led PNC government has moved, like a weather-cock, from a full-blown pro-imperialist to anti-imperialist and back again, now, to pro-imperialist, with in-between vacillation. The ruling Party's weak ideological understanding has permitted the US to get the required responses by playing in turn the siren's lyre or swinging a club. There is no space now to detail the sins of omission and commission of the regime in its domestic and foreign policies and non-aligned positions: it will suffice to say that it has led to both financial and moral bankruptcy. Colombia and Venezuela with NAM observer status have also somersaulted and, with seven other Caribbean and Latin American states, condemned Mexico and France for recognising the FDR and the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front as a representative political force and for calling for a negotiated settlement in El Salvador.

These and other setbacks, however, will only be temporary; they will not succeed in deterring the NAM from its goals. In this era of transition from capitalism to socialism, of sharpening national liberation and class struggles, of revolution, the people cannot be stopped. Imperialism, faced with any contradictions, will be defeated.

In the United States, as in other capitalist states, class battles in defense of living standards are sharpening. Faced with the threat of a new thermonuclear world war, the peace forces have become more assertive. In this regard, many of the allies in the Western Atlantic Alliance have expressed disagreement with the policies of the USA. Not as prostrate as in the immediate post World War II period, and unwilling to become the victims of a "limited nuclear war" in Europe, several European allies of the United States have expressed opposition or reservations to the deployment in their territories of US nuclear missiles. Expressing the sentiments of millions of Europeans, William Borm, a veteran leader of the Free Democratic Party, the coalition partner with Helmut Schmidt's social-democratic Party in the West German government, demanded the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in Europe and increased conventional defenses in an effort to escape an alternative to "capitulation or nuclear suicide." NATO's nuclear doctrine, he charged, had led security policy into a dead-end street, and another war in Europe "would mean certain destruction for the Germans, East and West, but not so for the United States." He criticised the "adventurous ideas of some influential political circles in the United States," which have "the decision of life and death"⁵⁹ on German soil. Faced also with grave economic and serious unemployment problems, West Europeans are unwilling to sacrifice their national interests by terminating trade links with the socialist countries, which developed with the "ostpolitik" policy of former Chancellor Willi Brandt, and reverting to the old cold war "containment of communism" and trade embargoes.

Italy will not take part in the NATO manoeuvres near Cuba in March, 1982. Canada, like France in Europe, has exercised its independence and refused to carry out US diktat towards Cuba. It has decided to make its territory free of nuclear weapons, condemned the US decision to give additional military aid to the embattled El Salvador military junta, and like many other countries rejected the request to send observers to witness the farcial elections. The Sub-Committee on Canada's relations with Latin America and the Caribbean sharply criticised the Caribbean Basin Initiative as "poorly planned and questionably motivated." Mexico objected to the linking of aid to political-ideological yardsticks and objectives, and indicated that it should be open to all nations. Even close friends of the USA in the Caribbean are skeptical. Prime Minister Eugenia Charles of Dominica, who recently stopped all scholarships to Cuba, said that "private investment plays an important role in the modernisation of developing countries, but we have more urgent needs." Prime Minister of

Barbados said that a Marshall-type Plan was irrelevant as a model for application to the developing world and rejected the idea that Caribbean development must be based solely on private initiative and the free market. He called for development as opposed to rehabilitation assistance, claiming that foreign investment "was being used as an excuse with no regard for the needs of the people."

Serious opposition has developed inside the United States against the economic philosophy at home and the interventionist policy of the Reagan administration in El Salvador. A recent public opinion poll showed opposition to the sending of US troops to that strife-torn country. The US Congress is moving to withdraw all military aid and advisers from El Salvador, and to curtail the President's present powers of committing US troops in foreign countries for 90 days in an emergency. The House of Representatives has already called for discussions between interested political forces in El Salvador.

Public pressure has forced the US State Department to explore the offer of Mexico to act as a mediator in the current conflict in Central America, and to normalise relations in the Caribbean Basin. This is a positive development and a recognition of the role of non-alignment as a viable alternative in the present geo-political conjuncture and aggravated Caribbean situation.

Non-Alignment as a powerful voice however must not be confused with non-alignment as a third force: an equidistant force fighting against the "two superpowers." Non-aligned Barbados and Guyana, unlike Cuba, Nicaragua and Grenada, have moved to this position.

Barbados Foreign Minister Louis Tull, addressing the UN General Assembly in late 1981, "called on Moscow and Washington to leave the Caribbean and Latin America to solve their own problems and to keep the area as a zone of peace."⁶⁰ He further pointed out:

... it is with grave concern that we view the open competition of the two superpowers in this region. It is unfortunate and frightening that Moscow and Washington should choose the internal conflicts of Latin America and the Caribbean to extend their theatre of war. We reiterate our firm commitment to ensuring that the Caribbean should remain a Zone of peace. Barbados believes that the problems of Latin America and the Caribbean must be solved by the people of Latin America and the Caribbean.

This observation flies in the face of history, linking the oppressor with the oppressed, the exploiter with the exploited. Unlike the modern period of the USA, the whole history of the USSR is one of struggle for liberation

inside and outside its territory. The assistance rendered to countries and peoples fighting for freedom and democracy has been attested to by many non-aligned leaders including Ahmed Sukarno, Kwame Nkrumah, Gamal Abdul Nasser, Indira Gandhi, Ho Chi Minh, Amilcar Cabral, Agostino Neto and Fidel Castro, to name a few. Aid from the socialist countries, especially the Soviet Union to non-aligned and other "third world" countries has been decisive in the national liberation struggles in Ethiopia, Vietnam, Angola, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Cuba, Guinea Bissau, Egypt (Suez crisis in 1956) and elsewhere, not only for securing and maintaining revolutionary-democratic people's power, but also for socio-economic transformations. Barbados, which refused to permit refuelling rights to Cuban planes bound for Angola in 1975, should be reminded that Angola could not have survived the military onslaught of South Africa and Zaire, backed by the CIA and China, had it not been for aid rendered by Cuba, the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries. This was why the Action Programme for Economic Cooperation, adopted by the 4th Non-Aligned Conference in Algeria included a special section on cooperation with the Socialist countries. It specifies that:

the non-aligned countries shall encourage the development of scientific and technical cooperation with the socialist countries, inter alia, through the conclusion of intergovernmental conventions, the establishment of the necessary joint bodies and the stimulation of relations between the organisations and institutions concerned.

Those who advocate an equidistant position and attack indiscriminately the two "super-powers" must remember the fate of Dr. M. Mossadegh, Prime Minister of Iran, who after nationalising the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company had rejected cooperation with the Soviet Union: a tanker blockade strangled the country; his government was destabilised by the CIA; he was placed under house arrest (where he subsequently died); the Shah returned and instituted a regime of torture and untold suffering for 25 years. Cuba did not make the same mistake as Iran under Mossadegh.

Vietnam also teaches important lessons. To meet the onslaught of an infuriated imperialism, it was necessary for her to develop the closest links not only with the socialist world, but also with the working class and democratic forces in the capitalist world and the national liberation movements in the third world. The people of the United States, for instance, played a significant role in forcing their government to bring an end to the undeclared but brutal war.

The non-aligned movement will succeed to the extent that the individual countries translate into practical domestic and foreign policies the principles and goals of the movement; secondly, that economic goals are linked with the world political struggle for major objectives such as detente and disarmament; and thirdly, that the United Nations is strengthened to uphold the principles and objectives of its Charter, achieve disarmament, maintain world peace and pursue vigorously the "Global Round" of negotiations for a New International Economic Order.

Above all, non-alignment must not become an ivory tower affair of governments. It will succeed only to the extent that in each country it becomes a genuine people's movement. This will ensure that the vacillating political leadership in some non-aligned countries are prevented from making an accommodation with imperialism against the people's vital interests. It will also be a guarantee that the liberation movement will go forward to peace, freedom and social progress.

NOTES

¹D. F. Fleming, *The Cold War And Its Origins* (Doubleday & Company, Inc. New York, 1961), p. 437.

²On February 10, 1952, John Foster Dulles, Foreign Policy Adviser to President Truman, in a broadcast stated: "the United States must not stand idly by while any part of the world remains under the rule of either communist or Fascist dictatorship" — cited in R. Palme Dutt's *The Crisis of Britain and the British Empire* (Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1957), p. 327.

³Santa Fe Committee, Council for Inter-American Security, Inc., *A New Inter-American Policy For the Eighties* (New York), p. 4.

⁴Edwin Lieuwen, *Arms and Politics in Latin America* (Frederick Praeger, New York, 1960), p. 4.

⁵C. S. Jha, *Non-Alignment In A Changing World* (The Statesman Press, New Delhi - j, 1967), p. 2.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁷C. S. Jha, *op.ci.*, p. 4.

⁸R. Palme Dutt, *The Crisis of Britain and The British Empire* (Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1957), p. 218.

⁹Main Documents Related to Conferences of Non-Aligned Countries, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Guyana 1972, p. 9.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹¹Main Documents Related to Conferences of Non-Aligned Countries, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Guyana 1972, p. 31.

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 82.

¹³*Ibid.*, p. 68.

¹⁴Nodari Simoniya, *Non-Alignment* (Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow), p. 54.

¹⁵Nodari Simoniya, op.ci., p. 13.

¹⁶D. F. Fleming, op.ci., p. 781.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 782.

¹⁸Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., *A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House* (Andre Deutsch, London), p. 444.

¹⁹Schlesinger, op.ci., p. 454.

²⁰Nodari Simoniya, op.ci., p. 37 refers to the *Far Eastern Economic Review* (January 20, 1978 p. 16), which on the eve of President Carter's visit to India in January 1978, pointed out that "the US Government no longer feels as it did in the days when John Foster Dulles was Eisenhower's Secretary of State that to be neutral is immoral . . . The watchword in Washington is that 'ideological pluralism' is understandable and acceptable in the emerging countries of the world." Similarly, for the countries of the African continent, President Carter wanted a new-colonialist alliance, like President Reagan's Central American Democratic community with Costa Rica, Honduras and El Salvador. He told *U.S. News and World Report* in June 1977: "If there is one overwhelming impression that's growing on me, it's the long-range strategic need - looking 10, 15, 20 years in the future - for a close friendship and mutual trust, social and political alliance" — cited in *World Marxist Review*, March 1978, p. 18.

²¹Nodari Simoniya, op.ci., p. 37.

²²*India News*, High Commission of India, Georgetown, Guyana, June 19, 1972.

²³Ted Roberts, op.ci., p. 15.

²⁴Nodari Simoniya, op.ci., p. 41.

²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 51.

²⁶Fidel Castro, *The success and the future of the non-aligned movement will depend on its refusal to allow itself to be penetrated, confused, or deceived by imperialist ideology*, Political Editions, Cuba 1973, p. 12.

²⁷*Ibid.*, p. 14.

²⁸*New Nation*, Guyana, August 6, 1978.

²⁹*Ibid.*

³⁰Fidel Castro, op.ci., p. 17.

³¹*U.S. News & World Report*, February 27, 1978, p. 24. In an article "Again, US is gearing up for Brush-Fire Wars" wrote that the United States is "once more starting to put together an elite military strike force to rush to any trouble spot in the world. The aim is to ensure that, in a foreign crisis affecting vital US interests, American power arrives first." Cited by Nodari Simoniya, op.ci., p. 31.

³²Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Foreign Affairs*, Spring 1979, p. 741, quoted in *International Affairs*, (Moscow, January 1980).

³³Kissinger, quoted in *Thunder*, official organ of People's Progressive Party, Guyana, August-December, 1979, p. 29.

³⁴Ronald F. Dochsai, President of Council for Inter-American Security, in Foreword to *A New Inter-American Policy for the Eighties*, op.ci. p. ii.

³⁵By "friends," Jeanne Kirkpatrick, United States Ambassador to the United Nations, means "traditional autocracies" of the type in Latin America and the Caribbean as distinct from "revolutionary autocracies" in the socialist countries — for her, there is hope of change with the former; with the latter, none.

³⁶R. S. Nyameko, "Fight US subversion of Trade Union Movement in Africa" (*The African Communist*, No. 87, Fourth Quarter 1981) states: "The CIA's experts on subversion confirm their role. William Colby, CIA Director under President Nixon, and Stansfield Turner, CIA Director under President Carter, stated: 'Covert action ought to be increased. The more aggressive the country's foreign policy, the more likely you are to use covert action as a supplement to diplomacy and as a substitute for military force. Victor Marchetti and John D. Marks in *the CIA and the Cult of Intelligence* wrote (p. 23): "Years later, in a letter to the attitude of the times. Referring to the CIA's coups in Iran and Guatemala, he wrote: 'Where there begins to be evidence that a country is slipping and communist takeover is threatened . . . we can't wait for an engraved invitation to come and give aid'."

³⁷Editorial Notes, *African Communist*, (Inkululeko Publications, London), p. 8.

³⁸Jeanne Kirkpatrick told the Senate Sub-Committee on April 7, 1981: "I would desire a democratic Namibia with some sort of framework for stability, some sort of framework with autonomy, democratic Government . . . This solution is one broadly accepted not only by Namibia, but its neighbours. In other words, an independent Namibia with a government acceptable to South Africa, and not a SWAPO government." — cited by R. S. Nyameko, op.ci. p. 26.

³⁹The former French Minister of Overseas Departments in the Valery D'Estaing government charged that "international communism is on the march in the Caribbean and Cuba is the staging post for Soviet action," that Cuba is providing both financial and political aid to Martiniquean dissidents, that "Martinique will stay French whether it likes it or not," and "France is one of the rare countries which is capable of transporting to the Antilles and Guiana in 10 hours a division and a half of crack troops.

⁴⁰Op.ci., p. 2.

⁴¹The Committee of Santa Fe wrote that the "three great principles were: 1) "no further European colonization in the New World;" 2) "abstention" by the United States from

European political affairs;" and, 3) opposition by the United States to European intervention in the governments of the Western Hemisphere. — op.ci., p. 3.

⁴²Alister McIntyre, former Secretary General of the Caribbean Common Market, in 1976 said that the region was faced with "unprecedented difficulties" including 20% inflation rate, a scandalous food importation bill of \$1,000 million, a worsening balance of payments problem and the need for 150,000 jobs for full employment by the end of the 1970-80 decade. And he lamented the shortage of funds for the public sector and "startling increases" in consumption expenditure. William Demas, President of the Caribbean Development Bank, estimated that the employment rate was between 10% and 20%; for the 15 to 19 age group, it was as high as 50%. And the rate of labour under-utilisation was between 30% and 50% throughout the region. A group of "wise men" appointed to diagnose the ills of the Caribbean territories pointed out that in the next decade, unless positive steps are taken to change the situation, it would definitely worsen with the prospect for some countries of a 40% unemployment rate, which "would be nothing short of a catastrophe."

⁴³Referring to the "Mutual Security Aid" programme under the Truman Doctrine, *The Times* of London on March 5, 1952 wrote: "The Programme will, as last year, be artificially divided into military and economic; and, as in 1951, there will be a tendency on the part of the Congress to accept the military part and cut the economic section to ribbons, because nobody understands that what is called economic aid is merely a cheaper form of military assistance." — cited by R. Palme Dutt, op.ci. p. 295. According to the *Guyana Chronicle* of March 2, 1982, total US Security assistance is likely to increase by \$1.67 billion for fiscal 1983 to \$8.7 billion.

⁴⁴United Front governments in Italy, Belgium and France were forced to expel left socialist and communists as a condition for receiving Marshall aid.

⁴⁵R. Palme Dutt, op.ci., p. 319.

⁴⁶*Guyana Chronicle*, February 25, 1982, p. 8.

⁴⁷Attempts are being made at the diplomatic level to prevent the NAM summit Meeting from being held in Libya after the next Conference in Iraq, and to shift it to Indonesia, one of the countries which Libya has described as "a Trojan Horse" within the Non-Aligned Movement.

⁴⁸The idea behind Central American Democratic Community is similar to the "Betancourt Doctrine" of the late President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela, a close friend of President Kennedy and the social-democratic Costa Rica leader Pepe Figueres — a doctrine which in the early 1960's condemned dictatorships of the right and the left. His proclamation that Venezuela would not recognise any government which did not come to power through the electoral process prepared the way for the diplomatic isolation and blockade of Cuba.

⁴⁹After Dominica was flattened by a hurricane in late 1979, Prime Minister Oliver Seraphine dismissed a Senator and the Minister of Agriculture on the ground that the aid donors did not like the "ideological complexion" of the government!

⁵⁰*Guyana Chronicle*, March 5, 1982, p. 9. In 1965, the Burnham-led coalition government, which was brought to power by Anglo-American imperialism, signed a secret agreement with the US government granting it the right to land military aircraft, equipment and

personnel at Atkinson, now Timehri, airport; to build military installations; and to overfly Guyana territory. Egypt, Somalia and Oman have also provided similar facilities to the Pentagon.

⁵¹S. Gopaul, "Role of Non-Alignment in a Changing World," *Indian Foreign Review*, May 15, 1976, p. 11.

⁵²*Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁵³C. S. Jha, op.ci., p. 8.

⁵⁴Main Documents Relating to Conferences of Non-Aligned Countries, p. 11.

⁵⁵*Guyana Graphic*, August 15, 1972.

⁵⁶*Sunday Chronicle*, August 12, 1976, p. 1.

⁵⁷Similarly in Africa, the non-aligned frontline states in the Organisation of African Unity achieved successes in Angola and Zimbabwe. In the latter country, for many years Britain kept in power the illegal Smith regime on the ground that it was not possible to use military force against "kith and kin." By 1979, on the threat by the African States at the Commonwealth Conference in Zambia to expel Britain from the Commonwealth, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, remarking that she was not prepared to draw African ire, agreed to a political settlement which led to the removal of Ian Smith and the assumption of power by Robert Mugabe.

⁵⁸Fidel Castro, op.ci., p. 26.

⁵⁹*Guyana Chronicle*, March 2, 1982.

⁶⁰*Insight*, West Indian Committee, (Goodyear Gibbs Ltd, London, November 1981), p. 3.

⁶¹Nodari Simoniya, op.ci., p. 16.