

From the Margins to the Centre: The Construction of the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace and the Non-Aligned Movement's Imagination of a New World Order (1964-1980)

Wu Yifeng, Gao Zhiping

College of History and Culture, Hubei University, Wuchang District, Wuhan City, Hubei Province, 430062, China

Keywords: Non-Aligned Movement, Indian Ocean Zone of Peace, New World Order, Third World

Abstract: After the Second World War, Britain's influence gradually contracted from the Indian Ocean region, and the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, began to expand their own spheres of influence in the Indian Ocean by virtue of their military power, which seriously affected the security of the Indian Ocean littoral and landlocked countries and regions. At the same time, the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) was established in the region after the Bandung Conference, and became an international organisation representing the voices of the Third World countries. As a result, the Indian Ocean littoral and landlocked countries began to make use of the platform of the Non-Aligned Movement to propose to the United Nations to build a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, and this proposal was adopted by the United Nations. In contrast to the unjust world system established by the two superpowers after the Second World War, the idea and intention of the Indian Ocean Peace Zone is an attempt to build a new world order based on independence, autonomy, peace and co-operation. Today, the struggle for this process continues in the global South, and from this perspective, the Indian Ocean region has gone from being a peripheral zone in the struggle for hegemony between the United States and the Soviet Union to becoming the centre for the construction of a new type of world order.

1. Introduction

In 1971, with the support of a large number of Third World countries, the idea of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, proposed by the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka at the Non-Aligned Movement, was adopted by the 26th United Nations General Assembly as resolution 2832 (XXVI), the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. It is noteworthy that this resolution, which was initially regarded as unattainable by countries such as the United Kingdom, provoked dozens of discussions on the construction of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, including by the United States and the Soviet Union, over the next decade. Meanwhile, countries such as Pakistan in South Asia supported the resolution as aimed at limiting India's regional hegemony, yet India also voted in

favour of the resolution in the face of potentially damaging its own interests. Furthermore, it is worthwhile to ponder how the Non-Aligned Movement's proposal for a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean should be viewed and what its implications are for today's world. However, the academic research on the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace is relatively limited, with most studies focusing on the field of international relations from the 1970s to the 1980s, and the historical research on the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace is still insufficient. If we want to explain the issue of India and its neighbouring countries in favour of the construction of an Indian Ocean zone of peace, we need to enlarge the horizon of the study to the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), which proposed the construction of an Indian Ocean zone of peace. In this paper, we will take the NAM's process of constructing the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace as a starting point to understand the reasons for the construction of the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace by the non-aligned countries and the connotation behind it.

2. Competition for Hegemony: The Emergence and Maintenance of United States and Soviet Military Power in the Indian Ocean Region

In the 1960s and 1970s, the United States and the Soviet Union were locked in a world-wide tit-for-tat struggle for global hegemony, and this was also true in the Indian Ocean region. Since the removal of South Asia from British administrative control and the contraction of British military power from east of Suez, the Indian Ocean region and the littoral states have also been transformed from a British sphere of influence into a sphere of contention between the United States and the Soviet Union. Of these, the hegemony's control of a country or region through military power and the exertion of influence over its neighbourhood is the most visible and direct means, and was particularly evident during the Cold War.

2.1 Soviet naval expansion in the Indian Ocean

After World War II, Britain remained the dominant power in the Indian Ocean, but with the independence of India and the reversion of sovereignty over the Suez Canal to Egypt, Britain's influence in the Indian Ocean diminished considerably. In the 1960s, the issue of the cost of maintaining military installations became a major political issue in post-war Britain. Both Labour and Conservative heavyweights argued for a reduced military presence in the Indian Ocean. The publication of the White Paper on Defence on 22 February 1966 (Command Paper 2901 and 2902) effectively declared that Britain would not continue its unilateral activities in the Indian Ocean, and in early 1968 Prime Minister Harold Wilson announced his government's intention to substantially reduce Britain's presence east of Suez by the end of 1971^[1]. Since then, Britain's sphere of influence in the Indian Ocean began to recede, and the Indian Ocean was no longer the "Lake of Britain" that Pannikar spoke of. At the same time, the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, began to enter the region, and the Indian Ocean gradually became a sphere of influence contested by the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, instead of "Britain's inner lake".

The Soviet Navy has been making frequent forays into the Indian Ocean since the early 1960s. According to British archives, since the early 1960s, the Soviet Union has significantly increased its presence in the Indian Ocean region in pursuit of its political and military strategic objectives through trade, economic and military assistance to coastal countries, cooperation in fisheries development, merchant shipping and space activities, and increasing naval deployments^[2]. The earliest Soviet vessel (other than merchant ships) to enter the Indian Ocean was an oceanographic research vessel in 1957, after which the Soviet Union was visited annually by vessels of a research nature. After the 1960s, the USSR supplied arms to a number of countries around the Indian Ocean at very competitive prices and sought naval basing rights from a number of recipients^[4]. During this

period, the Soviet Navy achieved remarkable growth in all aspects. In 1964, the Soviet Navy grew exponentially in terms of gross tonnage of ships, approaching that of the United States. In addition to aircraft carriers, the Soviet Union made significant advances in the number of other types of ships. In March 1968, Soviet naval forces made their first appearance in the Indian Ocean, when several ships of the Soviet Navy entered the ports of a number of countries in the Indian Ocean for a tour. Later in the same year, two other Soviet fleets visited the region. Since that time, the Soviet Navy has begun to conduct sustained activities in the Indian Ocean region and its presence has increased significantly^[3]. "Until the early 1980s, the Soviet Indian Ocean subfleet was large and already consisted of 10-15 ships, including 0-1 cruiser, 2-3 frigates, 1 amphibious ship, 1-2 minesweepers and auxiliaries. Even in 1979, it was more powerful than the combined naval forces of all the indigenous powers in the region, most of which had only littoral protection forces. Soviet forces paid particular attention to the area in the northwestern corner of the Indian Ocean, and Soviet ships regularly patrolled the Strait of Hormuz and kept a watchful eye on all ships in the area. The Soviet Union's continued pursuit of naval facilities in the Indian Ocean reflects its determination to maintain an effective and permanent military presence in the region."^[5]

According to scholarly analyses, the motivations for Soviet forces to enter the Indian Ocean included (1) strategic defence against U.S. ballistic missile submarines (SSBNs), (2) protection of the Soviet merchant fleet and communications, (3) counteracting China's influence in the Indian Ocean region, and (4) having the ability to threaten or block Western oil shipments and to increase political influence over the coastal states. Indian scholars have argued that the Soviet Union's geographic shortcomings were also an important reason for its focus on the Indian Ocean: on the one hand, the Soviet Union "could strike targets in Soviet Central Asia and the Urals because of U.S. bases in the Indian Ocean." On the one hand, the USSR needed to "detect and oppose US nuclear strike forces (submarines and attack carriers armed with Polaris or Poseidon missiles)" in the Indian Ocean, and to maintain a certain number of military forces in the region for countermeasures; on the other hand, the USSR's fleet was dispersed in both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and it was necessary to maintain "a rapid link between the European and Asian parts of the USSR". On the other hand, the Soviet fleet was dispersed between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and maintaining "a rapid link between the European and Asian parts of the USSR was essential", with the Indian Ocean being a key channel of communication between the two^[4]. In this regard, Elizabeth Kridl Valkenier has observed that "the Soviet Union's close economic cooperation with the Third World, including integration measures, inevitably brought the developing countries into the Soviet orbit." She summed up the Soviet doings as "a well-coordinated and well-executed economic programme that in many ways succeeded in replacing political penetration as a means of Soviet penetration into the Third World." Soviet policy in the Indian Ocean region, as in other regions, sought to strengthen the Soviet Union's own influence and interests and to curb the influence of China^[5]. It aimed to influence the countries in the region by demonstrating the strength of the Soviet Union as a superpower. But Soviet Indian Ocean policy was also experimental and opportunistic, designed to test Western reactions in the region in order to create the conditions for further expansion of Soviet influence without causing unacceptable developments or the danger of military confrontation with the United States. There is no doubt, however, that the exertion of such sustained Soviet economic and political influence in the Indian Ocean region undermines Western privileges here^[1]. The United States therefore sees the Soviet Union as the greatest challenge to its own Indian Ocean interests.

2.2 U.S. interests in the Indian Ocean

The United States military presence in the Indian Ocean region dates back to 1948, when they

established a naval base in Bahrain. At the beginning of the 1960s, the United States noted that the non-Western "Third World" was becoming increasingly unstable in the era of decolonisation. Within the next five to ten years, Africa, the Middle East and the Far East would achieve full independence or a high degree of autonomy, which meant that Western influence in the region would gradually diminish. From the 1960s onwards, in order to maintain the balance of power in the Indian Ocean, US naval forces began to move frequently in and out of the Indian Ocean. 1962, during the Sino-Indian Border Self-Defence Counterattack, a task force of the Seventh Fleet was "ordered" to enter the Bay of Bengal in order to help India to counterbalance China. 1971, in December, during the Indo-Pakistani War, in order to prevent India's victory over Pakistan, a task force of the Seventh Fleet was "ordered" to enter the Bay of Bengal. In December 1971, during the Indo-Pakistani War, in order to prevent India from becoming too powerful in South Asia after its victory over Pakistan, the United States sent a carrier task force from the Seventh Fleet into the Bay of Bengal again.

The entry of Soviet military forces into the Indian Ocean caused great alarm in Britain. Fearing that the Indian Ocean was becoming a "Soviet sea" and that there was nothing Britain could do about it, British Foreign Secretary Alec Douglas-Home turned to U.S. Secretary of State Rogers for help^[6]. As a result, the U.S. began to study the possible Soviet threat. In this context, on 9 November 1970, the United States issued a study memorandum, "Naval Involvement of the Soviet Union and Its Allies in the Indian Ocean Region, 1971-1975," which called for an assessment of the possible threat posed by the Soviet Navy to U.S. interests in the Indian Ocean, as well as options for allied naval forces and bases consistent with the possible threats and interests anticipated for the 1971-1975 period. Accordingly, Moynihan, the US ambassador to India, sees three possible US interests in the Indian Ocean:

(1) The free and unimpaired navigation of U.S. and allied merchant shipping, especially in the Persian Gulf, and the inter-oceanic navigation of our naval vessels; (2) the option of deploying port-launched ballistic missiles in this strategic area; and (3) the ability to pressure some littoral states at some point, if we so desire, for political or military reasons, and to be able to deter the Soviet Union from doing so.^[7]

In order to safeguard United States interests in the region, in 1972 the United States Navy declared the Indian Ocean to be included in the "area of responsibility" of the Pacific Fleet^[12]. At the same time, the construction of the Diego Garcia military base in the Indian Ocean, which had been justified and reviewed since the 1960s, began in the 1970s. According to Australian scholars, "the base was established in response to the growing Soviet naval presence in the former British colonies of Aden and Mogadishu." The United States Government claims that Diego Garcia is only an "improvised communications facility" and continues to implement its construction programme^[8]. The U.S. government claimed that the Diego Garcia base was only a facility with a civilian function, and therefore wanted to keep it and continue construction on it.^[9] In October 1972, the UK formally transferred the Diego Garcia base to the U.S., with the transfer agreement stating that, "The United States is permitted to construct, maintain, and operate a limited Naval communications site at the site. The site will include transceiver units, anchor points, airfields and associated logistical support, supply and accommodation facilities." The transferred and U.S.-built Diego Garcia Base has an 8,000-foot-long airfield runway, which has raised questions about the true purpose of the Diego Garcia Base. Renovation of the Diego Garcia base began in early 1971, and by 1973 Diego Garcia was operating the base's communications facilities^[11]. It was here that the United States consolidated its sphere of influence in the Indian Ocean.

While the United States entered the Indian Ocean to maintain U.S. nuclear strike superiority over the Soviet Union, U.S. security interests in the Indian Ocean were defined as military objectives for U.S. conventional forces, including the ability to "(1) protect U.S. economic interests in the Persian Gulf region; (2) use or threaten the use of force in support of U.S. diplomatic objectives in the

Middle East; (3) secure Indian Ocean air and sea lanes from harassment or interdiction; (4) intervene along the coast in support of other objectives; (5) check Soviet forces in the region and gain the upper hand in a crisis; and (6) protect at all times 'the establishment of friendly democratic regimes along the coasts and in the interior'." The fifth of these points is often seen as a U.S. response to the expansion of Soviet political influence in the Indian Ocean region^[4]. But the U.S. study group concluded that "U.S. interests in the Indian Ocean region are low and modest relative to the Atlantic and Mediterranean."

Significantly, some scholars have argued that the military race between the United States and the Soviet Union in the Indian Ocean region was more focused on the struggle for political influence, while exercising relative restraint in terms of military operations. "The U.S. strategic posture in the Indian Ocean region was primarily defensive, with the primary objective of preventing the Soviet Union from expanding its political influence, not pursuing the expansion of its own power in the region." But for the developing countries along the coast, the Indian Ocean was transformed from a "Lake Britain" under British rule to a "battlefield" for the US and the Soviet Union under the Cold War order from the second half of the 1960s to the 1970s, bringing great uncertainty to regional peace^[10]. For example, the U.S. ambassador to India, Moynihan, believes that the U.S. deployment of port-launched ballistic missiles in this strategic region "is something that many coastal countries, including India, are suspicious of and afraid of, and no matter how much we explain it publicly, almost no one will believe that it's true." In addition, the United States' quest to "put pressure on some littoral states for political or military reasons" would create strong frustration and scepticism in India.

As a matter of fact, India's concern is not unjustified, as the strong military power of the United States and the Soviet Union could easily cause anxiety among the countries neighbouring the Indian Ocean. Especially in the 1960s and into the 1970s, the military power of the United States and the Soviet Union far exceeded that of their contemporaries. In 1974, for example, "US and Soviet defence expenditures amounted to \$85 billion and \$109 billion, respectively, equal to 3-4 times that of China (\$26 billion) and 8-10 times that of the major European countries (\$9.7 billion for Britain, \$9.9 billion for France, and \$13.7 billion for the Bundesrepublik Deutschland)"; in terms of the troop numbers and equipment, "the armed forces of the United States and the Soviet Union amount to more than two million and three million men respectively, much larger than those of the European countries, and much better equipped than China's army of three million men." ; in naval affairs, "the two superpowers have a total tonnage of combat ships of 2.8 million tonnes (U.S.) and 2.1 million tonnes (USSR), considerably larger than Britain (370,000 tonnes), France (160,000 tonnes), Japan (180,000 tonnes), and China (150,000 tonnes)." By way of comparison, in 1974, China, Britain, and France together had 98 SLBMs, 102 submarine-launched ballistic missiles, 202 medium-range bombers, and none of the three countries had ICBMs or long-range bombers^[11]. This far superior military power not only ensured that the US and the Soviet Union had the power to destroy each other, but also gave the two superpowers the power to wipe out any other country in the world, which caused fear among post-war emerging countries such as India.

However, from the perspective of the Third World countries in the 1960s and 1970s, the gradual expansion of US and Soviet military power in the Indian Ocean threatened the sovereignty and territorial security of the Third World countries themselves. India's representative at the 21st Commonwealth Conference, K. Raghuramaiah, argued:

Countries that have experienced colonial rule are fully aware of the many traces left behind by colonial rule, such as the bases scattered from the shores of Australia to Africa In addition to this, the major powers are flaunting their naval and air power in the Indian Ocean under the guise of alliances and regional manoeuvres. The real purpose is to enable them to realise their Indian Ocean stakes in order to maintain parity with their possible strategic enemies. We do not want

any country to establish any base in the Indian Ocean. Future generations will never forgive us if we ignore this new colonialism.^[12]

It is thus clear that the expansion of the super-Power in the Indian Ocean region has brought the newly independent countries into the midst of the massive competition and global fragmentation triggered by the Cold War, and has aroused strong unease and indignation among the neighbouring countries. This has also made the newly independent countries along the Indian Ocean coast and in the hinterland hesitant in choosing the future path and ideological development of their countries, and to a certain extent has slowed down the political construction and economic development of their countries.

3. Peaceful Coexistence: The Third World Imagination of a New World Order and the Construction of an Indian Ocean Zone of Peace

After the Second World War, the Western colonial system collapsed and the Indian Ocean littoral and landlocked countries gained independence. In 1947, Britain recognised the independence of India, Pakistan and Burma, and in 1948, Ceylon became independent from British rule. Since then, nationalist movements in the Indian Ocean littoral and landlocked countries have intensified rapidly, and until the 1980s, all colonies belonging to the former Western colonial powers, except for the British Chagos Islands and the French Réunion Islands, had gained independence. The global military and ideological rivalry between the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, was accompanied by the emergence of a consciousness centred on the Third World countries, represented by the concept of non-alignment.

3.1 Anti-hegemonic Awareness in the Third World and the Founding of the Non-Aligned Movement

On 18 April 1955, the heads of State of 24 countries, at the invitation of the heads of the five Indian Ocean States of Myanmar, Ceylon, India, Indonesia and Pakistan, held the first Asian-African Conference of Developing Countries, known as the Bandung Conference, in Bandung. At the opening ceremony of the Conference, the President of Indonesia delivered an inaugural address in which he mentioned:

For many generations, our people have always been voiceless in the world. We were unnoticed, we were at the mercy of men, we endured hunger and suffering. Then we, the nations, demanded it, we fought for independence, we achieved it, and with it came responsibility. We have a responsibility to ourselves, a responsibility to the world and a responsibility to future generations. For this, we have no regrets.

The "heavy responsibility" referred to by President Sukarno is undoubtedly a good hope for the future development of the newly independent third world countries in a world of equality, prosperity and harmony. At the same time, the Bandung Conference had put forward a vision of a new international order. At the Bandung Conference, the participating countries recognized that "freedom and peace are interdependent. All peoples must enjoy the right to self-determination, and those who remain dependent peoples must be granted freedom and independence without delay. Indeed, all nations should have the right to choose freely their own political and economic systems and their own way of life, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. All nations should be free from suspicion and fear, practise tolerance with trust and goodwill, and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors.". Since then, the Bandung Spirit, which advocates "solidarity, friendship and cooperation", has given new norms and connotations to third world countries in their future international relations.^[10]

It is noteworthy that the Bandung Conference expressed its views on the emerging hegemonic

order:

(The Conference) considered the dangerous situation of international tension that currently exists and the dangers facing all mankind as a result of the outbreak of a global war in which nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, including nuclear weapons, would be used. All States are reminded of the terrible consequences that would ensue if such a war were to break out.^[11]

At the Bandung Conference, for the first time, Asian and African States reached a consensus on the nuclear issue and weapons of mass destruction: the States participating in the Bandung Conference emphasized that "the Asian and African States gathered here have a responsibility to mankind and civilization." Specifically, they considered that "disarmament and the prohibition of the production, testing and use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons of war are essential to save mankind and conciliation from the fear and prospect of mass destruction." Accordingly, States wish to "declare their support for disarmament and the prohibition of these weapons through and call upon the major interested States and world public opinion to bring about such disarmament and prohibition (of these weapons)". It is also hoped that "pending a total ban on the manufacture of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, the Conference calls upon all States concerned to agree on a moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons." From this, it can be seen that the Bandung Conference hoped to realise the third world countries' vision of world peace, stability and prosperity through such an idealistic approach as the "appeal"^[11]. Undoubtedly, the views of the countries at the Bandung Conference on nuclear war reflect the special connotation of the Bandung spirit. The Bandung spirit is not only "right and good" for the world community, but also emphasises the fact that all countries are part of the world's global village and are essentially bound by a common destiny and solidarity. The Bandung spirit was not only an early expression of global justice, as described by Boer, but also served as a spiritual inspiration for the subsequent establishment of the Non-Aligned Movement.

As early as 7 September 1946, Nehru mentioned in a Provisional Government radio address that "we need to keep as far away as possible from the grouping of superpowers, uniting one country against another, which has led to world wars in the past, and will perhaps again lead to a catastrophe on a much larger scale." This equidistant distance was the prototype of the policy of non-alignment, and the choice of non-alignment caused no small amount of trouble for the newly independent India^[12]. The US considered India's non-alignment an irresponsible and unwise move, while the Soviet Union considered India's foreign policy to be entirely pro-Western and non-independent. But non-membership in the "group of superpowers" also represented the Nehru government's willingness to become an independent sovereign state unencumbered by any of the parties, an approach that was subsequently supported by other newly independent Third World countries. On 6 September 1961 in Belgrade, marking the official birth of the Non-Aligned Movement. It is worth noting that the total number of official member states participating in the First NAM Summit was 25, with the Indian Ocean littoral and landlocked states of Afghanistan, Myanmar, Ceylon, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, the United Arab Republic (Egypt), and Yemen, totalling 13, accounting for more than half of the total^[11]. At the same time, three of the four founding members of the Non-Aligned Movement are also located in the Indian Ocean region. Undoubtedly, at the beginning of the Movement's existence, the third world countries bordering and landlocked in the Indian Ocean became the backbone of the Non-Aligned Movement as an organization.

Since its establishment, the Non-Aligned Movement has consistently advocated "the consolidation and strengthening of international peace and security; respect for the right of peoples and nations to self-determination Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-intervention and non-interference in their internal affairs; General and complete disarmament; prohibition of nuclear tests; peaceful coexistence among countries with different

political and social systems"^[11]. At the same time, the foreign policy of non-alignment has rapidly generated worldwide acceptance, not only by the vast number of developing countries, but also by the internal parties of developed countries with military alliance treaties, such as Japan. The global confrontation between the two hegemonic powers of the United States and the Soviet Union, with the risk of the outbreak of a new round of world war at any time, has had an extremely adverse impact on global peace and stability. On the other hand, the member countries of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), with different systems, backgrounds and beliefs, have learnt from each other, understood each other and joined hands to work together in the pursuit of world peace. At the first NAM Summit, in the Appeal of the NAM member States to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Nikita Khrushchev, and to the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, the NAM member States stressed that:

We are on the brink of a danger that threatens the world and humanity. It threatens not only to nullify our aspirations to make our people happy and prosperous, but also to endanger mankind itself. In view of the gravity of this crisis that threatens the world,... ... We frankly call upon the great powers to resume and continue negotiations and to enable mankind to follow the path of peace in prospect also enable mankind to create prosperity and peace and to live for prosperity and peace.^[12]

In contrast to the two super-Powers, it is the newly independent and underdeveloped countries of the third world that have assumed the moral and historical mission of humanity for global peace. The Non-Aligned Movement, through the non-aligned countries within its organization, had been the first to develop a broad conceptual identity unique to the Third World countries and, by doing so, had created a sense of community in the Third World, as opposed to the two hegemonic Powers. To this day, the vast majority of countries and social groups around the globe have adopted non-alignment as one of the norms in their diplomatic activities, and this "civilisational awareness", which emerged among Third World countries during the Cold War, has become a global consensus today. The third world countries have become the centre of the world, building a new world order that is different from the hegemony of the great Powers, by virtue of their morality and their desire for a new world.

3.2 Construction of the Non-Aligned Movement's Claim to the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace

In the early 1970s, in response to the military expansion of the superpowers in the Indo-Pacific, Third World countries fought vigorously at the U.N. In 1971, during the 26th session of the U.N. General Assembly, the Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned countries held consultations on the construction of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. The Ministers were of the view that "the establishment of a zone of peace, in accordance with the Lusaka Declaration, would contribute to international peace and security as well as to the stability of all nations and peoples." Meanwhile, The Prime Minister of Ceylon, Bhandaranak, in his address to the United Nations, explained in detail and in a comprehensive manner the concept of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. According to Bhandaranak, the connotation of a zone of peace is inherent in the concept of non-alignment, which requires that the space and territory of non-aligned countries must be isolated from the conflicts and rivalries of the major Powers.

Therefore, by definition, all areas under the jurisdiction of non-aligned countries should be zones of peace. However, "the concept of peace as it applies to maritime areas dates back to the 1964 Non-Aligned Conference. At that time we were concerned with only one aspect of the problem: the establishment of nuclear-free zones in many parts of the world, including Asia, and in September 1970, at the Lusaka Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries, we went a step further and called for peace in the Indian Ocean, a peace which would not only be free of nuclear weapons, but which

would exclude great power strife and rivalry^[9]." She pointed out bluntly that the proposal for an Indian Ocean zone of peace was not limited to a "collective security programme" in the Indian Ocean, "rather it is directly committed to contributing to the disarmament and strengthening of world peace that has been taking place for more than a decade." Bandaranak flagrantly emphasised that the Indian Ocean was different from other oceans and that "the existing naval bases in the Indian Ocean are particularly conducive to the implementation of this policy in the region. Among the littoral states of the Indian Ocean, there is neither a nuclear power nor any major maritime state. In fact, they are all geographically distant from the region and there is no reason to consider the Indian Ocean as vital to (the superpowers') their global strategic interests." It is for this reason that Bandaranak advocates that while "the major powers do not yet have a significant share of military power and strength in the Indian Ocean," it would be beneficial for the Indian Ocean to be in touch with the existing military bases and facilities, and in order to achieve a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean there is instead no need for "detailed regulations, as is the case in other regions^[9]." Her specific proposals for the construction of an Indian Ocean zone of peace are as follows:

An area in the Indian Ocean shall be designated as a zone of peace and shall be used exclusively for peaceful purposes under an appropriate regime of jurisdiction. There shall be no defensive or offensive installations at sea, on the subsurface seabed or on land, and ships of all States may exercise their right of transit. However, ships and chips carrying combat equipment, including submarines, shall be excluded; warships of any State shall not conduct military manoeuvres; naval intelligence operations shall be prohibited; and weapons tests of any kind shall not be conducted. The regulations to be established will be subject to effective international control.^[9]

With the efforts of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Third World countries represented by the Non-Aligned countries, the idea of constructing the Indian Ocean as a place of peace is gradually being realised. It is worth noting, however, that the Bandalanak proposal to prohibit the entry of navies into the Indian Ocean was challenged by a number of countries, including the non-aligned countries, and was openly criticised by the United States of America for seriously interfering with the freedom of navigation. This also posed a potential risk to the actual implementation of the Indian Ocean zone of peace in the future.

On 16 December 1971, as a result of the efforts of the Non-Aligned Movement and Third World countries, the United Nations, at its 2022nd plenary meeting, discussed the establishment of the Indian Ocean Safety Zone and adopted resolution 2832 (XXVI), which formally declared the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, and adopted the resolution Declaring the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, which briefly responded to the initiative of the Third Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement on the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. The Declaration briefly responded to the initiative of the Third Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement on the construction of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean by endorsing the view of the Non-Aligned Movement on the situation in the Indian Ocean at that time, that "the diversion of the limited resources of the States of the area [Indian Ocean] from the more urgent and productive tasks of economic and social construction, because of the financial and other obligations imposed by the military alliance, and the possibility of their further involvement in confrontations among the power blocs, are sufficient to prejudicial to their independence and freedom of action, thus increasing international tensions." At the same time, "disturbed by recent developments which foreshadow the extension of the arms race to the Indian Ocean region, thereby seriously threatening the maintenance of such a situation in the region" and "convinced that in a region where the arms race is not a major factor, it is a major factor in the maintenance of the arms race". And "convinced that the establishment of a zone of peace over a wide area of a region could have a favourable influence on the establishment of a permanent world peace based on the right of everyone to peace and justice in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations". It is therefore the hope of the United Nations that

"the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean would help to halt such developments, reduce international tensions and strengthen international peace and security". The purpose of the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace is to "halt the re-escalation and expansion of their [the major powers'] military forces in the Indian Ocean" and to "withdraw all bases, military equipment, logistic supply facilities, nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction deployments in the Indian Ocean, as well as all weapons of mass destruction deployments in the Indian Ocean based on confrontation between the major powers" by way of negotiation. The complete withdrawal of all bases located in the Indian Ocean, inclusive of military equipment, logistic support facilities, and the deployment of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction, along with any manifestation of military prowess by major powers rooted in rivalry within the Indian Ocean region.

The result was "to establish a system of universal collective security without military alliances, and to consult on the strengthening of international security through intra-regional and other co-operation, with a view to implementing this declaration and taking the necessary action". The declaration was formally adopted by 61 votes in favour, none against and 55 abstentions. The adoption by the United Nations of the Declaration on the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean could be described as a major victory for the non-aligned countries, and it provided ideas for the rest of the world to preserve their independence, sovereignty and peace.

In early August of the following year, the Non-Aligned Movement convened the Third Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Non-Aligned Countries in Georgetown. The Conference expressed great satisfaction at the adoption of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, and considered that "this initiative of the Third World and Non-Aligned countries is a major contribution to the strengthening of international security, and that its implementation will considerably strengthen the emerging architecture of world peace and contribute to the creation of conditions for the gradual attainment of the objectives of general peace and complete disarmament". "The Conference re-emphasised that the adoption of this Declaration "will strengthen the conditions for peace, security and cooperation in this important region of the Third World". In this context, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs considered further steps to be taken to implement the Declaration and agreed to coordinate their actions at the forthcoming twenty-seventh session of the United Nations General Assembly, as well as outside that forum, through consultations between coastal and landlocked States."

Since then, the idea of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean has risen from being an "ideal order" in the Third World to a "universal order", "the formation of which is itself a dynamic process of global history, the outcome of the tussle between oppressor and oppressed". The formation of a universal order is itself a dynamic process of global history, a stage-by-stage outcome of the entanglement of oppressive and oppressed relations." The Indian Ocean Zone of Peace (IOZP) as its centre is based on independence, autonomy, peace and cooperation, in sharp contrast to hegemony, which is full of deterrence, confrontation and hegemony. In the process of building the Indian Ocean zone of peace, the countries of the Indian Ocean region have begun to abandon the traditional contradictions of religion, ethnicity, system and ideology, and instead focus on the horizontal connection of the countries, and truly put into practice the "seeking common ground while reserving differences". The "common ground" not only stems from the similar history of suffering and struggle for national independence of the Third World countries, but also from the hope for prosperity and stability of the countries in the future, and the desire for a new world order of peace, co-operation and win-win situation. This political subjectivity, which was formed during the national independence movements but which seeks to transcend the boundaries of the nation-state and to move towards a new universalist world order, is what gave the twentieth century its unique historical significance". It is through this sense of "community" that the Non-Aligned Movement is transcending the old order by constructing a zone of peace, represented by the Indian

Ocean zone of peace.

In order to put into practice the ideas contained in the declaration of the Indian Ocean zone of peace, the United Nations adopted resolution 2992 (XXVII) in 1972, declaring the establishment of an "Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean" to establish an "Indian Ocean zone of peace". The Ad Hoc Committee is one of the nine ad hoc committees of the United Nations and publishes the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean every two years. China, which has just resumed its legitimate seat in the United Nations, plays an important role as a member of the Committee. The committee considered key definitional issues in the declaration of the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace, such as "definitions relating to the boundaries of the Zone of Peace as well as issues such as 'littoral and landlocked States,' 'foreign military bases,' and 'the context of great power rivalry.' 'Context of great power rivalry' and the precise meaning of such terms^[9]." And, participating states expressed a wide range of views on how the countries of the region could best contribute to the realisation of the objective. The following views were expressed: (a) the littoral and land-locked States of the Indian Ocean to reach a common view through close consultation; (b) the confirmation of their determination to settle their disputes by peaceful means without resorting to force, in accordance with the principle of mutual respect for sovereignty; and respect for the independence and territorial integrity of States without prejudice to the exercise of the right to self-defence by the use of force in response to an armed attack and the exercise of the right of self-determination; and (c) the need to promote and ensure regional security conditions within the region in order to strengthen India's right to self-determination; and (d) the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the littoral and inland islands of the Indian Ocean. The view was also expressed that reference should be made to the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Principles concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations in the consideration of the subject matter of the section. They also suggested that a further meeting should be convened afterwards in order to reach agreement on the issue of coastal and hinterland States^[9]. The Non-Aligned Movement was also highly concerned following the consensus reached by the representatives of the United Nations countries participating in that meeting. The declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace by the United Nations was undoubtedly a great encouragement to the Movement's global justice in the pursuit of world peace, for example, in the document prepared by the Non-Aligned Movement in Algeria in 1973, where special emphasis was placed in the political declaration:

Mankind has always longed for freedom. To achieve peace for the sake of happiness. It is no longer an unattainable ideal or one limited to a few. Peace is now within the reach of all the peoples of the world. The creative potential of our time has made it possible, and the fundamental demands of the people have made it a historical certainty.

The conferences (of the Non-Aligned Movement) in Belgrade, Cairo, Lusaka and Georgetown have been a strong expression of the aspirations of all peoples for peace and justice in a new world based on independence^[12].

It is for this reason that the Non-Aligned Movement has, since the 1960s, resorted to the power of international law through the platform of the United Nations in an attempt to establish a "universal order", thereby realizing the aspirations of the third world countries for a new type of international order. In the path of establishing a "universal order", the pursuit of global justice is not only in the interests of the vast majority of countries and peoples in the world, but also a proper significance of human development, and has therefore gained wide support. However, the construction of such a "universal order" subjectively requires the solidarity and cooperation of all countries, and objectively requires a certain degree of strength to confront the hegemonic order. Combined with the complex geopolitical situation and international relations in the Indian Ocean region, the construction of a genuine zone of peace in the Indian Ocean is still facing enormous

challenges.

4. Limitations of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Implications for the Era of the Construction of the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace

To this day, the construction of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean remains elusive. The construction of the Indian Ocean zone of peace depended mainly on the struggle of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement in the General Assembly of the United Nations and, after the adoption of the resolution, on the cooperation and efforts of all countries, especially the United States and the Soviet Union, which were the most militarily powerful countries in the Indian Ocean. However, in the Indian Ocean and within the Non-Aligned Movement, the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace (IOPZ) has been seen by countries represented by India as an enabler of their geographic hegemony in pursuit of regional interests. India's support for the IOP makes it impossible for the countries of South and Southeast Asia to maintain their own security without relying on the military power of the superpowers, and for the countries within the Indian Ocean to achieve the goals of the IOP, which are the exclusion of the military bases of the superpowers and the denuclearisation of the region. At the same time, the United States and the Soviet Union, which are superpowers outside the Indian Ocean, have used the United Nations resolution on the establishment of the Indian Ocean zone of peace as an instrumental policy to counterbalance each other's military power in the Indian Ocean region, and the two of them have no incentive to build a zone of peace, and are therefore unable to enter into genuine cooperation and practice with each other in the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

In the final analysis, however, the Non-Aligned Movement itself lacked the means to realise its claims, and it was unrealistic to aim at using and relying on moral force to achieve its objectives. In the process of building the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace, the Movement's internal decision-making was heavily influenced by the non-aligned powers, and there were occasional divisions within the Movement, which further limited the Movement's ability to realise its ideas in the international arena. At the same time, the United States and the Soviet Union had very close economic and political ties with some Third World countries. For example, the Colombo Plan, which was implemented by the US and Britain after World War II, aimed at helping Asian countries to achieve socio-economic development through economic and technical assistance. For the idea of building an Indian Ocean Peace Zone, the implementation of such plans also made it impossible for the Third World countries to cut themselves off from the superpowers such as the US and the Soviet Union in the full sense of political and military terms. At the same time, the global Cold War struggle for supremacy between the United States and the Soviet Union has also made it difficult for the United States and the Soviet Union to achieve real *détente* in the Indian Ocean, a region where both countries have major strategic objectives. As a result, the Non-Aligned Movement's idea of building a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean became a highly idealistic vision due to both internal and external factors.

However, the ideas put forward by the Non-Aligned Movement, such as the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, have to a certain extent played a role in the maintenance of world peace. After the United Nations resolution declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace was issued, not only did the littoral and landlocked countries of the Indian Ocean express their approval, but also countries outside the Indian Ocean, including China, strongly supported the resolution in the United Nations General Assembly. The Chinese delegation believes that "the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is a just proposition. It is based on the actual situation in the Indian Ocean region and reflects the strong desire of many Asian and African countries, including those in the Indian Ocean region, to safeguard their national independence and sovereignty and to oppose

the aggression and hegemony of the super-Power. We strongly support General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI), which declared the Indian Ocean a zone of peace, and believe that this resolution should be honoured and implemented." At the same time, the Chinese delegation has put more emphasis on the fact that it should be left to the countries within the Indian Ocean to determine their own development and oppose the expansionist and hegemonic actions of the superpowers. The Indian Ocean Zone of Peace is supported and endorsed by the vast majority of Third World countries in the world, and the Zone of Peace, in this form, is a visual expression of the Third World countries' vision of world peace and the realisation of genuine national independence and autonomy. Despite the strong idealistic flavour of the idea, mankind's relentless pursuit of peace has made it possible for the major Powers to take humanitarianism as an extremely important criterion in the use of military force, thus maintaining world peace to a certain extent.

At the same time, the relentless pursuit of world peace by the third world countries through the Non-Aligned Movement is based on the rejection of the world order dominated by the superpowers in terms of cold war hegemony, neo-colonialism and nuclear war. The Movement's advocacy of building a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean is, to a certain extent, a quest for a new kind of international order, centred on counter-hegemony and neo-colonialism, which is in stark contrast to the world order dominated by the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union. While constructing the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace, the Non-Aligned Movement has successively proposed and supported third world countries to establish a new international economic order centred on the economy and a new international maritime order; and a new world information and communication order centred on the right to information, which has become the central force of the third world countries in advocating for the construction of a new type of international order in this period. Although there were not many substantive results in these new orders, the Third World has been continuously pursuing the establishment of a new international order, which to a certain extent explains why the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) still exists after the Cold War.

It is for this reason that today the global South has incorporated the ideas of the Third World of the cold war period for the construction of a new type of international order, and is striving to establish a new order of international relations similar to the Indian Ocean zone of peace, such as China's community of human destiny, which is essentially a constructive concept that links the common interests and values of all humankind. Like the concept of the Indian Ocean zone of peace, a consensus on the ideas of peace, independence and cooperation is at the heart of similar ideas in the Third World and the Global South. This is also indicative of the fact that, from the Bandung Conference to the founding of the Non-Aligned Movement to today's practice of a community of human destiny, there has been a continuous imagination and endeavour for a new world order from the Third World to the Global South. From this perspective, the Indian Ocean region has been transformed from the periphery of the American-Soviet rivalry during the Cold War to the centre of the quest for a New World Order. At the same time, the Non-Aligned Movement, for all its limitations, has become a revolutionary force in the history of ideas.

5. Remainder

In the mid-to-late twentieth century, with the military power of the two hegemonic countries, the United States and the Soviet Union, touching the Indian Ocean region, the emerging third world countries in the Indian Ocean neighbourhood felt seriously threatened. At the same time, Indian Ocean powers such as India, in the form of the Monroe Doctrine, also undermined the interests of neighbouring countries. Therefore, the construction of the Indian Ocean zone of peace supporters are divided into two categories, India as the representative of the Indian Ocean region "big powers" is mainly to counteract the United States and the Soviet Union two superpowers in the Indian Ocean

military hegemony activities; to Pakistan, Nepal as the representative of the country is more concerned about the neighbouring countries for their own security implications. But the common point is that both are based on the concept of the Non-Aligned Movement and the United Nations purposes of their own security situation, they hope to "universal order" way to obtain their own and the superpowers or "big powers" in the interaction of the security situation. Meanwhile, the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), although less visible than it was before the cold war, has not been disbanded and remains active on the front lines of international diplomacy to this day.

Looking at this period of history through the lens of shock response, it should have been assumed that the Indian Ocean zone of peace and the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), which were products of the shock of countering great power rivalry, should have disappeared on their own with the dissolution of the Soviet Union, after the "end of history". But in fact, the unfair and unjust world order constructed by the superpowers still exists today, and therefore the efforts of the Third World or the global South to establish a new world order are still ongoing. The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), which began in the 1960s, has, in the spirit of Bandung, put forward proposals for the construction of a new international economic order, a new international maritime order, a new world information and communication order, and other proposals aimed at establishing a new, more internationalist world order that is not in the service of the superpowers. At the same time, in contrast to the unjust world system established by the superpowers after the Second World War against the Third World, the concept and intention of the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace is an attempt to build a new world order based on independence, autonomy, peace and co-operation. This "extraterritorial consciousness", born in the Third World, has long since become a "world consciousness" through the tireless endeavour and struggles of these countries, and today the struggle of the countries of the global South for this process is still going on, with more meaning and connotations. Since then, ordinary people all over the world have been talking about international affairs and daring to believe that they can be the driving force behind history. Today, viewed through the lens of realism and pragmatic politics, the vision of the Third World Movement may be seen as idealistic. However, at a time when the war-torn world is desperate to escape from its brutal hegemonic past, the discourse of internationalism does offer new hope to those who believe in the new world order depicted in the UN Charter.

The Non-Aligned Movement should be seen as an active and dynamic process of transformation of the world order, rather than a passive, negative and even more Eurocentric narrative under the "shock and response" paradigm. At the same time, acts such as the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace are more like "preventive measures" rooted in the historical and practical context of Third World countries, rather than a generalisation of the "shock and response" paradigm. The Indian Ocean Zone of Peace was proposed long before there was a real threat to the littoral and landlocked countries of the Indian Ocean, which were not yet "impacted", let alone "reacted" to. The Non-Aligned Movement's vision of a new world order was undoubtedly revolutionary in its time, and it was this revolutionary force that propelled the Third World countries to become a part of world history, and even, in a sense, to become the centre of the world. Emerging countries are by no means a barbaric, rigid and stereotypical presentation of hegemony, but should instead be a dynamic, dynamic and creative force. At a time when the United States and the Soviet Union were engaged in hegemonic activities, the world was threatened by war and large-scale conflicts. It was the Third World countries that took the lead in the pursuit of peace and stability, a revolutionary process born in the countries of the Third World region and aimed at building a new world order, which has been the goal of these countries from the Bandung Conference to the Non-Aligned Movement to the present day world. Likewise, China, as a Third World country, has always been committed to this revolutionary process, and since the very beginning of the establishment of the new China, the imagination and practice of the future world order of equality have had a visual expression: the

slogans "Long live the People's Republic of China" and "Long live the unity of the peoples of the world", which have been displayed on the two sides of Tian'anmen Square since 1950, have always been the goal of these countries. Long live the unity of the world's people"^[12]. By learning from and absorbing historical experience, China has put forward a programme for building a community of human destiny, which shares the same spiritual core as the zone of peace, focusing on the future destiny of humankind with a global perspective, and providing a new era in which the future destiny of humankind can be safeguarded with the help of a global vision. This programme shares the same spiritual core as the zone of peace, focuses on the future destiny of humankind from a global perspective, and provides a Chinese programme for moving towards global justice in the new era.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by Funded detail: the National Social Science Foundation of China under the major project "Collation, Translation and Research of Documentary Materials of the Non-Aligned Movement (1961-2021)" (Project Approval No. 18ZDA205).

References

- [1] Selig S., Harrison K. Subrahmanyam, *Superpower Rivalry in the Indian Ocean: Indian and American Perspective* [M], New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- [2] Nand Lal, *Indian Ocean & Peace Zone Politics*[D], Political Science PHD, Kashi Vidyapeeth, 1993, p. 66.
- [3] Rex Wingerter, *The United States, the Soviet Union and the Indian Ocean: The competition for the third world* [J], *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, 1977. *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, 1977, pp.52-64.
- [4] Kenneth MacPherson, *A History of the Indian Ocean* [M], Beijing: Commercial Press, 2015, p. 204.
- [5] *Documents on National Security Affairs (DNSA)*, 000076_011_0236, *Non-Strategic Naval Limitations in the Indian Ocean* [A], February 15, 1972, p. 1. February 15, 1972, p. 2.
- [6] Zhang Yuan, *U.S. Strategic Assessment of and Limited Response to the Entry of Soviet Military Power into the Indian Ocean in the Early 1970s* [J], *Boundary and Maritime Studies*. vol. 8, 2023, pp. 112-128.
- [7] Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers (II)* [M]. Beijing: CITIC Press, 2013.
- [8] S.L. Shakhder. *21st Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, 1975* [M], New Delhi: Lok Sabha Secretariat, 1976, p. 26.
- [9] Odette Jankowitsch, Karl P. Sauviant. *The Third World without Superpowers: The Collected Documents of the Non-aligned Countries*. Oceana Publications, Inc. Dobbs Ferry, New York, 1978.
- [10] U. N. General Assembly Resolution On Indian Ocean As Zone Of Peace[A], Cambridge University Press, *International Legal Materials* , JANUARY 1972, Vol. 11, No. 1972.
- [11] Yin Zhiguang, *The New World: Chinese Practices and Sources of Asian-African Solidarity* [M], Beijing: Contemporary World Press, 2022.
- [12] *General Assembly Twenty, 1969th Meeting, First Committee* [A]. 1973, AC1PV/1969, United Nations, p. 582.