
**An Analysis of the Possibility of
The Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77
Merging Together**

MA International Relations, Leiden University

Thesis Global Order in Historical Perspective

Name: Marianne Delcour

Student number: 1504932

Supervisor: Dr. Vineet Thakur

Date: 6 July 2018

E-mail: mariannedelcour@hotmail.com

Word count: 14.933



Universiteit Leiden

Content

Introduction	4
Chapter One: Literature Review	10
<i>Introduction</i>	10
1. <i>Supportive arguments given by the literature to the NAM and G77</i>	10
2. <i>Criteria given by the literature to the NAM and G77</i>	12
3. <i>Advice given by the literature to the NAM and G77</i>	14
<i>Conclusion</i>	16
Chapter Two: How are the NAM and the G77 similar and different?	17
<i>Introduction</i>	17
1. <i>General similarities and differences</i>	17
2. <i>The structure of the NAM and the G77</i>	19
3. <i>The Joint Coordinating Committee</i>	20
4. <i>The Summits of the NAM and the G77</i>	21
<i>Conclusion</i>	23
Chapter Three: Why have the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77 not merged together?	24
<i>Introduction</i>	24
1. <i>Political and economic issues</i>	24
1.1 <i>A division</i>	24
1.2 <i>A link between politics and economics</i>	26
2. <i>Cooperation and collaboration between the NAM and the G77</i>	27
2.1 <i>A History of Cooperation and Collaboration</i>	27
2.2 <i>A Harmonious Relationship</i>	29
2.3 <i>Risk</i>	29
<i>Conclusion</i>	30

Chapter Four: What are the advantages and disadvantages of the NAM and the G77 merging together?	32
<i>Introduction</i>	32
1. <i>Advantages</i>	32
1.1 <i>Institutional efficiency</i>	32
1.2 <i>The Joint Coordinating Committee</i>	33
2. <i>Disadvantages</i>	34
2.1 <i>National weakness</i>	34
2.2 <i>Unity</i>	35
2.3 <i>Negotiating capacity</i>	35
<i>Conclusion</i>	37
Conclusion	39
Bibliography	42

Introduction

With the end of the Second World War, the establishment of the United Nations (UN) and the process of decolonization, it was time for the Global South to address the system of international relations which, according to the Global South, was unequal and in favor of particularly Western powers. Yet, a single nation from the Global South still in its ‘developing’ phase could only do so much in its weak position facing the developed countries. Thus, the developing countries from the Global South got together, realized they had similar aims they wanted to pursue in international fora and that they were probably easier to attain if they were to work together. A cooperative mindset was developed and the developing countries created a united front that would operate as a strong force in international fora to promote their members’ goals and ideas. This mindset was formalized through the establishment of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) during the Belgrade Conference in 1961 and the Group of 77 (G77) during the first UN Conference on Trade and Development held in Geneva.¹ These names were distinctly chosen as the NAM represented the stance of its member states during the Cold War as being non-aligned with either the Western or the Eastern bloc and the G77 referring to its 77 original members.²

To this day the NAM and G77 are still operative as organizations representing the interests of the developing countries in international fora, with a particular focus on the United Nations. Despite the NAM and G77 having similar goals and founding and a history of cooperation, the two have remained autonomous organizations. Thus, the purpose of this thesis is to examine the fact that the NAM and the G77 have not merged together into one regional organization representing the Global South in the UN and other international fora. To do this, the critique, supportive arguments and advice provided by scholars given to the NAM and the G77 are compared to see whether they are compatible. Then, the organizations themselves are studied more in detail to consider how similar or different the organizations

¹ Wolfgang Spröte, “Non-Aligned Movement and the UN,” in *A Concise Encyclopedia of the United Nations*, ed. Helmut Volger (Leiden: Martinus Nijhof Publishers, 2010), 504 and “About the Group of 77,” The Group of 77, accessed December 30, 2017, <http://www.g77.org/doc/index.html>.

² “1. General Background,” The Non-Aligned Movement Iran, accessed February 15, 2018, <http://namiran.org/background-general/> and Mir A. Ferdowsi, “Group of 77 and UN,” in *A Concise Encyclopedia of the United Nations*, ed. Helmut Volger (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 2010), 207.

are. This enables a discussion on the fact that the NAM and G77 as two independent organizations have not merged together. Lastly, the possible advantages and disadvantages of the joining of the two organizations are debated. It should be noted that this thesis is not about providing a historical analysis of the organizations or assessing their successes and failures. Rather, this thesis focuses on the idea of the NAM and the G77 merging together to create one organization that would represent the whole of the Global South in international fora.

From the 18th to the 24th of April in 1955, 29 heads of states from Asian and African descent were gathered for the Bandung Asian-African Conference.³ As they discussed “the major issues of the time that confronted them,” noted by Morphet, this conference is argued to be the starting point of the creation of the NAM.⁴ Referring to the Cold War as having “polarized international relations,” Stojanovi further noted that the NAM was established as a consequence of “decolonization, the economic underdevelopment of newly formed states, [...] and the U.N. international security system.”⁵ What has been noticeable since the NAM’s inauguration in 1961 is the immense growth in membership which has risen from 25 to 120 countries as of 2016 when the 17th Summit was held in Venezuela.⁶ Furthermore, ever since the inauguration of the NAM, it has held a majority of seats in the UN.⁷ In addition, the NAM gained even more influence in 1992 when China turned into an observer of the organization which meant that NAM “was linked with a permanent member of the Security Council.”⁸ These three factors have showcased the true potential of the NAM and its capacity to influence international relations.

In 1962, the UN General Assembly (UNGA) accepted a proposal of the developing countries, who were discontent with the international trade agreements of the time, to hold a UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in 1964 during which the G77 was established.⁹ The desire of the Global South to unite, find solutions to their economic issues

³ NAM Iran, “1. General Background.”

⁴ Morphet, “Multilateralism,” 524.

⁵ Radoslav Stojanovic, “The Emergence of the Non-Aligned Movement: A View From Belgrade,” *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law* 13, no. 3 (Summer 1981): 444.

⁶ “Member States,” The Non-Aligned Movement Venezuela, accessed March 10, 2018, http://namvenezuela.org/?us_portfolio=creativo-proyecto-video.

⁷ Christos A. Frangonikolopoulos, “The policy and evolution of non-alignment: Past and future,” *Paradigms* 9, no. 1 (Summer 1995): 68.

⁸ Morphet, “Multilateralism,” 530.

⁹ John Toye, “Assessing the G77: 50 years after unctad and 40 years after the nico,” *Third World Quarterly* 35, no. 10, (December 2014): 1759-60.

and enable the creation of the G77 was based mostly on negative factors. Namely, as Williams explained, “the negativism of the developed countries and the realisation that results would only be achieved through concerted pressure.”¹⁰ Indeed, Behnam also noted this “shared and common perception of the inequitable nature of the then existing economic order, the unfair and unethical rules of the game and the necessity to change them” that spurred the establishment of the G77.¹¹ The increase in membership since its inauguration is also noticeable about the G77. The membership of the G77 now consists of 134 countries and is “the largest intergovernmental organization of developing countries in the United Nations.”¹² The influence of the G77 was further increased in 1997 when China was added to its list of members.¹³ Therefore, the NAM and the G77 have a similar capacity of international influence.

Furthermore, the two organizations have a long history of cooperation and collaboration. During the 15th Ministerial Conference of the NAM in 2008, the then Chair of the G77 and China noted that “the mandate for [economic development] cooperation is to be found in the very foundations of both groups.”¹⁴ The two organizations even created a special committee called the Joint Coordinating Committee (JCC) in 1994 in New York with the purpose of maintaining and intensifying the cooperation between the NAM and G77 and which is still operating now.¹⁵ Furthermore, certain similarities between the organizations have become evident. For instance, the member states of both organizations have overlapped since their establishments plus their general goals as they both represent the developing

¹⁰ Marc Andrew Williams, “The Group of 77 in UNCTAD: Anatomy of a Third World Coalition,” (PhD diss., University of London, 1987), 130.

¹¹ Awni Behnam, “2014: Fiftieth Anniversary of the Group of 77: From Unity Celebrating Diversity to Diversity Celebrating Unity,” *United Nations Chronicle* 51, no. 1 (May 2014): 42.

¹² G77, “About the Group of 77.”

¹³ Guy Arnold, *The A to Z of the Non-Aligned Movement and Third World*, (Plymouth: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2010), 144.

¹⁴ The Group of 77, “Message by the honourable W/ Baldwin Spencer, Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Antigua and Barbuda and Chair of the Group of 77 and China, Delivered by his Excellency John W. Ashe, Permanent Representative of Antigua and Barbuda to the United Nations, At the 15th Ministerial Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement,” Tehran: 29 July 2008, <http://www.g77.org/statement/getstatement.php?id=080729>.

¹⁵ Yash Tandon, *Development and Globalisation: Daring to Think Differently* (Geneva: South Centre, 2009), 37 and “Ministerial Declaration adopted on the occasion of the Thirtieth Anniversary of the Group of 77,” New York: 24 June 1994, <http://www.g77.org/doc/DECL30.htm>.

countries in international fora.¹⁶ Thus, given their similarities and history of cooperation, the following research question is examined in this thesis: Why have the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77 not merged together? In addition, this thesis aims to answer another question: What are the possible advantages and disadvantages of the NAM and G77 merging together?

The only form in which the merging together of these two organizations has been discussed concerned the merging together of the NAM's Action Programme for Economic Cooperation (APEC) and the G77's Caracas Programme of Action (CPA). During an intergovernmental meeting of experts on South-South cooperation as a district of the UNGA in 1995, as a suggested modality, the experts argued that "there may also be need to stress the value of merging and not merely harmonizing and coordinating the programmes of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Group of 77."¹⁷ Sauvant also suggested this in the same context but it never happened.¹⁸ Thus, the research of this thesis is relevant because it takes on an unanswered question concerning two organizations that are still active to this day and represent the majority of the world population.¹⁹ The states of the Global South that the NAM and the G77 represent in international fora still go through the hardship of being underdeveloping in a world that is still dominated by Western, industrialized, developed powers. That is why an effective and efficient organization of those states is necessary as they need to bind their powers together in order to, as former Secretary-General of the UN Boutros Boutros-Ghali noted, "transcend to a degree their peripheral and dependent position, to matter and be counted."²⁰ Thus, this thesis considers why the NAM and the G77 have not merged together and whether this would improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the organizations.

¹⁶ Hennie Strydom, "The Non-Aligned Movement and the Reform of International Relations," In *Max Planck Yearbook of United Nations Law*, ed. A. von Bogdandy and R. Wolfrum (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill N.V., 2007), 40 and Sally Morphet, "Multilateralism and the Non-Aligned Movement: What Is the Global South Doing and Where Is It Going?" *Global Governance* 10, no. 4 (October-December 2004): 525.

¹⁷ United Nations General Assembly, Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts on South-South Cooperation, "Expanding South-South Cooperation: Some suggested issues and modalities," A/AC.246/2 (19 June 1995), 5, <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N95/183/79/pdf/N9518379.pdf?OpenElement>.

¹⁸ Karl P. Sauvant, "The Non-Aligned Movement and Group 77: Towards Joint Cooperation," *Non-Aligned World* 1, no. 1 (1983): 63.

¹⁹ NAM Venezuela, "Member States,"; and G77, "About the Group of 77."

²⁰ Boutros Boutros-Ghali, "The G-77: An Essential Element of Democratization," *United Nations Chronicle* 51, no. 1 (2014): 7.

This thesis uses the methodology of a comparative analysis and applies this to the case of the NAM and G77. In this way, through a comparative analysis the NAM and the G77 are compared to each other regarding specific subjects to find possible answers to the question of why the NAM and G77 have not merged together. To further do this, the thesis is laid out in four chapters. The first chapter is a literature review, the second discusses the similarities and differences between the NAM and G77, the third aims to answer the research question and the fourth and last chapter examines the possible advantages and disadvantages of the NAM and G77 merging together. In more detail, the first chapter of this thesis is a literature review with the aim of examining how similar and different the literature about the NAM and G77 are. This will be done through a comparative analysis of three subjects. First, the supportive arguments, second, the criticism and lastly, the advice given by the literature to the NAM on the one hand and G77 on the other hand are compared and analyzed. The second chapter aims to answer the question: How are the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77 similar and different? This is done through another comparative analysis which focuses this time on the organizations themselves. The topics range from the organizations' structure and goals to the member states' shared past and present issues to conclude whether they have more similarities or differences.

The purpose of the third chapter is to answer the research question: Why have the NAM and G77 not merged together? This is done through an examination of the division of political and economic issues and a discussion of the cooperation and collaboration between the two organizations. Is there a distinct division between political and economic issues and what does this mean in relation to the research question? Can the organizations' past of intense collaboration provide an answer to the question? These subjects are examined in the third chapter and linked to the research question. The objective of the fourth and final chapter is to answer the additional research question: What are the possible advantages and disadvantages for the NAM and the G77 if they were to merge together? That is, if they were to merge together into one organization to represent the Global South in the United Nations and other international fora. The (dis)advantages that are discussed are considered from many different perspectives such as different current issues that the organizations have been facing that might be resolved if they were to join together. For instance, could a new incorporated organization bridge the gap that still exists between the developing and developed countries? Could it overcome the structural issues of the NAM and G77? The aim of the final chapter, thus, is to conclude whether or not it would be beneficial for the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77 to merge together. The discussion of this chapters' question adds to this thesis

an additional perspective to the research question of why the NAM and G77 have not merged together.

Chapter One:

Literature Review

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a comparative analysis of the literature that has been written about, on the one hand, the Non-Aligned Movement and, on the other hand, the Group of 77. The comparative analysis is based on three subjects. First, what supportive arguments has been given by the literature to the NAM and G77? Second, what critique has been given? Third, what kind of advice has been given by the literature? This comparative analysis does not merely provide a list of similarities and differences between the literature about the NAM and G77. Rather, besides this quantitative study, it further studies the relevance of each argument and so, provides a qualitative study. For this reason, it should be noted that not every subject noted by the literature is discussed here. Instead, the focus is put on those arguments that were deemed as relevant in relation to this chapter and this thesis in general. In addition to the similar and different topics that are to be demonstrated through this comparative analysis of the literature about the NAM and G77, there is what will be called a ‘third category.’ This category includes those forms of supportive arguments, critique or advice that was only discussed in the literature concerning either the NAM or the G77 but are argued to apply to both organizations even though the literature did not explicitly state this to be the case.

1. Supportive arguments given by the literature to the NAM and G77

The most significant and simultaneously most discussed supportive argument given to both the NAM and the G77 argued that the organizations represent the voice and interests of the Global South in international fora. Consequently, the organizations enabled an environment in which to create a form of unity and solidarity between the developing countries and, furthermore, “enabled the powerless to hold a dialogue with the powerful.”²¹ Indeed, the

²¹ Vijay Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People’s History of the Third World* (New York: The New Press, 2007), xviii. See A. W. Singham and Shirley Hune, *Non-alignment in an Age of Alignments* (Harare: The College Press, 1986), 35; L. K. Choudhary and Sanjeev Kumar, “Problems and Prospects of the NAM in the 21st Century: The Post – 13th NAM Summit Syndrome,” *India Quarterly* 59, no. 1-2 (2003): 126; Mourad Ahmia, “The Group of 77 at Fifty,” *United Nations Chronicle* 51, no. 1 (May 2014): 8; and Sauvart, Karl P.

NAM and G77 gain their strength from the cooperation between its member states as these states individually hold less to no power at all against the developed countries in such international fora as the UN.²² In addition, it was Savio and Srivastava who noted that the organizations not only represent the interests of the developing countries. Rather, they are also raising awareness about their international norms such as “multilateralism, and not bilateralism, peace and not conflicts, law as the basis for international relations, [and] trade and finance at the service of humankind, and not for a powerful minority.”²³ Thus, the representation of the developing countries is in itself a positive feature of the two organizations but is also linked to multiple other supportive arguments given to them which gives this argument its value.

While the value of the two organizations were showcased through the arguments discussed above, there were also supportive arguments of the literature that showcased the relevance of the organizations. Namely, the NAM and G77 as representatives of the Global South are relevant because they still face a considerable list of issues. These issues include, but are not limited to, poverty, economic and social underdevelopment, racial discrimination and armed conflicts.²⁴ These issues, indeed, on the one hand, make the organizations still relevant and deemed necessary. Yet, on the other hand, it could be used to demonstrate the failure of the organizations because these issues have persisted to remain despite their goal to eliminate them. However, as these issues are of an enormous and global capacity, it can be argued to be an unrealistic expectation of the NAM and G77 to solve them alone. They do not have the power to eliminate these issues and so, the persistent issues are not deemed as proof of the organizations’ failure, but rather showcase their relevance. Furthermore, it is positively regarded by the literature that the developing countries have no other option but the NAM and the G77 if they wish to be represented in international fora and, at the same time, have some

“Organizational Infrastructure for Self-Reliance: The Non-Aligned Countries and the Group of 77.” In: *The Principles of Non-Alignment*, ed. Hans Köchler (Vienna: International Progress Organization, 1982), 203.

²² Stephen Krasner, *Structural Conflict: The Third World Against Global Liberalism*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 3.

²³ Roberto Savio, “The Values of the G-77 Are More Actual than Ever,” *United Nations Chronicle* 51, no. 1 (May 2014): 38. See Govind Narain Srivastava, “The Future of the NAM: How to Make the Movement Effective,” in: *Non-Aligned Movement: Its Future and Action Programme*, ed. Bantarto Bandoro (Jakarta: Centre for Strategic and International Studies, 1992), 47.

²⁴ See S. I. Keethaponcalan, “Reshaping the Non-Aligned Movement: challenges and vision,” *Bandung: Journal of the Global South* 3, no. 4 (October 2016): 6; Choudhary and Kumar, “Problems and Prospects,” 143; and Srivastava, “The Future,” 47.

bargaining power against the developed countries.²⁵ In other words, there are no other organizations that can undertake the tasks of the NAM and G77 and so, this makes the existence of the organizations relevant at least for the developing countries.

In contrast to these similarities, differences in supportive arguments were also observed. Most significantly was the argument of Vieira in support of the NAM asserting that the organization provides its member states with ontological security. This means that, according to Vieira, “states have an existential need for stable and consistent identities” and the NAM has been able to meet this need by “(re-)producing among [the developing countries] a shared sense of self.”²⁶ Particularly after these states had decolonized, there was a sense of identity having been lost and in dire need of reinvention and for this, the NAM was a “coping mechanism,” as Vieira phrased it.²⁷ Vieira argued that the NAM to this day has been able to provide the developing countries with a sense of identity which in a globalizing world has become more important and more difficult to maintain. Although it was only Vieira who noted this, it is a valuable argument that shows the importance of the NAM from the perspective of the developing countries themselves. In the end, more similar than different qualitative supportive arguments were provided by the literature about the NAM and G77. Therefore, it is concluded that the literature about the NAM and G77 was more similar than different concerning the subject of supportive arguments.

2. Criteria given by the literature to the NAM and G77

Overall provided the literature about the NAM and G77 more critical than supportive arguments. Most notable was the critique that the NAM and the G77 are not focused enough on pursuing self-reliance or, in other words, becoming independent and self-sufficient.²⁸ This

²⁵ See John Graham, “The Non-Aligned Movement after the Havana Summit,” *Journal of International Affairs* 34, no. 1 (Spring 1980): 160; Ahmia, “The Group of 77,” 8; and István Tarrósy, “Need for non-alignment in our global world? The Non-Aligned Movement Today and Tomorrow,” *Croatian International Relations Review* (July-December 2005): 162.

²⁶ Marco Vieira, “Understanding Resilience in International Relations: The Non-Aligned Movement and Ontological Security,” *International Studies Review* 18 (2016): 292.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ See Strydom, “The Non-Aligned Movement,” 43-4; Panchali Sen, “Non-Aligned Movement and the New World Order,” *Jadavpur Journal of International Relations* 9, no. 1 (2005): 136-7; Frangonikolopoulos, “The policy and evolution,” 72; and Karl P. Sauvart, “The Early Days of the Group of 77,” *United Nations Chronicle* 51, no. 1 (May 2014): 29.

is related to their neglecting of the national issues of its member states who still too often “turn to the major powers for support.”²⁹ Issues that the NAM and G77 aim to tackle on an international level, such as poverty, food security and underdevelopment, are issues that are also in need of solving on a national level, especially for the developing countries.³⁰ These “internal weaknesses” are withholding these states from economic and social development and, consequently, are withholding the NAM and G77 from gaining international, influential power.³¹ Furthermore, this has showcased, according to the critical literature about the NAM and G77, how the organizations have been operating with a double standard for international, on the one hand, and national concerns, on the other hand. For example, while the organizations aim to be treated as equals in international relations, Strydom noted that “at the same time, they sought economic assistance and other forms of special (unequal) treatment” for their national economic development.³² This biased behaviour also has a negative effect on the influential power of the two organizations as it has damaged their international image.³³ Thus, this criteria that was given to both the NAM and the G77 has a valid argument as it correlates to the power that the organizations need in the international system.

An additional three linked arguments given by the literature criticized both the NAM and G77 for, first, their lack of cohesion, second, their lengthy debates and documents and third, their lack of action.³⁴ Indeed, the lack of unity between the member states of the

²⁹ Strydom, “The Non-Aligned Movement,” 44-5.

³⁰ See The Non-Aligned Movement, “17th Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Movement,” Margarita: 17-18 September 2016, 6, 148-9; and The Group of 77, “Second South Summit,” Doha: 12-16 June 2005, 8, 12, [http://www.g77.org/doc/A-68-948\(E\).pdf](http://www.g77.org/doc/A-68-948(E).pdf).

³¹ Prashad, *The Darker Nations*, 114.

³² Strydom, “The Non-Aligned Movement,” 44-5. See Satish Kumar, “Nonalignment: International Goals and National Interests,” *Asian Survey* 23, no. 4 (April 1983): 454; Zivojin Jazic, “The Non-Aligned Movement Yesterday and Today the Process of Globalization: Critical View,” *Croatian International Relations Review* (January-June 2005): 65-6; Aruna Mital, “Non-aligned movement and its relevance today,” *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research* 2, no. 17 (July 2016): 23; and M. S. Rajan, “Non-Alignment: The Dichotomy between Theory and Practice in Perspective,” *India Quarterly* 36, no. 1 (January 1980): 59.

³³ Choudhary and Kumar, “Problems and Prospects,” 136.

³⁴ For lack of cohesion criteria see Bimal Prasad, “The Evolution of Non-Alignment,” *India Quarterly* 34, no. 3. (1983), 308; and Toye, “Assessing the G77,” 1773. For lengthy debates and documents see Jazic, “The Non-Aligned Movement,” 63; Sally Morphet, “The Non-Aligned in ‘The New World Order’: The Jakarta Summit, September 1992,” *International Relations* 11, no. 4 (1993): 370; Graham, “The Non-Aligned Movement,” 153; and Williams, “The Group of 77,” 286. For lack of action see Choudhary and Kumar, “Problems and Prospects,”

organizations explains the long negotiations that take place which, consequently, has produced long documents and not much action. However, these issues of the organizations can be explained to a certain extent which the literature too often neglected to do. Even though many scholars noted the various differences amongst the member states of the NAM and separately of the G77, only a few identified these differences as a reason for the critique just mentioned.³⁵ The major differences causing a lack of cohesion and action and lengthy debates is the fact that the developing countries are “at very different socio-economic stages and hav[e] very different political systems” as well as economic systems.³⁶ Therefore, Rajan argued that “to expect solidarity and identity of views” of these organizations’ member states is “absurd.”³⁷ Discussing international organizations in general, Koremenos, Lipson and Snidal also contended that it is unrealistic to expect mutual cooperation “where competing equilibria are in play, many actors are involved, and [thus] uncertainty is high.”³⁸ In conclusion, the comparative analysis demonstrated that the critical literature on the NAM and G77 was relatively similar.

3. Advice given by the literature to the NAM and G77

The most noted similar given advice stated that the two organizations ought to put more effort into South-South cooperation.³⁹ As Behnam explained that such “cooperation was seen as a demonstration of their unity and a countervailing power vis-à-vis the North in the negotiating processes” and as such, is necessary for the developing countries to dedicate as much

143; Keethaponcalan, “Reshaping,” 9; Morphet, “The Non-Aligned in ‘The New World Order’,” 1993; and Carol Geldart and Peter Lyon, “The Group of 77: A Perspective View,” *International Affairs* 57, no. 1 (Winter 1980-1981): 98.

³⁵ See Malabika Banerji, “Institutionalization of the Non-Aligned Movement,” *International Studies* 20, no. 3-4 (August 1980): 555; Prasad, *The Darker Nations*, 100; Sauvart, “The Early Days,” 32; and Ferdowsi, “Group of 77,” 210.

³⁶ Spröte, “Non-Aligned Movement,” 505.

³⁷ M. S. Rajan, “Institutionalization of Non-Alignment: Widening Gulf between the Belief and the Prospect,” *International Studies* 20, no. 1-2 (1981): 48.

³⁸ Barbara Koremenos, Charles Lipson and Duncan Snidal, “The Rational Design of International Institutions,” *International Organization* 55, no. 4 (Autumn 2001): 765.

³⁹ See Keethaponcalan, “Reshaping,” 13; Tarrósy, “Need for non-alignment,” 162; Choudhary and Kumar, “Problems and Prospects,” 147; Boutros-Ghali, “The G-77,” 7; Geldart and Lyon, “The Group of 77,” 97; Leo Mates, *Nonalignment Theory and Current Policy* (Belgrade: The Institute of International Politics and Economics, 1972), 356; and Sen, “Non-Aligned Movement,” 136-8.

attention to as possible.⁴⁰ Another advice provided for both the NAM and G77 asserted that the bond of their member states needs strengthening. Sauviant argued that their unity is “a precondition for achieving the desired changes” as the individual member state has little influential power compared to the organizations representing them as a unity.⁴¹ A ‘third category’ advice held that, alongside South-South cooperation, the NAM and G77 should also increase its North-South cooperation to further enhance the organizations’ influence and international development.⁴² Yet, while these forms of advice are valid and understandable, they are all already agenda items of the NAM and G77 and also regarded as vital by the organizations.⁴³ Therefore, the advice is not definite enough to be of further value for the organizations. What does it mean to increase South-South and North-South cooperation? How are the organizations supposed to strengthen their unity? Even if the purpose of the literature was not to provide a detailed framework of advice, which the literature lacked to mention, the advice given was not new, neither for the literature nor for the organizations.

Additional ‘third category’ advice was not only vague whilst it could have been concrete, it was also contradictory. It was vague as it concerned the creation of new membership criteria, which was argued for in relation to the NAM, with the purpose of eliminating those member states who do not adjust themselves in accordance with the criteria. Sen was the exception who distinctly argued for the need of the membership criteria that “nonaligned countries shall not resort to use of weapons for resolution of mutual disputes.”⁴⁴ The other scholars merely stated the need for distinct membership criteria but did not make any concrete suggestions as to what these criteria should be which, thus, leaves this advice as vague. What made this advice contradictory was that, on the one hand, there were scholars arguing for the need of new, clear membership criteria but, on the other hand, there were those who endorsed the inclusive membership of, in this case, the NAM but which is also argued to be the case for the G77.⁴⁵ Thus, one form of advice limits the membership of the organization whilst the other aims to increase it making it difficult for the two organizations to

⁴⁰ Behnam, “2014: Fiftieth Anniversary,” 42.

⁴¹ Sauviant, “The Early Days,” 32. See Banerji, “Institutionalization,” 563; and Prasad, “The Evolution,” 308-9.

⁴² See Morphet, “The Non-Aligned in ‘The New World Order’,” 372; Sen, “Non-Aligned Movement,” 144 and Keethaponcalan, “Reshaping,” 12-3.

⁴³ NAM, “17th Summit,” 89, 143; and G77, “Second South Summit,” 11, 16.

⁴⁴ Sen, “Non-Aligned Movement,” 146.

⁴⁵ See Choudhary and Kumar, “Problems and Prospects,” 138; Srivastava, “The Future,” 47; Frangonikolopoulos, “The policy and evolution,” 82; and Mates, *Nonalignment Theory*, 360.

decide what advice to follow as they are contradicting each other. To conclude, the literature on the NAM and G77 concerning advice was for the greater part complementary.

Conclusion

This chapter was besides a literature review also a comparative analysis of literature about, on the one hand, the NAM and, on the other hand, the G77. For this, the literature was divided in three subjects to analyze the similarities and differences and a ‘third category’ was introduced. First the supportive arguments, then the critique and lastly, the advice provided by the literature to the NAM and G77 were discussed and analyzed. The supportive arguments showed the value of the organizations as they represent the developing countries in international fora and, in addition, demonstrated the organizations as still relevant primarily due to the recurring international issues. The critique held that the NAM and G77 need to concentrate more on the national weaknesses of their member states and, in this way, minimize their biased behaviour. The advice provided stated that the organizations should intensify their South-South and North-South cooperation and the unity amongst the developing countries. Yet, this was counterargued to be unclear and not new advice as the NAM and G77 separately already view these subjects as critical agenda items. In conclusion, concerning the subjects of supportive arguments, critique and advice, the literature about the NAM and the G77 was more similar than different. This reiterates the research question of this thesis as it is now even more questionable why the NAM and the G77 have not merged together despite the greater similarity that was observed in the literature about the two organizations.

Chapter Two:

How are the NAM and the G77 similar and different?

Introduction

In the previous chapter it was demonstrated how similar and different the literature about the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77 are. The literature on the organizations may have been complementary, but that does not mean that the same can be concluded about the organizations themselves. Therefore, in this chapter, the organizations themselves are examined in more depth to answer the following question: How are the NAM and the G77 similar and different? The purpose of this chapter is to provide a comparative analysis of the NAM and the G77 as two autonomous international organizations and conclude whether they are complementary or not. How similar the organizations are is of major importance to keep in mind when moving on to the third chapter which discusses the research question of why the two organizations have not merged together. The more similar the organizations are, the more illogical it is that they have not merged together. Yet, the more different the organizations are, the more logical it is that they have not merged together. In order to get to a conclusion, this chapter, first, provides some general similarities and differences between the NAM and the G77. Then, the structure of the two organizations are compared, followed by a discussion of the Joint Coordinating Committee. The final and most critical section is a comparative analysis of the latest Summits documents of the NAM and the G77 to distinctly study whether there is a similarity between the concerns, goals, strategies and language of the two organizations.

1. General similarities and differences

In this section, some general, notable similarities and differences between the NAM and the G77 are discussed. The NAM and the G77 were both established in the early 1960s and, thus, in the same context of the Cold War, the struggle for independence and the undermining position of the Global South in especially the UN.⁴⁶ The NAM also considers itself to have played a catalyst role in the establishment of the G77 and afterwards. Sauvart demonstrated

⁴⁶ See Geldart and Lyon, "The Group of 77," 80-2; Prasad, "The Evolution," 304; and Prasad, *The Darker Nations*, 7, 114-5.

this by quoting the Final Communiqué of the 1978 Havana meeting of the NAM where they “reiterated the need for the Movement to maintain its catalytic role in the Group of 77.”⁴⁷ Plus, since the establishment of the two organizations they have both been primarily focused on achieving their goals through the system of the UN.⁴⁸ Lastly, the NAM and the G77 have an immense overlap in members.⁴⁹ Therefore, firstly, are the two organizations concerned with the same global issues that particularly threaten peace and economic development such as poverty, climate change and an unequal trading system.⁵⁰ Secondly, do the member states of both the NAM and the G77 face the same internal struggles, for example corruption, and, thirdly, share their members the same experience of having been undermined by Western aggression, for instance through colonialism.⁵¹

There is a common view that there is one significant difference between the NAM and the G77. This concerns the initial focus of the NAM on politics and of the G77 on economics, with an emphasis on *initial*. Since the 1970s, namely, the NAM has shifted its policies and interests more towards economic-related matters.⁵² As Sauvant phrased it, “while political matters did not decline in absolute importance for the movement, they did so in relative importance.”⁵³ Furthermore, as is observed in this chapter in the section about the Summits of the two organizations, it is also not the case that the G77 does not concern itself at all with

⁴⁷ Sauvant, “Towards Joint Cooperation,” 68. See The Non-Aligned Movement, “7th Summit Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement,” New Delhi: 7-12 March 1983, 110, http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/7th_Summit_FD_New_Delhi_Declaration_1983_Whole.pdf; Williams, “The Group of 77,” 76; and Idriss Jazairy, “Fiftieth Anniversary of the G-77,” *United Nations Chronicle* 51, no. 1 (May 2014): 10.

⁴⁸ Morphet, “Multilateralism,” 525; Prashad, *The Darker Nations*, 102-3; Geldart and Lyon, “The Group of 77,” 101 and Strydom, “The Non-Aligned Movement,” 40.

⁴⁹ NAM Venezuela, “Member States,”; and “The Member States of the Group of 77,” The Group of 77, accessed March 5, 2018, <http://www.g77.org/doc/members.html>.

⁵⁰ See NAM, “17th Summit,” 6-7; and The Group of 77, “Forty-first Annual Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Member States of the Group of 77,” New York: 22 September 2017, 5, [http://www.g77.org/doc/A-72-511\(E\).pdf](http://www.g77.org/doc/A-72-511(E).pdf).

⁵¹ Prashad, *The Darker Nations*, xvii-xviii; Vieira, “Understanding Resilience,” 292; Keethaponcalan, “Reshaping,” 3; Kumar, “Nonalignment,” 450; and Sauvant, “The Early Days,” 32.

⁵² See Lorenz M. Lüthi, “The Non-Aligned Movement and the Cold War, 1961–1973,” *Journal of Cold War Studies* 18, no. 4 (Fall 2016): 100; Keethaponcalan, “Reshaping,” 3; Geldart and Lyon, “The Group of 77,” 93; Frangonikolopoulos, “The policy and evolution,” 69; Prasad, “The Evolution,” 306; Rajan, “Institutionalization,” 49; and Sauvant, “Organizational Infrastructure,” 196-7.

⁵³ Sauvant, “Towards Joint Cooperation,” 34.

political matters. Lyon remarked accurately that “the notion that the NAM is predominantly political and the Group of 77 concerned with economics points only to priorities, not to exclusive categories.”⁵⁴ Thus, it is argued here that this supposed major difference between the NAM and the G77 is not as major as is often thought to be. The NAM does not exclude itself from economic issues and, in a similar sense, the G77 does not exclude itself from political issues.

2. The structure of the NAM and the G77

Although there are only so many institutional structures for international organizations such as the NAM and G77, it is a topic discussed here as it is related to the two main research questions of this thesis. The more similar the structure is, the more it reiterates the question as to why the two organizations have not merged together. Plus, concerning the question about the (dis)advantages of merging together, the similarity or difference in structure can make the process itself of merging easier or more complicated. The comparative analysis demonstrated that a vital similarity between the structure of the NAM and G77 regards their decision-making which is of primary concern for the organizations in order to take action and produce results. Namely, the two organizations both make decisions by consensus and this means of decision-making “strengthen[s] the solidarity and unity [...] presupposes respect for different points of view and [...] does not require implying unanimity.”⁵⁵ The meetings of the organizations are also similar as, most notably, both organizations hold Summits and Annual Ministerial Meetings “in New York during the regular session of the General Assembly of the UN.”⁵⁶ Yet, while the NAM has been holding Summits since its inauguration, the G77 did not start with this until 2000. Plus, the summits of the G77 are only set up every five years instead of every three years like the NAM Summits.⁵⁷ A final noted similarity between the structure of the NAM and the G77 is that both organizations have multiple offices at different branches of the UN, for example at UNCTAD, the UN Environment Programme, the UN Educational,

⁵⁴ Peter Lyon, “Non-Alignment at the Summits: From Belgrade 1961 to Havana 1979 - A Perspective View,” *The Indian Journal of Political Science* 41, no. 1 (March 1980): 151.

⁵⁵ “Structure of NAM,” The Non-Aligned Movement Venezuela, accessed March 10, 2018, http://namvenezuela.org/?us_portfolio=project-video.

⁵⁶ NAM Venezuela, “Structure of NAM.” See G77, “About.”

⁵⁷ Spröte, “Non-Aligned Movement,” 506; and NAM Venezuela, “Structure of NAM.”

Scientific and Cultural Organization and at the UN Industrial Development Organization.⁵⁸ Therefore, it is concluded that the structures of the two organizations are considerably similar.

3. The Joint Coordinating Committee

How similar and different the NAM and the G77 are can also be examined by reviewing the cooperation between the two organizations. The NAM and the G77 may be autonomous organizations, but this does not mean that the organizations do not work together. The NAM and the G77 formally acknowledged the advantages of close and effective cooperation between their organizations in June 1994 when they established the Joint Coordinating Committee during the thirtieth anniversary of the G77.⁵⁹ The JCC was formed, as stated by the Coordination Committee on Economic Cooperation among Developing Countries in 1993, “for the purpose of enhancing collaboration, avoiding duplication of efforts, and promoting greater efficiency in the attainment of common goals of NAM and the G-77.”⁶⁰ This has been reiterated ever since in every final document of each NAM Summit. Since its inauguration, the JCC has been primarily concerned with “UN reform, and in expanding and deepening South-South cooperation.”⁶¹ It is noticeable that whenever a document of the NAM or the G77 mentions the JCC, it is always in a positive light and with a reaffirmation of their desire to continue the strengthening of the cooperation and coordination between the two organizations. Thus, the JCC is a confirmation of, first, the desire of the NAM and the G77 to cooperate and coordinate and, second, of their ability to do so. This entails that the NAM and the G77 themselves were able to find enough common ground between the organizations on which to base the creation of the JCC. In other words, the NAM and G77 are more similar than different because otherwise the JCC could not have been established.

⁵⁸ G77, “About,”; and NAM, “17th Summit,” 10.

⁵⁹ G77, “Ministerial Declaration adopted on the occasion of the Thirtieth Anniversary.”

⁶⁰ “Final Report adopted by the Eighth Session of the Intergovernmental Follow-up and Coordination Committee on Economic Cooperation among Developing Countries (IFCC-VIII), Panama City, Panama, 30 August - 3 September 1993,” in: *The Collected Documents of The Group of 77*, ed. Mourad Ahmia, volume V, *The Perez-Guerrero Trust Fund for South-South Cooperation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 326.

⁶¹ The Non-Aligned Movement, “16th Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement,” Tehran: 26-31 August 2012, 10, <https://www.mea.gov.in/Images/pdf/final-document-of-xvi-nam-summit.pdf>.

4. The Summits of the NAM and the G77

In order to examine how similar and different these subjects are between the organizations, this section studies the documents published after their latest held Summits. This is done through a comparison of concerns, goals, strategies but also language. Thus, the final document of the 17th Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in Venezuela on 17-18 September 2016, is compared with the Declaration of the Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Group of 77, convened in Bolivia on 14-15 June 2014. The documents have an overlap in goals including most notably the creation of a just and equitable new world order, sustainable development, economic growth, reducing inequality and the strengthening of the United Nations and South-South cooperation. They are also complementary in more detail regarding their concerns surrounding these issues and their strategies of how to attain their goals. For example, the NAM and G77 are similar in calling poverty “the greatest global challenge facing the world today.”⁶² The organizations are both concerned with the effect climate change has had on the process of the eradication of poverty and believe this process can be enhanced through economic development and food security. The organizations also had a similar view on sustainable development which is argued by both to have an economic, social and environmental pillar that are all inter-linked. The same was stated about economic growth which should be promoted “in harmony with nature.”⁶³ The NAM and G77 both view limited climate change, food security, trade, technology and South-South cooperation as essential for their strategy to promote sustainable development. In addition, for the same purpose, do they ask for policy space from the international community to let the developing countries develop without any restrictions and constraints from the international system.⁶⁴ The organizations further emphasize the importance of South-South cooperation as they regard this as a strategy to improve the “individual and collective resilience” of the organizations and so, improve their status on a national and international level.⁶⁵

The language of the Summit documents are markedly similar. The two documents even frequently have the exact same text about a variety of topics such as trade, democracy, food security, middle-income countries and their critique on unilateral sanctions.⁶⁶ The NAM

⁶² NAM, “17th Summit,” 149; and G77, “Second South Summit,” 8.

⁶³ NAM, “17th Summit,” 152. See *ibid.*, 128; and G77, “Second South Summit,” 7, 10.

⁶⁴ NAM, “17th Summit,” 130; and G77, “Second South Summit,” 15.

⁶⁵ NAM, “17th Summit,” 145. See G77, “Second South Summit,” 18.

⁶⁶ See NAM, “17th Summit,” 17, 88, 167, 139, 143; and G77, “Second South Summit,” 27, 7, 12, 39, 41.

and G77 also use a lot of the same terms. For example, the organizations stress for the international system, including implementations, processes, exchanges and negotiation processes, to be “transparent,” “inclusive,” “multilateral” and “equitable.”⁶⁷ In this way are the organizations in a similar sense both vague in their documents. The organizations do not explicitly explain what they mean with phrases as transparent or universal, leaving it questionable for the reader as to what an “equitable, transparent, consultative and inclusive process” entails.⁶⁸ Also, the organizations often call for reforms of, for instance, the global economic governance, but neglect to specify concrete and realistic steps that can be set in motion by the international community to realize these reforms.⁶⁹ Instead, they stress the need for reform “in order to establish an equitable, transparent and democratic international system that strengthens and broadens the participation of developing countries in international economic decision making and norm setting.”⁷⁰ Thus, the organizations state their aims and reason why they aim for this but the documents regularly lack a more detailed framework that can be put into immediate action.

Finally, it is noted that the NAM and G77 in the documents often call upon the developed countries to improve their efforts in supporting the developing countries on subjects such as agriculture and public health and medicines.⁷¹ The two organizations also regularly refer to the UN and their responsibility in matters such as economic growth, South-South cooperation, the creation of employment and the issues of middle-income countries.⁷² Yet, the NAM is the organization who emphasizes the role of the UN to a greater extent than the G77 and, as an additional difference, the G77 is the organization that more often also notes its own responsibility and that of its member states in their quest for a new world order. A difference between the two documents is the subject of disarmament and international security to which the NAM dedicates a separate section in their document whilst the G77 does not directly acknowledge these topics. It should be noted though that the G77 does discuss the situation of the Middle East and calls for a peaceful solution for the Palestinian territory which arguably has been threatening international security for decades.⁷³ The G77 further

⁶⁷ See NAM, “17th Summit,” 5, 17, 55, 132; and G77, “Second South Summit,” 6, 12, 16, 27.

⁶⁸ G77, “Second South Summit,” 22.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 36 and NAM, “17th Summit,” 11.

⁷⁰ NAM, “17th Summit,” 31.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 148, 191; and G77, “Second South Summit,” 12.

⁷² See NAM, “17th Summit,” 31-2, 135, 144, 140; and G77, “Second South Summit,” 10, 18, 39.

⁷³ G77, “Second South Summit,” 39.

refers to the sovereignty issues of the Malvinas Islands and Chagos Archipelago and also stresses the need of safeguarding cyberspace, an additional two topics argued to be of concern for the maintenance of international security.⁷⁴ The substantial difference is the elaborate discussion of the NAM about disarmament, in particular of nuclear weapons, and the absence thereof in the document of the G77.⁷⁵ Yet, in the end, it is concluded that a comparison of the final documents of the latest NAM and G77 Summits revealed that the similarities outweigh the differences and the organizations primarily have the same concerns, goals and strategies.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to compare the NAM and the G77 in order to see how similar and different the organizations are. First, some differences but primarily similarities were remarked. Most notable was the overlap in membership of the two organizations and that, on the one hand, the NAM does not only focus on politics and, on the other hand, that the G77 does not only focus on economics. Second, the structure of the organizations was discussed and it was concluded that the structures of the two organizations are complementary with the most significant similarity being the means of decision-making which is through consensus. Third, it was noted that the organizations already for decades have been closely cooperating and coordinating their efforts through the Joint Coordinating Committee. This showcased that the NAM and G77 themselves discovered enough similarities on which this Committee has been based on. Lastly, the concerns, goals, strategies and language of the NAM and the G77 as expressed in the documents published after their latest held Summits were examined. For the greater part were these documents complementary as they held similar views and their texts were even regularly identical. So, each section of this chapter ended with the conclusion that the similarities outweighed the differences. In other words, the NAM and the G77 are more similar than different which means that the research question of this thesis is once more stressed. Why have the NAM and G77 not merged together despite their similarities?

⁷⁴ Ibid., 33, 40.

⁷⁵ NAM, "17th Summit," 64-74.

Chapter Three:

Why have the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77 not merged together?

Introduction

The examination of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77 so far has brought forward the conclusion that the two international organizations are remarkably similar. In addition, it has been clarified that the possibility of the two organizations merging together has not been a topic of discussion in the literature about the NAM and G77. This situation has only highlighted the purpose of this thesis, and this chapter, which is to answer the research question: Why have the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77 not merged together? It should be noted that the process of merging together such large international organizations as the NAM and the G77 with such a long history is certainly not underestimated as is discussed in this and the next chapter. To answer the research question, the first section re-analyses, as it has been briefly touched upon in the first chapter, the conception that the NAM is focused on political matters of concern to the developing countries and that the G77 is focused on their economic issues. Then, the second section discusses a history of cooperation and collaboration between the NAM and the G77 and it is hypothesized that this could provide an answer to the research question.

1. Political and economic issues

1.1 A division. A few scholars argued that the NAM is concerned with political issues and the G77 with economic issues.⁷⁶ These scholars merely mentioned this division and did not examine whether this separation of issues is present in practice. Yet, the two organizations themselves also hold that there is a division amongst them with the NAM targeting political

⁷⁶ See Ingo Winkelmann, "Groups and Groupings in the UN," in: *A Concise Encyclopedia of the United Nations*, ed. Helmut Volger (Leiden: Martinus Nijhof, 2010), 213; Spröte, "Non-Aligned Movement," 504-5; Rajan, "Institutionalization," 48; and Chris Alden, Sally Morphet and Marco Vieira, *The South in World Politics* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 57.

and the G77 economic concerns. The NAM and G77 distinguished this division particularly in two documents. First, the final document of the 7th NAM Summit of 1983 stated that

“the two programmes should concentrate on certain priority areas to avoid duplication. The Non-Aligned Movement will concentrate on the areas of transport, technology, fisheries, health, insurance, sport, housing, standardization of weights and measures, education and culture, tourism, transnational corporations, research and information systems, industrialization, women , employment and telecommunications and peaceful uses of clear energy. The Group of 77 will deal with the question of trade, industry, food and agriculture, raw materials, energy and financial and monetary co-operation.”⁷⁷

This clarified the separation between issues in a very concrete manner. The second document is a more recent confirmation that the NAM and G77 still hold the conviction that there is a separation of issues amongst them. It is a Joint Communiqué of the JCC held in 2014 which stated the following:

“The Non-Aligned Movement is the principal political platform representing the developing countries in multilateral fora, in particular the United Nations Organization and the Group of 77 is the principal economic forum providing the means for the countries of the South to articulate and promote their collective economic interests and enhance their joint negotiating capacity on all major international economic issues within the United Nations system.”⁷⁸

This concludes that the NAM and G77 still believe that there is an active division that describes what problems each organization is supposed to be concerned with. Therefore, it could be argued that the NAM and G77 themselves might resist full incorporation of their organizations because the presumption of this difference between them is withholding them from merging together. In other words, it is hypothesized that the NAM and G77 would answer the research question of this thesis by stating that they have not merged together because the NAM deals with the political issues of the developing countries and the G77 with their economic issues.

⁷⁷ NAM, “7th Summit,” 136.

⁷⁸ “Ministerial Meeting of the Joint Coordination Committee (JCC) between the Group of 77 and the Non-Aligned Movement on the occasion of the celebration of the Fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Group of 77, Algiers, Algeria, 30 May 2014,” in: *The Collected Documents of the Group of 77*, ed. Mourad Ahmia, volume VI, *Fiftieth Anniversary Edition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), 414.

1.2 A link between politics and economics. In practice, the separation of issues in such a concrete manner between the NAM and G77 is not present. The NAM and the G77 both deal with a variety of topics that includes both political and economic but also, for instance, social and environmental concerns, as was shown in the previous chapter. Furthermore, politics and economics in international relations and in the international system are closely linked together, something which the NAM and G77 seem to be aware of. A statement made by the Chair of the G77 during a Ministerial Meeting of the NAM Co-ordinating Bureau in 1998 showcased this most clearly as the Chair stated that “lasting peace and security cannot be assured nor maintained in the absence of sustained economic growth and development.”⁷⁹ In addition to the link between economic and political development and how they reinforce each other, there is also a strong connection between economic and political power being used in international relations. If a state has economic strength, it has a higher possibility of simultaneously increasing its political clout in international relations and vice versa. Indeed, Prashad quoted a 1987 NAM meeting where the Chair stated that “the stronger we are economically the more respect we shall get from the economically strong,” respect correlating here with international political power.⁸⁰

Lastly, it was Mates who reaffirmed the link between economics and politics on another level. He argued that economic issues are primarily dealt with through a political platform such as international conferences. Furthermore, Mates noted that it is only through these political platforms that the NAM and G77 “can wrest any concessions, owing to the fact that the developed countries do not depend on the underdeveloped countries economically.”⁸¹ Thus, it is through political power that the developing countries can only try and pursue their economic development and other goals in the international system. So, it has been argued here that politics and economics are closely linked together. The NAM and G77 seemed to have acknowledged this statement yet in another way, namely, through their cooperation. Their cooperation is a means of linking the political and economic interests of the developing countries together. Therefore, considering the long history of cooperation between the NAM and G77, it is contended that the NAM and G77 themselves also regard the linking of politics

⁷⁹ The Group of 77, “Statement by his Excellency Mr. Ali Alatas, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, Chairman of the Group of 77, at the Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement,” Cartagena de Indias: 18-20 May 1998, <http://www.g77.org/Speeches/051898.htm>.

⁸⁰ Prashad, *The Darker Nations*, 214.

⁸¹ Mates, *Nonalignment Theory*, 353.

and economics to be of relevant importance, especially in international relations. Even though the organizations themselves might argue in contrast, it is concluded in this thesis that a distinct division between political and economic issues between the NAM and G77 does not actively exist and so, it cannot be argued to answer the research question as to why the two organizations have not merged together.

2. Cooperation and collaboration between the NAM and the G77

2.1 A history of cooperation and collaboration. It was in 1927 during the first meeting of the League against Imperialism held in Brussels that “the projects of the Third World began to take shape,” as Prashad phrased it.⁸² Prashad went on to provide a number of reasons, most notably the eventual outbreak of the Second World War, as to why no further gatherings of the developing countries on that scale were able to be held until the Bandung Conference in 1955.⁸³ This Conference laid down the foundation for the NAM and then the NAM is argued to have laid down the foundations for the G77. The organizations themselves have stated this in distinct words during the first Ministerial Meeting of the JCC where it was remarked that the Bandung Conference “recognized the urgency of promoting economic development” and so, “in response to this call,” the G77 was established.⁸⁴ In addition, Sauviant argued how the convening of the first UNCTAD meeting itself, during which the G77 was formally inaugurated, “owes considerable credit to the non-aligned countries.”⁸⁵ Overall, since the establishments of the two organizations, the NAM’s “catalytic role in the Group of 77” has been emphasized multiple times by scholars and also the NAM itself.⁸⁶ Even the Chair of the G77 during a Ministerial Meeting of the NAM Co-ordinating Bureau in 1998 referred to “the Non-Aligned Movement as the conceptual core of the G-77,” reaffirming once more the close link between the developing countries and especially in the format of the NAM and the G77.⁸⁷

⁸² Prashad, *The Darker Nations*, 16.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 22, 31.

⁸⁴ “Ministerial Meeting of the Joint Coordination Committee,” ed. Ahmia, 414.

⁸⁵ Sauviant, “The Non-Aligned Movement,” 59.

⁸⁶ Sauviant, “Towards Joint Cooperation,” 68. See NAM, “7th Summit,” 1983, 110; Jazairy, “Fiftieth Anniversary,” 10; Alden, Morphet, Vieira, *The South in World Politics*, 69; and Sauviant, “The Non-Aligned Movement,” 58.

⁸⁷ G77, “Statement by his Excellency Mr. Ali Alatas.”

The partnership between the NAM and G77 through the JCC has included cooperation in many different fields such as South-South and North-South cooperation, transnational organized crime, the equality of women, UN reform and the environment. For example, the JCC during the creation of UN Women was “the first [...] to submit a detailed, concrete and comprehensive set of elements” that they viewed as important for the new entity.⁸⁸ Regarding UN reform, the organizations through the JCC have been aiming towards “revitalising the work of the General Assembly, [...] strengthening the role of the ECOSOC, [...] democratising the Security Council, [...] and [...] reforming the Secretariat.”⁸⁹ The JCC also got involved with environmental issues and has presented the organizations’ concern that particularly developing countries are vulnerable for “environmental risks.”⁹⁰ Yet, the main topics on which the NAM and G77 promote their cooperation is economic development and peace.⁹¹ Furthermore, since the 14th NAM Summit held in 2006, each final document of a NAM summit has noted that “The Heads of State or Government associated themselves with and reaffirmed all of the positions of the Group of 77 and China concerning economic and social development issues and other related issues” as documented by the G77 during their most important meetings and the Heads of State and Government further “affirmed the Movement’s commitment to work towards the full implementation of the decisions and recommendations contained in those documents.”⁹² This reaffirms the immense scale of cooperation and collaboration that takes place between the NAM and G77 but also the support that the organizations provide for each other to this day. Thus, this seems to only strengthen

⁸⁸ UN General Assembly, 104th Plenary Meeting, “Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit,” A/64/PV.104 (2 July 2010, New York), 5, https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/685544/files/A_64_PV.104-EN.pdf.

⁸⁹ The Non-Aligned Movement, “Report of the Activities of the Chair of the Movement since the Tehran Summit, August 2012 – September 2016,” Margarita: 17-18 September 2016, 54.

⁹⁰ “Joint Statement by G-77 and NAM on Informal Consultations of the General Assembly on United Nations System-Wide Coherence: Environment,” New York: 13 September 2007, <http://www.g77.org/statement/getstatement.php?id=070913>.

⁹¹ See G77, “Message by the honourable W. Baldwin Spencer,”; and The Group of 77, “Declaration of the South Summit,” Havana: 10-14 April 2000, http://www.g77.org/summit/Declaration_G77Summit.htm.

⁹² The Non-Aligned Movement, “Document on the Methodology of the Non-Aligned Movement, 14th NAM Summit,” Havana: 11-16 September 2006, 69. See The Non-Aligned Movement, “XV Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Movement,” Sharm el Sheikh: 11-16 July 2009, 73; NAM, “16th Summit,” 105; and NAM, “17th Summit,” 127.

the research question. Why have the NAM and G77 not merged together, despite their history of cooperation?

2.2 *A harmonious relationship.* As the NAM and G77 have such a long history of cooperation and collaboration on a wide variety of topics that are of concern to the developing countries, plus the fact that they even established a Committee to facilitate and enhance this cooperation, it is argued that the NAM and G77 overall have a satisfying and virtuous relationship. It was Sauviant who already stated this a decade before the JCC was even established:

“the relationship between the two groups have been very harmonious. Each could draw strength from the activities of the other; duplication in work was largely avoided and conflicts over areas of competence did practically not occur.”⁹³

On the one hand, the harmonious relationship strengthens the research question, but, on the other hand, it is also a possible answer to the question. When considered from another perspective, it could be argued that the two organizations have not merged together *because the relationship between the NAM and the G77 is already solid, valuable and harmonious.* The establishment of such a good partnership between any two actors, be it states or organizations, is difficult in itself to achieve. Plus, once established, the maintenance of such partnership consistently requires a lot of time and effort. The NAM and G77 have been able to find enough common ground to create a relationship and even created the JCC to ensure and keep reinforcing their relationship. Because of this, the option of merging together could be argued to be unnecessary. Therefore, it is hypothesized that the NAM and G77 have not merged together because the two organizations are already satisfied with the relationship that they currently have and want to continue strengthening it.⁹⁴

2.3 *Risk.* The process of merging together could bring forward all kinds of issues that could threaten this well-established relationship. The incorporation of international organizations that are the size of the NAM and G77 is a process that should not be underestimated. As Krasner argued, it is at least “easier to sustain an existing set of principles,

⁹³ Sauviant, “Towards Joint Cooperation,” 62.

⁹⁴ See NAM, “17th Summit,” 36; UN General Assembly, 105th Plenary Meeting, “Agenda item 48 (*continued*), Strengthening of the United Nations system,” A/51/PV.105 (New York: 31 July 1997), 15, <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N97/859/00/pdf/N9785900.pdf?OpenElement>; “[Non-Aligned Movement has not outlives its usefulness, says Colombian Pres\[id\]ent](http://www.g77.org/nc/journal/julaug97/5.htm),” *Journal of the Group of 77, July/August 1997*, <http://www.g77.org/nc/journal/julaug97/5.htm>.

norms, rules, and decision-making procedures than to create a new one.”⁹⁵ Also Sauvart, who suggested the merging together of the Action Programme for Economic Co-operation of the Non-Aligned Countries and the Caracas Programme of Action of the G77, still noted that this would be “no easy task.”⁹⁶ This process could put the harmonious relationship between the NAM and G77 at risk of being demolished due to new issues and questions arising. Because of this, the advantages of merging together would have to be significant enough for the organizations to even consider going through this process. Indeed, as it is proven nor disproven that merging together will be beneficial, Koremenos, Lipson and Snidal contended that international actors “are reluctant to gamble on untested solutions.”⁹⁷ So, it would be a hard task in itself to get the member state of the organizations to agree taking on such a gamble. The transaction costs are also a considerable issue.⁹⁸ The incorporation process itself will cost time, resources and effort but, at the same time, the work of the organizations would at least partially have to come to a halt which further increases the transaction costs. The need to merge together, in this sense, is almost lost. Thus, it could be argued that the NAM and G77 have not merged together because it is a risky process that could harm not only their relationship but the work of the organizations as well.

Conclusion

Why have the NAM and G77 not merged together? In the end, two hypothetical answers were studied, one of which could be argued to explain the lack of incorporation of either the NAM into the G77, vice versa or even the establishment of a whole new organization that would include both the NAM and G77. The first examined a possible answer to the research question that dealt with the division between politics and economics. The NAM and the G77 have been and still to this day present themselves as autonomous organizations as they hold that they have a different concern of focus. The NAM is focused on politics, the G77 on economics. This was viewed as a possible barrier between the two organizations, the organizations’ own conviction that there is this hard line of division between them. Indeed, if this separation between the NAM and the G77 was as distinct as they themselves present it to be, it seems more logical for the two organizations to not merge together perhaps and, instead, have each

⁹⁵ Krasner, *Structural Conflict*, 293.

⁹⁶ Sauvart, “Towards Joint Cooperation,” 216.

⁹⁷ Koremenos, Lipson and Snidal, “The Rational Design,” 1076.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

focus on their own specialty. Nonetheless, it was counterargued that this division between the NAM and the G77 is not as distinct as the organizations themselves held. In addition it was stated that politics and economics are closely linked together and they cannot be so easily separated from each other, especially not in the international system. Therefore, in the end, it was asserted that the hypothesis, that the NAM and G77 have not merged together because of the separation of political and economic issues between them, was not a possible answer to the research question.

The other hypothetical answer concerned the history of cooperation and collaboration between the two organizations. Rather than reinforcing the research question, the history of cooperation between the NAM and the G77 could be argued to answer the research question when analysed from a different angle. The answer held that it could be argued that the NAM and G77 have not merged together because they already have a corresponding and harmonious relationship. This reason was essentially two-parted. First, it was argued that the NAM and G77 themselves are also satisfied and happy with their partnership. Over the years, the organizations have established a firm ground on to which they have built their relationship and continuously aim to strengthen this. Second, it was contended that the process of merging together is challenging and demanding which could be argued to put this well-established relationship and the work that the organizations are doing at risk. Thus, this risk is avoided by the organizations by maintaining their relationship as it is. So, this hypothetical answer to the research question leads into the second purpose of this thesis. As it is now understood why the NAM and G77 have not yet merged together, it is questioned in the next chapter what the advantages and disadvantages are of the NAM and G77 merging together.

Chapter Four:

What are the advantages and disadvantages of the NAM and the G77 merging together?

Introduction

The main research question has been answered but another one remains. Therefore, the aim of this chapter is to discuss the following question: What are the advantages and disadvantages of the NAM and the G77 merging together? This has been noted as the second purpose of this thesis as Sen held that “the important question is how to strengthen the Movement and make it more effective.”⁹⁹ With this, the relevance of this research subject is shown as it is examined how (dis)advantageous the incorporation of the NAM and the G77 into one organization would be and whether or not it can be argued as advice for the organizations. However, it is not the aim of this chapter or thesis to provide a detailed framework for the actualization of the process of merging the NAM and G77 together. Rather, at this point in this thesis when the multiple similarities between the two organizations have been demonstrated and it has been reasoned why they have not merged together, it has come to the aim of studying whether or not the incorporation of the two organizations into one would be beneficial. This chapter first discusses the advantages and then the disadvantages of the NAM and G77 merging together. The negotiating capacity can be argued to be one of the core arguments that determines the advantageousness for the organizations of merging together and so, is discussed throughout this chapter in more detail.

1. Advantages

1.1 Institutional efficiency. The advantages for the NAM and G77 to merge together can be examined from different perspectives. For instance, the merging together of the two organizations is deemed as advantageous for the efficiency of the organizations. The NAM and G77 are criticized for having too many meetings and working groups.¹⁰⁰ The “sheer number” of meetings, as an intergovernmental meeting of experts on South-South cooperation

⁹⁹ Sen, “Non-Aligned Movement,” 134.

¹⁰⁰ See Jazic, “The Non-Aligned Movement,” 66; Leo Mates, “The Movement Is Facing Discord and Trial,” in: *Non-Alignment: Perspectives and Prospects*, Edited by U. S. Bajpai (New Dehli, India: Lancers Publishers, 1983), 53; Savio, “The Values,” 38; and Singham and Hune, *Non-alignment*, 48.

in 1995 stated, “imposes a heavy burden on the vast majority of the developing countries, thereby detracting from their effectiveness.”¹⁰¹ The amount of meetings in addition to working groups can be downgraded in the situation where there would only be one organization representing the developing countries. This correlates to another benefit in the case of the NAM and G77 merging together, namely that it enables the member states to send less delegates overseas as it was Williams who noted that this is especially costly for developing countries.¹⁰² An additional feature that could enhance the efficiency of the organizations representing the developing countries concerns their resources. The merging together of the organizations, as has been stated by the Chair of the G77 referring to the close collaboration of the organizations, “avoid[s] unnecessary duplications and overlaps of the funds, programmes and agencies’ functions” and, instead, empowers “optimal utilization of their resources and capabilities.”¹⁰³

1.2 The Joint Coordinating Committee. The reasons for the establishment of the Joint Coordinating Committee can essentially also be regarded as reasons for the NAM and G77 to, rather than harmonize their efforts, fully combine their organizations. These are significant arguments as they are provided by the organizations themselves. First, the NAM and G77 argue, for example, that the purpose of the JCC is to avoid duplication of the NAM and G77 which is guaranteed to be avoided if the organizations merge together.¹⁰⁴ Second, merging together could, as is stated in relation to the purposes of the JCC, “advanc[e] the collective concerns and interests of developing countries at the relevant international forums,” third, “provide greater efficiency in the attainment of the common goals of the developing countries,” and lastly, stimulate the “expanding and deepening [of] South-South cooperation.”¹⁰⁵ Each of these arguments reinforces the next. No duplication of efforts would probably make the work of the organizations more effective and efficient which, eventually, could lead to intensified South-South cooperation, one of the core concerns of the NAM and

¹⁰¹ UNGA, Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts on South-South Cooperation, “Expanding South-South Cooperation.”

¹⁰² Williams, “The Group of 77,” 217.

¹⁰³ G77, “Message by the honourable W. Baldwin Spencer,”; and G77, “Statement by his Excellency Mr. Ali Alatas.”

¹⁰⁴ The Non-Aligned Movement, “Basic Documents of the XII Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement,” Durban: 2-3 September 1998, 14, <http://namiran.org/Files/12thSummit/Final+Document.pdf>; and G77, “Message by the honourable W. Baldwin Spencer.”

¹⁰⁵ NAM, “17th Summit,” 10.

G77. In short, the purposes of the creation and reinforcement of the JCC provide valuable reasoning for the merging together of the NAM and G77 because, one, it is reasoning provided by the organizations themselves and, two, is directly concerned with one of the most important goals of the developing countries, which is South-South cooperation.

In sum, the merging together of the NAM and G77 into one organization could reduce the transaction costs for its member states. Furthermore, these arguments have demonstrated that the merging together of the NAM and G77 also means a greater extent of centralization. This is argued by Koremenos, Lipson and Snidal to enhance mutual cooperation as it could, indeed, make the negotiations amongst the developing countries and between them and the developed countries more competent and productive. While these advantages may not be guaranteed to occur in the situation where the NAM and G77 were to merge together, it is hypothesized that that situation would enable an environment in which it is highly possible for these advantages to become operative.

2. Disadvantages

2.1 National weakness. It was already discussed in the previous chapter that the process of merging together is not easy as it most likely will come with many costs and carry many risks. Yet, there are also possible disadvantages to occur once the process is finished. Or rather, there are certain current issues of the NAM and G77 that can be argued to remain even if the organizations incorporate into one. Most notable are the problems with promoting domestic reform, unity and the negotiating capacity of the developing countries in international fora. The member states of the NAM and G77 are regarded as weak not only on an international level but also nationally. Thus, as noted in the literature review of this thesis, the organizations have been criticized for not focusing more on the domestic reform of its member states whilst a lot of them deal with weak “national political regimes” and “lack national economic and military capabilities.”¹⁰⁶ This is and will likely continue to be an issue “simply because there is a symbiotic relationship between the health of national institutions and the health of international institutions,” as Strydom noted.¹⁰⁷ In other words, the member states’ national weakness also negatively affects the organizations’ international power of the organizations as it hurts their image and authority in the international system. Yet, in the

¹⁰⁶ Krasner, *Structural Conflict*, 3, 13.

¹⁰⁷ Strydom, “The Non-Aligned Movement,” 45.

circumstances that the two organizations merge together, there is no assurance that more attention will be directed towards the domestic issues of its member states.

2.2 Unity. The unity, or rather the lack of coherence, is something that the NAM and G77 have also been criticized for because this is argued to be essential as the Declaration that established the G77 stated that this is “an instrument for enlarging the area of co-operative endeavor in the international field.”¹⁰⁸ In a similar way as with the national weakness will the incorporation of the two organizations into one not guarantee the strengthening of the unity and solidarity amongst the developing countries. This is because merging together will not remove all the differences evident between these states, which is contended to be the main barrier withholding the enhancement of consensus between the developing countries. Yet, it is because of this huge diversity and the large number of member states that it is unrealistic to expect solid unity of such organizations, as has been argued in the literature review. In addition, if a new organization were to present the developing countries’ voice as one, that would mean that the organization is neglecting those voices that diverged.¹⁰⁹ Nevertheless, intensification of the unity can positively affect the international power of the organizations and the NAM and G77 separately do state the strengthening of solidarity and unity amongst its member states to be one of their goals, it is still regarded as a current issue that is most likely to remain if the NAM and G77 merge together.¹¹⁰

2.3 Negotiating capacity. What has been referred to as international and influential power is essentially the negotiating capacity of the organizations. The success of the NAM and G77 heavily depend on this as they operate within the international system and through international relations. The organizations have been closely working together on South-South and North-South cooperation as they are believed to increase the national economic and social development of the developing countries and so, enhance their international bargaining position.¹¹¹ The focus here is on the North-South cooperation because after decades this is still

¹⁰⁸ The Group of 77, “Joint Declaration of the Seventy-seven Developing Countries made at the Conclusion of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development,” Geneva: 15 June 1964, <http://www.g77.org/doc/Joint%20Declaration.html>.

¹⁰⁹ Rajan, “Institutionalization,” 48.

¹¹⁰ G77, “Message by the honourable W. Baldwin Spencer,”; and NAM, “Report of the Activities of the Chair of the Movement,” 4.

¹¹¹ See NAM, “17th Summit,” 145; G77, “Second South Summit,” 18; NAM, “16th Summit,” 76-7; and Morphet, “The Non-Aligned in ‘The New World Order’,” 372.

unbalanced and regarded by the developing countries as unequal.¹¹² Yet, the cooperation remains critical as Morphet quoted a Yugoslav “writing about the Belgrade Summit “[...] that no major task or goals of the [Non-Aligned] Movement can be solved without establishing a dialogue and cooperation with the centres of political, economic and military might in the notorious triangle Europe-USA-Japan.””¹¹³ From one perspective, it is held that the negotiating capacity of the NAM and G77 against the major powers would increase if they were to merge together due to their numerical strength and symbolic power of presenting a unity. The two organizations themselves at least believe this to be true, “that coordination and cooperation between these two groups is essential in order to strengthen and advance the position of the developing countries.”¹¹⁴ Having the majority in various international fora enables the possibility for the organizations to “block new rules, members, or officers,” as Koremenos, Lipson and Snidal noted.¹¹⁵ Mates also discussed that numerical strength could “better their chances of exerting moral and political pressure.”¹¹⁶

However, emphasis should be put on *chances* as numerical strength “did not, of course, guarantee success” as Williams and also Mates argued and as the history of the organizations themselves have demonstrated.¹¹⁷ Therefore, from another perspective it is hypothesized that the weak bargaining position of the two organizations would not increase if they merged together as numerical strength and unity does not automatically amount to power and influence in international forums. The weak negotiating capacity of the developing countries is primarily a consequence of a deeply rooted power gap between the developing and developed countries and this is not about to disappear on the occasion of two organizations merging together representing the Global South as one.¹¹⁸ Rather, it is hypothesized that “the power of the purse,” the developed countries, will continue to

¹¹² G77, “Message by the honourable W. Baldwin Spencer,”; UNGA, 105th Plenary Meeting, “Agenda item 48,” 16; and G77, “Statement by his Excellency Mr. Ali Alatas.”

¹¹³ Morphet, “The Non-Aligned in ‘The New World Order’,” 372.

¹¹⁴ The Group of 77, “Ministerial Declaration,” New York: 24 September 1999, <http://www.g77.org/doc/Decl1999.html>.

¹¹⁵ Koremenos, Lipson, Snidal, “The Rational Design,” 772.

¹¹⁶ Mates, *Nonalignment Theory*, 360.

¹¹⁷ Williams, “The Group of 77,” 77. See Mates, *Nonalignment Theory*, 356.

¹¹⁸ See Krasner, *Structural Conflict*, 3; Frangonikolopoulos, “The policy and evolution,” 79 and Savio, “The Values,” 38.

overcome the “power of the majority,” the developing countries, as Swart phrased it.¹¹⁹ Indeed, in the current international system economic power often equals political and influential power which the developing countries barely have compared to the developed countries. Savio as well pointed out that “the United States as a rich superpower cannot be bound by the votes of countries that, all together, have a smaller GDP than the American one.”¹²⁰ From the perspective of the developed countries, they primarily see “the alleged benefits of accepting Southern demands [as] long term and uncertain, while the costs are immediate and tangible.” For this reason are the developed countries reluctant towards advanced North-South cooperation. Thus, as long as this is not changed, the process of merging together can be argued as unlikely to stimulate North-South cooperation.¹²¹ This does not mean that the organizations have no influence and power as they can “resist the application of unwelcome decisions” in international relations.¹²² But, it is hypothesized that the bargaining position of the Global South will not change if the NAM and G77 were to merge together and present themselves as one organization.

Conclusion

If the NAM and G77 merge together, it is considered to make the organization more efficient because of a reduction in transaction costs in the following ways: first, there would be no duplication of work, second, the resources of the organizations can be combined and used to its full potential, third, it is likely that there would be less meetings and working groups, and fourth, member states would only have to send delegates to one organization rather than two. The organizations being more efficient to some extent could translate into more effectiveness. Although this is in no way guaranteed, efficiency on its own can be argued to be an advantage of the two organizations incorporating into one. The operation of merging together itself was argued in the previous chapter to be risky and, consequently, a reason for why the NAM and G77 have not done this. Here, the difficulty of the operation was also asserted to be a disadvantage due to, indeed, the possibility of harming the relationship between the two organizations and the international power of the developing countries but also due to the

¹¹⁹ Lydia Swart, “The Voice of the Majority: The Role of the Group of 77 in the UN General Assembly,” *United Nations Chronicle* 51, no. 1 (May 2014): 40.

¹²⁰ Savio, “The Values,” 38.

¹²¹ Krasner, *Structural Conflict*, 272.

¹²² Choudhary and Kumar, “Problems and Prospects,” 146.

considerable transportation costs. Besides these difficulties, there were other issues that the NAM and G77 currently face that are likely to remain if they were to merge together. These issues included the national weakness of the developing countries, the lack of unity amongst them and, most importantly, their weak bargaining position against the developed countries. This position was hypothesized to not increase or change significantly if the NAM and G77 merge together.

In the end, it is stressed that it cannot be proven nor disproven that the potential advantages and disadvantages discussed here will occur if the organizations merge together. Institutional efficiency can be argued to be an advantage of the process but this does not outweigh the potential disadvantages noted here. It is hypothesized that, if the NAM and the G77 merge together, first, the advantages will be minimum, second, the circumstances of the developing countries in the international fora will mostly remain the same, and, third, it would risk harming the image and work of and relationship between the organizations. Therefore, it can be concluded that it is disadvantageous for the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77 to merge together which, simultaneously, can be argued to be a reason as to why the organizations have not merged together.

Conclusion

The purpose of this thesis was to answer the research question: Why have the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77 not merged together? To enhance the study of this subject by providing another perspective, the thesis also aimed to answer the question as to what the advantages and disadvantages would be in the situation that the NAM and G77 do merge together. In order to answer these questions, the research began by a discussion of similarities and differences between the two international organizations by providing two comparative analyses. The first comparative analysis was incorporated into the first chapter, a literature review, and examined the similarities and differences between the academic literature that has been written about the NAM, on the one hand, and the G77, on the other hand. This was done through a discussion of the supportive arguments, critique and advice given to the organizations by the literature. Yet, it was a critical review and not merely a list of what has been written about the organizations. Thus, in short, the most vital points were: the NAM and G77 represent the interests of the developing countries in international fora, but the organizations are neglecting the national weaknesses of their member states and, therefore, the organizations are advised to be more concerned with, amongst other things, South-South cooperation, yet this advice was argued to be vague and not new. In the end, this chapter showcased that the literature about the NAM and the G77 was more similar than different.

The second comparative analysis was the subject of the second chapter of this thesis and had the aim to clarify how the NAM and G77 as international organizations are similar and different. Thus, the second chapter examined various subjects such as the institutional structures of the organizations, the Joint Coordinating Committee and the latest Summits held by the NAM and the G77 which state the concerns and goals of the organizations. This analysis was more critical than the previous one because it could have either answered the research question or, once again, reinforced it. If it would have demonstrated there to be no apparent similarity between the NAM and the G77 as organizations, it could have been argued that the NAM and G77 have not merged together because the organizations are distinctly different. However, this was not the case as this second comparative analysis also demonstrated that the NAM and G77 as organizations on various and essential subjects are identical. Thus, two comparative analyses determined the existence of evident similarities between the NAM and the G77. Consequently, the comparative analyses had reinforced the

research question because why had the NAM and G77 not merged together despite their similarities?

Two possible answers to this question were then studied. Some scholars but most importantly the NAM and G77 themselves stated that the NAM focuses on political issues and the G77 on economic issues. Thus, they argued that there is a definite division between the two organizations which could have reasoned why the organizations have not merged together. Nevertheless, it was counterargued and demonstrated that such a separation was not evident as both organizations deal with a variety of issues and goals of the developing countries in general. Plus, it was discussed that there is a distinct link between politics and economics, especially in international relations, which further argued that there can be no definite separation between them. Then, the cooperation and collaboration between the NAM and G77 was examined. It was determined that the two organizations have a long history of collaboration and that their relationship is a hypothetical answer to the research question. Namely, it can be argued that the NAM and G77 have not merged together because the relationship between the two organizations is satisfying and harmonious which was also noted to be believed by the organizations themselves. In addition, the process of merging together was argued to have various risks involved. As it would bring forward new questions and issues for the organizations to deal with, it could negatively affect their established relationship and the organizations' functioning. Thus, the NAM and G77 can be argued to not have merged together in order to avoid harming their relationship and their work. The research found this two-parted hypothetical answer for the research question and so, the first part of the end conclusion of this thesis.

The second part of the end conclusion of this thesis held the question of what the advantages and disadvantages are of the NAM and G77 merging together. This was examined to provide another perspective to the research question. Whilst examining why these two organizations have not merged together, it could also be considered whether or not this would even be regarded as advantageous for the organizations. As it may be questionable why the two organizations have not merged together considering their similarities, it may become understandable in the case that the incorporation of the two organizations into one is argued to be disadvantageous. The study demonstrated that an advantage of merging together could be the improvement of their institutional efficiency. A disadvantage of the incorporation of the NAM and the G77 into one organization was that it includes multiple risks. However, emphasis was put on the argument that the circumstances of the organizations in the case that they merge together would, for the greater part, remain the same. This includes critical issues

of the organizations such as their weak bargaining position in international fora and, thus, was regarded as another disadvantage. Therefore, the conclusion hypothesized that the merging together of the NAM and G77 held more disadvantages than advantages. This, indeed, was then argued as another possible answer as to why the NAM and G77 have not merged together.

The main subjects of this thesis were the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77. The approach of this thesis was to provide research from the perspectives of the organizations themselves as much as possible. So, in short, why have the NAM and G77 not merged together? The main reasons for this is that it can be argued that, first, the organizations are satisfied with the harmonious and valuable relationship that they have already established and strengthened over the decades and, second, by maintaining their relationship as it is they are avoiding taking any unnecessary risks. Indeed, merging together can be further argued to be relatively disadvantageous and so, can be seen as a reason for the organizations to not merge together. As a final remark it is noted that for further research on this subject it could be interesting to examine more primary documents of the NAM and the G77 in order to determine whether the organizations themselves have ever discussed this subject or something closely related to it as this could provide a valuable additional perspective to the study.

Bibliography

Ahmia, Mourad. "The Group of 77 at Fifty." *United Nations Chronicle* 51, no. 1 (May 2014): 8-9.

Alden, Chris, Sally Morphet and Marco Vieira. *The South in World Politics*, 57-90. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Arnold, Guy. *The A to Z of the Non-Aligned Movement and Third World*. Plymouth: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2010.

Banerji, Malabika. "Institutionalization of the Non-Aligned Movement." *International Studies* 20, no. 3-4 (August 1980): 549-563.

Behnam, Awni. "2014: Fiftieth Anniversary of the Group of 77: From Unity Celebrating Diversity to Diversity Celebrating Unity." *United Nations Chronicle* 51, no. 1 (May 2014): 42-43.

Boutros-Ghali, Boutros. "The G-77: An Essential Element of Democratization." *United Nations Chronicle* 51, no. 1 (2014): 6-7.

Choudhary, L. K. and Sanjeev Kumar. "Problems and Prospects of the NAM in the 21st Century: The Post – 13th NAM Summit Syndrome." *India Quarterly* 59, no. 1-2 (2003): 121-154.

Ferdowsi, Mir A. "Group of 77 and UN." In: *A Concise Encyclopedia of the United Nations*, edited by Helmut Volger, 207-212. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 2010.

"Final Report adopted by the Eighth Session of the Intergovernmental Follow-up and Coordination Committee on Economic Cooperation among Developing Countries (IFCC-VIII), Panama City, Panama, 30 August - 3 September 1993." In: *The Collected Documents of The Group of 77*, edited by Mourad Ahmia, volume V, *The Perez-Guerrero Trust Fund for South-South Cooperation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Frangonikolopoulos, Christos A. "The policy and evolution of non-alignment: Past and future." *Paradigms* 9, no. 1 (Summer 1995): 62-85.

Geldart, Carol and Peter Lyon. "The Group of 77: A Perspective View." *International Affairs* 57, no. 1 (Winter 1980-1981): 79-101.

Graham, John. "The Non-Aligned Movement after the Havana Summit." *Journal of International Affairs* 34, no. 1 (Spring 1980): 153-160.

Jazairy, Idriss. "Fiftieth Anniversary of the G-77." *United Nations Chronicle* 51, no. 1 (May 2014): 10-13.

Jazic, Zivojin. "The Non-Aligned Movement Yesterday and Today the Process of Globalization: Critical View." *Croatian International Relations Review* (January-June 2005): 59-66.

"Joint Statement by G-77 and NAM on Informal Consultations of the General Assembly on United Nations System-Wide Coherence: Environment." New York: 13 September 2007. <http://www.g77.org/statement/getstatement.php?id=070913>.

Keethaponcalan, S. I. "Reshaping the Non-Aligned Movement: challenges and vision." *Bandung: Journal of the Global South* 3, no. 4 (October 2016): 1-14.

Koremenos, Barbara, Charles Lipson and Duncan Snidal. "The Rational Design of International Institutions." *International Organization* 55, no. 4 (Autumn 2001): 761-799.

Krasner, Stephen. *Structural Conflict: The Third World Against Global Liberalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Kumar, Satish. "Nonalignment: International Goals and National Interests." *Asian Survey* 23, no. 4 (April 1983): 445-462.

Lüthi, Lorenz M. "The Non-Aligned Movement and the Cold War, 1961–1973." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 18, no. 4 (Fall 2016): 98-147.

Lyon, Peter. "Non-Alignment at the Summits: From Belgrade 1961 to Havana 1979 - A Perspective View." *The Indian Journal of Political Science* 41, no. 1 (March 1980): 132-153.

Mahoney, James. "Strategies of causal inference in small-N analysis." *Sociological Methods & Research* 28, no. 4 (May, 2000): 387-424.

Mates, Leo. *Nonalignment Theory and Current Policy*, 327-364. Belgrade: The Institute of International Politics and Economics, 1972.

———. "The Movement Is Facing Discord and Trial." In: *Non-Alignment: Perspectives and Prospects*, edited by U. S. Bajpai. New Dehli, 51-60. India: Lancers Publishers, 1983.

"Ministerial Meeting of the Joint Coordination Committee (JCC) between the Group of 77 and the Non-Aligned Movement on the occasion of the celebration of the Fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Group of 77, Algiers, Algeria, 30 May 2014." In: *The Collected Documents of the Group of 77*, edited by Mourad Ahmia, volume VI, *Fiftieth Anniversary Edition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Mital, Aruna. "Non-aligned movement and its relevance today." *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research* 2, no. 17 (July 2016): 22-27.

Morphet, Sally. "The Non-Aligned in 'The New World Order': The Jakarta Summit, September 1992." *International Relations* 11, no. 4 (1993): 359-380.

———. "Multilateralism and the Non-Aligned Movement: What Is the Global South Doing and Where Is It Going?" *Global Governance* 10, no. 4 (October-December 2004): 517-537.

"Non-Aligned Movement has not outlives its usefulness, says Colombian Pres[id]ent." *Journal of the Group of 77*. July/August 1997. <http://www.g77.org/nc/journal/julaug97/5.htm>.

Prasad, Bimal. "The Evolution of Non-Alignment." *India Quarterly* 34, no. 3. (1983): 299-309.

Prashad, Vijay. *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*. New York: The New Press, 2007.

Rajan, M. S. "Non-Alignment: The Dichotomy between Theory and Practice in Perspective." *India Quarterly* 36, no. 1 (January 1980): 43-63.

———. "Institutionalization of Non-Alignment: Widening Gulf between the Belief and the Prospect." *International Studies* 20, no. 1-2 (1981): 39-55.

Sauvant, Karl P. "The Early Days of the Group of 77." *United Nations Chronicle* 51, no. 1 (May 2014): 27-33.

———. "Organizational Infrastructure for Self-Reliance: The Non-Aligned Countries and the Group of 77." In: *The Principles of Non-Alignment*, edited by Hans Köchler, 186-218. Vienna: International Progress Organization, 1982.

———. "The Non-Aligned Movement and Group 77: Towards Joint Cooperation." *Non-Aligned World* 1, no. 1 (1983): 22-75.

Savio, Roberto. "The Values of the G-77 Are More Actual than Ever." *United Nations Chronicle* 51, no. 1 (May 2014): 36-38.

Sen, Panchali. "Non-Aligned Movement and the New World Order." *Jadavpur Journal of International Relations* 9, no. 1 (2005): 133-150.

Singham, A. W. and Shirley Hune. *Non-alignment in an Age of Alignments*, 33-56. Harare: The College Press, 1986.

Spröte, Wolfgang. "Non-Aligned Movement and the UN." In: *A Concise Encyclopedia of the United Nations*, edited by Helmut Volger, 503-505. Leiden: Martinus Nijhof, 2010.

Srivastava, Govind Narain. "The Future of the NAM: How to Make the Movement Effective." In: *Non-Aligned Movement: Its Future and Action Programme*, edited by Bantarto Bandoro, 38-47. Jakarta: Centre for Strategic and International Studies, 1992.

Stojanovic, Radoslav. "The Emergence of the Non-Aligned Movement: A View From Belgrade." *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law* 13, no. 3 (Summer 1981): 443-450.

Strydom, Hennie. "The Non-Aligned Movement and the Reform of International Relations." In *Max Planck Yearbook of United Nations Law*, edited by A. von Bogdandy and R. Wolfrum. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill N.V., 2007.

Swart, Lydia. "The Voice of the Majority: The Role of the Group of 77 in the UN General Assembly." *United Nations Chronicle* 51, no. 1 (May 2014): 39-41.

Tandon, Yash. *Development and Globalisation: Daring to Think Differently*, 35-37. Geneva: South Centre, 2009.

Tarrósy, István. "Need for non-alignment in our global world? The Non-Aligned Movement Today and Tomorrow." *Croatian International Relations Review* (July-December 2005): 157-163.

The Group of 77. "Joint Declaration of the Seventy-seven Developing Countries made at the Conclusion of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development." Geneva: 15 June 1964. <http://www.g77.org/doc/Joint%20Declaration.html>.

———. "Ministerial Declaration adopted on the occasion of the Thirtieth Anniversary of the Group of 77." New York: 24 June 1994. <http://www.g77.org/doc/DECL30.htm>.

———. "Statement by his Excellency Mr. Ali Alatas, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, Chairman of the Group of 77, at the Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement." Cartagena de Indias: 18-20 May 1998. <http://www.g77.org/Speeches/051898.htm>.

———. "Ministerial Declaration." New York: 24 September 1999. <http://www.g77.org/doc/Decl1999.html>.

———. "Declaration of the South Summit." Havana: 10-14 April 2000. http://www.g77.org/summit/Declaration_G77Summit.htm.

———. "Second South Summit." Doha: 12-16 June 2005. [http://www.g77.org/doc/A-68-948\(E\).pdf](http://www.g77.org/doc/A-68-948(E).pdf).

———. "Message by the honourable W. Baldwin Spencer, Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Antigua and Barbuda and Chair of the Group of 77 and China, Delivered by his Excellency John W. Ashe, Permanent Representative of Antigua and

Barbuda to the United Nations, At the 15th Ministerial Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement.” Tehran: 29 July 2008.

<http://www.g77.org/statement/getstatement.php?id=080729>.

———. “Forty-first Annual Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Member States of the Group of 77.” New York: 22 September 2017. [http://www.g77.org/doc/A-72-511\(E\).pdf](http://www.g77.org/doc/A-72-511(E).pdf).

———. “About the Group of 77.” Accessed December 30, 2017. <http://www.g77.org/doc/index.html>.

———. “The Member States of the Group of 77.” Accessed March 5, 2018. <http://www.g77.org/doc/members.html>.

The Non-Aligned Movement. “7th Summit Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement.” New Delhi: 7-12 March 1983.

———. “Basic Documents of the XII Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement.” Durban: 2-3 September 1998. <http://namiran.org/Files/12thSummit/Final+Document.pdf>.

———. “Document on the Methodology of the Non-Aligned Movement, 14th NAM Summit.” Havana: 11-16 September 2006.

———. “XV Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Movement.” Sharm el Sheikh: 11-16 July 2009.

———. “16th Summit of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement.” Tehran: 26-31 August 2012. <https://www.mea.gov.in/Images/pdf/final-document-of-xvi-nam-summit.pdf>.

———. “17th Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Movement.” Margarita: 17-18 September 2016.

———. “Report of the Activities of the Chair of the Movement since the Tehran Summit, August 2012 – September 2016.” Margarita: 17-18 September 2016. http://cns.miis.edu/nam/documents/Official_Document/7th_Summit_FD_New_Delhi_Declaration_1983_Whole.pdf.

The Non-Aligned Movement Iran. “1. General Background.” Accessed February 15, 2018. <http://namiran.org/background-general/>.

The Non-Aligned Movement Venezuela. “Member States.” Accessed March 10, 2018. http://namvenezuela.org/?us_portfolio=creativo-proyecto-video.

———. “Structure of NAM.” Accessed March 10, 2018. http://namvenezuela.org/?us_portfolio=project-video.

Toye, John. "Assessing the G77: 50 years after unctad and 40 years after the nieo." *Third World Quarterly* 35, no. 10 (December 2014): 1759-1774.

United Nations General Assembly. Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts on South-South Cooperation. "Expanding South-South Cooperation: Some suggested issues and modalities." A/AC.246/2 (19 June 1995). <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N95/183/79/pdf/N9518379.pdf?OpenElement>.

———. 105th Plenary Meeting. "Agenda item 48 (*continued*), Strengthening of the United Nations system." A/51/PV.105 (New York: 31 July 1997). <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N97/859/00/pdf/N9785900.pdf?OpenElement>.

———. 104th Plenary Meeting. "Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit." A/64/PV.104 (2 July 2010, New York). https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/685544/files/A_64_PV.104-EN.pdf.

Vieira, Marco. "Understanding Resilience in International Relations: The Non-Aligned Movement and Ontological Security." *International Studies Review* 18 (2016): 290-311.

Williams, Marc Andrew. "The Group of 77 in UNCTAD: Anatomy of a Third World Coalition." PhD diss., University of London, 1987.

Winkelmann, Ingo. "Groups and Groupings in the UN." In: *A Concise Encyclopedia of the United Nations*, edited by Helmut Volger, 212-216. Leiden: Martinus Nijhof, 2010.