CHAPTER –I

FOREIGN POLICY: A CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING
Foreign policy is one of the wheels with which the process of international politics operates. Foreign policy is not separate from the national policy, instead it is a part of it. It consists of national interests that are to be furthered in relation to other states. Almost all the states determine the course of their foreign policies within the limits of their strengths and the realities of the external environment. The non-political relations also fall in the scope of foreign policy.

The term ‘foreign policy’ has been defined in number of ways. George Modelski defines it as, “The system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behaviour of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment”.

Modelski, in his definition, has emphasized only those aspects of policy, which aim at the change in the existing behaviour of states, as the primary objectives of foreign policy. In fact, foreign policy includes both the change in the existing behaviour and continuation of the behaviour at different times. It is concerned both with the change and the status quo in so far as they serve the national interests.

Feliks Gross has taken a very liberal view of the term foreign policy. He opines if a state decides not to have any relations with some country, it is also a foreign policy. Its concern is both negative and positive. It is negative when it aims at furthering its interests by not changing the behaviour and it becomes positive if it demands a change in the behaviour of other states to adjust its national interests.

In the words of Padelford and Lincoln, “Foreign policy is the key element in the process by which a state translates its broadly conceived goals and interests into concrete courses of action to attain these objectives and pressure its interests.”

Padelford and Lincoln have explained two functions of foreign policy. Its first function is to attain its broadly conceived goals and second function is to pressurize the national interests.

In the words of C.C. Rodee, “Foreign Policy involves the formulation and implementation of a group of principles which shape the behaviour pattern of a state
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while negotiating with (contacting) other states to protect or further its vital interests."  

This includes not only the general principles but also those means necessary to implement them. Thus, these principles are those broader interests which states strive to achieve in international relations.

F.S. Northedge considers foreign policy to be the use of political influence in order to induce other states to exercise their law making power in a manner desired by the state concerned. It is an interaction between forces originating outside the country’s borders and those working within them.

The term ‘the foreign policy of a nation’ is used, according to the Research Staff of the Brookings Institutions, to refer to the complex and dynamic political course that a nation follows in relation to other states. The foreign policy of a nation is more than the sum total of its foreign policies (throughout courses of action to achieve using objectives), for it also includes its commitments, the current forms of its national interests and objectives and the principles of right conduct that it professes.

Joseph Frankel writes that foreign policy “consists of decisions and actions which involve to some appreciable extent relations between one state and others.”

Hugh Gibson defines foreign policy as “a well rounded, comprehensive plan, based on knowledge and experience, for conducting the business of government with the rest of the world. It is aimed at promoting and protecting the interests of the nation. This calls for a clear understanding of what, whose interests are and how far we can help to go with the means at our disposal. Anything less than this falls short of being a national foreign policy.”

The foreign policy is the sum total of the principles, the interests and objectives which a state formulates in conducting its relations with other states.
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DETERMINANTS OF FOREIGN POLICY

Foreign policy is that part of national policy which the states adopt in relation to other sovereign states. All these states are the components of the international system. They are sovereign, independent and to a large extent cling to the idea of Nationalism. Thus,

- the sovereignty of the states,
- their inter-dependence, and
- their domestic and international circumstances

Are the three elements which generate and determines the foreign policy and its direction.

The first element is the sovereignty of the state which determines the principle of safeguarding the territorial integrity of the states. The element of interdependence necessitates the principle of bargaining in foreign policy as the states endeavour to achieve the maximum possible advantage under all circumstances. The third element, the domestic and international circumstances adds the factor of realism. The foreign policy of all states is based on these three principles.

Principles of Safeguarding the Territorial Integrity

This is the primary duty of a state to protect the property of its citizens and to safeguard their interests whatsoever they are. This duty also involves the concept of security of national boundaries and if necessary to occupy other alien parts of the territory. The state’s aiming at the protection of their own territority pursues the policy of status quo. The state’s aiming at subjugating occupied or non-occupied territory may be named as pursuing the revisionist policy. The policy of safeguarding the interests of the citizens inside or outside the state is known as policy of “prestige”.

Theory of Bargaining

Inter-dependence of the states is an important phenomenon in international politics. All the states big or small are dependent on one another for one or the other reasons. This inter-dependence may result in conflict or cooperation so the states under these stresses endeavour to create a situation under which international behaviour may not be broken completely. Foreign policy strives to create such a balance with bargaining. For example, India has not recognized Israel to dissuade the
countries of Middle East from interference in case a dispute arises between India and Pakistan.

**Theory of the Promotion of National Interest**

It is the pious duty of all sovereign states to promote and further their national interests through their foreign policies. There may be a little bit of difference between the interests of one state with that of another as they naturally vary according to time, place and location, but the interests as self preservation, security and well-being of its citizens are the common interests on the basis of which foreign policy is generally formulated.

**SPECIFIC DETERMINANTS OF FOREIGN POLICY**

The foreign policy of each state is determined by the above mentioned general principles, but it cannot be denied that the states have their own specific interests which necessitate upon the states to adopt different types of foreign policies. These specific interests are termed as factors which help in shaping and moulding foreign policy.

The specific determinants can be roughly divided under three categories, namely, **Internal factors, External factors and Policy Making factors.**

**INTERNAL FACTORS**

The internal factors can be divided under the following sub-categories-

- Historical and National Values
- Geography
- Public-Opinion
- National Capacity
- The Structure of Society
- The Political Organization

**Historical and National Values**

The foreign policy is shaped and conditioned by the history alone. The nation inherits a style and culture which in their turn influence and decide the course of actions, the nation has to follow in relation to other sovereign states. There is
continuity and change in India’s foreign policy. The element of continuity represents the legacy of history.

The influence of history can also be seen in the foreign policy formulated by the newly-independent state like India. In his first statement on foreign policy, after Jawaharlal Nehru, became head of the Interim Government on 7 September 1946, he said, “We are particularly interested in the emancipation of colonial and dependent countries”. Having been dependent people and having struggled non-violently for freedom, India naturally supported the freedom movement of dependent people, everywhere as in Indonesia, Algeria, Vietnam, and Morocco. India’s policy of non-alignment is natural outcome of its history. It reflects all those principles India had stood for. In the principles of ‘Panchsheel’ the eight fold, duties of Buddhism are characterized.

Tradition is also a factor in the making of foreign policy. Foreign policy is a form of social action undertaken by men, a foreign minister is part of the social milieu in which he operates and he cannot disregard the basic value held in his society. The relevant historical factors are five-fold, the nationalist movement from the foundation of the Indian National Congress in 1885, India’s consciousness of social inequality under British rule, the resolutions passed by the Indian National Congress on foreign relations, Indian political thinking in the present century with its interesting mixture of nationalism and internationalism and exclusion of the Indian life during British rule form the decision making process in foreign relations. Each one of these factors has had its influence on the foreign policy as it was shaped by Jawaharlal Nehru and followed by him and successors.

Geography

Geography is the factor that directly determines the national goals and co-aspirations and hence is one of the most potent factors in influencing the formulation of the foreign policy. Geographical factors, like the size and the location of a country, its natural resources and the number of its population contribute to the power of the
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nation, which in turn shapes its foreign policy. The foreign policy of Britain in pre-second world war period was centred on the principles of Balance of Power, superiority on the seas and expansion of empire. These aspects of the policy were the natural corollary of geography. Britain is surrounded from three sides by the sea and on the fourth side lays the English Channel that separates it from the rest of Europe making it an island.

The location of Pakistan, adjacent to the Soviet Union and China has undoubtedly moulded her position in international politics and given her an influence out of proportion to her size and population. Nepal’s position as an independent buffer state between India and China has also posed problems for India largely explicable in terms of Nepal’s location.

Although geography was and remains to be an important factor in foreign policy yet in recent years, owing to scientific and technological advancement its importance is receding. The inventions of supersonic jets, I.C.B.M.s and rockets have made the mountains and seas invincible. However, it does not mean that geography has lost its importance altogether, it still plays a significant role. Soviet Union’s historic concern about the East European countries is because of geography and the USA’s deep involvement in South American States is again because of geographical proximity.

**Public Opinion**

Public opinion shapes the foreign policy, provided it is clear and well shaped. It could be significant factor only in developed state. In developing or under-development states either it does not reflect on foreign policy issues or it is too naive to play a significant role. Studies of public attitudes conclude that the vast majority of people even in highly literate societies are unknowledgeable, uninterested and apathetic with regard to most issues of world affairs. Other studies suggest that government, university and private programmes that have sought to create wider
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public knowledge and appreciation of the complexities of international politics have seldom met with success\textsuperscript{15}.

The strong opposition of the American public to the government’s policy on Vietnam led Nixon to adopt a policy of gradual withdrawal of US forces from Vietnam. With Lord Strong, who was Permanent Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, we may say that the public ventilation of issues of foreign policy, often at awkward moments, hampers the flexibility, resourcefulness and imagination with which diplomatic relations might otherwise be more fruitfully conducted\textsuperscript{16}.

\textbf{National Capacity}

National capacity means the military preparedness of state, its technological advancement and modern means of communication. The economic development and enlightened political institutions are also associated with the national capacity. National capacity is the pivot of foreign policy. It determines as well as implements it. In fact, the foreign policy is directly associated with the national capacity. If the state increases its national capacity its foreign policy will need a big change. It will strive to achieve a status of distinction in international relations; if it decreases the state will have to compromise with its poor status. For example, at the end of Second World War Britain became a less powerful state in Europe as well as in the world. This change in national capacity has brought overwhelming diversions in British Foreign Policy.

\textbf{The Structure of Society}

National morale is recognized to be an important element in the power of a state and, therefore, in the successful conduct of foreign policy. It is evident that a homogeneous society makes stronger national unity and morale than a heterogeneous one, sharp division in society-divisions between rich and poor, divisions on the basis of religion, regional imbalances make it difficult for a government to count on that immediate and nation-wide cooperation from society which is so essential for a
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successful foreign policy\textsuperscript{17}. Such cooperation is demanded in particular when the society’s wealth and personnel have to be explained in the prosecution of a war. The structure of society has another implication for the analysis of foreign policy: a plural society with its members following different religions as in India indicates a policy of secularism with inevitable repercussions on both domestic and foreign policy\textsuperscript{18}.

**The Political Organization**

The internal political structure of a country has an important impact upon the country’s approach to international affairs, as is evident from a comparison of the decision-making processes in an absolute monarchy or a dictatorship on the one hand and in a parliamentary democracy on the other. It is true that as David Hume puts it, it is ............... an opinion only that government and this maxim extends to the most despotic and most military governments as well as to the most free and most popular\textsuperscript{19}. A despotic government has greater power, through censorship and the promulgation of regulations, to prevent the expression of undesirable opinions than a free government does. Indeed, the distinguishing mark of a free government is the very freedom allowed the citizens to express their options on public policy, domestic or foreign. There are besides, established institutions such as an elected parliament, political parties and a free press for the expression of opinion\textsuperscript{20}.

**EXTERNAL FACTORS**

External factors are of two types-
- Flexible: International Environment, International Organizations, World Public Opinion
- Rigid: Reaction of the States

**International Environment**

The establishment of friendly and cooperative relations between nations are the aims of a sound foreign policy, the complexity of task arises from the very nature
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of international politics. The multiplicity of attitudes and their interactions apart the difficulty of conducting foreign policy arise from the fact that a state has no sure means of controlling the behaviour of other sovereign states. It can persuade, promise or deny economic and military aid, it can threaten another state with the use of force and, nevertheless, it cannot be certain the state will act in the way it desires.

There is another source of difficulty. The world is continuously changing, new events and personalities create fresh foreign policy problems for all concerned. To select instances at random, the impact of the October Revolution of 1917, the rise of Communist Power in China in 1949, the rise of De Gaulle to power in France in the fifties and the emergence of new states in Asia and Africa since Foreign Ministers of the time. Yet it has been rightly said that there is both continuity and change in the foreign policies of all states, for every nation also has its history and its traditions. The statesman who not only merely reacts to events but also acts on his own, anticipating events, has a certain limited advantage over another who is caught by events.

**International Organizations**

The international organizations have started playing important role in foreign policy formulation. The states have to take a note of international law, treaties and contracts so that their violation may not jeopardize the policies. The Communist China, for a long time, showed utter disregard of these factors and consequently could not secure its due position in the field of international relations. Only after 1971 she recognized their importance and that move on the part of Communist China have introduced new dimensions in international politics.

**World Public Opinion**

World public opinion is very dynamic element. Like a flicker of light it influences the foreign policies only too occasionally. Only if the domestic public opinion supports the world public opinion it becomes an important determinant of foreign policy. The establishment of democratic institutions, the increase in the standard of living, the scourge of First World War and expansion of education have made the world public opinion a significant factor in foreign policy. The States never
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dare pursue the interests contrary to world public opinion. At least they will pursue only those interests which are not opposed to world public opinion.

The opinion is a factor which faces many obstacles in crystallization. The first and foremost is the ideological division of the world in which the acting good or bad of one part become naturally adverse to other part. The role of propaganda, absence of free press and economic backwardness of a large number of states thwart the evolution of a real public opinion.

**Reactions of the States**

The states have to take notice of the interests of other states while formulating their policies. They will never endeavour to pursue those interests which are totally opposed to the fundamental interests of other states.

Hitler in 1939 committed a blunder when he refused to be guided by the British reactions and events ahead with his Polish invasion. The result is well known. Japan’s failure in assessing American reactions in Pearl Harbour incident again brought disaster to Japanese policy which had intelligently avoided offending the USA up to that period.

**POLICY MAKING FACTORS**

In the formulation of foreign policy, the statesmen including all other policy makers play a decisive role. As the final shape of foreign policy is the handiwork of these elites, the impact of their views and personality is but natural. Policy makers define the situation not only in terms of conditions abroad, but also in terms of what is feasible bureaucratically. They receive information from various government agencies and the alternatives they consider are often alternatives that have been drafted and debated by lower officials of various government departments. Henry Kissinger has suggested that there are three important styles of foreign policy making today-

- Charismatic revolutionary
- Ideological
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➢ Bureaucratic- pragmatic.

The dictators generally try to change the public opinion in their favour through a controlled press. Leaders like Mussolini, Hitler, Mao-Tse-Tung and Ayub Khan have done the same. Generally the policy makers have to consider internal problems, public opinion, external circumstances and reactions of other states. In these tasks they are assisted by a number of departmental experts.

Policy making factors can be divided under the following sub-categories-

➢ Head of the Government and Foreign Ministers
➢ Legislature
➢ Foreign Office and Other Services
➢ Ideologies

**Head of the Government and Foreign Ministers**

In a totalitarian state foreign policy depends upon the whims of a dictator. In a democracy the general public is not competent enough to participate in it effectively. The American President Truman used to say that the President is the maker of foreign policy. In a parliamentary democracy it is the Prime Minister who wields this authority. India’s foreign policy of Nehru-era was nothing but Nehru’s ideas on foreign policy. The influences of Disraeli, Asquith, Churchill and Atlee can be noted in British Foreign Policy.

Personality equations play a very significant part in politics and administration. This sometimes makes the foreign minister more important than the President or Prime Minister. Dr. Henry Kissinger virtually became the symbol of American foreign policy in Nixon and Ford period.

**Legislature**

Legislature is the last authority in decision making and the strings of pursue are under its control. The post second world war period has seen a new aspect of foreign policy, i.e. the economic aid and assistance to promote the national interests.

For that matter the executions of foreign policy depend upon the legislature for sanctions of huge amounts. The USA is the chief donor of economic assistance. This has made the Senate a powerful factor in formulation of the foreign policy. Again, the treaties though concluded by the executives, Prime Minister or President
but they must be satisfied by the legislatures before they are applied. This again makes the legislature important determinant.

**Foreign Office and Other Services**

In the state characterized by a highly developed foreign affairs bureaucracy, there are also unlimited possibilities for foreign officers, military organizations or intelligence agencies to take actions formulated independently by the top political leadership.

In theory, the ministers make the policy and the permanent official merely execute it, but in practice the officials formulate the policy and the ministers are only advice-sender. Neville Chamberlein clashed with the foreign office over his policy of Appeasement, he removed Lord Vansittart from his post of Under Secretary. Nevertheless, where policies are less firm and clashes less pronounced the advice of the officials carries much weight.

Foreign policy is not conducted by diplomacy alone, it relies heavily on the scientists who supply them with up to date weapons, on economists and also especially today, on intelligence and propaganda services.

In the world of today the weapons are not used, on the contrary, they are produced only to deter. Here the scientists start playing an important role. In the same manner, the governments have to rely upon the information rendered by the intelligence agencies. The role of Central Intelligence Agency of the USA is now open secret. We know from the newspaper revelations that this agency was responsible for the Coup in Chile, invasion of Cuba in 1961, the U-2 reconnaissance flight over Soviet Union and murder of many heads of the government of hostile states.

**Ideologies**

Ideology is the basis as well as the goal of foreign policy. The states establish their political and economic institutions on the basis of ideology and endeavour to translate those very principles in the sphere of foreign policy. The ideology prescribes for policy makers both national roles and an image of the future state of the world. It
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establishes the long-range goals of a state's external behaviour, to be promoted through diplomacy, propaganda, revolution or force. Its relevance to day-to-day problem solving and to the development of specific actions in concrete situations, however, may be only very slight. In this realism a Communist government operates like any other.\textsuperscript{25}

As is obvious, a particular ideology has a goal which the state strives to achieve in international relations. The ideological division of the world between Soviet bloc and American bloc has focused two types of foreign policies. One is communist oriented and the other non-communist. A sort of affinity can be traced among the states of identical ideologies while there is feeling of animosity among the states adhering to contradictory ideologies. This is the root cause of cold war and post war tensions.

NATIONAL INTERESTS AND NATIONAL VALUES

National interest is the big concept in foreign policy. These are the aspirations of the state, which are to be achieved through foreign policy. The policy makers are governed by their respective national interests. National interests are the governing factors which loom large in diplomatic conferences, bilateral or multilateral. The success and failure of all these conferences depend upon the national interests involved. Lord Palmerston was too right to say that friendship or enmity is never permanent in foreign policy, it is the national interests that are permanent and it was the pious duty of the states to follow them. The time-honoured definition of national interest as ‘the general and continuing ends for which a nation acts’ could be accepted as a working definition.\textsuperscript{26}

The particularistic element in national interest of different nations and even of the same nations at different times stems primarily from stage of social and economic development which it has reached.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{25} For a discussion of ideological influences in Soviet Foreign Policy, Jan F Triska and David D. Finally, “Soviet Foreign Policy”, New York, MacMillian, 1968, pp.107-27.
\textsuperscript{26} “United States Foreign Policy: 1952-1953”, pp.373-5.
\textsuperscript{27} A. Appadorai, “The Domestic Roots of India’s Foreign policy: 1947-1972,” Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1981.
The interests of one nation necessarily not opposed to the interests of other states. States, in pursuing their national interest are bound to take into account universal ideals and principles of internal national law and morality, such as peace, justice, keeping the nation’s word, the sanctity of treaties and non-intervention in other nation’s affairs, freedom and a decent standard of living for all men\(^{28}\).

**FOREIGN POLICY OBJECTIVES**

The concept of objective, which is essentially an “image” of a future state of affairs and future set of conditions that governments through individual policy makers aspire to bring about by wielding influence abroad and by changing or sustaining the behaviour of other states\(^ {29}\). If all the objectives of foreign policy are to be explained by one single word, that word is undoubtedly the ‘National Interest’, but this word is too ambiguous to lead us to any clear understanding. Paul Seabury opined that ‘the national interest can indicate such ideal objectives which the states pursue through their foreign policy or it can simply be the interpretation of the policy makers or its meaning may be different to different individual and groups\(^ {30}\).

In principle, the foreign policy is always formulated on the basis of national interests but in practice the policy may drift far off from these goals under the pressure of international environment and power pattern.

The objectives of foreign policy are divided in three categories namely-

- Core values and Interests
- Middle Range Objectives
- Universal Long Range Objectives

**Core Values and Interests**

Core values and interests determine the foreign policy of a nation. The bases of these objectives are those necessities and beliefs on which the existence of the state depends. Core values and interests can be described as those kinds of goals for which
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most people are willing to make ultimate sacrifices. They are usually stated in the form of basic principles of foreign policy and become articles of faith that a society accepts uncritically. These necessities and beliefs are as follows:

**National Security**

National security is the primary goal of a foreign policy. The treaties, contracts and alliances which the states conclude with other state rest on this objective. In 1823, the then President of the USA declared the famous Monroe doctrine which aimed at checking the interference of European powers in the affairs of Americans. The concept of national security is not confined to territorial integrity or security of national borders. It may include the security or cultural and political institutions and beliefs and values. Most policy makers in our era assume that the most essential objective of any foreign policy is to ensure the sovereignty and independence of the home territory and to perpetuate a particular political, social and economic system based on that territory.

After self-preservation and defence of strategically vital areas, another prominent “core value” or interest is ethnic, religious or linguistic unity. Irredentist movements, subversion and sometimes racial warfare are often the products of frontiers that divide ethnic, language or religious groups.

**Economic Development**

The promotion of economic interests of a nation is the fundamental goal in foreign policy as this is directly associated with state’s existence. So the state would always strive to adopt a course of action which brings economic prosperity thereby making its armed forces well equipped, citizens much relaxed and state significant factor in international politics. It will be no exaggeration to mention that the national interests are more economic than political and foreign policy more guided by economic factors than by political one. War, imperialism and colonialism, treaties, alliances and contracts are totally based on the idea of economic prosperity. India at
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the dawn of its independence shrewdly opted for a policy of non-alignment to seek the help of both the blocs for its economic prosperity.

**Middle-Range Objectives**

The primary commitment of many modern governments must be to pursue those courses of action that have the highest impact on domestic, economic and welfare needs and expectations. It may be difficult to gain much public support for other types of objectives such as glory, territorial expansion or power for its own sake. The middle range goal has no particular time element, but most of today’s leaders in developing countries hope that they can begin to catch up with more economically advanced countries within their own lifetimes. The middle range objectives include international cooperation, prestige and protection of the interests of the nationals. These objectives can be illustrated as follows-

**The Interests of Pressure Groups**

The existence of pressure groups with global interest is a new phenomenon in politics which has a significant influence in foreign policies also. The pressure groups yield a considerable influence on their respective governments which has to include the interest of these pressure groups in foreign policy to bring stability in national politics, or to assure the support of these groups in dominating the domestic policy scene. India’s repeated assurance to the Arab World to support them against Israel is because of the pressure of Muslim factor in Indian politics. As one British diplomat has claimed most important decisions are often made, not as part of a concerted and far-sighted policy, but under the urgent pressure of some immediate crisis.

Recent empirical studies demonstrate that changes in public attitudes follow government actions, which imply that governments are instrumental in creating the “mood” that also constrain them.
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Non-Political Cooperation

In the field of international relations mutual cooperation is more than necessary today. So the objectives of a foreign policy inevitably include economic, cultural and social cooperation. The economic aid to the developing states and the facilities the states give to the foreign students to pursue higher and technical education will explain this.

Promotion of National Prestige

The objective of this type includes those policies of states which are meant to focus an impressive image on the states abroad. The states generally resort to propaganda through mass media to create the desired effect. The competition between two Super Powers to reach the planets is motivated by this desire. The success of any of them in its mission would certainly prove the scientific and technological superiority of one over the other. In the past, as today, this was done primarily through diplomatic ceremonial and displays of military capabilities, but increasingly in our era prestige is measured by levels of industrial development and scientific and technological skills\(^38\). Industrialized countries and major powers can increase their international prestige through a number of policies and actions, including expansion of military capabilities, distribution of foreign aid, diplomatic ceremonies including reciprocal visits by heads of state and industrial and scientific exhibition and particularly through development of nuclear weapons and the capacity to explore outer space\(^39\).

Territorial Expansion

The policy of territorial expansion includes imperialism and colonialism which the states adhere to meet their economic and political aspirations. From 18\(^{th}\) to 20\(^{th}\) century the European States had adopted the policy of imperialism to capture the markets, raw materials and to claim superiority in European affairs. Territorial expansion becomes an end in itself, whether or not it fulfills any strategic, economic or social needs. Others do not occupy foreign territory but seek advantages, including

\(^{39}\) Ibid, p.145.
access to raw materials, markets and trade routes, which they cannot achieve through ordinary trade or diplomacy\textsuperscript{40}.

In modern times the traditional imperialist policy has undergone a change and this can be explained by illustrating its two prevalent forms. The first is a policy which aims at the increase of areas of influence, while the other seeks capture the economic resources reducing the other state to the status of dependency. The economic or dollar imperialism of the Western European Countries and of the USA falls in this category, while the Russian policy of imperialism can be covered in the former type expansion of areas of influence or ideology.

**Universal Long Range Objectives**

These are objectives aiming at restructuring the international system. The plans and dreams which an ideology forms to establish the international system of its own liking is the distant goal of foreign policy. Hitler’s liking is the distant goal of foreign policy. Hitler’s idea of ‘Thousand Years Reich, the idea of world revolution in Socialistic Countries, the plans of the USA to make the world safer for democracy are undoubtedly the foreign policy goals but with some distinction. As Lenin and of the great modern visionaries, wrote in 1920, “We have always known as shall never forget that our task is an international one and that our victory [in Russia] is only half a victory, perhaps less, until an upheaval takes place in all states including the wealthiest and most civilized\textsuperscript{41}.”

While the primary and middle range goals are the policies immediately to be pursued, foreign policy is always coloured by them but the long range goals are the ambitions which the states may achieve in distant future and/ or them the states never press to much in the present.

**FOREIGN POLICY ORIENTATION**

The involvement of a state in the field of international relations expresses the nature of its foreign policy objectives. It reveals whether the objectives are primary, middle range, long range or mixed. The involvement of the state in international

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid, p.150.
relations is both necessary and expedient as the states fail to fulfill their objectives through their limited means. They depend on international environment.

The general policies, strategies and obligations of a state are termed as orientation. Four conditions or variables can help account for the selection of any particular strategy. First, it is the structure of the international system. The patterns of dominance, subordination and leadership of an international system establish some limits on the freedom of action of the component units. Second, a state’s general foreign policy strategy can be linked to the nature of its domestic attitudes and social and economic needs. Third, the degree to which policy makers perceive a persisting external threat to their own values and interests will have great bearing on their orientation towards the external environment. Finally, a state’s geographic location, topographical characteristics and endowment in natural resources can often be linked to its choice of orientations.42

The orientation of foreign policy of a state can only be understood by a continuous observation of its moves in the field of international politics. Generally three types of orientation of foreign policy can be traced, they are-

- Isolation
- Non-Alignment
- Coalition Making and Alliance Construction.

Isolation

Isolationist orientation are often based on the assumption that the state can best gain security and independence by reducing transactions with other units in the system or by maintaining diplomatic and commercial contacts abroad while handling all perceived or potential threats by building administrative walls around the home base.43 The policy of isolation is a strategy which aims at avoiding such transaction as may be detrimental to the security, liberty and welfare to the nation. The states, generally adopt this policy in view of the topographical characteristics, freedom of action, freedom from international complication and tension and economic necessity. The policy of isolation is not the policy of isolating oneself from the rest of the world.

43 Ibid, p.110.
It only means to avoid the pitfalls of international interest. Logically, at least an isolationist orientation would be adopted or could succeed, only in a system with a reasonably diffuse structure of power, where military, economic or ideological threats do not persist and where other states are regularly shifting alliances. Geographical and topographic characteristics are related in many ways to a strategy of isolation. The topographical characteristics of Nepal and proximity of two big powers to its borders have forced Nepal to opt for the policy of isolation.

**Non-alignment**

The term non-alignment is of post 1945 origin. It is an independent policy which does not associate itself with the so called communist and non-communist blocs. It is a policy of keeping out of alliances because the alliances and counter alliances may breed tension and ultimately lead to disaster. Nonalignment may be explained by perception of external threat as well as by domestic economic and political variables. To be non-aligned is to maximize opportunities to meet domestic economic needs, while minimizing dependencies.

In contemporary international politics the policy of non-alignment is very popular with the newly independent states. As independent states, however non-aligned nations have room to maneuver and may be able to influence the behaviour and actions of both blocs. Successful strategies of non-alignment require the juxta position of many conditions including favourable structure of power and influence in the system, national capacity to defend independence and territorial integrity against those who do not honour a neutral position, the benevolent attitude or indifference of the great powers, reasonable remoteness from the main centres of international conflicts and a reasonable amount of internal political stability.
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Coalition Making and Alliance Construction

Governments that seek to construct permanent diplomatic coalitions or military alliances assume that they cannot achieve their objectives, defend their interests or deter perceived threat by mobilizing their own capabilities. They thus reply upon and make commitments to other states that face similar external problems or share similar objectives\textsuperscript{49}.

The states with common problems and common enemies generally make diplomatic and military alliances. The diplomatic pacts are made to achieve economic and cultural interests while military alliances are purely for collective defence. E.C.M is a diplomatic pact aiming at resolving the economic problems by identical economic policies, but NATO, SEATO and CENTO are purely military alliances. As Thucydides noted over 2,000 years ago and as modern experimental and historical studies have substantiated, mutual fear is the most solid basis upon which an alliance is organized\textsuperscript{50}.

Indeed, one systematic study of 130 military alliances, non-aggression treaties and entities between 1815 and 1965 shows no relationship between the distance separating allies and the creation or duration of the alliance\textsuperscript{51}.

DOMESTIC IMPERATIVES IN INDIA’S FOREIGN POLICY

India’s first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, told the Constituent Assembly on 8\textsuperscript{th} March 1948 that in spite of being a Minister in charge of External Affairs, he was more interested in internal affairs than external affairs because he believed that external affairs could follow internal affairs\textsuperscript{52}. He told the Lok Sabha more clearly on 2 September 1957, “If we want to play any part in world affairs that part is completely dependent not on our loud voices but on the strength, unity and conditions in the country\textsuperscript{53}.” Indira Gandhi echoed the same theme when she stated

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{49} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{50} Thucydides, “A History of the Peloponnesian War,” trans. Benjamin Jowett, Oxfords: Ascendance Press, 1930, Book III, Par II.
\item \textsuperscript{52} India, Constituent Assembly (Legislative), Debates, Vol.3, no.2, 8 March 1948, p.1947.
\item \textsuperscript{53} India, Lok Sabha, Debates, series 2, Vol.6, 26 August-5 September 1957, session 2, col.11434.
\end{itemize}
that foreign policy can not be divorced from a country’s internal policies, as it is essentially a reflection of domestic pre-occupations\textsuperscript{54}. As regards geography, three aspects of the Indian geography merit our attention: its location and frontiers, size and climate and natural resources.

**STRATEGIC LOCATION AND FRONTIERS**

India’s strategic location at the centre of the great Asian arch and on the Indian Ocean has made it inevitable from ancient times that she should play a vital role in the history of Asia and the World. “Look at the map”. Jawaharlal Nehru told the members of the Constituent Assembly on 8\textsuperscript{th} March 1949, “If you have to consider any question concerning South-East Asia, you can not do so without India. So also with the Far East. While the Middle East may not be directly connected with South-East Asia, both are connected with India”\textsuperscript{55}. On another occasion, he observed, “Whichever problem in Asia you may take up, somehow or other India comes into the picture. She can not be ignored because as I said, her geographical position is a compelling reason”\textsuperscript{56}”. In fact, India’s strategic location is one reason why India has been able to play an important role in international relations and why both the Super powers have attempted to programme India into their respective global strategies.

India’s strategic location on the Indian Ocean and its peninsular character with extensive and open coastline make it dependent on the Indian Ocean. It will be a very long time before air power, whether commercial or military can make a major difference in this basic situation. The rise of any hostile power with access to the Indian Ocean would not only disrupt our foreign trade which depends upon freedom of the Indian Ocean but also undermine our global importance and jeopardize our security\textsuperscript{57}. The logic of strategic location, therefore, inevitably makes India a sea-fearing nation\textsuperscript{58}. In view of the importance of the Indian Ocean for India, it is not


\textsuperscript{58} J. Bandyopadhyaya, “The Making of India’s Foreign Policy” New Delhi, 1979, pp.40-46.
surprising that it has raised voice against the American pressure in this area and it has been demanding that this area should be converted into a Zone of Peace. India’s Prime Minister told the Lok Sabha on 23 February 1968 that the Government of India maintained “a close and careful watch over the political and other developments” in the Indian Ocean area.\(^{59}\)

India’s land frontiers of some 9425 miles bordering China, Pakistan and Bangladesh have also great significance for its foreign and defence policies. It is, therefore, no mere coincidence that some of India’s most troublesome disputes concern her relations with her neighbours.\(^{60}\) In his letter to K. P. S. Menon, India’s first Ambassador to China, Nehru summed up this dilemma of choosing between the USSR and the US thus: Our foreign policy will ultimately be governed by our internal policy. That policy is far from being Communist and is certainly opposed to the Communist Party of India. Nevertheless, there is a great and growing feeling in India in favour of some kind of a vague socialist order of society. There is much goodwill for America and expectation of help from her in many fields, especially technical. The Soviet Union being our neighbour, we shall inevitably develop closer relations with it. We cannot afford to antagonize Russia because we think this may irritate some one else.\(^{61}\)

The US support to Pakistan and the Soviet support to India in their dispute over Kashmir compelled India move somewhat closer to the Soviet Union vis-à-vis the USA, because Kashmir’s position on the flank of both Indian and Pakistani territories means that possession of Kashmir by either country must complicate the other’s defence problems. Also, its snows fill the four major rivers that irrigate West Pakistan and parts of Indian Punjab. In the words of Nehru: Kashmir, because of her geographical position, with her frontiers marching with three countries, namely, the Soviet Union, China and Afghanistan, is connected with the security and international

\(^{59}\)Selected Speeches of Indira Gandhi, New Delhi, 1971, p.39.


contacts of India. Economically also, Kashmir is intimately related with India. The Caravan trade routes from Central Asia to India pass through Kashmir State.62

Size

Apart from India’s strategic location, the fact that India is the seventh largest state in the world having the total area of 1,232,060 sq miles extending some 2,000 miles from north to south and about 1,850 miles from east to west is not without considerable geo-political significance. India’s big size including its size of population which is now more than a billion, has many fold effect on its foreign policy. India’s big size sprawling over a vast area in Asia and along the Indian Ocean led Panikkar to think that India is a maritime power and requires links with the West on this account.64 The vastness of India’s territory has an important bearing on her external security. The more the invading forces march into the country, the more difficult it becomes for them to keep in touch with the lines of supply. India’s big size, in fact, serves as a warning to China and Pakistan against any possible attempt to conquer and occupy whole of India even if it is unrealistically assumed that such a conflict would remain bilateral for a long time. On the other hand, India’s enormous and fast increasing population has tended to reduce rather than strengthen its foreign policy capabilities by retarding the rate of its economic growth and contributing to scarcity of resources for investment, military equipment, food, etc. and thereby making India dependent upon foreign sources.

Natural Resources

The fact that India has a relatively abundant supply of natural resources has a significant bearing for its foreign policy capabilities from the long-term point of view. The total inventory of physical resources possessed by India includes minerals, water, soil and natural vegetation. However, despite the abundance of water resources, lack of proper utilization of the same creates growing domestic demands within India for irrigation and hydro-generated electricity. This, in turn, influences India’s policy

towards its neighbouring countries like Bangladesh and Nepal\textsuperscript{65}. Similarly, despite availability of valuable fertile soil, India’s agricultural yields are still far less in comparison to many parts of the world\textsuperscript{66}. No wonder, India had been a habitual importer of food, particularly from the USA. One of the important reasons for poor food production in India has been its critical dependence on the vagaries of the monsoon.

**ECONOMIC STRUCTURE**

**India’s Economic Situation**

India’s economic situation at independence was thus marked by problems of underdevelopment, average consumer expenditure being one of the poorest in the world, meagre yearly savings and hence lack of finance for a self-sustaining economy and the bulk of population living below the poverty line\textsuperscript{67}.

**Developmental Compulsions in Foreign Policy**

Nehru was fully aware of this central task of economic amelioration and their implication for India’s foreign policy is evident from his speeches. He had observed in the Constituent Assembly on 8\textsuperscript{th} March 1948, “Surely this House realizes that nothing is more important in the opinion of this Government that to make India economically strong”. He said that the first task of that Assembly was to free India through a new constitution, to feed the starving people and to cloth the naked masses and to give every Indian the fullest opportunity to develop himself according to his capacity\textsuperscript{68}.

(a) Defence

The nature of relationship between defence and development is highly complex, being fraught with conflicting drivers and directives. It may be asserted safely that India’s wars with China in 1962 and with Pakistan in 1947-48, 1965 and

\textsuperscript{68}India, Constituent Assembly (Legislative), Debates, n.1, p.1768.
1971 have caused severe economic strains and adversely affected developmental plans. This is why, Indian policy makers tend to regard defence and development as competitive items of expenditure. This is evident from the fact that Indian defence budgets have been subject to the upward pull arising from the configuration of external threat conditions and the downward push arising from the urgency of domestic economic development.

Though the neglect of defence preparedness and bitter experiences of expelling the Pakistan intrudes from the Kargil height in 1999 has once again jolted New Delhi to devote more attention and resources for defence, India’s defence expenditure is nonetheless much lower than that of Pakistan. George Rosen points that India was able to carry out its development plans with relatively minor diversion of resources to military purposes and without involving the military in economic planning for development. Nehru rightly emphasized that India’s defence cannot entirely depend on military power but, to a considerable extent, on diplomacy as well. The policy of non-alignment was found fit for serving India’s defence requirement.

In addition to the relevance of non-alignment to India’s defence needs, it was also thought to be useful for maintenance of world peace-a minimum precondition for India’s economic development. Nehru, therefore, once remarked, “The interest of peace is more important, because if war comes everyone suffers, so that in the long distance view self-interest may itself demand a policy of cooperation with other nations.” This goal of India found ample reflection in Article 51 of Part 4 of the Constitution dealing with Directive Principles. India supported struggles against colonialism, racialism and imperialism. This inevitably led Indian foreign policy to clash with that of the United States. The US support to the French colonial interests in Indo-China or the Portuguese interests in Goa against India. As a result, India and the
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72 Nehru, “India’s Foreign Policy,” n.4, p.79.
73 Prasad, n.9, p.864, and Bandyopadhyaya, n.7, p.63.
74 India, Constituent Assembly, (Legislative), Debates, Vol.2, 4 December 1947, p.1263.
US clashed in the UN and elsewhere over the issue of the independence of colonial countries.

(b) Foreign Aid, Trade and Investment

India’s poor economic condition compels it to seek foreign aid often in forms of capital, technology and arms and sometimes in form of food for survival of its people. This creates tensions in India’s relations with the donor countries. While aid giving States act largely in their own interests and in the furtherance of these interests they seek modifications in recipient countries’ policies. Nehru told the Lok Sabha in 1952, “I am quite clear in my mind that I should rather wish that our advance was slower than we become dependent on the aid of other countries.” India sought to secure both, aid and independence. It tried to diversify the sources of aid that could enable it to minimize the pressure by any state or bloc by offsetting such pressure from one side by the pressure from the other. India preferred aid from multilateral institutions like the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, etc., rather than bilateral aid.

HISTORICAL EXPERIENCES AND CULTURAL PHILOSOPHICAL OUTLOOKS

Foreign policy is a form of social action and the foreign policy makers are influenced by the socio-cultural milieu in which they operate. Nehru emphasized that the foundation of India’s foreign policy was determined by various factors including the historical experiences and cultural-philosophical outlooks of its people. Thus replying to a debate on foreign affairs in the Lok Sabha in 1958, he remarked: It is a policy inherent in the circumstances in India, inherent in the past thinking of India, inherent in the world mental outlook of India, inherent in the conditioning of the Indian mind during our struggle for freedom. I am quite convinced that whoever might have been in charge of the foreign affairs of India and whatever party might have been in power in India, they could not have deviated very much from this policy.

76 India, Lok Sabha, Debates, series 2, Vol.23, 9 December 1958, cols.3959-61, emphasis added.
In the words of Indira Gandhi, “India’s foreign policy is a projection of the values which we have cherished through the centuries.” To begin with, a preference for the middle path is the hallmark of Indian tradition and culture as seen in the Sanskrit saying, which goes, atisarvatra varjyet (Let us eschew excess at all times). The ancient Indian science of medicine, Ayurved declares: Anuyayatpratipadam sarva dharmashu maddhyamam (One should choose middle way among all duties).

Michael Brecher states, “The central message of India’s philosophical tradition dating back from the Buddha has revolved round the rejection of absolutes and extreme positions. On the contrary, it has stressed philosophical relativity, intellectual Catholicism and co-existence of good and evil, in short the golden middle path of compromises and tolerance of opposites.”

In ancient India, the concept of prajna (reason) was given paramount importance. This concept indicates how one may pursue the three ends of life-dharma, artha and Kama. Yet another ancient belief is that the concept of dharma changes with the change of yuga (time). It is this flexible approach to duty and rational tradition, rejuvenated by the Indian Renaissance of the second half of the 19th century, that led the makers of our foreign policy to reject the philosophy of the Cold War-the philosophy which entailed acceptance of the membership of any bloc and in tune with the ancient tradition of debates and discussions (sastrarthta), they chose non-alignment. Nehru stated: It (tolerance) has been our way of life and is as old as our strength and culture. In the old days we talked of religion and philosophy, now we talk more of the economic and social system. But the approach is the same now as before. That is the reason why we try to be friendly with all countries whether we agree with them or not.

The Indian tradition of tolerance is reflected in its policy of secularism. Nehru reiterate, “The State of Jammu and Kashmir has been to us not merely a piece of
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81 Broadcast from New Delhi, 7 November 1946, Cited in Indian Council of World Affairs, Jawaharlal Nehru on World Affairs 1946-64, New Delhi, 1964, p.78.
territory which acceded to India five and quarter years ago, but a symbol representing certain ideals and principles for which our national movement always stood and which have been enshrined in our Constitution”. Nehru was nearly sure that Kashmir question would have been settled long ago but for the pro-Pakistani attitude of the US-led Western powers. In 1928, the Indian National Congress, for instance, observed, “The struggle of the Indian people for freedom is a part of the general world struggle against imperialism and its manifestations.”

When India became independent, it should vigorously pursue the cause of emancipation of colonial and dependent territories and of promotion of racial equality, through a policy of Non-alignment and Panchasheel. When in his very first broadcast to the nation as a head of Interim Government on 7th September 1946, Nehru declared that anti-imperialism and anti-racialism is the Kernel of our foreign policy, he only gave voice to a deep Indian sentiment and tradition against imperialism. The Conferences convened by Nehru in Delhi in 1949 to consider the question of securing Indonesia’s freedom from Dutch and India’s support in the United Nations for the struggle for freedom in Algeria and Tunisia and in Namibia are examples of this policy. India believed that peace can be maintained by removing the roots of conflict like colonialism, racialism, underdevelopment, arms race, interference in other country’s domestic affairs, etc., and in brief by improving the health of the international system. The essence of this view is the determination to avoid force till it becomes unavoidable. It is integral to true negotiation as such.

Yet, the tradition is explicitly mentioned in the Indian epics such as the Ramayana, and the Mahabharata, etc. In this sense, even the Bhagvadgita, which is apparently a plea to engage in war, in fact, recommends non-violence as a way of life and prescribes war only as a last resort.
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The Indian emphasis on negotiation as a way to peace, its tradition of
tolerance and anti-imperialism has led this country to seek peace through peaceful
means and peaceful co-existence. India’s spokesman said at Bandung in 1955, “One
does not seek peace through security, but security through peace\textsuperscript{88}.” Holding such a
view, India developed a conception of collective security, which brought about sharp
differences between her and the US both in and outside the UN. These differences
were highlighted in the discussions on the question concerning Vietnam and Laos, on
the holding of nuclear tests and on the conclusion of a treaty with Japan. The
differences between the two countries on American military aid to Pakistan, and in
the past on the admission of the People’s Republic of China to UN were also at least
partially projections of the same differences in their fundamental approach to the
question of peace and security.

**SOCIAL STRUCTURE**

India has large variety of social, religious, linguistic, regional groups and a
great amount of diversity in political opinions and economic interests. For a variety of
geographical, cultural and communication reasons, people in different regions of
India look at the nation in peculiar ways. For instance, peoples in the north, especially
in Punjab, Jammu and Kashmir identify themselves with those from the Central Asian
culture. This compliment is more or less returned by the peoples of Bengal and Tamil
Nadu in their attitude towards the peoples of the northern states. Similarly, their
prolonged isolation from the main centres of activity in the country has only rarely
given the people of hill regions both in Laddakh and in the Northeast a sense of
belonging to India. Particularly remarkable is the ethnic frontier of Tibet, which spills
over into the Indian borderlands across the Himalayas. Almost all along the northern
frontier, there is a Mongoloid fringe of population on the side of the Himalayas
including that of Himalayan kingdom. Ethnocentric psychology among these would
pose a serious threat to India’s security in war as well as in peace.

\textsuperscript{88} Appadorai, n.71, p.231.
India’s domestic diversity, when projected into foreign affairs, inevitably led to a policy which could neither be pro-US nor pro-Communist. For, any attempt to lean too much on one side could have produced undesirable repercussions on the domestic scene. Nehru shunned both the political extremes of Left and Right and opted for a middle course. In the domestic sphere, this was reflected in his preference for the mixed economy in which private and public enterprises co-existed. In the international sphere, this strategy and outlook found reflection in the policy of non-alignment. The aforesaid tailoring of foreign policy to ensure national integration notwithstanding, it is well known that the task of state and nation building in India is yet to be accomplished. On the contrary, the strengthening of centrifugal forces in areas of strategic importance like Assam and other areas of the Northeast, Punjab, Kashmir, Tamil Nadu, etc., threatens to undermine the viability of the State itself. Such centrifugal tendencies within our State system coupled with even greater failure in the task of nation building in our neighbouring countries have vital implications for our foreign policy, security and integrity.

To begin with, domestic conflicts in India provide foreign countries an opportunity to interfere in the domestic affairs of India. The Chinese support to Mizo and Naga insurgency or to the Naxalite movement in India during the sixties and early seventies and Pakistan’s encouragement to extremists in Punjab and Kashmir are widely known examples. Though Washington is now showing greater understanding of India’s problem created by Pakistan sponsored terrorism, earlier, the US too had displayed sympathy towards these forces of internal subversion in the name of protecting human rights. Former President of US Clinton himself had compared the Kashmir situation with ethnic conflicts in Bosnia and Somalia during his address to the UN General Assembly in 1993 that invited sharp reaction from India.

Social conflicts sometimes compel leaders to seek foreign support for and assistance in domestic actions intended to eliminate or control that conflict. The Vajpayee Government made strenuous efforts to build up an international coalition against trans-border terrorism. Fortunately for India, due to the changed circumstances of the post-cold war and post Soviet era, both President Bush of the US and President Putin of Russia shared India’s concern about this problem. Social conflicts, like any other domestic problem, tend to adversely affect foreign policy capability of India, create a poor image of the country abroad and divert the attention of its leaders from international problems to the solution of pressing domestic problems. The killings of Christians during the BJP-led Government has, for instance, forced Prime Minister, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, to virtually beg apology from the head of the Vatican church during his visit there in 2000\textsuperscript{91}.

Across the borders from India are people with ethnic ties to groups within this country. Some 20 percent of Sri Lanka’s population is Tamil speaking, majority of Bangladeshis are Bengali speaking. The population of Nepal’s southern Terai districts are ethnically similar to groups in contiguous areas of India.\textsuperscript{92} These overlapping ethnicities have generated pressures on New Delhi to safeguard interests of these groups, in part to forestall cross border migration into India. The Indian decision to erect a barbed wire fence along its borders with Bangladesh is grim manifestation of how to deal with the problem of demographic invasion from the neighbour.\textsuperscript{93} Likewise, influx of the Tamils from Sri Lanka into India due to ethnic violence there and India’s concern for sensitivities of its own Tamil population compelled New Delhi to get itself involved in the murky affairs of the Island.\textsuperscript{94}

\textsuperscript{91} The Hindu, Chennai, 11 October 2000.
\textsuperscript{92} Anderson, n.16, pp.46-47.
\textsuperscript{93} “The Unwanted Immigrants,” India Today, New Delhi, 15 June 1984, pp.124-39. In addition to Bangladeshis, the slow and steady inflow of the Nepali people has contributed to crisis in Assam.
\textsuperscript{94} Jha,”Indo-Sri Lanka Accord,” n.6, pp.19-21, 37.
POLITICAL STRUCTURE AND PROGRESS
The Constitutional Set-Up

India’s Parliamentary political system provides for a federal polity with elected Governments in the States and the Union. The Constitution provides the essential institutions through which the people and their representatives can at least in theory influence and even control the foreign policy of the country. Article 19(1) of the Constitution provides Indian citizens freedom of speech and expression and freedom to form association and union. Article 246 of the Constitution exclusively authorizes the Indian Parliament to legislate on all matters, which bring India into relations with any foreign country. Article 253 also authorizes Parliament to make any law for the whole or any part of the territory of India for implementing any treaty, agreement or convention with any other country or countries or any decisions made at any international conference, association or other bodies. Article 73 further makes it clear that the Federal Government has full executive powers for the implementation of laws, treaties or agreements made by it.

Demands that special interests and concerns of various parts of the land should be taken into account while formulating foreign policy involving those interests or concerns. This explains why the Union Government has been occasionally compelled to take into account the interests and view of the states like Tamil Nadu over India-Sri Lanka relations, Gujarat over the Kuchchh issue and West Bengal over Berubari issue and so on. As regards Parliamentary control over executive in foreign policy making, it is open to Parliament, at least in theory, to make its views known to the Government and compel it to accept these views.

The solid majority of the Congress party in Parliament (except for 1967-71 and 1991-95 period) the rigid party discipline and the dominance of leaders (particularly Nehru and Mrs. Gandhi after her electoral victory in the March 1971 elections) marginalized the role of Parliament in this regard. The Congress Party’s Standing Committee on External Affairs did little more than obtain clarifications from Nehru: the Parliamentary Party was informed rather than consulted. Like Nehru,

Mrs. Gandhi regarded the formulation of foreign policy as natural monopoly of the executive, as both considered that external affairs required much secrecy and that foreign policy making should be the responsibility of those experienced and knowledgeable in foreign affairs\textsuperscript{96}.

**Political Process**

Ironically, that very look at the actual characteristic of the ruling regime and operation of the Indian polity indicates the significance of democratic political processes in the shaping of India’s foreign policy. The Congress Party, which ruled the country for most of the time, represented the widest support base within the country despite several changes in its character and now struggling to recover its lost ground. While the BJP, which was heading the federal Government during 1999-2004, had not yet attracted the majority of electorates, its leader and Prime Minister, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, commands widespread acceptability and making conscious efforts to enlarge the party’s support base. This relationship between political process and foreign policy in India can be summarized as follows -

**Interest-Articulation**

The significance of the function of interest-articulation regarding foreign policy issues by interest groups in India may appear limited, but it merits serious attention especially in view of the presence of strong and articulate religious as also other interest groups in this country. The Hindus are theoretically in majority, but they are so divided on the basis of caste, language, and region, etc., that they are by and large not influenced by any pan-Hindu ideology. On the other hand, the Muslims are linked by religious affinity to the countries of West Asia and North Africa, except Israel, and South-East Asian States of Indonesia and Malaysia.

Democratic politics is such that political parties in India vie with each other to attract the Muslim vote bank thereby leading to perversion of secularism. As indicated earlier, even the BJP, which championed the cause of the Hindus, is now trying to woo the Muslims. Another notable example of the Muslim pressures in

\textsuperscript{96} Ilchman, n.93, pp.220.
India’s foreign policy is its policy towards West Asia. Although India has many political, economic and strategic interests in West Asia, yet it can hardly be gainsaid that the calculation of Muslim sentiments is one of the major reasons why India has to maintain friendly relations with the Arab States and a constant anti-Israeli stance till the late 1980s despite the Arab support to Pakistan during India-Pakistan conflicts. This became evident for the first time, when India granted dejure recognition to Israel on the general principle accepted by India that governments established in sovereign nations should be recognized even if we do not agree with their policies. This was the rationale in our recognizing China and in our recognition of Israel. But despite this, if India did not immediately follow up the dejure recognition with the exchange of diplomatic personnel, no doubt because the Government of India did not want to wound the susceptibilities of the Indian Muslims.

Indian big business wants the political leadership to follow liberalization only on terms that can protect its interests. Business interest groups in India are coming out of their earlier mind and now showing greater interest in forging collaborations with the foreign companies. This explains their enthusiastic welcoming of foreign leaders like President Clinton and his business team, when they visited India in March 2000 and their accompanying the Indian Prime Ministers to Western capitals. Prime Minister Vajpayee’s team for his US visit in September 2000 that consisted of a large number of businesspersons is only the latest example of this trend. During the Cold War era, however, the Soviet lobby in India was more politically organised than the Western lobbies, as the Communist Party in India acted as the central platform for all pro-Soviet activities in this country.

**Interest-Aggregation**

In a democratic political system like India, political parties cannot come into power by taking into account the interests of only a particular interest group. They have to combine interests of various segments of the society. Some parties outside the
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Congress system did not share the faith in parliamentary democracy. The Communist Party of India in particular was deeply distrustful of the bourgeois led Congress Party and its motives in adhering to the democratic system. The Telengana uprising by the Communists in 1948, though eventually aborted, was a serious enough challenge to the democratic order. The Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China regarded India as neither independent nor neutral until about the mid fifties and they supported the Communist attempts to bring an armed revolution in India. But by deftly taking an independent stand in foreign affairs, Nehru not only made it possible for the post-Stalin USSR to turn towards India, but also helped in changing the attitude of the Communist Party of India towards parliamentary democracy.\textsuperscript{100}

**Public Opinion**

Given the literacy and poverty of a vast majority of India’s population, it is not possible for them, by and large, to get the benefits of the press or parliamentary debates and policy statements. Further, the fact that foreign policy decisions cannot be taken without a reference to the reactions they produce elsewhere and disagreement among various sections of press regarding foreign policy issues restrict the role of press in India’s foreign policy making.\textsuperscript{101} Lastly, audio-visual means of socio-political education like television, until the eighties being controlled by the state, lacked credibility and could hardly be a satisfactory basis for the effective influence of public opinion on foreign policy making. Public opinion thus played a reinforcing role in the making of India’s foreign policy. Not only the broad strategy of non-alignment, but also all issues relating to imperialism, racialism and military alliances have received the specific support of the Indian people. Thus, for example, India’s struggle in the UN against South African apartheid since 1946 received strong support from the domestic public opinion. Recently, the Indian people have widely supported the Government’s actions to flux the Pakistani intrudes from Kargil in 1999 and develop closer ties with great powers including the US, Russia, Japan, France, etc.

\textsuperscript{100}Jha, “Foreign Policy and National Integration,” n.75, pp.1-15.
In addition, public opinion has also exerted a restraining influence on foreign policy. The adverse opinion at home has compelled the Government on several occasions to reverse its policy postures. To cite just a few examples: the initial pro-Soviet attitude of the Indian delegation on the Hungarian question at the UN in 1956 was considerably modified by Nehru within a few days, largely under the pressure of domestic public opinion. The most important reason advanced by Nehru for granting asylum to the Dalai Lama was that denying that to him would have created anger among hundreds of millions of Indians. Even more significant role public opinion played in compelling Nehru to repudiate the agreement entered into by the Government of India with the Voice of America on 9th July 1963. Menon admitted that in general terms, “Public opinion plays a role in every thing through inhibition, fear, tradition and pride.” Public opinion has continued to influence major foreign policy issues such as India’s involvement in the Bangladesh crisis and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, etc., in the post-Nehru era. We can, therefore, safely conclude that domestic imperatives play a significant role in the shaping of India’s foreign policy.
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