INTRODUCTION

Foreign Policy of a nation is the "key" to the understanding of the international phenomenon that has been variously described as international relations, international affairs, world affairs and world politics which is a subject of continuous change and development. In the wake of changing circumstances the conventions of foreign policy need constant re-evaluation to become more effectively operational and more creative to grapple with the futuristic challenges both at regional and global levels. "A foreign policy has to be dynamic and adaptable to new situations and challenges. The touchstone in the evaluation of foreign policy is this: can it serve the national interest in the best way?" Since the establishment of United Nations and emergence of new nation-states after the process of de-colonization interrelationship among the states has assumed a greater significance and even more complexity so much so that every government has to interact in a particular manner in relation to governments of other states. "Utilizing a state's resources to accomplish a set of goals in foreign relations involves many aspects is a complex phenomenon".

The study of international behaviour is, broadly speaking, the content of foreign policy. The behaviour of every state affects the behaviour of other states in some form or the other, either
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favourably or adversely. It remains the endeaevour of the state to minimize the adverse effect and maximize the favourable effect of the actions of the states. The adjustment of the actions of the states in favour of one’s own state has been called by Modelski “the purpose of foreign policy”. He defines foreign policy 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”. The foremost task of foreign policy, in his view, “must be to throw light on the ways in which states attempt to change, and succeed in changing, the behaviour of other states”. But Modelski’s definition appears to be incomplete, as those actions of the other states in which change is not possible or desirable do not fall within the scope of foreign policy. In fact the aim of foreign policy should be to regulate, and not merely to change, the behaviour of other states. Regulation means adjusting the behaviour of other state to suit one's own interest as best as possible.

In simple terms, foreign policy may be defined as a systematic statement of deliberately chosen courses by a nation for the protection and promotion of its interests by means of playing an intelligent role in the sphere of world politics. Hartmann defines it as “a systematic statement of deliberately selected national interests”. He further clarifies that foreign policy connotes a greater degree of

rational procedure, and "a type of planning involved in a step-by-step progress to a known and defined goal".\textsuperscript{9}

Padelford and Lincoln opine that through foreign policy, every state decides "what course it will pursue in world affairs within the limits of its strength and the realities of the external environment".\textsuperscript{10} They explain, "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 those objectives and preserve its interests".\textsuperscript{11} These definitions emphasize the action aspect of foreign policy which refers to, according to Schleicher, "the actions of government officials to influence human behaviour beyond the jurisdiction of their own state".\textsuperscript{12} In the broad sense it includes "the objectives, plans, and actions taken by a state relative to its external relationship".\textsuperscript{13} In the words of Rodee, "foreign policy involves the formulation and implementation of a group of principles which shape the behaviour pattern of a state while negotiating with other states to protect or further its vital interests"\textsuperscript{14}

The facts gleaned through the above definitions underline that every state decides its course of action in international relations in the light of its means and ends and these principles involve those interests which influence the behaviour of the states, intending to establish their relations to further and promote them. These
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principles are those broader interests, which states strive to achieve in international relations. Foreign policy can be defined as "the sum total of the principles, interests, and objectives which a state formulates in conducting its relations with other states". Hence the conduct of foreign relations, behaviour at international level and the regulation of the action of other states by a nation constitute the broad thematic spectrum of the foreign policy.

The thematic fabric of foreign policy and the regulation of behaviour of other states are extremely complex, the complexity emerges from the very nature of world politics which is ceaselessly experiencing unprecedented changes on account of revolutionary advancements in the means of transport, communications, computers, science and technology and ushering in of the information age and revolution in military affairs (RMA). In a vastly altered international environment due to multifarious developments "there is more contact, confrontation, controversy and collaboration among the states than ever before". Every state has to take note of the attitudes of other states, not only to itself but also towards every other. The complexity of foreign policy arises from the interaction of the desires of the states forming the international community to achieve their national interests and their consequent attitudes to international issues, all connected directly or indirectly with issues of peace and war.

It is now a commonplace in the theory of international politics that national interest is the governing principle of foreign policy,
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which may be explained as a state's objectives that generally represent the wide interest of the people of the nation. National interest has been defined by Robert O' good as "a state of affairs valued solely for its benefit to the nation" like preservation of territory independence and fundamental governmental institutions, self-sufficiency in conduct of foreign relations for national prestige.17 Morgenthau analyses the concept as "the political tradition and the total culture context within which a nation formulates its foreign policy".18 Thus, national interest in his view implies protection of a nation state's physical, political and cultural identity against encroachment by other nation states. These points can be further elaborated as :-

(i) Preservation of physical identity is protection of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of a nation state,

(ii) Preserving political identity is preservation of existing politico-economic, regimes in existence,

(iii) Preservation of cultural identity implies maintenance of ethnic, religious, linguistic historical norms, traditions and precedents of nation-states. These basic objectives enable the statesmen to take policy decisions and make different formulations.

The national interest of a nation serves two purposes; it gives policy a general orientation towards the external environment and more importantly, serves as the controlling criterion of choice in

immediate situations. The dominant view in other words, dictates the nature of a state's long term effort in foreign policy and governs what it does in a short term context, thus, adding consistency to a nation's foreign policy. The national interest are the general and continuing ends for the attainment of which a nation conducts its foreign relations and foreign policy is inconceivable without national interest.

On the other hand objectives of foreign policy are the product of national interest. They are “interests spelled out and made more precise in the light of the present day complexity of international relations”. Common objectives of the foreign policy of all the nations can be enumerated as maintaining the integrity of the state, promoting economic interest, providing for national security, protecting national prestige and developing national power and maintaining world order. These objectives can be supplemented by specific objectives according to the problems and conditions of the particular country. It can be surmised that national interest is the “key concept” in foreign policy and the starting point in foreign policy making is the national interest. “As long as the world is politically organized into nations, the national interest is indeed the last word in world politics” “Self interest is not only a legitimate, but a fundamental cause for national policy...it is vain to expect governments to act continuously on any other grounds than

national interest...They have no right to do so being agents not principals.”23 Lord Palmerston has explicitly pronounced: “We have no eternal allies and we have no eternal enemies. Our interests are eternal and those interest it is our duty to follow.”24 It becomes evident that no nation, no matter how lofty ideals and how genuine its desire to abide by them can base its foreign policy on considerations other than its own national interests.

The overriding role of national interest in the making of foreign policy has not been accepted by other political leaders and political scientists who express the contradictory opinions as they define the national interest in terms of “selfish ends to serve” and insist that “the guiding force must be the principles of morality not the expediency”.25 No doubt, national interest is a singularly vague idea, exceptionally nebulous and unclear concept that assumes a variety of meanings in various contexts it is used. As a matter of fact, the concept of national interest has never been objectively or scientifically defined. Robert Osgood describes them as “state of affairs valued solely for its benefits to the nations”. According to Morgenthau, the content of national interest is determined by the political traditions and the total cultural contexts within which a nation formulates its foreign policy. He maintains that the main requirement of a nation-state is to protect its physical, political and cultural identity against encroachment by other nation-states.

The concept of national interest has been classified by Joseph Frankel into aspirational, operational and explanatory and polemical. On the aspirational level national interest refers to the vision of good life, to some ideal set of goals which the state would like to realize if this were possible. On the operational level, it refers to the sum total of its interests and policies actually pursued. On the explanatory and polemical level the concept is used to explain, evaluate, rationalize or criticize foreign policy. There is no doubt that the nature of national interest precludes the possibility of a full rational definition but, despite all the difficulties of definition, foreign policy is generally concerned as being based upon the concept of national interest. The concept remains of central importance in any attempt to describe, explain, predict or prescribe international behaviour.

THE CORE OF NATIONAL INTEREST:

Although national interest in its details differs, the core of national interest is the same for different countries. "The minimum essential components of the national interest of any modern state are security, national development and world order, all interrelated to each other". All nations desire and continuously search for national security, political independence and territorial integrity. Second to security comes the promotion of economic interest, which includes the preservations or acquisition of favourable conditions and terms of trade. While security and economic prosperity are core components, the national interest of a country may include other elements also. For instance, the maintenance of international peace,

the promotion of international law, or the establishment of global organization may also be one of the objectives of foreign policy of some states, especially great powers. As Karl Deutsch observes: “the large and more powers. As Karl Deutsch observes: “the large and more powerful a nation is the more its leaders, elites and population increase their level of aspiration in international affairs.” Arnold Wolfers describes such foreign policy goals as “milieu goals”. Finally some countries believe it to be their national interest to serve some kind of world mission such as “world revolution”, “confinement of communism”, “defence of frontiers of freedom” etc.

**INFERENCES:** **Interdependent World**

This discussion would lead us to infer that there are certain dangerous consequences of regarding the national interest as supreme. A nation’s claim of primacy of its national interest may run afoul of the interest of other nations. In the present day interdependent world each nation has to accommodate its interest with those of others. Today national interest is being challenged by competing interest such as regional, global and even sub-national interest. Our generation will have to decide whether to give precedence to nations whose strategic, economic and socio-cultural needs are better satisfied in a broader (regional or global) setting or to the state in its existing boundaries. The foreign policy makers of our time are forced to define the objectives in a manner acceptable to others and account has to be taken of a sort of international consensus about what is morally permissible in international relations.

To sum up, as a general organizing concept “national interest” is unlikely to disappear within the foreseeable future although the states will probably be increasingly circumscribed in the freedom of its definition. It is bound to be interpreted in a more liberal and enlightened form. In other words, it will have to accommodate the ideal of international integration and the concern for the survival of mankind in its conceptual framework to become legitimate.

FACTORS CONDITIONING FOREIGN POLICY:

The foreign policy of a country is “compounded out of many factors and forces. Some of them are permanent, some temporary, some are obvious, others obscure. All interact upon one another”. In devising its foreign policy a nation must consider certain basic facts of existence. This frame of reference includes its geographic strategic situation, population potential, economic endowments and ideological environment. Brecher includes in the components of foreign policy, geography: external and global environment; personalities (Elite Images); economic and military position; and public opinion. Among foreign policy inputs James Rosenau includes size, geography, economic development, culture and history, great power structure, alliances, technology, social structure, moods of opinion, political accountability, governmental structure, situational factors (both external and internal). “Fundamentally, foreign policy has its roots in the unique historical backgrounds, political institutions, traditions, economic needs,
power factors aspiration, peculiar geographical circumstances and basic set of values held by a nation”. Among basic determinants, J. Bandhyopadhyaya includes geography, economic development, political tradition, domestic milieu and international milieu, military strength and national character.

1. THE GEOGRAPHIC-STRATEGIC FACTOR:

It is told the “pacts may be broken, treaties unilaterally denounced, geography holds its victim fast.” A nation can escape anything but the constraints of geography.

A permanent and stable determinant of foreign policy is geography. It determines the temperature, resources, frontiers and neighbours. The size of the state, topography, shape, location and climate are important components of geography. A size large enough to support a population sufficient to man an adequate military establishment, a climate which is uniform and conducive to physical vigour, preferably either temperate or tropical highland, a topography offering boundaries with natural defence barrier such as mountains, forests, swamps, rivers, deserts and oceans and a shape which is compact rather than disintegrated or scattered and thus easier to defend, provide part of the necessary power potential allowing a state to pursue an independent foreign policy. Location is one of the crucial elements in moulding the foreign policy outlook.

The traditional viewpoint of the relation of geographic-strategic factors to foreign policy was developed much before the

demonstration of the importance of air power augmented by the invention of nuclear weapons. In the context of new technological developments this view seems to suffer from much exaggeration and rhetoricism. We no longer believe in statement phrased in deterministic language such as: "the geographical position of a nation is the principal factor conditioning its foreign policy" or: "England was destined by geography to command the seas", or: "sea routes have beckoned the Japanese abroad." The effect of geography on political phenomenon has become the victim of the law of diminishing utility in view of technological revolution and scientific progress.

Three aspects of the geography of India merit our attention: the size of the country, its location and its frontier India is, territorially a big country, the seventh largest in the world; it is the second most populous country. It measures some 3,200 Km. From north to south and about 2,933 km. From east to west and covers an area of 3,287,263 sq.km.\textsuperscript{32} It has a land frontier some 15,200 km. long.

In the context of foreign policy, the huge size and the large population have a three-fold effect.

First, they tend to give a sense of importance to the people about the role of India in world affairs, potential, if not actual. Size is not strength, but potential strength; wise and strong government, national unity and the effective development of technology would help to transform potential into actual strength. Jawaharlal Nehru reflected this point of view when he told the Lok Sabha on 30
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September 1954, that, next to the United States of America, the Soviet Union and China, “the obvious fourth country in the world is India.33

The second effect is that the large size is a warning to potential aggressors not to attempt, by conquest, to occupy the whole country. History shows, for instance, that Napoleon’s attempt to conquer Russia in 1812 failed largely because of the size of the country. The More the invading forces march into the country, the more difficult it would be for them to keep in touch with the lines of supply.

The third effect. India’s huge population, growing at a high rate34 and the large bulk of them living at the subsistence level, has lent to the economic development of the country a high place among foreign policy objectives.

Economic development, in its turn, has made the seeking of foreign aid and the import of considerable foreign capital and know-how an essential part of India’s diplomacy.

Geography helps to shape foreign policy, as geographical factors, like the size and the location of a country; its natural resources and the numbers of its population contribute to the power of the nation, which, in turn, shapes its foreign policy. “But we must not exaggerate their importance, for their effectiveness, depends upon a combination of several factors, including the quality of
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governmental leadership and technological strength. The equation of national power contains many variables, and it is the relationship among these variables that largely determines whether nations will be weak or strong.  
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2. THE ECONOMIC RESOURCE FACTOR:

Today, no state in the world can boast of economic self-sufficiency. Even the United States is greatly dependent upon world trade for economic prosperity. This mutual interdependence of the economics also works as a determinant of foreign policy. Economic interdependence leads to international economic activity which is expressed in terms of tariffs, import quotas, trade agreements and other financial arrangements. Sometimes maladjustment in international economic relationship create tension in the world which further takes the form of political and military action. States are not equally gifted by nature with natural and economic resources nor they are capable of utilizing available resources. Therefore, nations make their foreign policies in a way so that the supply of war materials may not run short and their trade may have a favourable balance. International economic activity also needs facilities and protection of foreign investment. All these economic factors have bearing on foreign policy.

3. THE IDIOLOGICAL FACTORS:

The foreign policy of a nation is conceived in the minds of men who subscribe to certain fundamental beliefs relating to the
distribution of power in society, the proper function of government and a particular way of life. Policy is expressed in terms of these beliefs and behaviour, though custom and tradition is conditioned thereby.36

There has been a great debate on whether ideology per se acts as a determinant of foreign policy. Some scholars say that democratic nations believe in peace while dictational regimes believe in war. But reality falsifies this hypothesis. America and Britain, by no means, are less war-prone than Russia and China. At times a leader makes the use of ideology merely to justify his policy or behaviour in familiar terms which is acceptable to his countrymen. But on the other occasions a nation goes to war not for national security but only to compel others to subscribe to its ideology. An objective view on this matter is that ideology alone is not a policy goal. This is proved by the fact that nations professing opposite ideologies live in peace with each other for a number of years. However, there is another side of the picture. Foreign policy of the Soviet Union cannot be fully explained if one ignores the ideology of communism. ‘World revolution’ remained one of the chief objectives of the USSR’s foreign policy for many years. Russian expansion after 1945 aimed at establishing of communism as much as per political domination. It is safer to maintain that values and ideologies do not fully determine foreign policy objectives although they influence their directions. While long-range objectives can be deduced from an

ideology, the shorter the time scale the less necessary correlation between the aspirations and the actual policies.\textsuperscript{37}

**IDEOLOGY AND NATIONAL INTEREST:**

Ideology and interest are closely related to each other. Ideology is not merely a set of ideas and beliefs but a goal for fulfillment of a nation’s foreign policy objectives. The inter-relationship between ideology and interest has been a dominating characteristic of traditional international politics. Nations always try to win support for their point of view on the basis of ideology. In the conflict between national interest and ideology it is the former that takes precedence over the latter. For example, the Russian foreign policy during the inter-war period and even the post World War-II period was guided more by power consideration rather than ideology. Ideology is essentially an instrument of foreign policy which emphasises the subordination of ideology to interest. The function of ideology is to create among nations habitual compliance, in the sense that nations think it to be in their own interest to behave in a particular way\textsuperscript{38}. It is in this particular behaviour that they fulfill their national interest. The United States annexation of Honolulu or intervention in small states is covered in the ideology of humanitarianism. Political, economic, social, cultural consideration are invoked to legitimize and rationalize a particular action of a nation in the garb of ideology. While intervention is considered antithetical to the ideology of liberalism the United States has its own justification for intervention in states. In other words there “is


always some handy ideology with which one can justify what needs to be done. If the professed ideology does not fit, it can be justify what needs to be done. If the professed ideology does not fit, it can be reinterpreted, or if this involves intellectual somersaults which might frighten the customers, it can be superseded temporarily by another ideology".39

Ideology is necessarily connected with national interest. Every state tries to mould and remould ideology into the framework of its national interest. Ideological considerations become subordinate when national interest converge e.g. the U.S.S.R. alliance with the Allied powers during the Second World War for a common foreign policy objective of the destruction of Germany. The rigidity of ideology loosens and states enter into alliances and counter-alliances for common motives and purpose. Ideological factors then become “mere verbal pseudo-rationalizations after the fact and at worst insignificant if can completely irrelevant.40

However, the other view on this relationship is that the two are not different but they can be juxtaposed.41 believes that “there is ordinarily a close relationship between interest and ideology. Each seems to be affected by the other, because the interest may both shape ideology and be shaped by it. They tend to converge, although they are not mutually reinforcing, seems to depend on the intensity of attachment of interest and ideology”.

Thus, ideology is essentially a tool of foreign policy and therefore remains subordinate to national interest. The above fact also makes apparent the relationship between ideology and power. It is the element of power that binds the two together. Power is aspired for, as well as exercised for the sake of national interest. This struggle for power is exercised in the garb of ideology. It is with this rationale in mind that\textsuperscript{42} establishes a triangular relationship between power, authority and ideology.

Indian ideology of foreign policy was an outcome of her struggle for freedom struggle. The Indian leadership eschewed parochial attitudes and developed internationalist outlook towards neighbouring states. After independence India developed her own ideological principles and adopted the policy of non-alignment and Panchsheel as the corner stone of her relations with other nations. The “core” ideas and thinking that formed part of India’s non-alignment, continue to be a part of India’s foreign policy. India remains opposed to military alliances and power blocs. India continues to strive for time-bound total nuclear disarmament and the elimination of weapons of mass destruction as key foreign policy goals and is, hence, not supportive of discriminatory international treaties such as NPT and CTBT. India’s commitment to the resolution of disputes between nations bilaterally and without resorting to the use of force, is comprehensive and unwavering. While India is a strong votary of the UN system for ensuring a stable, just and equitable world order, India seeks its early reform, particularly the re-organization of the Security Council, to reflect present realities, and opposes its domination by the P-5
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members. India is supportive of the movement towards the emergence of a new international economic order based on free market economies. India supports genuine democracies and is strongly opposed to racial discrimination, the denial of human rights and discrimination based on religion, caste or gender.

4. THE POPULATION FACTOR:

It, as a determinant of foreign policy, is relevant both in quantitative and qualitative terms. The political, economic and military phases of nation's foreign policy is also moulded by the size, character and distribution of its population. It is believed that the greater the number of population, the greater will be its power. Manpower determines the standard of living, values, the way of life and even expectation of a nation. The significance of China and India rests partly on the large size of their population. Besides the quantity, the quality of population as revealed in its educational level, skilled labour, technical know-how, health and strong national character, is a determinant of foreign policy. The quality of population also influences the quality of political system, public administration, leadership and even execution of foreign policy.

5. THE STRENGTH OF PUBLIC OPINION:

The public opinion, particularly in democratic states, cannot be overlooked as one of the determinants of foreign policy. It was the strength of the public opinion in the United States politics, which forced their government to order withdrawal of the American forces from the South Vietnam. Similarly, it was under the pressure of public
opinion that Mr. Krishna Menon had to resign in 1962 after the Chinese invasion. It seems that public opinion in general has come to stay as a force of substance in moulding the policy of a nation.

Padelford and Lincoln have divided all these determining factors into two categories: (1) subjective, and (2) situational. The first covers national interest and the second covers international environment.

Under subjective factors the following facts are taken into consideration: (1) international factors; (2) psychological factors; (3) internal public opinion; (4) policy makers; and (5) proposed policy. Situational factors include: (1) international organization; (2) world public opinion; and (3) reaction of other states.43

Further, the strength of a nation in military terms may also influence its foreign policy. Only those states have adopted aggressive postures who feel themselves militarily strong.

Situational factors can be divided into two categories: (i) Internal situation, and (ii) External situation.

Under the first category come the capability of nation, its power position. The power status of a country depends upon its diplomatic personnel, military strength, communication facilities and economic resources etc. A rational foreign policy is that policy in which the objectives correspond with internal situation.

External situation three factors together form what is known as external situation. They are (1) world organization creating static international environment, (2) world public opinion creating

dynamic international environment (3) reaction of friendly states about the foreign policy of a country.

To conclude, foreign policy involves the interplay of a wide variety of basic determinants, political institutions and the personality of decision makers. The basic determinants are the boundary conditions of decision making which no rational policy maker can ignore. Political institutions such as public opinion, party organizations, pressure groups, legislative, executive and foreign office must be regarded as major parameters of the decisional system. Finally, the personality of the ultimate decision makers, their ideological predilections, psychological propensities inevitably condition the final choice of ends and means.44