The socialist movement in India began as a revolutionary protest expressing a desire to build a new society. Indeed, the organizational work of socialists in India started during the 1930's. In Nasik Jail (1932-33), Jaya Prakash Narain, Achyut Patwardhan, Ashok Mehta and others discussed the problem of Indian society, and the idea of creating a national 'Congress Socialist Party' was formed. On May 17, 1934, the first All India Conference of Socialists was held in Patna under the Chairmanship of Acharya Narendra Dev. By another conference held on October 21-22, 1934 in Bombay the Congress Socialist Party was formally established. The main object of the Congress Socialist Party then was "the achievement of independence...... and the establishment of a socialist society." For many years prior to Indian independence the party worked inside and outside the Congress and worked tirelessly to give Congress ideology a socialist orientation.

The Socialists and congressmen were diametrically opposed to each other on certain issues. With the acceptance

of office by the congress, the rift between the socialists
and the congressmen further widened. With the passage of
time, differences between the Socialist Party and the Congress
Party cropped up and the general attitude of the party was
that of hostility towards the Congress. It is evident from
the fact that when the Congress Working Committee meeting,
in January 1946, reaffirmed its faith in non-violence, the
Congress Socialists disapproved it. They criticized the
congress leaders for abandoning the path of revolution and
1
taking to constitutionalism.

When the Party met in a conference at Kanpur in March,
1947, it took a momentous decision to delete the word 'Congress'
from its title and its membership was thrown open to all
congressmen and non-congressmen.

In the historic Nasik Conference held in March 1948,
the Socialists decided to leave the Congress and form a separa-
te Socialist Party with democratic socialism as its need and
2
ultimate goal. Their main charges against the Congress Party
included its authoritarian outlook and the gross misuse of
the state power for the benefit of the party. It also alleged
that the party has become a heaven for capitalists, opportu-
nists, communists and reactionaries at the alter of the

2. For details see, "History of the Socialist Party", *Jenata
   (Bombay)*, March 21, 1948.
socialists and has turned all measure to suppress all pro-
gressive forces of the country." Thus the socialists said,
to continue traditions of the congress, to counter act totali-
tarianism, to checkmate the reactionary forces which are gain-
ing strength day by day, there is a great necessity of an oppo-
sition party, the necessity is urgent."

Thus in 1948 the name of the congress socialist party
was changed to socialist party and finally to the Praja Socia-
list Party in 1952, after the first general elections, as a
result of the merger of the Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party, formed
in 1951, and the Socialist Party.

In 1956 a large section of the PSP following the lead
of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia split away to form the Socialist Party
of India on account of some differences among the P.S.P. mem-
ers on certain issues. In 1964 the Party passed another trans-
formation when a section of its members headed by Shri Ashok
Mehta split away to join the congress and the Socialist Party
led by Dr. Rammanohar Lohia. Now a new unified party under the

1. See, "Resolution on Political situation", moved by A. Narender
Deva in Nasik Conference, Nasik Report 1948, p.18; The same
emphasis for the need of a Socialist Party was also laid by
Jaya Prakash Narayan at Nasik Conference. He said, "In the
condition existing in the country today Socialist Party alone
can fulfill the need for a popular opposition party. Thus
taking into consideration all the aspects of the question,
the conclusion we reach is that we must leave the Congress
now and function as an independent party." Ibid., p.94.

2. Surendra Nath Divivedy, Why Praja Socialists, Bombay,

3. On the issue of conflict, see, Rammanohar Lohia, Marx,
Gandhi and Socialism, Hyderabad, Navhind, 1963.
name of Samukta Socialist Party came into being on June 7 through the merger of the PSP and the Socialist Party. The merger resulted from protected negotiations which followed an earlier unsuccessful attempt in 1963 to achieve unification.

The Socialist parties had their own ideologies and programmes and accordingly had different notions regarding the foreign policy. For a long time the Socialist Party was not concerned with the foreign policy of its country. When it came into being in 1934 as Congress Socialist Party foreign policy was not considered as one of the points on which it purposed to exert influence upon the Congress. There was a demand that a free India should make foreign trade a state monopoly. As time went on, the socialists established contacts with socialists in other countries. Only when the Party left the Congress in 1948, did foreign policy become an important chapter in its programme.

The Socialist Party took an independent stand on international issues. It condemned both Western imperialism and


Russian imperialism. In a resolution on international situation passed in Nasik Conference by the Socialist Party in March 1948 the Socialists developed the idea of a "Third Force" for the first time in India. Having the resolution on the international situation, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, when tracing the idea of "Third Camp", said:

"The need of today is a call for third camp — the camp of world peace. Quite a number of Asiatic countries have come into their own. They want to safeguard their freedom they are small nations. Our country should develop lasting friendship with them to eradicate poverty from their lands. We should also try to help such peoples to whom freedom has not yet come. These should be our tasks — the tasks of our foreign policy."

In a policy statement adopted by the General Council of the Party in Bombay in October 1949, the Socialist Party outlined its policy. According to it, "the Socialist Party stands for the ideals of (i) world government & (ii) peace. The pursuit

1. Rammanohar Lohia, Foreign Policy, Allahabad, Vishva Vidyalya Press, 1963, p.369. He again said,"Let us pitch our tents everywhere and strengthen the third force. We must sign treaties of permanent friendship with Burma, Nepal, Ceylon, and other independent countries of South East Asia. Such treaties should lead us into a permanent, federation. Simultaneously such a federation comes into being to strengthen the third camp, the world can be made safe for democracy and permanent peace. Ibid., pp. 361-362. See also Socialist Party of India, Report of the Sixth Annual Conference held at Nasik, March 1948, S.P. Publication, Bombay, 1948, p.31.
of these twin objectives necessitates adoption of a positive foreign policy. This policy comprises of four elements: (i) Freedom of peoples; (ii) Democracy and Socialist Justice; (iii) Comparatively equal returns to human labour throughout the world; & (iv) active neutrality. It further said that the party stood for the freedom of the colonial people.

'\textit{It again said, "what the party is advocating is a policy of active and positive neutrality. India must not isolate herself. She should seek to extend the sphere of this neutrality by bringing in countries which desire peace and want to keep aloof from the conflict of power blocs and thus form a third camp \textemdash the camp of peace."}'

According to it the policy of building up the third camp has to be done on two levels, Governmental and popular. "The Government of India should enter into non-aggression pacts and treaties of enduring friendship with as many countries as possible and achieve a network of regional alliances including East Asian Countries, the Arab League, our Western neighbours and others. On popular level the Socialist Party will try to strengthen peace throughout the world."

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Policy Statement adopted by the General Council of the Socialist Party of India at Bombay, October 1949, Bombay, S.P. Publication, 1949, p.34.}
\item \textit{Ibid.}
\item \textit{Ibid., p.37.}
\end{enumerate}
In its election manifesto of 1951-52, the Socialist Party advocated the policy of non-involvement. Withdrawal of India from the Commonwealth to shed its remaining colonial character. The Manifesto pledged to strengthen the United Nations and work for collective security, and would maintain friendly relations with all peoples and governments and would support freedom movements.

The Socialists supported the government's stand on foreign policy in general because it did not differ much from their own policy of non-involvement in the politics of either of the two power blocs. The Praja Socialist Party, formed in 1952, followed the same lines in supporting the government. It fully endorsed the objectives and means of India's foreign policy which it called 'active neutrality'. Speaking in Parliament Acharya Kriplani said, "I have no hesitation to say that I support the general principles of our foreign policy. Our Prime Minister has enunciated the principles that should guide all nations in their dealings with each other if world tensions are to be reduced and if peace is to prevail. What are those principles? They are of neighbourly goodwill and of universal peace. They postulate peaceful co-existence of nations holding different ideologies......They are also principles that followed from the manner in which we achieved our independence.

They are useful principles. They have been enunciated from
time to time by political theorists. They are at the basis of
the United Nations Organization.

The persistent criticism of the party's leaders only
related to certain specific aspects of Government policy, e.g.
Commonwealth membership, 'The Hungarian conflict, Goa issue,'
and on details of strategy and tactics which in their view were
equally important and which they alleged the Prime Minister often
ignored or unilatered with the result that (according to party)
the government had not succeeded in making clear the distinct
and independent character of India's foreign policy. They
believed that such a policy has created an impression abroad
that India is alternatively leaning towards one bloc or the
other.

In its National Executive Resolution held at Madras in
June 1961, the Praja Socialist Party likewise favoured the
independent foreign policy of the country and has extended
its support to the government whenever it has followed a genuine
policy of non-involvement in the context of power groups. It


2. See, _Ibid.,_ cols. 6605-6; also see, Acharya Kripalani,
"For Principle Neutrality", _Foreign Affairs, Vol. III,
1958-60, p.46; The Party's 1957 Election Manifesto did not
differ from the Government's foreign policy on fundamentals,
the Party however, deplored the sad state of our relations
with our neighbours and the neglect of the vital interests
of the nation.
has likewise favoured. The policy of keeping out of military alliances and of seeking peace and ensuring it through disarmament and a strengthened United Nations.

Again in 1962 it reiterates its faith in an independent foreign policy. It makes it clear that the policy of non-alignment does not involve a firm stand against oppression and injustice. The party advocates the promotion of developing associated life among countries of South-East Asia, both for political and economic purposes. It is of the opinion that, "while a nation's foreign policy must have high objectives it must safeguard the vital interest of the nation." The PSP urges special effort to foster a foreign policy of collaboration in political and defence matters.

The Praja Socialist Party's election manifestoes of 1966 and 1967 demanded the recovery of the territory lost to China and Pakistan; a declaration that Kashmir's accession to India was irrevocable, opposition to military alliances; close links with both the Arab countries and Israel; self sufficiency in conventional and nuclear arms; and the establishment of co-operative agricultural communities as a second line of defence.

1. PSP National Executive Resolution, adopted at Madras on June 17-19, 1961, Janata (Bombay), June 25, 1961, p.18; see also, S.L.Poplin, ed., 1962 General Elections in India, New Delhi, Indian Printing Works, 1962, p.86; The same stand was taken by the Party in 1962 in supporting the Government.
3. See, PSP's Election Manifesto adopted by National General Council of the Praja Socialist Party on October 8, 1966 at Lucknow; "The Times of India; National Herald, November 5, 1966; and for 1967 Election Manifesto see also PSP Election Manifesto. New Delhi, 1967."
The 1967 election manifesto shows that PSP sought an independent force with regard to China. It considered that "a settlement with China, is not in the national interest unless aggression is vacated". There was a plea for forging a close link with Asian countries against Chinese expansionism. The Party manifesto was critical of the congress policies for being lukewarm. The Party took the Indian government's task for not taking the initiative in the matter, because of the fear of disapproval by "one super power or the other". This policy "becomes an invitation to Chinese communism and a justification for American intervention."

The Praja Socialist Party consistently reiterates its earliest stand on foreign policy matters year by year. But the recent election manifesto of the Party released in 1971 shows that PSP has given up its old angularities. It is more in accord now with the policy of the government, except on certain issues. While adhering to the policy of non-alignment the Party "will not refuse" to judge every international issue on its merits. It wants to strengthen the United Nations, to safeguard the Indian ocean against exploitation by the big powers, and to strengthen the struggle of the people suffering under imperialist and non-imperialist regimes.

1. This marked the departure from the stand taken by the PSP in 1961 and 62 in supporting the government whenever it follows a genuine policy of non-involvement in power bloc politics.
The Party stands for the liquidation of colonialism and imperialism in all forms and condemns race segregation and the like. It also favoured a ban on the use of nuclear weapons and general disarmament. It has made positive neutrality its professed goal and has opposed military pacts and favours the formation of a third force, free from the cold-war politics of either of the blocs.

The Samyakta Socialist Party, the party of Socialist unity as it calls, — stands, "to achieve, by democratic and peaceful means, a socialist Society, free from social, political and economic exploitation of man by man and of nation by nation."

In a draft statement on the political line released on February 1, 1965, S.S.P. affirmed that it will try to "bring the two powers together" to organize a joint programme to end poverty. The SSP however, did not accept the foreign policy of India in toto. It has accepted the policy of non-alignment with reservations. To put in the words of the SSP leader, Late Dr. Rammanohar Lohia "India should come closer to its neighbours, particularly Afghanistan, Nepal and Malaysia. 'Our attitude towards the Soviet Union and United Nations should be guided by the support we receive from them on the issue of Indo-Pak relations and the solution of the problem of poverty.'"

The Samyukta Socialist

2. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), September 25, 1965.
Party claimed that borrowed clothing, borrowed industry, borrowed wealth, borrowed thinking have uprooted India's foreign policy. It advocated a policy of "non preference between powerful countries like the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R." That alone it was advocated, would evoke equal cooperation from the people and governments of powerful countries like U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.

With regard to Pakistan, the S.S.P. sought to pursue its clear policy of "confederation of reunion." According to it where confederation is not possible on the government level, the people and the parties or organizations will carry on this work. In its 1971 Election Manifesto the Samyukta Socialist Party condemned the Indian foreign policy as a "weak-kneed" Policy. "In the context of national interest, the primary aim of foreign policy should be that either Tibet becomes independent or Kailash Mansavower, and the east flowing Brahmaputra becomes the boundary line between India and China. To string then the defence of our Western frontiers, it is also necessary to strengthen democratic forces at work in Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan."

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
The Samyukta Socialist Party has also attacked the government's foreign policy from time to time. It held "India's foreign policy in the last 18 years has been one long essay in futility. It has not advanced India's security nor the cause of freedom and democracy in Tibet, Nepal, Bhutan, Sikkim and the northern borders." Presiding over the third annual session of the Samyukta Socialist Party National Conference in Gaya on December 28, 1967, the Party Chairman, Mr. S.M. Joshi referring to the political situation in the country charged the Congress with vacillation in the domestic and foreign policies; the Congress has neither courage nor determination. As a result the country is going towards disaster." According to the Party "The Congress governments, (a) evasion on the issue of the removal of foreign status from public places; (b) the continuance by it of the issue of a foreign tongue as a medium of administration and instruction in the name of bogus cosmopolitanism and; (c) its growing dependents on foreign powers have robbed Indian foreign policy of all initiative and dynamism."

The statement of principles, programme and political line of the Party says that the Samyukta Socialist Party will not let the country's attention be diverted from the basic task

---

of Socio-economic transformation of a firm policy in regard to China by futile talk about manufacturing the bomb now and seeking the nuclear shield of either of Russia or both U.S.S.R. and America."

**NON-ALIGNMENT:**

The Praja Socialist Party was the first party to enunciate the principle of non-alignment with military blocs and it still adheres steadfastly to it. The party wanted the government to adhere strictly to the policy of non-alignment. Speaking in the Lok Sabha Ashok Mehta said that, "Non-alignment is a natural policy of India. Prime Minister often told us it is the natural and inseparable policy of India. It is widely accepted in the country. The super powers would be embarrassed if we change it today. When we are getting aid from both the blocs, it is intelligent and lucrative to remain non-aligned." The Ganga Saran Sinha, the Praja Socialist Party leader, said, "With regard to the policy of non-alignment and neutrality, we have no difference with Prime Minister Nehru and our government. We are one with them so far as the basic policy and fundamental principles are concerned. However, we disagree with him on the measures adopted to implement that policy."

1. Ibid., p. 31.
2. Lok Sabha Debates, No. 9, November 26, 1969, col. 1927.
the policy of non-alignment the Praja Socialist Party in its National Executive said that it believes that policy of non-alignment does not mean condoning international injustice or oppression, non-alignment when real involves a firm stand against oppression and injustice from whatever quarters they come. To it upholding the common standard in international relations is the essence of non-alignment.

Though the Party supported the policy of non-alignment yet it always pointed out the defection of the policy from the rigid path of non-alignment. It thinks that the policy of non-alignment cannot be allowed to prevent us from seeking and obtaining military help that we need for defending ourselves against powerful aggressors. Shri Ashok Mehta, Chairman of the Praja Socialist Party, speaking in Madras on March 15, 1963 regretted that neither the exponent of non-alignments nor the exponents of alignment (Mr. Nehru & Shri Rajagopalachari) had made a correct assessment of the political situation of the world.

To him India should align herself with certain countries in certain aspects, where it would be advantageous for her. Where it was not the advantage of India, Shri Mehta said, "non-alignment was best." Ashok Mehta suggested that India should

3. Ibid., p. 10.
keep her non-alignment policy in regard to affairs of European and African countries. At the time of China-India conflict the National Executive of the Party stated that, "While non-alignment is a basically sound policy as between the two power blocs led by the U.S. and the Soviet Union, India is certainly aligned against China and must seek every help from all countries to strengthen her armed forces and economic industrial base."

To Praja Socialist Party the policy of non-alignment was never security-oriented. As S Surendra Nath Dwindi has observed in Parliament: "Times without number, we, the Praja Socialist Party have made it perfectly clear that the policy of non-alignment is a sound and basic concept. We have no quarrel with that policy, the policy mainly was meant to further national interest and to cease tension in the international field. The main point is that while implementing this policy, you had certain ambitions in your mind and yourselves always trying to avoid and face realities. The main defect of this policy, and a very great one too, is that it was never security oriented."

Speaking in the Lok Sabha, Mr. Nath Pai P.S.P. leader contrasted the policy of non-alignment of the brave, the courageous and the honest to that of the opportunists the cowardly and the timid.

1. Ibid., September 1, 1963, p.6.
To Samyukta Socialist Party the principle of neutrality or non-alignment or non-involvement has been the dominant theme in Indian as well as Afro-Asian foreign policies. According to it "India is neutral only in the sense that it has avoided formal intengement with military blocs, that in the United Nations it sometimes backs the Atlantic countries and sometimes the Communists ones, that its leader wants to be recognized by posterity as-peace-makers and mediators in the current world conflicts." According to it Non-alignment has become a meaningless formula short of all ideological content so that Asian and African states have not hesitated to extend it to India China conflict. Dr. Rama Manohar Lohia the Samyukta Socialist Party leader, was of the opinion that the policy of non-alignment intensified the cold war and the war of tension in the world." To the Party the so-called policy of non-alignment has been a policy of periodical support and dependence on one or the other power bloc.

When India signed the 20 years treaty of friendship and co-operation with the Soviet Union on August 9, 1971, it was supported by the Socialist of the country. But some of the thought that this security pact is not in conformity with non-alignment for instance. Mr. Samar Guha, P.S.P. did not agree


with the government that the treaty was an extension of the non-alignment policy. Mr. Ashoka Mehta in his article "An unequal treaty", said that "in the event of an attack from Pakistan the Soviet Union will help us, but in return it restrains our moves against Pakistan."

In a joint statement, the Socialist Party Chairman, Mr. Kapoori Thakur and the general Secretary, Mr. Dandavate said that, "a defence treaty or security pact which leads to our alignment is not desirable." To the Party Chairman the terms of the Treaty also seemed to bind India for 20 years to have mutual conciliation, "jeopardizing thereby our initiative in matters of foreign policy and defence and blowing up our cherished policy of non-alignment."

COLONIALISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION:

Opposition to colonialism has played a dominant role in the evolution of India's international policy before and after the achievement of independence. The Praja Socialist Party always stood for freedom of the people rattling under the colonial rule, and expressed its dissatisfaction over the western policies of racial disesimination.

3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
In its Kanpur Conference held in March 1947, the Party sent its greetings to the people’s of Indo-China and Malaya in their struggle for independence and demanded the immediate withdrawal of foreign armies of occupation and other kind of foreign intervention.

The Socialist Party firmly believes that like the South East Asian region some of the North African countries should also be liberated from control by the European powers. Therefore the struggle for freedom has to continue until the last vestige of imperialist domination has been destroyed. "The Socialist Party will support all popular movements aimed at achieving this end."

The Praja Socialist Party strongly condemned the reign of terror let loose by the French government in order to perpetuate their rule in Africa. It also deplored the failure of the United Nations to take up this issue and implement its character.

The National Council of the Party in December 1953, reaffirmed its faith in equality of all nations and peoples and deplored the policy of the Indian Government which rests on collaboration with Britain, which continues to be the major

---

colonial power in the continent of Africa.

The Praja Socialist Party also favoured the Part played by the freedom fighters of Goa in the liberation movement against portuguese colonialism. It deplored the Governments misunderstanding of the Goa problem and its inability to find any solution for it and the flexible opposition to popular efforts. In its National Executive resolution, held on June 1961, in Madras the party stated that, "Anti-colonialism has to be purposeful; liquidation of the remnants of colonialism in our own country — the portuguese possessions — brooks no delay." In the same resolution the Party urged the government to take a bold step towards the question of Goa. The Praja Socialist Party asserted that this is not a matter for diplomacy alone and that it is the inalienable right of the people in these settlements to revolt against foreign tyranny, and that it is equally the right and duty of the Indian people as a whole to support such revolts. The Praja Socialist Party also expressed its strong sense of resentment at the policy of grass racialism followed by the South African Union

---


2. Janata (Bombay), June 25, 1961, p.19; the Party condemned the Government's policy with reference to Goa as weak and ineffective, and suffered from swift turn as it refused to allow the citizens of Indian Union to offer Satyagraha for the political freedom of Goa. Policy Statement adopted by the Second National Conference of the Praja Socialist Party held at Gaya, on 26-30 December 1955, p.90.
Government. It extended its greetings to the people of Africa who are fighting for freedom and against exploitation from French, British, Portuguese and Belgian Imperialism and racial menace. According to it racial segregation and supremacy imposed by the European colonialists in Africa is unjust and inhuman.

The Samyukta Socialist Party also supported the stand taken by the Government on colonialism and racialism. It upheld the cause of colonial and coloured peoples. It disliked the Governments weakness and vacillation on these issues. The Party wants that the Government of India must take a lead in the liberation of colonial countries.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS:

Ever since the Praja Socialist Party was formed it opposed India's association with the Commonwealth. It refused to believe that India could follow an independent foreign policy while she remained within the Commonwealth of Nations. The Socialist Party in its policy statement in 1949 declared that, "If India is to play its part in world affairs effectively, it will have to avoid all such associations and commitments as are likely to compromise this fundamental issue. It is clear that

1. Rammanohar Lohia, "Foreign Policy", op.cit., p. 325.
India's membership of the British Commonwealth is inconsistent with this basic policy of neutrality. It will mean that on every vital issue India shall have thrown in her weight on the side of Anglo-America. It will mean that there will be no independent foreign policy." The Conference of the Praja Socialist Party held on December 29-31, 1963, in Allahabad deplored the policy of Indian Government which resulted in Britain exercising effective control over the economic affairs of Asian states. The only way according to the party is to reverse this trend, is for India to give the inferior membership of the British Commonwealth and free itself from the economic and strategic apron-strings of Great Britain. Acharya Kripalani, the Praja Socialist leader, speaking in the Lok Sabha also demanded the withdrawal of India from the Commonwealth of nations. He said, "If England and other commonwealth countries persist the showing scant regard for our vital interests and sided with our opponents, our membership of the Commonwealth cannot continue." Surendra Nath Dwikedey the P.S.P. leader, in 1966 speaking in the Lok Sabha said, "We should leave the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth should go because it serves no purpose except the purpose of Britishers, it is not good remaining in


2. Ram Manohar Lohia, op.cit., p. 316; also see, Two years of PSP, op.cit., p. 28.

the Commonwealthe quitting the Commonwealthe had always remained a part of Praja Socialist Party's attitude on foreign policy.

Like the P.S.P., the S.S.P. consistently demanded India's withdrawal from the Commonwealth. One of the arguments for India's quitting the Commonwealth, according to the S.S.P., is the attitude of Britain in regard to Pakistan vis-a-vis India. It had stabbed India in the back through stoppage of supplies of machines and spare parts so necessary for the repair of our planes during emergencies. In joint statement the party accused Britain of "International anisconduc* by refusing to recognise Kashmir as an integral part of India.

Rammanohar Lohia, the S.S.P. leader, while addressing a public meeting at Fatehgarh on October 3, 1965 said that, "India should break off with the Commonwealth immediately as we had solid ground to believe that the Britishers had given an assurance to Mr. Jinnah, founder of Pakistan, that they would defend the existence of Pakistan for ever. The recent attitude of Britain had strengthened his belief."

The Samyukta Socialist Party believes that it was not only in India's economic and political interests to quit the Commonwealth, but was also necessary to meet the Chinese influence in the Afro-Asian and backward countries. The 1971 election manifesto of the S.S.P. also demanded that India must have the British Commonwealth

1. Ibid., Vol. XLI, No. 8, November 15, 1965, col. 1895.
2. The Statesman (Delhi), October 12, 1965.
3. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), October 10, 1965.
INDIA AND CHINA:

The Praja Socialist Party stands for close relationship with neighbouring states. It always desired to strengthen relations with the People's Republic of China. It wanted the People's Republic of China to be accorded its right place in United Nations organization. But the China's continuing attack on India's frontiers came as a shock to the Party which looked upon China as a friend and ally. After 1962 border conflict with China the party's attitude in regard to China became very rigid. It condemned China as guilty of deliberate and unprovoked aggression on India. During the war the party extended its full support to the war efforts of the Government. H.V. Kamath, Deputy leader of the Party in the Lok Sabha said, "We want every inch of our territory should be cleared of the last Chinese soldier. ..... The Himalayas are not today a physical barrier....... they are an ideological frontier between democracy and communism...... and this communist conspiracy must be scotched, not at the foot-hills of the Himalayas."

The Praja Socialist Party wanted that the Chinese aggression to be repulsed. The party over-ruled the idea of a compromise with China, as was voiced in some vocal sections of the public opinion. It equally opposed the proposal for negotiations with China on the basis of the withdrawal of

Chinese forces to the position occupied by them before September 8, 1962.

The Colombo formula, evolved by six non-aligned states - Cambodia, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, Ghana and the U.A.R. according to the PSP has dealt with the problem as if it were a mere boundary dispute, and has not even referred to China as aggressor and the aggressor is permitted to enjoy the fruits of his aggression.

The National Executive of the PSP held the unilateral cease-fire by China and her so-called peace proposals are only a part of China's strategy to weaken, and even paralyse India's will to resist aggression. To Party the acceptance of the Colombo proposals by government will only exist that undesirable process of demoralization. The Andhra Pradesh PSP's Executive which met on 26th February described the Colombo proposals on the Sino-Indian border dispute as totally unacceptable and dangerous. According to it, "The six nations that met at Colombo, instead of condemning China for illegal occupation of Indian territory, had indirectly lent their seal of approval to the aggression by asking India to allow it retain

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid. Ex: The meeting of the National executive Party was held in New Delhi on January 28-31, 1963 under the Chairmanship of Shri Ashok Mehta.
large parts of Indian territory under its exclusive control and also to agree to have a joint civil administration over some of the other illegal occupied Indian areas."

The Praja Socialist Party categorically stand that acceptance of Colombo proposals would mean national humiliation and loss of Indian territory. So the Prime Minister has no right to accept the proposals. Shri Hem Barua, speaking in the Lok Sabha said that, "By our acceptance of the Colombo Proposals we have made a defacto cease-fire line into a de jure line. This is defacto appeasement." Nath Pai asserted in the Parliament that, "If we are asked to succumb to such proposals that will mark the disintegration of this country and if India disintegrated, there may not really be such a thing in Asia. It will only be larger China."

The Party demanded that the Government should insist upon immediate vacation of all areas forcibly occupied by the Chinese. Speaking in Allahabad on February 23, Ashok Mehta, Chairman of the Party, said that people must recognize China

1. Ibid., March 10, 1963, p.8.
3. Ibid., Surendra Nath Diwivedy also condemned the proposals as dangerous. Speaking in the Lok Sabha, he said, "I feel that Colombo proposals were dangerous in their implications and disastrous in their consequences for the country politically and militarily they were advantageous and favourable to our enemy", Lok Sabha Debates, Vol.XII, No.29, January 23, 1963, cols. 6946-50.
as India's enemy. "We must try to seek co-operation of these countries which are trying to weaken our enemy," he added. The party observed in this connection, on 'Anti-compromise day', to carry on a ceaseless struggle for the liberation of territory from Chinese occupation, and to oppose any move by the Government to compromise with the Chinese imperialism. The party was opposed to any negotiation with China so long as Chinese aggression is not completely vacated. It also voiced its opposition to the Government for its inability to prepare the country and its armed forces to meet the Chinese attack.

The PSP again ruled out any negotiation with China so long as aggression is not vacated in its election manifesto of 1967. The 1971 Election manifesto highted the need for closer cooperation with other Asian countries in the face of an aggressive policy pursued by China.

The PSP, time and again, lamented over Government's over-optimism and short-sightedness in regard to China. The advocacy on the part of the Indian delegates for seating Red China in the UN reflects the wish thinking of the Government. Despite the aggressive postures accross the borders even before

1. Ibid., March 10, 1963, p.2; Ashok Mehta thought that it was the Government responsibility to stiffen the people's will to resist and to seek cooperation and unity in the task of an early victory.

the actual conflict break out, failed the Indian Government to realise the dangers endemic in such a policy.

The Government in regard to China, "has taken the slippery road of compromise and surrender of our national territory, taking all the time about dignity and honour; it has refuse to break of diplomatic relations with the aggressor who remains in occupation of our sacred soil, and finally it has proved itself to be devoid of self respect by exchanging greetings with the Chinese Government on its National days and by supporting the aggressor's membership of the United Nations." The 1967 Election manifesto of the S.S.P. declared that,"the needs of defence are firstly a strong will, secondly economic power and thirdly military strength." In the contingency of war, the manifesto said, S.S.P. would not hesitate to "made radical and all round changes in the armed forces and stands for compulsory conscription." According to the party the Primary aim of foreign policy should be that, "either Tibet becomes independent or Killes Kilas Mansarover, and the east-flowing Brahmaputra becomes the boundary line between India and China."

3. Ibid.
The Samyukta Socialist Party consistently affirmed its stand for strengthening the will of the people to defend their frontiers, and gave top priority to the territorial integrity of the country.

**INDIA AND PAKISTAN:**

Pakistan is a bit of India torn away from her on August 15, 1947 and constituted into a separate state. One of the major causes for India and Pakistan conflict is in regard to the Kashmir issue. On the basis of international law as understood and applied in the United Nations, Kashmir is a part of India and Pakistan, irrespective of what the law provides, committed an aggression which was condemned by all peace loving nations.

The Praja Socialist Party always emphasized the need for cordial and friendly relations with Pakistan and always demanded a firm and positive policy towards Pakistan. Speaking in the Lok Sabha, the PSP leader, Late Mr. Nath Pai had said, "I hold that there is nothing more desirable then friendship with Pakistan and we believe that no price is too high to win that friendship we would be ready to go to any extent to cultivate and win that friendship."

1. *Sec, Janata* (Bombay), March 12, 1950.
Kashmir, being an integral part of India, duly recognised by the Indian constitution and the world public opinion, opposed the intervention of third parties in Kashmir Affairs. In its national executive resolution held on January 15, 16, and 17, 1954 at Patna, the Praja Socialist Party held, "Mishandling and foreign interference of more than one variety conspire to make the naturally difficult situation in Kashmir well-nigh insoluble. Yet a fair and wise solution is imperative not only in the interest of the two countries, but of peace and goodwill among nations."

According to the Party the accession of Kashmir to India is lawfull, and defacto. Speaking in the Lok Sabha Surendra Nath Dwivedy said, "Let us not fall into the trap of a make believe peace or a solution of the Kashmir question. There is no question and there can be no negotiations on the question of Kashmir with any body ..... Kashmir is entirely our own concern ..... Pakistan must accept India's sovereignty over Kashmir."

The Party opposed Government's decision of taking the Kashmir issue to the United Nations. Curiously enough instead of providing a solution further worsened the situation due to

1. "Resolution passed at the Meeting of the National Executive of PSP held at Patna on January 15-17, 1954", Rammanohar Lohia, op.cit., p. 329.
'extraneous reasons'. The Party therefore demanded the withdrawal of the dispute from the United Nation. Surren-drarnath Diwivedy speaking at the Forth National Conference of the PSP held at Poona said:

"I have only one thing to say about Kashmir. The dispute has now dragged on for more than a decade. India took the complaint of United Nations hoping for a just and early solution. But what has been our experience? No one seems to be interested in the essential justice or right of the claims put forward on both sides. Nor does any one seems to reach an early solution. What shall we do under the circumstances? I would say withdraw the dispute from the UNO which has proved itself incapable of solving it. India and Pakistan may then both be forced to start direct talks and search for a mutually acceptable basis for solving the tangle."

The Fourth Conference of the Party rejected the idea of holding a plebiscite in Kashmir. The party was of the opinion that plebiscite would not be considered as a means for solving the dispute. It reaffirmed that the state of Jammu and Kashmir

is an integral and alienable part of the Indian Union and the question of plebiscite, therefore, should not arise. A\textsuperscript{nd} added no such thing happened in other parts of the Indian Union. It however, stressed that an attempt should be made to settle all differences with Pakistan in a friendly spirit.

Again in 1961, the Party reiterated its firm opinion that Kashmir is an alienable part of India and the illegal occupation of a part of Kashmir by Pakistani forces should therefore be vacated. Surendranath Duividy said that, "...... it is time that we give notice to the United Nations telling them, since they have failed all these years to find out a formula or to make Pakistan vacate, and because we want direct negotiations, we withdraw it from the United Nations." The Seventh National Conference of Praja Socialist Party passed a resolution re-iterating its firm stand that Kashmir accession to India must be considered as final and irrevocable. It regretted that ever since the time when Pakistan committed aggression against Kashmir, the policy of the government of India had one of "indication and hesitation."

The 1965 conflict between India and Pakistan gave a new jolt to the Indian foreign policy. But however, the PSP's

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{Ibid.}, p. 143.
  \item \textit{Janata} (Bombay), March 25, 1962, p. 10.
\end{enumerate}
strategy remained unchanged in relation to Kashmir. Criticising the Tashkent Declaration, the Praja Socialist Party's National Executive held in New Delhi on February 18, 1966 held that withdrawal of Indian troops would mean a total repudiation of the assurances given to the people and Parliament. "The PSP can never be a party to such a commitment that runs counter to the fact that Kashmir is an integral part of India." It believes that Tashkent Declaration could not be considered as an isolated event. It had set up a certain vacation of a demand for the settlement of the dispute with Chinese aggression in the "spirit of Tashkent."

The Praja Socialist Party expressed concern over the growing collusion between China and Pakistan and stated that "the threat to India's security has increased manifold," and "therefore it emphasized the need to strengthen India's defence with a sense of urgency." The 1967 manifesto of the Party demanded the recovery of territory lost to China and Pakistan and a declaration that Kashmir "accession to India was irrevocable." In view of the close cooperation between Pakistan and China, the PSP advocates for building up sufficient armed forces on the part of India for the defence of the country.

The Samyukta Socialist Party also favours cordial and harmonious relations between India and Pakistan and always seeks to pursue its clear policy of confederation or reunion. The Party believes that the artificial partitioning of the Indian sub-continent is the root cause for the present rift between India and Pakistan and therefore the sooner it is undone, the better for both the countries. As Narain has observed very rightly (September 16, 1965) that, "the objectives of the current Indo-Pak conflict would be achieved successfully only with the annulment of Pakistan and established of a united India again." To achieve this purpose India should not hesitate to take arms aid from any country. It should be prepared to fight alone if necessary.

Due to the Indo-Pak conflict the Samyukta Socialist Party demanded for the reunification of India and Pakistan. But as Raj Narain said that reunion did not mean subjugation of one country by another but reunion of the two countries on principles

1. The idea of confederation of India and Pakistan constitutes the main part of Lohia's foreign policy. According to him "there should be a confederation between India and Pakistan having common citizenship of the people; secondly, this confederation must have some universal power with regard to foreign military and communications policies; thirdly the confederation of India and Pakistan will have five units consisting of United Bengal (both East and West Bengal); the rest of India (Jammu and Kashmir); rest of Pakistan (Srinagar and Pakhtoonistan.") See, "Third camp versus Non-alignment", Mankind (Calcutta), Vol. XII, No.1, March-April 1965, p.43.

2. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), September 17, 1965.
of equality and mutual harmony.

The Samyukta Socialist Party felt disappointed over the Tashkent Agreement. In the Party National Executive held in Patna on January 18, 1966, the details of the declaration were discussed. It held that withdrawal of troops would be of no use unless Pakistan reciprocate. Mr. Joshi the Chairman of the Party observed: "Withdrawals are not in our Party's hand but exposing the country to any risk should be carefully thought over."

The SSP in a resolution adopted at Patna on January 20, 1966 said that only a confederation of India and Pakistan could sustain the Tashkent spirit and remove the basic cause of conflict between the two countries. In the same vein Ram Sevak Yadav, General Secretary of the Party opined that a "confederation," by consent or conflict or by a mixture of both, is the only remedy for the Indo-Pak conflict, achieve this among several other steps, the party also suggests that the people of both the countries should launch a movement to undo the 'mischiefs of the partition' by moving in the direction of establishing a confederation, without which all talks of friendly relations between the two countries would be futile.

1. Ibid.
3. Ibid.