CHAPTER VIII

KIRPALANI ON INTERNATIONAL POLITICS AND FOREIGN POLICY

Though Acharya Kripalani could not be claimed as an international leader, his outlook on international politics was valuable and his impact on the domestic politics and India's foreign affairs could not be underestimated. He loved freedom and hated aggression. As President of the Indian National Congress he had observed, "Through our sufferings we know what aggression means to a subject people. The hard cruel strokes of foreign domination have taught us to value international peace and goodwill."¹

When in the year 1947, the French made fresh attempts to reimpose their control over Vietnam and to crush the Vietnamese nationalist efforts at freedom, Acharya Kripalani, as the Congress President, was the first Indian to raise his voice on behalf of the subject people. He issued a press statement on 4 January 1947 in which he regretted that the French who valued their

freedom so highly were trying to deprive the poor Vietnamese people of their rights.  

The students all over India observed 21 January 1947 as "Vietnam Day" to express India's solidarity with Indochina. The students of Calcutta too had organised demonstrations and meetings. Two hundred students were arrested by the Calcutta police.  

Acharya Kripalani, on 23 January 1947, condemned the brutal police firing on the students in Calcutta and pointed out that the demonstrations were meant to show India's solidarity with the cause of an Asiatic people struggling against European imperialism. 

Acharya Kripalani, while making a statement in the parliament, on behalf of the KSP, observed, Cyprus and Aden have proved a great hindrance to Indo-British collaboration. He condemned the British Government's policy of terror against the Africans and the Indians who lived in Africa. 
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In another statement in the Lok Sabha, Kripalani strongly criticised the governments of Britain and other Commonwealth countries for their policy of racial discrimination. He viewed Britain's support for Dr. Malan and his doctrine of apartheid in South Africa as dangerous. He charged that Britain too was suffering from the colour bar.  

In 1956 the world was rocked by two crises. One was the combined attack by England, France and Israel on Egypt. The other was Russia's intervention in Hungary. Acharya Kripalani condemned both these actions.

Though India attained independence on 15 August 1947, her foreign policy as an independent nation was being formulated in the year 1946 itself by the Interim Government which started functioning in that year (1946). It was understood that India was free to follow her own foreign policy. Accordingly, just after five days after the formation of the Interim Government, Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister, declared in a broadcast on 7 September 1946 that India proposed to keep away from the power politics of groups which were aligned one way or another. In the past these groups had led to the two World Wars and they
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might again lead to a greater disaster. And hence India wanted to be out of such group politics. Acharya Kripalani was one of the great critics of India's foreign policy. He had realised the hollowness of the foreign policy as early as 1950s. To him, it was neither independent nor serving the vital interests of the country. He held that this policy believed in passive and negative neutrality and was based on appeasement, sentimentalism and cheap popularity. According to Kripalani nothing concrete had been achieved in the field of foreign policy. It was a foreign policy marked by attractive words.

In a statement in the lok Sabha Kripalani cautioned the Government of India that unless it made serious efforts for consolidating a third area of peaceful nations, Indonesia and other Southeast Asian nations might not remain neutral any longer.

Under the leadership of Nehru, the main issues and themes of India's foreign policy had been outlined in 1946 itself.

---


These were: Promotion of international peace; cooperation with the United Nations; friendship with all nations — more particularly with the neighbouring countries; membership of the Commonwealth of Nations; freedom of dependent peoples; and opposition to racial discrimination. 10

The Indian foreign policy stood on two pillars. One was the pillar of non-alignment and the other was the pillar of Panchasheel or five principles. The five principles were incorporated in the Trade and Intercourse Treaty signed with China on 29 April 1954. The preamble to the treaty enunciated the five principles:

i. Mutual respect for each others' territorial integrity and sovereignty;

ii. Non-aggression;

iii. Non-interference in each others' internal affairs;

iv. Equality and mutual benefit; and

v. Peaceful co-existence.

Acharya Kripalani held the view that India's practice of Panchashheel in relation to China had not been wise. It resulted in India's surrender of her rights in Tibet. He felt that India's faith in this doctrine was one-sided as the other nations were not equally prepared to repose their faith in the doctrine. While discussing the futility of the doctrine in the Lok Sabha, Kripalani said, "This great doctrine was born in sin because it was enunciated to put the seal of an approval upon the destruction of an ancient nation (Tibet) which was associated with us spiritually and culturally." According to Kripalani, the Soviet Union and Communist China had subscribed to the philosophy of five principles. But they had no qualms about the principles when they suited their purposes. The Soviet Union invaded Hungary in 1956. China was similarly wrong in Tibet. Therefore Kripalani felt that the philosophy of five principles had been "blown up."

When China, after signing the Sino-Indian Treaty in April 1954, invaded Tibet, Kripalani opined that the philosophy of Panchashheel may remain a pious wish to which nations may pay lip service."12

According to Kripalani, India was so weak and afraid in applying the policy of non-alignment in case of the USSR and China. India did not want to displease these communist countries. Kripalani said,

"Our [Government of India] condemnation of Russian action in Hungary in 1956 was so halting and belated that it lost its merit. We were more forthright in condemning the British, French and Israeli action in Egypt, and also American and British action in West Asia when troops were landed in Lebanon and Jordan. In case of Tibet ... our attitude from the beginning has been in contradiction with our avowed principles. It has had the appearance of weakness and opportunism, of purchasing Chinese friendship at the cost of Tibet."\(^13\)

In his speech in the Constituent Assembly, Nehru had observed that, whatever policy may be laid down, the art of conducting the foreign affairs of the country lies in finding out what is most advantageous to the country.\(^14\)

---


By this criterion India’s foreign policy was failing in the 1950s. In 1959 when the news of China’s occupation of the Indian territory became public, people felt that the foreign policy was not advancing the vital interests of the country. Kripalani gave his evaluation of the policy as follows:

"Whatever may have been the failings of the Congress Party government in international affairs, it would always with some justification show that it had added to the prestige and standing of India in the international world. But all this prestige did not advance any vital interests of India or diminish tensions on her borders. Our relations with Pakistan are as strained as ever. The Kashmir issue remains internationally confused. In case of the tiny Portuguese imperial possessions in India, no progress has been made; indeed the situation has deteriorated. On her northern frontier, India allowed the annihilation of the buffer kingdom of Tibet without a protest; we have recognised the legitimacy of the Chinese claim there. The question of the citizenship of Indian nationals domiciled for decades in Ceylon still hangs fire. There is no improvement in our relations with South Africa."

When China occupied the Indian territory known as Aksai Chin (in Ladakh), Nehru said that the area occupied by China was barren and rocky. Alluding to this statement in September 1959, Kripalani said that we should not underestimate the value of the land to the enemy. The land may be barren or green with forest. It may be populated or not. Any land is valuable to the enemy. We cannot think of giving away the deserts of Rajasthan to Pakistan just because they are deserts. Any kind of Indian territory can be used by the enemy as a spring-board for future action. And hence no one should underestimate the importance of the territory which is liable to be seized by the enemy.16

Kripalani was aware of China's intentions. He foresaw the danger on the Indian border. He forewarned the Nehru government of the danger of the Chinese attack on the border. Nehru called Kripalani a visionary and dreamer. He felt that he was imagining things. Kripalani retorted, "Thank God, throughout our lives we have been visionaries and dreamers; and thank God at least some of our dreams have been realised; and thank God again that some of us still remain dreamers and visionaries, visionaries of a happier India."17

---
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Kripalani's fears were confirmed when China attacked India in 1962.

While discussing the official policy on Tibet in the Lok Sabha, Kripalani pointed out how that policy was ill-considered and mistaken in several respects; he said:

"We feel that China, after it had gone communist, committed an act of aggression in Tibet. The plea is that China has the ancient right of suzerainty. This right is out of date, old and antiquated. It is theoretical; it was never exercised or very rarely exercised and even then in theory. It had lapsed by the flux of time ... I consider this as such a colonial aggression on the part of China as any colonial aggression indulged in by any Western nation."18

Though Kripalani was a great critic, he was a cooperator too. He held that the opposition parties and their leaders should be one with the government when it comes to the foreign policy of the nation. All parties should act as a team in the matters of foreign policy. We may have differences on the

various domestic questions and policies. But as regards the vital questions of foreign policy, the safety and security and the independence of the country, the parties must rise above their particular differences and put up a united and coordinated stand.¹⁹

The various political parties were agreed on the broad issues and outlines of the foreign policy. There were of course differences as regards the emphasis on the particular aspects of the foreign policy. The Panchashree approach towards international affairs was accepted by all.²⁰

As a parliamentarian Kripalani used to give sound advice to the ruling party. He pleaded that it was in the interest of the ruling party to consult the opposition parties on the various questions of foreign policy. Such consultations, Kripalani held, would enable the spokesmen of the opposition parties to defend the government policies more knowledgeably as their arguments would be backed by the necessary information. He believed that such consultations would not take away the right or authority of the government to formulate the policy or implement it as per its own initiative and plans. The Irime

Minister and the ruling party do have considerable powers and freedom to act on particular issues of foreign policy and these powers or freedom are not compromised by the process of consultation. To Kripalani, the foreign policy of India was concerned not only with the enunciation of the abstract principles but also with the adoption of proper strategies and tactics. Kripalani felt that in the area of strategies and tactics the Indian leaders had not been very able or wise. He was afraid that the strategies and tactics adopted thus far were such that they had not brought too many advantages to the country.21

He believed that one had to be very careful in the practice of neutrality and expression of opinion on the affairs of other nations in the world. By all means we should have our opinions on the various issues or problems. But we should be careful in choosing the time and the manner of expressing our opinion on these issues or problems.22 Referring to Nehru's policy in respect of Vietnam, Kripalani felt that it was not necessary for the Indian leaders to express their opinion so very often. Nehru told North Vietnam and China to stop the

hostilities and try for the negotiated settlement of the crisis. When both these parties spurned the suggestion, Nehru turned to the Americans and told them to stop bombing. Kripalani argued that Indians cannot, at this stage of their national development, afford to take sides on such international issues. 23

Kripalani, as a non-violent and true Gandhian, opposed any power blocs. He was against the military alliances. In a statement made in the parliament, he warned the government of India that taking the military aid was as dangerous as taking the economic aid. 24 He was against increasing the defence expenditure of the nation. In 1958 he said:

"We had believed that in a non-violent India the last thing the government would contemplate would be an increase in the military budget, but I am sorry to say, and I think it would disturb the soul of the father of the nation (Gandhi), that in recent years there had been an increase of about Rs.1,000 million, more than in the previous year, and then in the supplementary demands..."

23. Ibid., p.57.

there was an increase of Rs. 140 million ... May I ask why we are increasing our military establishment?"25

However this Gandhian position was slightly relaxed in view of the various dangers to India's defence and in particular the danger posed by Communist China. When the Chinese aggressive activities on the border began in 1959, Kripalani was in agreement with the government of India's position of seeking military aid for the defence of the country. Speaking on the Sino-Indian relations, Kripalani said:

"As the Chinese aggression has nothing to do with world communism, we shall be entitled to seek help in a military emergency, both from the East and the West and, of course, from neutral countries, even as we get economic aid from every quarter. Help may be had on lease or any other honourable basis not impairing our sovereignty of independence. A declaration of readiness to accept foreign military aid in an emergency ... will be very helpful."26


But at the same time, Kripalani was against seeking any military aid for solving the country's internal problems. He was completely against nuclear weapons and he was for unilateral nuclear disarmament. In an International Convention organised by the Gandhi Peace Foundation, in June 1962, to consider the ban on nuclear weapons, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the then President of India, in his inaugural speech, asked India to set an example to the world and disarm unilaterally at once to make her appeal effective. Kripalani not only fully supported Dr. Rajendra Prasad but also went a step ahead and declared, "My love ... of nationalism, or my idea of nationalism is that my country may become free, that, if need be, the whole country may die, so that the human race may live." 27

Acharya Kripalani wanted India to be self-sufficient in all fields. He disliked the foreign loans and considered them dangerous as, for the repayment of these loans, India may be required to export steel and agricultural products which may lead to further losses and exploitation. 28 In his statement in parliament, Kripalani suggested that the government should make efforts for bringing about large grouping of underdeveloped

countries in the matter of economic and mutual aid. He further suggested that the priority should be given to the smaller countries for military and economic aid.29

As early as 1954 Kripalani entertained doubts about the United States economic aid and he felt that this aid was not free from troubles.30 He pointed out that concessions to the United States private capital may look attractive but they may mean negation of the basic socialist policies in India.31 Acharya Kripalani strongly opposed the intervention of any third party on the issue of Kashmir and condemned the attitude adopted by the United States and some other countries which were pressing India for a plebiscite without paying attention to the rights and wrongs of Pakistan's aggression.32

Acharya Kripalani supported the stand of government of India in 1958 when he took the decision to oppose the American military intervention in Lebanon. Kripalani held that there was no justification for the American intervention in this case.33
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At the fifth Congress of the Socialist International held in Vienna in July 1957, Acharya Kripalani supported various plans and proposals for the reconstruction of a unified, demilitarised and uncommitted Germany free from the military alliances both of the Western powers and the Soviet Union. Kripalani opposed not only the wrong policies of the United States but also those of the Soviet Union. He was quite critical about the diplomacy and policy of the Soviet Union. He felt that the Soviet Union talked of peace but it was busy piling up weapons of war. According to him,

"In international politics Russia's diplomacy has been in recent years more complicated and enigmatic than that of the capitalist countries. It is as subtle, secret and opportunist. It began by declaring war with the league of robbers. Today it swears by the league even more than the imperialist powers. Russia began by declaring that only through war was there any chance for the world proletariat. Today it [59g] believes in peace and organises peace demonstrations."  

Kripalani believed that Russia was talking of peace now because she needed peace to strengthen her economic system and perfect the instruments of war. Kripalani had no doubt that Russia was following the same old policy of the Czars which was based on nibbling into the territories of the weak neighbouring countries and bringing them under Russian dominance.36

Kripalani noted that India had developed close relations with Russia in cultural and economic matters. As a result a good number of Indian artists, businessmen, journalists, economists, technicians and trade unionists visited the Soviet Union and the Russian counterparts visited India. On account of these visits and increase in trade and commerce, the relationship between the two countries became close. In 1954 the Soviet Union proposed to build a steel plant in India and Kripalani viewed this as a triumph for the communists.37

In 1958 Kripalani made a statement in the Lok Sabha regarding the policy of Yugoslavia towards Russia. He said the only crime committed by Yugoslavia was that it did not join the Russian bloc and allow itself to be like other European countries under the Soviet control and dominance.38
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Kripalani was well aware of China's ambition to become the sole dominant power in Asia. While the government of India was satisfied with its agreement with China concluded on 23 May 1951, Kripalani was not happy. He made a statement in the parliament that he was in total disagreement with the government of India over this matter.39

When some areas of India were shown as belonging to China in the maps published by China, Kripalani took note of this and immediately alerted the government against the aggressive designs of China.40

Kripalani deemed Tibet a "buffer state" between China and India. Therefore he held that "in international politics, when a buffer state is destroyed by a powerful nation, that nation is considered to have committed aggression against its neighbours."41 Kripalani continued to regard China's occupation of Tibet as a deliberate act of aggression."42

---
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Commenting on the indifferent attitude of the government of India towards the problem of Tibet, Kripalani said,

"Our government's attitude is understandable on the assumption that Tibet is a far-off country and none of our business. But supposing what has happened in Tibet happens in Nepal; suppose the Chinese 'liberation' force comes to Nepal, then I am sure, we will, whether we are well prepared or ill prepared, go to war against China, cost what it may." 43

When Dalai Lama took asylum in India after the revolt of Tibet, he made a heart-rending statement in Tezpur. Dalai Lama's statement compelled Kripalani to express his concern over the fate of the Tibetans. He felt that the government of India had let down Tibet because of its friendly relations with China. He argued that the government was not only failing in its duty but was also appearing partisan in this matter. 44 Kripalani was also unhappy about the various uncertain and confusing utterances of the government of India concerning Tibet.
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Ifipalaoi never believed that China would respect the autonomy of Tibet even if Tibet accepted the suzerainty of China. Kripalani believed that "even if we go on being friendly to China to the end of days, we cannot have her friendship. She thought little of our friendship when she openly accused the government of India of having allowed Kalimpong to be used as the command centre of Tibetan revolt."46

In April 1960, when Chou En-lai visited India to discuss the border issue, Kripalani led a delegation of the opposition party MRD (except the Communist MPs) and handed over a letter to Jawaharlal Nehru regarding their stand on the proposed talks between the two Prime Ministers. It was hoped that there would be no dilution of the Indian government's stand on the border and nothing would be done which could be construed as a surrender of any part of Indian territory.47

Kripalani's commonsense was proverbial. His feet were planted on the earth. He was never lost in the clouds. Yet his realism was not to be equated with opportunism.48

---
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All this did not mean that Kripalani was against friendly relations with China. He was always in favour of establishing good relations with all countries and especially the neighbouring ones. But he did not like the policy of China as the Chinese were found to be selfish in one way or the other. Therefore, as per his assessment, he would always advise and warn the government of India to be careful while dealing with China.

Acharya Kripalani was deeply disappointed by the attitude of Jinnah and his concept that religion was the basis of nationality. He was always sore about this and remarked, "It was left to the political genius of England, in pursuit of its imperial policy of 'Divide and Rule' in India, to discover the absurd conception that religion is the basis of nationality. The Muslim League under Jinnah helped in the imperial game..." 49

According to Kripalani, the Nehru-Liaquat Pact of April 1950 was meant to solve the refugee problem. But the pact was not honoured by Pakistan. Kripalani therefore asked the Indian government to take all possible steps, not only in theory but also in practice, and put pressure on Pakistan or apply sanctions. 50


As regards the accession of Kashmir to India and the holding of plebiscite, Kripalani was clear that this was the business between India and Kashmir as part of India. Pakistan should not try to meddle in this internal business of India. He said the issue of plebiscite was before the United Nations and no third party was justified in taking any questionable interest in the problem of Kashmir. The accession of Kashmir to India was complete de jure as well as de facto.

Kripalani said that, in his opinion, because of the US-Pakistan military agreement, the United States became involved in the already troublesome Indio-Pakistani relations. He felt that such military aid to Pakistan from the United States would not only disturb the balance among the Asian countries but also endanger the peace and security of India. He held that the US-Pakistan military agreement of 1953 came about due to India's failure to solve the Kashmir problem.

Kripalani strongly condemned the formation of the regional pacts like the SEATO and the Baghdad Pact. He felt that these
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pacts, which included Pakistan, disturbed the peace of the Asian sub-continent.55

In a statement in the Lok Sabha, Kripalani stated that Britain and some other Commonwealth countries had always misrepresented India's position and sided with Pakistan. At the SEATO conferences they did not hesitate to express their opinion in favour of Pakistan.56

When the Kashmir issue came up again for discussion in the parliament, Kripalani was firm in his stand and declared that "... plebiscite would not be considered as a means for solving the dispute."57

In 1958, while making a statement in the parliament on the US military aid to Pakistan, Kripalani warned that the military pact and the aid would not serve the cause of peace or the vital interests of Pakistan or the US and would only sow the seeds of dissensions in the sub-continent.58

55. Lok Sabha Debates 7(2), 30 September 1954, Col.3835.
56. Lok Sabha Debates 3(2), 28 March 1956, Col.3606.
57. Lok Sabha Debates 1(2), 25 March 1957, Col.730.
58. Lok Sabha Debates 13(2), 14 March 1956, Col.4905.
Kripalani suggested to the government of India that, while solving its border problems with Pakistan, it should be guided by international practices. 59

When the Pakistan army opened fire on the Assam border continuously for two months in 1958, causing the death of several Indian nationals and heavy damage to Indian property, and when Prime Minister Nehru thought that these were insignificant accidents, Kripalani expressed his grave concern.

He observed sarcastically,

"I agree with the Prime Minister that they are insignificant accidents in our relationship with Pakistan. However, I am afraid, they are not so insignificant for the people who suffer from them and lose their lives." 60

Kripalani said that he would not like such border incidents to be viewed as "insignificant" and suggested to the government that stringent measures should be taken to protect the life and property of the border people. 61
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Acharya Kripalani demanded that the government of India should break India's link with the Commonwealth when the SEATO council at Karachi discussed the Kashmir issue in March 1956. Kripalani urged the government to make it clear that "if England and other Commonwealth countries persist in showing scant regard for our vital national interests and side with our opponents, our membership of the Commonwealth cannot continue." 62

When a Pakistani aircraft attacked an Indian Air Force ground unit near Amritsar on 5 September 1965, India, in view of the grave threat to her territorial integrity, was forced to make a thrust into Pakistan on the Lahore-Sialkot sector on 6 September. Even the usually pro-Pakistan British Press 63 had admitted that when the Indian troops moved across the Sialkot areas, "their military move was a response ... to Pakistani drive towards Jammu. If that drive was not stopped Indians could see the danger of losing Kashmir outright by military conquest." 64 But the British Prime Minister Harold Wilson, who had maintained a total silence when Pakistan had been intensifying her military offensive against India, immediately issued a statement

62. Lok Sabha Debates 3(2), 23 March 1956, Col.3607.
63. Times (London), 15 September 1965.
64. Ibid.
questioning the Indian defensive action. He said, "I am deeply concerned at the increasingly serious fighting now taking place between India and Pakistan and especially at the news that Indian forces have today attacked Pakistan territory across the international frontier in Punjab."65

Bhagwat Jha Azad (Congress MP) moved a resolution in the parliament on 24 September demanding India's withdrawal from the Commonwealth. When the matter came up for discussion, Kripalani repeated his demand for quitting the Commonwealth.

Acharya Kripalani, as president of the 54th session of the Indian National Congress, in 1946, in his speech, pleaded for close and friendly relations with Ceylon and Burma. Expressing his fellow-feeling with these countries Kripalani said:

"Ceylon and India have been good neighbours all along and the Congress is determined to maintain and develop these relations ... Indian nationals in Burma must identify themselves with the people of Burma and mix with them as sugar does with milk. Knit together
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In a common friendly relationship, India, Burma and Ceylon will be in a position to fulfil their historical mission in the creation of a federation of free Asiatic nations that would constitute a powerful bulwark against imperialism and exploitation whether of the Western or the Eastern type. 66

Acharya Kripalani condemned the agreement, signed between Sri Lanka and India, on 29 October 1964, which was meant to end the controversy over the status of the Indian emigrants in Sri Lanka. Under the agreement, out of 9.75 lakh immigrants 5.25 lakh immigrants were to be granted Indian citizenship and 3 lakh immigrants were to be absorbed as Sri Lankan citizens. The fate of the remaining 1.50 lakh immigrants was to be decided in 1965. Kripalani characterised this agreement as absolutely against India and unjust to the people of Indian origin without whose consent the agreement had been reached. 67

As regards the Arab-Israel relations, Kripalani felt, "There is no doubt that the way Israel was established..."
Palestine was a great injustice done to the Arabs ... But now the Israel state is a fact which cannot be ignored. 68

In an article Kripalani praised Israel's socialism and urged the Arabs to learn a lesson from it. 69 Kripalani felt that India's foreign policy was based on "cowardice" and that India's refusal to extend diplomatic recognition to Israel was based on the fear of Arabs, Pakistan and Muslims in the country. 70

Acharya Kripalani was very much concerned over India's relations with Japan. While making a statement in the parliament, he viewed the Colombo Conference, which was held in April 1954, as incomplete without the participation of Japan. 71

Acharya Kripalani may be said to have a fairly long and illustrious career as a parliamentarian. He was a patriot but at the same time he was a humanist. He stood for India's friendly and constructive relations with all nations in the world.
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and he also argued for low military budgets and even unilateral disarmament. He was well informed, impartial and forthright in presenting his views and arguments on the various issues of international politics and India's foreign policy.