CHAPTER - II

INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The Nehru Era:

India's foreign policy is fundamentally based on the principles of peaceful co-existence, friendship and co-operation among all the countries of the world irrespective of their political systems. The foreign policy is aimed at promoting international peace and security and maintaining good and friendly relations with all the countries of the world. India, which was a colonial country under the mighty British rule, experienced the power politics of Super Powers during Cold War period, and chose for herself the path of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. India, while conducting its external relations with Super Powers distanced itself aligning with either of the blocs, thereby pursuing independent foreign policy, and maintaining its sovereignty. India's policy also maintained aloofness in the politics of Super Powers without taking the side. Thus, India always took just and independent judgments depending upon the issues involved in the international arena. Therefore, India's independence in foreign affairs paved the way for the concept of non-alignment that became not only the guiding principle but also the corner stone of India's foreign policy. It was this foreign policy that started off the Non-Aligned Movement; which
later on became one of the largest movements the world has ever seen, comprising more than one-thirds of the world's total population, covering a broad geographical and ideological spectrum.

**EVOLUTION OF INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY**

**Pre-Independence Days:**

The evolution of India's foreign policy can be traced even to pre-independence days of Indian National Movement. India being a colonial country was under the dominant rule of the British government, which ruled this country for about 200 years. As a result the external relations of India were being conducted and controlled by the British government. The British Secretary of State for India was overall in charge of the Indian foreign relations. Therefore, India had no foreign policy of its own prior to 1947. However, the idea of foreign policy surfaced in the minds of the Indians during pre-independence days, because of the articulated interests of the Indian National Congress leaders, like Jawaharlal Nehru. Further the roots of India's foreign policy may also be found in the principles advocated by Mahatma Gandhi and the various resolutions that were adopted and passed by the Indian National Congress in its sessions during the time of the British rule in India. But the leaders of Indian National Congress started taking more interest in foreign affairs only after the First World War.

The role played by the Indian National Congress in the formulation of India's foreign policy was very crucial and significant
in as much as the leaders of Congress have adopted and passed a number of resolutions on foreign policy during its various sessions held in different parts of the country. Perhaps the exact origin of India's foreign policy dates back to the year 1921. It was the meeting of the All-India Congress Committee in New Delhi in 1921 was "a landmark in the history of India's foreign relations". For the first time the Congress passed a resolution on foreign policy, which included the statement that "the present government of India in no way represent Indian opinion". This resolution is important in as much as it was the first significant declaration on the part of nationalist India that its interests in the field of foreign policy were diametrically opposed to those of Britain. It further laid down basis of an independent India's foreign policy.”

However, the Congress leaders even under the British rule tried to establish external relations with several colonial and dependent countries. These relations basically aimed at seeking both moral and sympathetic support for its ongoing struggle for independence. Further, India also extended moral support to many colonial countries during their struggle for independence. Extending sympathy and support to other countries in their national struggles has always been the hallmark of the Indian policy. “Thus in 1924, the Belgaum Congress Session conveyed a message of sympathy to Egypt against the British colonial policy. India also asked for

withdrawal of Indian troops from Mesopotamia as well as from other British colonies".² It was during the course of India's struggle for independence that the all India Congress Committee passed another important resolution in its session held at Madras in 1927, which stressed the need to conduct independently the external relations of India with the rest of the world without the interference of the British government. The resolution protested against the use of Indian troops in China, Mesopotamia and Persia and deplored the "extensive war preparations, which the British government was carrying on in India"³. Indeed, the foundations of India's foreign policy had been laid down at the Madras Session of the Congress. "In 1928, the Congress assured the people of Egypt, Syria, Palestine and Iraq of its full sympathy with them in their struggle to free themselves from the grip of Western imperialism which in its view was also a great menace to the Indian struggle."⁴ In the same year, "the Congress declared that the Indian struggle was part of the general world struggle against imperialism and hence desired that India should develop contacts with other countries and peoples who were also combating imperialism. It also decided to open a Foreign Department in its office to develop such contacts".⁵ This declaration of the Congress no doubt resulted in laying the solid foundation of India's foreign policy. Subsequently in 1936 a full-

² Quoted in N.M.Khilnani's Panorama of Indian Diplomacy, S. Chand and Co., New Delhi, 1981, p- 85.
³ K.P.Misra in Supra No-1, p.22.
⁴ N.M.Khilnani in Supra No-2, p-85.
fledged separate Department of Foreign Affairs was started in the Indian Congress party under the able guidance and leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru.

The Congress resolution of 1930 condemned the acts of Nazis and Fascists and that of 1939 disapproved and dissociate itself from the British foreign policy in respect of its involvement in world war-II and the question of giving freedom to subject peoples. “The all India Congress Committee reaffirmed its determination to oppose all attempts to involve India in a war or to use Indian resources in such a war without the consent of the Indian people... It also advised the Congress Ministries in the provinces not to assist in any way the war preparations of the British Government and to remain prepared to give up office if the Congress policy led to this contingency”6 There were also some important resolutions passed by the Congress, which greatly helped to take part in the international affairs independently. Therefore, from the above discussion it is evident that throughout the struggle for independence the Congress party resolutions on foreign policy had played a crucial role in providing roots to the ideas like Anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, anti-power politics, independence and good friendliness. These are some of the important ideas that emerged during the struggle for independence that not only became the guiding principles but also the basic principles of India’s foreign policy.

However, it was during the time of Second World War that the British government sent Indian troops abroad without taking into confidence the Indian Legislative Assembly. These indifferent attitudes of the British government made the Congress leaders discontented and disassociate itself from the British foreign policy. Taking into consideration the British government’s apathy towards the Congress and its leaders in the foreign policy matters, Nehru in his broadcast of September 7, 1946, declared, “India shall take full part in international conferences as a free nation with our own policy and not merely as a satellite of another nation.” This was not only considered as the bold step but also a serious attempt on the part of India towards formulation of her independent foreign policy.

An assessment of the Congress resolutions from 1921 to 1947 reveals “an acute awareness of the dangers in the growth of fascism, a sympathetic approach to the aspiration of the Soviet Union, a consistent criticism of the continuation or expansion of Western imperial power any where in the world, and a sensitive exposure of all forms of racial, social, and economic discrimination.”

Apart from the Congress resolutions on foreign policy the role of various leaders who greatly contributed to the development of India’s foreign policy during the time of pre-independence days is also very important. Therefore, the foreign policy of any country is

---

shaped, influenced, and determined by several factors like geography, history, past experience, interaction of ideas, the domestic affairs, economic policies, political parties, and the perception of the leaders. These are the crucial factors, which contribute to the development of a country's foreign policy. The latter factor i.e., the perception of the leaders of the interests played a predominant role in determining the country's foreign policy. It can be seen from the history of India's foreign policy that several political leaders and important personalities greatly influenced the formulation of India's foreign policy during the course of its evolution. In fact, the words of some Congress leaders in designing the country's foreign policy were unquestionable and were all in all. To such an extent the Congress leaders influenced the making of India's foreign policy. No doubt, the involvement of those personalities and their ideas, which have been incorporated in shaping the foreign policy, has provided a distinctive policy for the country. In this context, it is pertinent to evaluate the role of various personalities who influenced India's foreign policy.

**Mahatma Gandhi:**

First of all, the influence of Mahatma Gandhi the father of free India and the unquestioned leader of the Indian struggle for independence in formulating India's foreign policy were of great importance. Till the advent of independence Mahatma Gandhi mainly dominated the Indian political scene. He advocated the
ideals, such as peace, non-violence, brotherhood, through which he achieved independence, also used them as the greatest weapons against the mightiest British Empire the world has ever seen. These ideas preached by Mahatma Gandhi were regarded as the governing principles of the Indian National Congress. Later on he recommended the application of these principles in formulating India's foreign policy. This became not only the guiding principles but also the corner stone of India's foreign policy. Besides, Mahatma Gandhi also advocated the concept of peaceful co-existence with other nations of the world and mutual settlement of various disputes amongst the countries, without the interference of the super powers, have also been taken care of while framing the foreign policy of independent India.

Pandit Nehru, quite aptly expressed the principles of Mahatma Gandhi, in his address to Columbia University: "Means and ends are thus intimately and inextricably connected and cannot be separated. The great leader of my country, Mahatma Gandhi ...(under whose inspiration and sheltering care I grew up,)... always laid stress on moral values and warned us never to subordinate means to end. After a generation of intense struggle with a great and powerful nation we achieved success, and perhaps the most significant part of this achievement, for which credit is due to both parties, was a manner of it. That revolution demonstrated to us that physical force need not necessarily be the arbiter of man's destiny
and that the method of waging a struggle and way of its termination are of paramount importance."

Apart from the freedom struggle, Mahatma Gandhi also played a crucial role when the Congress drafted several resolutions on foreign policy. He was the guiding spirit behind all the resolutions that were drafted and piloted by Jawaharlal Nehru. In fact, Mahatma Gandhi was instrumental in moving the Congress resolutions on foreign policy matters keeping in mind the aspirations of the Indian people. Therefore, the foreign policy is not only the product of its mere immediate past but also the thoughts of Gandhi and ideals proclaimed by the Congress from time to time. Hence India's foreign policy has its basis in Gandhism.

Post-Independence days:

As we have discussed earlier, prior to 1947 India had no foreign policy of its own. It was only after it became independent in 1947 that India began to evolve its own foreign policy in the light of its requirements and the prevailing international situation. Besides, it began to conduct its external relations with the rest of the world directly as sovereign state. The post independent foreign policy was formulated taking into consideration the various factors such as the Congress party resolutions, ideology of national leaders, power politics of the Super Powers, Cold War, colonial experience,

---

imperialism, racial discrimination etc. India's foreign policy, ever since her independence advocated the principles of friendship and co-operation with all the countries of the world irrespective of their political systems. Especially the establishment of friendly relations with the neighbouring countries was the principal plank of India's foreign policy.

In order to achieve its national interests/objectives and to promote international peace, India had maintained good and friendly relations with almost all countries of the world. While securing the interests, the conduct of the Indian foreign policy was governed by the principles such as preservation of sovereign independence, pursuance of independent foreign policy by avoiding alignment with power blocs, mutual understanding and cooperation, promoting international peace and prosperity etc. The post-independence foreign policy of India followed the path of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence in order to achieve these objectives. The policy of non-alignment advocated by both Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru on the idea of non-involvement and non-entanglement became the corner stone of independent India's foreign policy.

The post-Independence foreign policy was formulated on the principle of non-alignment because India achieved its independence during the time when the Cold War clouds were already looming large on the globe as a result of which it not only underwent but
also experienced the power politics of the Super Powers. This naturally made India formulate her foreign policy on the lines of non-involvement and non-alignment that became the basic principle of India's foreign policy.

It was Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of India's foreign policy, who continuously held the External Affairs Ministry as well from 1947 to 1964, played a decisive role in shaping the India's post-independence foreign policy. His contribution towards India's foreign policy formulation and implementation was memorable and highly appreciable. Nehru's authority on foreign policy matters was all in all and his word in cabinet discussions was final, to which several members of the Congress and his colleagues in the government supported actively. In short, Nehru's role in India's foreign policy matters was a one-man show.

**Jawaharlal Nehru**:

Apart from Mahatma Gandhi, the role played by Jawaharlal Nehru in formulating India's foreign policy was unique and significant. It was Nehru the hero of freedom struggle and the towering personality in India's foreign policy to whom the credit for formulating India's foreign policy before and after the independence accrues. Nehru, who was instrumental in formulating and fashioning the country's foreign policy, was regarded as the sole architect of the foreign policy of independent India. Besides Mahatma Gandhi's principles, the ideological commitment of Nehru
greatly influenced the shaping of India’s foreign policy. Nehru, who was Western educated was deeply impressed by the Western Liberal Democratic ideology of the western countries and also the Soviet Union economic policies. But Nehru wanted to keep away from both the ideologies while formulating India’s foreign policy. However, Nehru had followed the H.J.Laski’s ideology, which was a synthesis of Liberalism and Marxism. In fact, the policy of non-alignment was indirectly the result of the synthesis of Liberalism and Marxism.

Nehru, who took keen interest in formulating and implementing India’s foreign policy, influenced the west through his charismatic image that greatly helped to change the discriminatory attitudes of the foreign countries towards India. Taking into consideration the role-played by Jawaharlal Nehru in the international field, Mahatma Gandhi wrote “Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is Indian to the core but, he being also an internationalist, has made us accustomed to look at every thing in the international light instead of the parochial”.10

Due to the sincere efforts of Jawaharlal Nehru in 1936 a separate Foreign Affairs Department was opened in the Indian National Congress under his leadership. This was used in developing outside contacts and organizing the anti-imperialistic movement of the dependent people across the world. The Foreign Affairs Department greatly helped Nehru in passing the resolutions on foreign affairs and formulation of India’s complete and clear

---

10 Quoted in A.B.Shah’s (Ed), India’s Defense and Foreign Policies, Manaktalas, Bombay, 1966, p-90.
foreign policy. Nehru as an internationalist acted as a bridge of balancing factor between the Indian National Congress and the anti-colonialist forces of the world during the time of struggle for independence. It is because of Nehru's endeavour and articulated interest that the foreign policy of India has occupied a unique position in the international arena. Commenting on the role of Nehru in formulating India's foreign policy, V.B. Karnik opines that "The framework was provided from time to time by Nehru: his ideas and ideology, his aims and aspirations, his judgments and impressions, his desires and ambitions, his likes and dislikes, his passions and prejudices... constituted the timber of which went into the building of that framework."¹¹

No doubt, there was an element of truth in the above-mentioned views. It is clear that it was the Nehru who formulated the Indian foreign policy. However, India had to formulate its foreign policy taking into consideration such ideas as imperialism, colonialism, and power politics that emerged during the time of India's struggle for independence. Further the historic declarations of the Congress and the principles advocated by Mahatma Gandhi were instrumental in providing roots to the anti-cold war, anti-imperialism, anti-racialism, anti-power politics and pro-neutralism, peaceful co-existence and friendliness with neighbours. (Indeed, the foreign policy of India was not formulated or constituted at one time

but it is evolutionary in nature drawing inspiration from its past history, past thinking and the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi.) While commenting on foreign policy, D.C. Sharma in Lok Sabha observed, “Our foreign policy has the framework of our Indian culture and tradition which has lasted for thousands of years. It is rooted in the philosophy which Mahatma Gandhi gave us and it is also grounded in the theory and practice of the foreign policy which Pandit Nehru expounded to us and to the whole world”. In short the foreign policy of India is not formulated by some personalities or individual leaders but by the interaction of many forces within the country and also outside the country.

Jawaharlal Nehru had a long tenure as Prime Minister of India and had made substantial contributions to the field of international relations, which put India on the diplomatic map of the world. It was during his tenure as Prime Minister that India’s foreign policy came under heavy influence due to certain developments of far reaching consequences such as the beginning of Cold War and Sino-Indian war of 1962. These developments, no doubt greatly influenced the formulation of post-independence foreign policy on the lines of non-alignment, test ban, non-proliferation etc. Now it is significant to understand these events, which had a great bearing on India’s foreign policy during Nehru’s regime.

12 Quoted in Tanveer Sultan Supra No. 11, p-10.
Beginning of Cold War – 1950:

There was a drastic change in the international scenario due to the developments of far-reaching political consequences that had taken place soon after the Second World War. Firstly, the end of Second World War with direct-armed confrontation and the beginning of Cold War without armed struggle but with a diplomatic and an ideological clash are said to be the important developments that had taken place during the said period. In short, it can be defined as a state of intense diplomatic, political, economic and ideological struggle short of armed belligerency and clash. Secondly, it was marked with the emergence of newly achieved independent countries as a result of rapid decolonisation. Thirdly, it was after the defeat of the Axis powers i.e., Japan and Germany in 1945 that the international scene was mainly dominated by the rivalry between the two warring groups, United States and USSR, each endeavoring to contain the other and, in the process, attempting to muster friendly and subordinate nations on its side. "This state of affairs was known as the “Cold War” – the phrase was coined by Walter Lippmann – and was characterised by extreme hostility between the two factions, especially in public international organizations such as the United Nations, but with little actual fighting, and this, where it occurred, was mainly between one Super
Power, normally the United States, and an ally or client state of the other." ¹³

**a) Cold War:**

There are divergent versions with regard to the exact origin of Cold War. Some say it is the Bolsheviks revolution of 1917 in the Soviet Russia, which sowed the seeds of Cold War. On the contrary some opined that the Cold War had started soon after the Second World War, which was widely prevalent and accepted version. Therefore, we may not go into the details of the origin of the Cold War as it is beyond the scope of this study. Here we are concerned more about the impact of Cold War on the newly emerged independent countries like India, as part of rapid decolonization process.

**b) India and Cold War:**

By the time India achieved its independence in the year 1947, the Cold War had already started and the world was being bifurcated into two hostile groups, namely, American block and U.S.S.R. Block each jockeying for the supremacy in the globe with conflicting ideologies. The world was virtually divided into two blocs, and a line was drawn in Europe "the crossing of which was recognized as *casus belli*".¹⁴ During the Cold War era the Super

---


Powers were busy in consolidating their positions in the international arena. As a result, each group entered into military and political alliance with their respective supporters and followers. America through number of alliances such as NATO, SEATO etc., started in organizing its friends and supporters into American bloc. Similarly, to counter American move, Russia also entered into Warsaw Pact with Communist countries that owed allegiance and support to USSR. This trend of alliances and counter alliances created an atmosphere of chaos and confusion in the international politics. The newly independent nations like India, which were looking forward to an era of peace and development, were greatly perturbed because of the alliances. Despite the unfavorable conditions in the international situation, India, which like other nations, was moving inevitably towards the establishment of peace and security, came under the heavy influence of Super Power conflicts when it was groping in the dark to evolve its independent foreign policy.

Thus, it is clear that right from independence India had to confront with the problem of evolving foreign policy consistent with its national interests during the time when the whole world was divided virtually into two blocs. As a result, India, which was just liberated from the clutches of British colonialism, had to undergo the impact of politics of power blocs. In such an atmosphere India wanted to achieve its rightful and honored position in the
international horizon thereby drawing the attention of the Super Powers with an idea of establishing peace and harmony in the globe.

To avoid the foreign entanglements by joining either of the blocs, India decided to keep away from the power blocs aligned against one another. Explaining India's stand in the world Jawaharlal Nehru declared that "We propose as far as possible, to keep away from the power politics of groups aligned against one another, which had led in the past to world wars and which may again lead to disasters on even vaster scale. We believe that peace and freedom are indivisible and denial of freedom anywhere must endanger freedom elsewhere and lead to conflict and war. We are particularly interested in the emancipation of colonial and dependent countries and peoples".15

c) Cold War and Non-Alignment:

India having suffered a lot as a colonial country under the dominant British rule determined to preserve its hard earned independence without joining either of the two blocs and mortgaging its power of independent decision to either of the blocs in the domestic and international affairs. To quote Jawaharlal Nehru, "What does joining a bloc mean? After all it can only mean one thing; give up your view about a particular question, adopt the other party's view on that question in order to please it and gain its

---

favour.\textsuperscript{16} India felt that by taking side or joining the camps would prove costly to her independence and would lead to a new form of imperialism. Hence, India's opposition to alignment with the power blocs and opposition to imperialism and colonialism gave birth to the concept of non-alignment. India believed that the only way through which it could achieve its goal was to adopt a policy of non-alignment. Later on it not only became the basic principles but also the corner stone of India's foreign policy. Perhaps, it is the non-alignment, which played a historic role during the Cold War period that helped India to identify and retain its power status and position in the international arena.

India as a colony considered herself isolated from active participation in world affairs because she was bound by the decisions of the British Government. It also resented twice for its involuntary involvement in two world wars at the behest of Great Britain. Therefore, this involuntary involvement with Great Britain and its allies in times of war undoubtedly contributed to the development of India's foreign policy on the lines of non-alignment with power blocs, especially with Western alignment with which she had been familiar all along. In short, India decided not to join either of the two blocs in the interest of economic development, to maintain independent judgment in evaluating and deciding foreign

\textsuperscript{16} A. Appadorai and M.S. Rajan., \textit{India's Foreign Policy and Relations}, South Asian Publishers, New Delhi, 1985, p-43.
affairs and to follow independent foreign policy, to safeguard interests and to promote the international peace.

Therefore, India had to evolve its foreign policy taking into consideration all the major factors discussed above, such as Cold War conflicts, Super Powers alliances, imperialism, and colonialism etc., which greatly influenced the formulation of India’s foreign policy on the lines of non-alignment.

The 1962 Indo-China War:

India and China the two giants of Asian Continent emerged as two independent nations in 1947 and 1949 respectively with diametrically opposite methods of achieving the independence. India achieved her independence through the non-violence method, preached by Mahatma Gandhi while China resorted to civil war. Therefore, right from the independence days there was difference between the two countries with regard to the method of achieving independence and the ideologies. As the international community and the smaller nations in the Asian continent were closely observing the developments that are taking place in the region, it became essential for the two countries to maintain good and friendliness in the interests of South Asian region in particular and the whole world in general. The strained relations and hostility between the two countries always had a great impact in the South Asian countries. Therefore, the leaders of both the countries strove hard in order to restore normal relations between the two countries.
thereby keeping the region as zone of peace, despite certain conflicting ideologies and inherent differences. However, certain developments of far reaching consequences that took place after 1949 ultimately led to the deteriorating relations between the two countries. Now we can discuss the issues relating to the China war of 1962.

a) Tibetan Issue:

The first and foremost important issue that led to the deteriorating relations between the two countries was the Tibetan Issue. Soon after the installation of the new government, the Chinese leaders with expansionist nature thought of annexing Tibet to China. Accordingly, in October 1950 China attacked eastern Tibet and occupied Chamdo. India, a peace loving country vehemently protested against Chinese invasion on Tibet and offered to mediate in response to Tibet's request. As a result, India lodged another protest with a protest note saying that the invasion by Chinese troops on Tibet can only be regarded as highly deplorable and lamentable. The government of China instead of resorting to force should have solved the problem with peaceful means. In response to India's protest China replied, "The Tibet is an integral part of the Chinese territory. The problem of Tibet is entirely the domestic problem of China. The Chinese Peoples Liberation Army must enter Tibet, liberate the Tibetan people and defend frontiers of China...The problem of Tibet remains a domestic problem of the
peoples Republic of China and no foreign interference will be tolerated". 17

Protests and counter protests were exchanged between India and China over the Tibetan issue but these could not yield any desired results in normalizing the relations. On the contrary, they further worsened the situation. (Without making any efforts to normalize the relations). China continued to claim Tibet as its integral part despite protests not only from India but also world at large. Even the Tibet's request for the mediation of the UN did not help resolve the issue.

b) Korean Issue:

The Korean War was another important issue that led to the deteriorating relations between India and China. In 1953 China engaged its troops in Korean War. When the peace was restored in Korea, the sizeable numbers of troops were moved into Tibet. This naturally created a tense situation in the Sino-Indian relations. Further the large-scale deployment of Chinese troops along the Indo-Tibetan border posed great threat to India's security and integrity. India by its position as the Chairman of the Neutral Repatriation Commission (NNRC) of the war prisoners had to undertake the job repatriating the war prisoners in Korea. China alleged that India, being partisan, sided with the Americans on the

17 Quoted in G.P. Ojha, Mrs. Indira Gandhi's Foreign Policy Choice, Mrinal Book House, Meerut, 1982, p-104.
prisoners of war in Korea. This again heightened the tension in the Sino-Indian relations.

**Tibetan Revolt:**

Further in 1959 a dramatic event took place when Tibetan guerillas suddenly revolted against Chinese belligerence and wanted to safeguard its territorial interests. The main object behind the revolt was to liberate Tibet from the Chinese clutches and to regain its lost autonomy. But China soon realized that it was the handiwork of India without whose support the Tibetans dared not revolt against Chinese army. Besides, China also alleged that India that was sympathetic towards the cause of Tibetans not only extended her help but also allegedly supported the Tibetan rebellion. This hostility took further shape through para-military patrol clashes and at last culminated in the 1962 border war between the two countries.

It was pertinent to note that during the 1962 war India lost substantial miles of its frontier to China. In any case, the Chinese aggression in 1962 did not lead to any basic change in India's foreign policy. Indeed, in spite of the initial set back, India was able to face that aggression and its sequel without any fundamental break with the past so far as the foreign policy was concerned. That was the best tribute to the soundness of Nehru's leadership in the field of foreign policy. Even the Indian leaders who relentlessly opposed Chinese policy towards Tibet at last conceded the
accession of Tibet, to which China's "New Agency" wrote "the Chinese Peoples army will hoist the Red Flag over the Himalayas".\(^{18}\)

**The Post Nehru Era:**

Soon after the glorious role of Jawaharlal Nehru, the golden era of India in world affairs came to an end. The successor of Nehru, Lal Bahadur Shastri had little experience in so far as the external affairs were concerned unlike his predecessor. In fact, Shastri followed in the footsteps of Nehru in so far as non-alignment the basic principle strategy of India's foreign policy was concerned. In his first speech as Prime Minister in June 1964 Shastri affirmed, "Non-alignment will continue to be the fundamental of our approach to world problems and our relations with other countries. On his arrival at London on December 1964 for talks with the British Prime Minister, he went even further and reiterated that there would be "no deviation" from the lines of policy laid down by Nehru".\(^{19}\)

However, Lal Bahadur Shastri influenced India's foreign policy in his own way. As a result, the leaders of Jan Sangh sought clarification whether there is any deviation from the policy as announced by Nehru and also surrender of Indian Territory to China or Pakistan. Similarly Communists also charged that foreign policy was being deviated to the right. But Shastri disarming the charges gave a reference to Tilak, Gandhi and Nehru and said

---


\(^{19}\) Quoted in Tanveer Sultan's, Supra No-11, p-29.
“...Mahatma Gandhi deviated completely from Lokmanya Tilak, Aurobindo Ghosh and Lajapat Rai. In a way Gandhiji was the preceptor of Jawaharlalji, his Guru in a sense. But did Jawaharlalji always agree entirely with Gandhiji? No. And yet, could you find a more loyal and devoted follower of Gandhiji than Jawaharlalji?”.20

As Prime Minister, Shastri made some noticeable contributions in the field of foreign policy which elevated India's position in the international sphere. Though the period of Shastri as Prime Minister was short, yet it was an important period in the history of India's foreign relations. It was during this brief period of Lal Bahadur Shastri that India had to face two important crucial issues i.e. nuclear explosion by China in October 1964 and the war that occurred between India and Pakistan in 1965. These two developments had great bearing on India's foreign policy.

China's Nuclear Explosion 1964:

It was during Shastri's period that China successfully exploded an atom bomb in October 1964 by making its first nuclear test and also joining the world’s nuclear club as its fifth member. (USA, UK, USSR and France other members). In fact, the Chinese bomb had announced with a bang to the world the emergence of China as a great nuclear power. However, the Chinese Prime Minister "assured that though China stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, it was compelled to conduct

nuclear testing. China's making of nuclear weapons was entirely for protecting the Chinese people from the US nuclear threat. He solemnly reiterated that at no time and in no circumstances would China be the first to use nuclear weapons."21 The detonation of an atom bomb created a sense of insecurity not only in India but also in the smaller countries of South Asian region. Even the explosion of bomb drastically altered the operational environment of India's nuclear policy.

Taking into considerations the gravity of explosion, Shastri said, "the Chinese atomic blast had caused shock not only to him but to the whole mankind as it cut across the general desire of humanity to live in peace. He hoped that the voice of the peace loving people in all the countries of the world would be raised against it and the world conscience awakened to fight against this aggression on peace and security."22 Even, some leaders cutting across party lines expressed serious reservations over the Chinese development and wanted a fitting reply to China. As a result, a faction of leaders within the ruling Congress party brought pressure on Shastri and demanded for immediate production of nuclear bomb to counter the Chinese threat. However, a faction which was against bomb, stood for Shastri and stated that to produce bomb was not only against the ideals of Nehru who fought tooth and nail for complete disarmament in United Nations and outside but also

21 Quoted in Shri Ram Sharma's Lal Bahadur Shastri, An Era of Transition in Indian Foreign Policy, Kanishka Publishers, New Delhi, 2001, p-57.
22 Ibid., p-102.
against the principle of non-alignment. However, the Cold War between the two factions which was blown out of proportionate, resulted in splitting the party on the lines of anti-bomb and pro-bomb, just like the moderates and the extremists during the struggle for independence. Even, Atal Bihari Vajapayee the Jan Sangh leader proudly declared, “the only reply to Chinese bomb was an Indian bomb”.23 Above all H.J.Bhabha, the Chairman of the Indian Atomic Energy Commission in his broadcast on UN day claimed “India could explode a nuclear device within 18 months”.24 Thereby making way for India to join the bandwagon of nuclear nations and to become the Sixth member of the nuclear club.

Shastri had to withstand mounting pressure not only from within the Congress party but also from the opposition parties. Shastri did not say categorically that under no circumstances will India produce the bomb. However, Shastri and his colleagues began to introduce some departures from Nehru’s policies in the altered circumstances produced by the Chinese bomb as well as changed domestic policy. In fact at one point of time Shastri made up his mind to go far nuclear bomb due to the pressure but the other faction prevented him from doing so. Commenting on the production of nuclear bomb to give a fitting reply to Chinese bomb once Shastri himself while replying to a debate on the issue of nuclear weapons declared in parliament that “The government

23 L.P.Singh, Supra No-20, p-30.
24 Shri Ram Sharma in Supra No-21, p-104.
policy was not rigid or static and that it would change according to circumstances."^{25}

From the above discussion it is evident that in the post Nehru era the influence of Nehru started declining when the two pro and anti bomb factions started gaining momentum within the Congress party. This was in spite of Nehru's categorical statement that "No man can prophesy the future. I should like to say on behalf of my government and I think I can say with assurance on behalf of any government of India, that whatever might happen and whatever the circumstances, we shall never use this atomic energy for evil purposes".^{26} However, during Shastri's period the pro-bomb lobby forced India to go in for nuclear bomb, which was against the wishes and ideas of Nehru who was one of the world's leading opponents of nuclear weapons. Therefore, it appears that the deviation from the Nehruvian foreign policy began during Shastri's period in so far as nuclear weapons was concerned, irrespective of the circumstances that led to the departure despite Shastri's reiteration that he has not deviated from the actual path as set forth by Nehru.

The 1965 Pakistan War:

The 1965 war has been considered as an important development in the history of India's foreign relations because the
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war occurred during the post-Nehru era and it was a challenging task to the leadership of Lal Bahadur Shastri. In fact, the 1965 War, which expected to pave the way for improvement of Indo-Pak relations, failed to solve the Kashmir problem.

Since the days of India’s independence, the Kashmir issue always remained a major contentious issue in the Indo-Pak relations. The two-nation theory that became the dividing line of India’s partition continues to be a principal source of conflict between Pakistan’s Islamic ideology and India’s secular nationalism. The partition gave rise to many disputes and problems of far reaching political consequences. Most of the disputes settled gradually through mutual negotiations and bilateral talks between the two countries. However, the issue of Kashmir continues to remain unsettled despite several rounds of untiring talks, dialogues and the proposed mediation of international organizations. Kashmir was assigned a position of proximity by both the countries, and as a result of which none of them was in a position to part it. Because of the importance attached to Kashmir by both the countries, “India sees in Kashmir not only an important link in its geographic line of security and its economy, but also a largely Muslim area possession of which tends to justify India’s secular political philosophy. Pakistan, in turn, sees Kashmir as advantageous to her military security, as a largely Muslim area of some economic value, and as a land contiguous to Pakistan...”27 Therefore, the two warring

27 Roy C. Macridis. Supra No.8, pp-332-333.
countries could not be able to reach an amicable settlement and to find a lasting solution to the Kashmir problem, due to an aggressive and hostile attitude of Pakistan towards India.

Therefore, the matter was referred to the United Nations Security Council for its mediation. The United Nations Security Council passed a resolution proposing that the Kashmir dispute should be resolved through mutual negotiations between India and Pakistan and also spoken about plebiscite. However, India ruled out the options of either holding a plebiscite as proposed by UN Security Council or accepting any outside intervention according to Pakistan in resolving the Kashmir issue. Since there was no breakthrough in resolving the vexed issue and disgust over Security Council's resolution, Pakistan decided to acquire Kashmir by waging an undeclared war against India, and resolved to resort to methods other than peaceful to achieve its aims. It was in "October 1958 that the then President Ayub Khan declared: The first thing to note about Kashmir is that, apart from any other consideration, from the purely security point of view, we have to continue the struggle for the liberation of the state of Jammu & Kashmir. In no circumstances can we give up that struggle...We shall be infinitely glad to have a settlement through peaceful means. But if we are forced to adopt means other than peaceful, the blame will surely lie at the doorstep of India."28 As a result, Pakistan that was bent upon

28 Quoted in A. Appadorai and M.S.Rajan's, Supra No.16, p-96.
using violent method hatched a conspiracy and fomented communal violence along the Line of Control along Indian borders to acquire Kashmir. The aggression started in the early August of 1965.

It was during the same period that some important developments of severe nature also took place in the international arena, which not only added strength to Pakistan but also infused a sense of confidence in it. The first and foremost development is that China developed close relations with Islamic Pakistan. This was viewed as a strange alliance between the two countries by the international observers, which was aimed at isolating India.

Further, taking the advantage of the hostile relations between India and Pakistan, China gave an ultimatum to India in September 1965 to remove all the “aggressive military structures” on the Sikkim-China border within three days time29, which according to China, were illegally constructed by India. Though China did not participate in the war her moral and material support was sufficient to heighten security tensions in India. Above all, America also openly supported Pakistan with sophisticated arms and ammunition in the ensuing war. This gave a deathblow to India’s interests in times of severe crisis with Pakistan. In fact the military alliance with US first and later with China disturbed the regional
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power hierarchy and posed a secure threat to India's political ambitions both within and outside the region.

**Tashkent Declaration:**

When Indo-Pakistan war was on, the Prime Minister of Soviet Union Kosygin wrote a letter to Ayub Khan and Lal Bahadur Shastri. The letter stated, "The parties should enter into negotiations for the peaceful settlement of the differences that have arisen between them. As for the Soviet Union, both sides could count on its willing cooperation or, to use the accepted expression, on its good offices in this matter."\(^{30}\) Accordingly both the parties accepted the invitation and signed the Tashkent declaration. "The agreement called for both sides to withdraw their forces to position held prior to August 5, and to repatriate prisoners of war. Both sides pledged not to have recourse to force and to settle their dispute through peaceful means."\(^{31}\)

However, the Tashkent Declaration failed to resolve the core issue of Kashmir. From the Indo-Pak war two things were clear, "one was that no country, except Malaysia and Singapore, was prepared to come out openly to support India...Even the Soviet Union, after reiterating that Kashmir was an integral part of India, chose to assume, like other several countries, a posture of neutrality when it came to pulling up Pakistan."\(^{32}\) Though India was

\(^{30}\) A.Appadorai and M.S.Rajan in Supra No-16, p-98.  
^{31} Quoted in George Perkovich's, India's Nuclear Bomb, The Impact on Global Proliferation, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2000, p-110.  
^{32} Quoted in Shri Ram Sharma. Supra No-21, p-2.
committed for friendship and peaceful co-existence with its neighbouring countries, still, at the same time it had to fight with them, which was mainly due to the circumstances that went against its interests. For each country, national interests are far more important than any other matters. Therefore, in order to protect its vital interests India had to retaliate Pakistan's act despite compromising, however, with the basic principles of India's foreign policy such as friendship, peaceful co-existence and non-alignment. This greatly influenced the India's foreign policy and also necessitated to review its policy in the light of the Indo-Pak war.

**Indira Gandhi's Period:**

After the sudden death of Shastri in January 1966, Indira Gandhi emerged as the leader of the Congress Party after its factional politics. Like her father Jawaharlal Nehru, she too created a glorious record and made a landmark in the history of India's foreign policy. Indira Gandhi had moved away from Shastri's little India posture. But she had scrupulously refrained from following in the footsteps of her father. However, she continued to strengthen the policy of non-alignment founded by her father. But her approach was more realistic than idealistic.

During the post Nehru era perhaps much of the credit for strengthening of the foreign policy rightly goes to Indira Gandhi. It
was the ideals of Nehru that greatly influenced Indira Gandhi as far as the foreign policy of India was concerned. As Nehru’s daughter she had opportunities to travel to most of the countries thereby holding talks with the world leaders. The main objective of Indira Gandhi was to put India on the diplomatic map of the world. In fact, the active involvement of Indira Gandhi in the Indian diplomacy greatly helped her to become familiar with almost all top leaders of the world. As a result, her stature in the international world enhanced and she came to be recognised as one of the important leaders of the world. In all this, Indira Gandhi had the greatest influence of her father Nehru. In fact, Indira Gandhi in her statement on foreign policy “on 26th January 1966 categorically said that Nehru’s principles would continue to guide her: The fundamental principles laid down by my father to which he and Shastriji dedicated their lives, will continue to guide us. It will be my sincere endeavour to work for the strengthening of peace and international cooperation, so that people in all lands live in equality, free from domination and fear”.

Indira Gandhi, a dynamic leader in the world politics, always considered nation’s interest as important as the external setting in shaping India’s foreign policy. She never compromised with India’s interests. As head of the government “she always carried overall responsibility for foreign policy, but her direction was more than institutional. She concentrated decision-making in her own

33 Quoted in A.Appadorai and M.S.Rajan, Supra No-16, pp-48, 49.
hands". Sixteen years as Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi greatly influenced the foreign policy of India and also dealt with several problems of world politics. Certain issues she dealt with and the international developments had great bearing on India's foreign policy such as the beginning of détente, signing of the Simla agreement, revival of diplomatic relations with China and Pakistan, dialogues between America and USSR in the 1980s, etc., are regarded as the major events of Indira Gandhi's period.

**Détente in the 1970s:**

During the late sixties, the Cold War conflicts between the two Super Powers were gradually came down and the tensions were diluted. Further there was also shift in the East-West relations from the tensions of Cold War to the compulsions, especially in the matter of military strategy and security. This period was marked by the dilution of Cold War and rise of détente, which tended to be an era of peace and security in the world. In the words of Northedge and Grieve, "the Super Powers had, by 1962, come to respect each other's sphere of interest and hence 1962, when the Cuba crisis occurred and quickly subsided, may be regarded as the true beginning of the end of the Cold War, or the start of the East-West détente, though some would date this from the construction of the Berlin wall in August 1961 and the Soviet-American agreement
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of that year not to place weapons of mass destruction in outer space".  

As peace strategy and diplomatic doctrine, "détente was designed, in the words of Henry A. Kissinger, to create an environment in which competitors can regulate and restrain their differences and ultimately move from competition to co-operation".  

a) Meaning of Détente:

"Détente is French term, meaning relaxation of tension, with watering down of antagonism and hostility between the Super Powers, an atmosphere of relaxation that found expression in the term détente". The Super Powers taking into consideration the prevailing international situation, decided on their own to get rid of rivalry and began to think about mutual trust and cooperation. As a result, in the 1970s the animosity and hostility between the Super Powers began to disappear and the international scene was dominated by an era of peaceful coexistence and co-operation. In the words of Baral "Détente means an effort by both Super Powers to develop goodwill, understanding and co-operation between them which may gradually help in increasing the identity of the Cold War conflict".  

---
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b) Role of Non-Alignment:

The newly emerged independent countries formed under India’s leadership, the third force called non-aligned group. This group in a way compelled the Super Powers to adopt the policy of peaceful co-existence that were practicing the policy of conflict and contradiction. Most of the colonial countries that achieved their independence by 1963 became the active members of the non-aligned movement and followed in the footsteps of India. These non-aligned countries were in a position to mobilize the world public opinion in their favor in so far as the international issues were concerned. This naturally made the super powers extremely difficult to go against the interests of the non-aligned countries and cold-shoulder their (NAM) opinion. By the time the Non-Aligned Movement assumed significance on the international horizon the Super Powers were not in a position to withstand its growing influence and as a result decided to mend their attitudes slowly. In view of the crucial role played by the members of the non-aligned movement, the Cold War between the two Super Powers came to an end and paved the way for peaceful co-existence.

The Simla Agreement of 1972:

The Simla Agreement between India and Pakistan is considered a milestone in the history of Indo-Pak relations, because, after 1971 Indo-Pak war it provided an opportunity for both the warring countries to settle their long-standing disputes amicably without
the interference of the third parties, including the issues of 1971 war. Besides, several foreign policy experts and the statesmen also predicted that there would be a sea change in the Indo-Pak relations, and would raise the hopes of a settlement on Kashmir. But things began to change gradually when Pakistan stuck to her stand on Kashmir and continued to raise the vexed issue again and again in almost all the international forums despite as agreed in the Simla Agreement, which provided for peaceful settlement of the issue.

Factors responsible for the Simla Agreement:

Basically, the Simla Agreement was the outcome not only of the Indo-Pak war of 1971 but also of the developments that had taken place in the then East Pakistan (present Bangladesh). East Pakistan, which was under the autocratic rule of the West Pakistan (present Pakistan) decided to revolt against it in order to achieve to its independence. India, a crusader against imperialism and colonialism, and a champion of dependent people, decided to help East Pakistan in the noble cause of its independence. As a result, the Indira Gandhi Government had given moral, material and political support to the people of East Pakistan. This naturally made Pakistan unhappy, and the relations between India and Pakistan started drifting, and soon were at cross roads. It was during the 1970 general elections the Awami League of East Pakistan secured full majority and Sheikh Mujibur Rahaman was to be invited to form the Government. But Bhutto "advised Yahya not to follow up
the result of the elections held in April 1970, in East Pakistan by allowing Mujibur to become the Prime Minister of the whole Pakistan.”39 Then Mujibur demanded autonomy for East Pakistan, which was also ruled out by the West Pakistan. As a result, in March 1971 the military leadership at the insistence of Bhutto started unprecedented massacre of Bengalis. This resulted in a massive influx of Bengali refugees into India. According to Bangabandhu Mujibur Rahaman, this genocide “resulted in the killing of about 30 lakh, and refugees of about 1 crore into India.”40 Further the Pakistani army also fanned communal tensions along Indian border and also conducted raids on India. This naturally made India retaliate against Pakistan. Before entering into war, India recognized Bangladesh as an independent nation. At last war between India and Pakistan broken out with the support of Bangladesh on 4th December 1971 and finally Pakistan was made to surrender for its debacle in the war. India declared ceasefire on 17th December 1971 and paved the way for the dialogues. After the ceasefire, India initiated the process of normalization of its relations with Pakistan. Samer Sen., the Indian delegate to the U.N., stated in a note to the Secretary General, Kurt Waldheim, on January 12, that India was ready to start bilateral negotiations with Pakistan on mutual troop withdrawal on Western and Kashmir fronts.41

39 T.N.Kaul, Supra No-7, p-179.
As part of normalization of Indo-Pak relations both Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and Pakistani President Z.A. Bhutto signed an agreement in July 1972, popularly known as Simla Pact. “The Importance of the Simla Summit consisted in the fact that for the first time Indo-Pakistani negotiations went beyond a particular problem or a specific set of issues. From the Indian perspective it meant the working out of a new arrangement for peace on the subcontinent, taking into account the power equations in South Asia.”

The Simla Agreement provided an opportunity for both the countries to resolve their differences amicably putting an end to the conflict and confrontation that have hitherto marred their relations thereby promoting harmonious relations and establishment of durable peace in the subcontinent.

Though there was general criticism from certain political parties about the Simla Agreement, Indira Gandhi refuted the allegations leveled against her as baseless. “But it was she who consolidated India’s relations with Pakistan through the Simla Agreement, and thus began the process of normalization by re-opening diplomatic relations between countries in 1976. Though the principles followed by Nehru and Indira Gandhi were identical, the latter implemented them more dynamically and courageously. As a result India’s prestige in the world rose. More to the point, the prospects of peace in the Indian subcontinent improved”. Further, both the leaders
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and the people of Bangladesh acclaimed the crucial role played by Indira Gandhi in achieving the independence and extending the support to the people of East Pakistan. After the 1971 Bangladesh war, India emerged as the dominant power in the South Asian region. For achieving glorious victory in the war Indira Gandhi was nicknamed "Durga", "Kali"(the War Goddess), and she was also conferred with "Bharat Ratna", the highest civilian award of the government of India.

Lack of mutual trust was the root cause for the strained relations between the two countries. However, by signing the agreement Indira Gandhi made a significant contribution in improving the Indo-Pakistan relations, thereby removing the misgivings in the relations hitherto existed. She also took the initiative to create an atmosphere of mutual trust in improving the Indo-Pak relations and aimed at establishing international peace and security.

**Reviving of Diplomatic Relations with Pak and China:**

For a couple of years the relations between India and China remained frozen even though India had initiated several measures to normalize the strained relations. This was mainly because of the absence of direct contacts and positive response from Chinese side, especially after the 1962 war. However, by 1976 it had become essential for India to normalize the Sino-Indian relations due to various reasons. The "Post-1962 India demonstrated her relative power in the 1971 Bangladesh war, the 1974 nuclear explosion and
in the merger of Sikkim in 1975. It was this relative position of strength that Indira Gandhi sought the normalization of relations with the Peoples Republic of China (PRC) in 1976.\textsuperscript{44} This was with an intention to reduce India's dependence on Moscow after the Indo-Soviet Treaty of 1971. Similarly, China too wanted to reduce the Soviet influence in South Asia, anticipating the probable threat to their occupation of Tibet. So these developments in both the countries culminated in the normalization of Sino-Indian relations.

As a result, a far-reaching development took place in the spring of 1976 when the government of India unilaterally announced its decision to restore full diplomatic relations with China, and accordingly Indira Gandhi designated K.R. Narayanan as its ambassador. This was considered as one of the bold steps forward in normalizing the long-standing strained relations between the two countries. But at the same time China also decided to reciprocate by restoring diplomatic relations with India and welcomed its move in improving the relations with China. This period also coincided with the resumption of trade and cultural relations between the two countries. Perhaps, "The initiative that India took in 1976 in normalizing relations with China was a sign of maturity suggesting that Indian diplomacy did not change its direction with the change of governments in the country."\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{44} Dawa Norbu, India and Tibet in Lalit Mansingh and Others (Eds) Vol-2, Indian Foreign Policy, Konark Publishers, New Delhi, 1998, p-270.
Like China, India's relations with Pakistan were also not cordial and remained frozen since the 1965 Indo-Pak war. However, the signing of the Simla Agreement in 1972 between India and Pakistan under the leadership of Indira Gandhi and President Z.A. Bhutto paved the way for the normalization of relations and revival of diplomatic relations between the countries. The initiative taken by both the leaders in this regard was highly appreciated and welcomed by the leaders of the South Asian countries who were in favour of establishing peace in the region.

Therefore, it was under the leadership of Indira Gandhi that India was able to take a bold step in reviving the diplomatic relations with China and Pakistan. It was because of Indira Gandhi's efforts the peace was established in the Asian region, which was a hot bed for internal conflicts between India and China on the one side and between India and Pakistan on the other.

Super Powers' Dialogues in the 1980s:

The year 1980 was marked with a downward trend in the process of détente and revival of Cold War. It was during this period that the ideological frictions and differences between the US and USSR on various international issues started again. The reemergence of Indira Gandhi in 1980 on the Indian political horizon coincided with Russia's intervention in Afghanistan. It was in the same year that Ronald Reagan was elected President of America. The first four years of his administration, the American foreign policy remained aggressive, assertive, extremely conservative
and combative. As a result, Reagan's tenure particularly took tough stand against the Soviet Union. Consequently Super Power relations took a nosedive.46

The following issues that cropped up between the two Super Powers had a direct bearing on India's security and integrity. The differences between the two Super Powers were aroused mainly over the issues such as i) Afghanistan crisis 2) supply of highly sophisticated weapons to Pakistan 3) issue of Diego Garcia, etc.

a) The Afghanistan Crisis:

The Afghan issue was a major cause of concern between the two Super Powers because US did not like the Russian intervention in Afghanistan and termed it as illegal, immoral and against the rights and wishes of the people of Afghanistan. Further, US also regarded Russia's move as an attempt to en-circle China, to pressurize Pakistan and to reach the warm waters of the Persian Gulf. Therefore, America condemned and opposed Russia over Afghanistan issue, and also criticized its support to a puppet government. When the ideological differences between the Super Powers started taking further shape India, under the leadership of Indira Gandhi, decided to adopt watch and wait attitude. In fact, the Soviet's intervention in Afghanistan had created a piquant situation for her government. “She could not endorse the Soviet action in
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Afghanistan as it was against the professions of Indian foreign policy. At the same time she could not condemn the Soviet Union, as it would benefit countries like Pakistan, China and US whose clandestine support to the insurgents in Afghanistan only made the Soviet intervention possible. But India did not to condemn Russia because it felt Russia’s intervention in Afghanistan was to prevent certain forces that were trying to install anti-communist and anti-Soviet regime in Afghanistan. This naturally made Americans consider India’s stand to be supportive of Soviet Union.

b) US Arms Supply to Pakistan:

America with an intention to subdue Soviet Union decided to offer economic and military aid to Pakistan. It was during the said period that India had some serious implications due to American policy. America evolved a strategic consensus in which Pakistan came to occupy a very significant position. *It served as the conduit through which US assistance reached the Afghan rebels, provided recruits for the insurgency operation from the Afghan refugee camps and extended to them training and other facilities. It played a significant role in lining up Islamic countries against the Soviet presence in Afghanistan. Besides, it was assigned an important place in the scheme for defense of American interests in the middle east.* The American policy was no doubt a matter of great concern
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for India. Because, America's arms supply to Pakistan increased its military capability, which in turn increased India's threat perception.

Besides, America offered help to China for purchase of its sophisticated arms. Accordingly, China seized the opportunity to modernize its army. This naturally created an atmosphere of insecurity, and altered the power equations in the South Asian region in general and Asian region in particular. Further, the American policy indirectly managed to encourage both Pakistan and China to pursue their anti-India policy. Consequently, India had to suffer both politically and economically due to the deteriorating relations between the US and USSR.

c) Differences Over Diego Garcia:

US, with a view to increasing its naval strength, decided to develop Diego Garcia, a strategic island in the India Ocean, as a strong naval base. It developed the naval base in Indian Ocean to safeguard interest in Asia, and to check the growing Russian power in Asia and in the Indian Ocean area. Taking into consideration the developments that are taking place, India strongly opposed the Super Power rivalry in Indian Ocean. Further, India felt that the development of Diego Garcia as a strong military base in the Indian Ocean would certainly increase the tension not only between the super powers but also in the South Asian region. Therefore, India wanted that Indian Ocean should be declared as "Zone of Peace"
which would be free from Cold War politics. In fact, India criticized American policy in respect of Diego Garcia and supported the claim of Mauritius, which was demanding for the return of Diego Garcia Islands to Mauritius, the original and legal owner.

In fact, “America had contended that the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan that had provoked them to go all out to build up Diego Garcia as a powerful base and look for facilities for the rapid development force in Oman, Kenya and Egypt. One may not agree with them totally but the Americans went to the extent of saying that all the military bases they might acquire in the Indian Ocean and all their naval bases in the Gulf area could not equal the striking power of the land-based Soviet forces in Afghanistan.49

Therefore, during the 1980’s India’s relations with America were not so cordial and friendly because of its pro-Soviet policy. Above all, the issues that cropped up between US and USSR further deteriorated India’s relations with US. India, which all along opposed US policy, decided to improve its relations with the West when her economic interests were at stake. Therefore, India continued to improve its relations with US despite some hiccups in order to meet its economic requirements. At the same time, an important change took place in Indo-US relations in the mid 1980s when US realized that India with or without it (US) is emerging a prominent center of power, not only in South Asia but in the Asian

49 Quoted in Shri Ram Sharma, Supra No.47, p-62.
region as well. This prompted US to have normal relations with India.

India's policy towards West:

The year 1982 was, marked as an era of India's shift towards West and improvement of relations with US. By 1982, India under Indira Gandhi's leadership began to move closer towards West thereby creating a sort of apprehension in the Indo-Soviet relations. On the contrary, US also became soft towards India when it approached International Monetary Fund (IMF) for loan as IMF was subjected to the influence of the US.

Rajiv Gandhi:

Rajiv Gandhi had shouldered the mantle of India's leadership at the critical juncture after the tragic assassination of Indira Gandhi. It was during this period that India was facing a severe crisis both within and outside and the situation was grave all over the country. Internationally speaking, Rajiv Gandhi also had to brave many storms.

As far as India's foreign policy is concerned Rajiv Gandhi followed in the footsteps of his grand father Jawaharlal Nehru and his mother Indira Gandhi, who were not only the guiding spirits but also leading players on the world stage. Still the approach of Rajiv Gandhi had some differences from that of his predecessors. The inclinations of Rajiv Gandhi towards West to get the technological
know how is a classic example for his differences with his predecessors who were inclined more towards East than West. Under his leadership India’s foreign policy started improving relations with the West, without deviating from the actual path as set by his predecessors.

Rajiv Gandhi the youngest Prime Minister of India greatly influenced the formulation of foreign policy of India. He being a new comer on the international scene demonstrated a great deal of dynamism and enthusiasm in the formulation of India’s foreign policy. However, the role played by Rajiv Gandhi in formulating India’s foreign policy can be studied in the light of some important developments that proved his leadership quality in resolving the intrinsic issues such as the terrorist activities along Indian border supported by Pakistan, improvement of relations with the Super Powers, strained relations between India and China and above all the ethnic problem in Sri Lanka. In fact, these issues are dealt separately in the next chapter.

**The Coalition Era: National Front Government:**

Soon after the end of Rajiv Gandhi’s glorious era in the Indian political system an era of coalition Government began in the late1990’s. For the first time a coalition Government was formed under the leadership of V.P.Singh with the support of Right and Left and some smaller parties having divergent ideologies. Since it was a coalition Government, the Prime Minister could not devote much
time to the foreign affairs because he was busy in managing the coalition partners and also because his was a weak leadership. In a dramatic event, on 2nd August 1990 Iraq invaded Kuwait a Gulf country with an avid intention to control the oil resources. This naturally irritated the USA, which had interest in Kuwait. India, instead of condemning the attack, assumed a spuriously neutral stance on Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. This naturally raised several questions in the international community on the propriety of India's muteness that all along fought for sovereignty and supremacy of the non-aligned countries. This clearly proved that India for the first time in the history of its foreign policy failed to perform its legitimate duty as the leader of the Non-Aligned Movement. Even, India's credibility at the United Nations as well as amongst the Gulf countries suffered grievously due to its policy stance adopted on the Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

When V.P.Singh lost power due to internal squabbles at the end of 1990, Chandra Sekhar became the Prime Minister of India for a short span. He opposed the invasion of one non-aligned country by another, and joined the international community's call for Iraq to vacate Kuwait. The important issue, which Chandra Shekhar dealt with, was the Gulf war (January 1991), which had a bearing on India's foreign policy. It was during this period that a dramatic development took place when America attacked Iraq in January 1991 without any provocation. In fact, India's act was criticized by several leaders for its inactiveness and remaining a silent spectator
without protesting the high handedness of the Americans. Further, the most controversial decision during the regime of Chandra Sekhar was allowing refueling facilities to the American aircrafts involved in the Gulf war. Commenting on India's stance the then Foreign Secretary, J.N.Dixit said "There has been much ado about India diluting its Non-aligned and neutral position by having allowed this facility to the US. One has to analyse this decision in terms of India's interests and compulsions". Therefore, It was during the regime of National Front government that the foreign policy of India was in great shambles owing to mishandling of the issues.

P.V.Narasimha Rao's Period:

The regime of P.V.Narasimha Rao as Prime Minister of India was one of glorious and crucial moments in the history of India's foreign policy. It was during this period that he gave much importance to the economic development of the country, which is one of the pre-requisites of sound foreign policy. He was considered as the architect of Indian economic reforms introduced in the 1990s. Therefore, the modern economic boom in India is largely attributed to the fundamental reform started by Prime Minister Rao and Dr. Man Mohan Singh the then Finance Minister.
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P.V. Narasimha Rao took the reins of the country when the economy was on the verge of collapse due to low foreign exchange reserves and also when the country's foreign policy was in shambles. Soon after assuming the office, he introduced a number of reforms in the Indian economy to tide over the Balance of Payments (BOP) crisis. He was the only Prime Minister after Rajiv Gandhi who opened up the Indian economic policies to integrate with global economy. Although, the stage was set for liberalization in the early 1980s, it is only during P.V. Narasimha Rao's regime that the process of globalizing the economy began rapidly.

At the same time, he also turned his attention towards bringing the foreign policy back on the track. He made sincere attempts to strengthen India's foreign policy thereby improving India's relations with all countries of the world, including her immediate neighbours. The greatest achievement of P.V. Narasimha Rao in the field of country's foreign policy was the signing of the peace talks with China with a view to ending the long-standing border dispute between the two countries.

The United Front Government:

H.D. Deve Gowda became the Prime Minister in June 1996 by heading the United Front coalition government. The foreign policy plank of the UF government reiterates continuation of the policy as enunciated by his predecessors. I.K. Gujral was appointed the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the country. He was an able
statesman who could diplomatically handle the River Ganga Sharing water issue and sorted out the Ganga water problem with Bangladesh and also dealt firmly with the issue of signing the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). In fact, he was given free hand in dealing with external affairs matters during Devegowda’s tenure.

**Signing of Draft CTBT:**

It was during H.D.DeveGowda’s regime that there was tremendous pressure from certain quarters to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). However, India refused to sign the CTBT, since it was discriminatory. Talking about India’s foreign policy, the Prime Minister said that it would resist international pressure to sign the CTBT. Before reaching any agreement on nuclear test ban, India would have to keep in mind the overt and covert nuclear activity by our neighbours.⁵¹ In July 1996 even Russia offered to hold talks with India in order to persuade it to sign the CTBT, followed by US pressure to sign CTBT and not to block the treaty. I.K.Gujral the then External Minister taking into consideration the pressure from US, on 2nd August 1996 while replying in Lok Sabha categorically stated that “We will not dilute our stand – not at all. The question of revising our position on the present draft does not arise”.⁵² Further, India’s stand was
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reiterated that the world required nothing short of a global nuclear disarmament to which India remained committed. It was also clarified that India would continue to pursue its nuclear policy despite pressure from the nuclear countries.

**Sharing of Ganga Water:**

During the UF government's regime the sharing of Ganga water became the bone of contention between India and Bangladesh. However, the Foreign Affairs Minister I.K. Gujral took the initiative to resolve the long-standing issue on priority basis. Accordingly, both the countries under the respective foreign ministers met in Dhaka in September 1996 and agreed on the broad principles to enter into an agreement for permanent sharing of Ganga water. At the meeting it was resolved to work out the details on the quantum of water sharing between the two countries. It is because of the determined efforts of the UF government the issue of sharing water ended in an agreement.

**The Foreign Policy of National Democratic Alliance (NDA) Government:**

Another coalition government was formed under the leadership of A. B. Vajapayee in 1998. As Prime Minister of India, he made significant contributions to India's foreign policy. The first and foremost development was carrying out of nuclear tests. It was a surprising development. In 1998, the NDA government under A.B.Vajapayee's leadership shocked the world and many of his
country's citizens by detonating five nuclear weapons in the desert of Rajasthan. It was important to note that the NDA government set the record by exploding the nuclear weapons at a time when 149 countries had signed a ban on nuclear testing. It also became the first non-congress government to depart from the decades of nuclear restraint.

Carrying out nuclear tests caused a great deal of concern not only for the security aspect of the neighbouring countries but also for that of the world at large. The impact of the explosion naturally altered the power equations in the South Asian region. Like China, Indian government also clarified that the nuclear weapon testing was not directed against any country but to protect its interests. The nuclear tests were the outcome of the hegemonic policy of the nuclear power countries that were involved in perpetuating their nuclear domination and preventing other countries to acquire nuclear capability. As a result, India always claimed that CTBT and NPT (1968) were discriminatory in nature because the nuclear nations always refused India's proposal for a universal disarmament.

Further, the issue became a debatable topic in the international arena when the world was moving towards elimination of nuclear weapons. Perturbed over the developments that had taken place in India, the international community strongly criticized its actions. Besides, several countries including America and its ally Japan
imposed economic sanctions on India for its nuclear explosions and going against the principles of NPT and CTBT. However, India boldly faced the consequences arising out of the economic sanctions. Speaking in the parliament A.B.Vajapayee said, “There is also a consensus that if attempts are made to impose unreasonable restrictions on our economic sovereignty and if the inflow into our country of the aid coming from world organizations is stopped, then we will face the situation unitedly.”53 As a result, India withstood all the economic sanctions imposed by various countries and emerged as one of the strong countries in the world. However, the nuclear tests brought structural changes in the Indian foreign policy.

**Bus Diplomacy:**

The Bus diplomacy played a significant role in promoting the cordial relations between India and Pakistan. In order to strengthen the people to people contact and to strengthen the bond of friendship between the two countries Prime Minister A.B.Vajapayee came with an innovative idea of introducing a bus service from New Delhi to Lahore. As part of bus diplomacy, Vajpayee himself travelled all the way to Lahore and signed the Lahore Declaration on 21st February 1999. In fact, Vajpayee took concrete steps with regard to bus diplomacy.

---

Lahore Declaration:

As part of declaration, both countries agreed to work on the principle of co-operation and co-existence and also agreed to reduce their forces along the Line of Control. Hopes were expressed that the normalization of relations between the two countries would be strengthened. However, things did not move on the expected lines and took a nosedive when intruders from Pakistan were found occupying the strategic locations along the Line of Control, especially in the Kargil sector of Kashmir in the mid May 1999.

Kargil Conflict:

The preparations for Kargil intrusions were made at the time of Lahore Declaration itself, but India was not aware of these happenings. But the Indian leadership continued to deny the intrusions that had taken place in the Kargil sector. In fact, however, "the intrusion was detected on 3rd May 1999, by "shepherds" who are occasionally retained by the Brigade Intelligence team for forward information gathering."54 The intruders were not terrorists as believed to be but were Pakistani army soldiers backed up by Pakistan government. When the situation went out of control, the Indian military launched its offensive under "Operation Vijay" to flush out the intruders in the high terrain of Kargil. Though, a "war like situation" was created in the Kargil

54 From Surprise to Reckoning "The Kargil Review Committee Report, Govt. of India, National Security Council Secretariat, Sage Publication, New Delhi, 2000, p-229.
sector of Kashmir, it was only after the then Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir; Farookh Abdullah's briefing that the Prime Minister Vajpayee realized the gravity of the situation. Then immediately the valiant Indian soldiers retaliated and drove out the Pakistani intruders from the Kargil. During the war Pakistan even threatened to use nuclear weapons against India. But, Pakistan did not stick to its stand, may be because of realising India's nuclear capability.

Though India's military acted quickly in driving out the intruders yet one felt that the intrusion should have been avoided much before the government intelligence agencies had been alerted. The gross inadequacies in the nation's surveillance capability and intelligence agencies were the root cause for large-scale intrusion as reported by the Kargil Review Committee Report. Therefore, opposition parties including Congress party criticized the NDA government for handling the Kargil issue.

**The Foreign Policy of United Progressive Alliance (UPA) Government:**

The foreign policy of India under Man Mohan Singh government became one of debatable issues in so far as the issue of voting against Iran on its nuclear programme was concerned at the insistence of US. Because, the left parties who are partners in the UPA government strongly opposed India's move of voting against Iran in the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) meeting.
Particularly the Communist Party of India (Marxist) held Prime Minister Man Mohan Singh for taking a major step affecting the country's independent foreign policy and its status in the Non-Aligned Movement. It is but natural that the left parties oppose the West. In fact it was an embarrassing situation to the UPA government at the Center. There is no doubt whatsoever that the UPA government voted against Iran in the Security Council in order to appease the United States. By voting with US against Iran India became party to another "infamous exercise in intimidation and coercion" against a country with which it had friendly relations and vital energy stakes.

Iran, the signatory to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) has a right to enrichment of Uranium and to develop nuclear technology for civilian purpose. The U.S. and three European countries along with Russia are demanding that Tehran should give up uranium enrichment. Although India, which had entered into an agreement with Iran for supply of gas through pipeline chose to vote against Iran when the issue came up before the international Atomic Energy Commission of UN Security Council. America right from the agreement opposed the Iran- Pakistan- India gas pipeline on several counts with an idea that "the pipeline would help anchor friendly ties among Iran, Pakistan, and India. This would greatly undermine US strategic leverage with India and Pakistan against Iran in the future."55

The Bush Visit:

The pro-left parties strongly manifested the public opinion against George W. Bush the American president during his recent visit in the first week of March 2006. Mr. George W. Bush was in India to sign the "historic" nuclear civilian agreement. Once again the signing of the nuclear agreement between India and United States evoked strong protests and the issue not only became debatable but also controversial to the pro Left Parties. Because, the Left parties, being supporters of the UPA government, strongly opposed the deal as "bad bargain" and termed it as detrimental to the country's commercial and strategic interests. Even CPI (M) Polit Bureau Member Brinda Karat criticized the deal and said "The UPA government by agreeing to the pre-determined framework of the U.S. is pushing India into a relationship which will not serve the interests of the Indian people." 56 However, Man Mohan Singh in reply to V.P. Singh the former Prime Minister of India said, "the Government was fully conscious of the imperative need that nothing should be done that can harm our national security interests or cast shadow on the requirements of our Minimum Credible Nuclear Deterrent. Further there will be no negative effects on research and development in the nuclear field". 57

The study of evolution of India's foreign policy reveals that its foreign policy has undergone several ups and downs and also is not
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rigid and, in fact, is flexible. Besides, it was also not crystal clear while dealing with certain issues such as Sri Lanka, China etc. India’s foreign policy proved beyond doubt that it is not static but adjustable in the case of its tilt towards West. This has been proved in the case America, where India had tilted towards West during Indira Gandhi’s period (1980-84). This naturally created a sense of mistrust in India’s relations with Soviet Union. India’s tilt towards West was generally construed as deviating from the actual path as set forth by the foreign policy makers. Even, there were also structural changes in the Indian foreign policy when new developments took place in the international situation. Therefore, India’s foreign policy is an admixture of both tilt and upright.

Some Theoretical Dimensions of Leadership:

For understanding Rajiv Gandhi’s leadership in the formulation of India’s foreign policy, it is pertinent to understand some theoretical dimensions of leadership. There are different theories expounded by different theorists on leadership study. In this connection an attempt is made to understand some theories. Among the following theories about leadership, a few theories, which are more relevant to the present study, have been identified. Trait Theory, (Great-Man theory), Behaviouirul theory, Situational leadership theory and Participative theory of leadership have been relied upon to explain and analyse the leadership of Rajiv Gandhi. These theories have been selected for their wider dimension and
universal relevance, because these theories are more appropriate in explaining the leadership in the context of formulation of India’s foreign policy under the able leadership of Rajiv Gandhi.

**Trait Theories of Leadership:**

The trait theory of leadership identifies various traits, characteristics, abilities, behavioral pattern or skills that leaders have to demonstrate. Further, this theory deals with different traits of the leader such as charismatic, ethical, goal oriented, initiative, inspiring, empowering etc. The term ‘traits’ may be taken to mean the personal characteristics of a leader. Stogdill identified the following traits as critical to leaders, viz, adoptable to situation, alert to social environment, ambitious and achievement oriented, assertive, cooperative, decisive, dependable, dominant, tolerant of stress, willing to assume responsibility."58 The theory states that persons who possess these traits of leadership are presumed to be psychologically better adjusted to display better judgment and engage themselves in various political and social activities. The person who has these traits would be considered a potential leader. This theoretical approach is attempted in order to answer the vital question what are the characteristics or traits that make a person a leader?. To which, Fred Luthans states that “the earliest theories, which can be traced back to the ancient Greeks and Romans, concluded that leaders are born, not made”.59 Similarly, Dessler

also found that “some leaders are characterized by certain traits; they were initially inspired by a “great man” concept of leadership”.60 According to Worchel and Cooper, this theory states that “certain individuals are born to lead has been labeled the “great man” theory of leadership. In its simplest form it states that history is shaped by a few men in leadership positions, and these men possess certain unique traits that qualify them for the leader’s role”.61 The implication is that leaders are born with unique traits or have some unique background. Adair has listed certain inborn qualities “such as, initiative, courage, and intelligence and which together predestine a man to be a leader. By the exercise of will power itself seen as an important leadership trait, or by the rough tutorship of experiences, some of these qualities might be developed”.62 All these definitions presuppose that leadership qualities are based on heredity.

There are many great leaders in the world who are born with certain special traits, which made them leaders. If the same analogy is applied to Rajiv Gandhi’s leadership, it is proved beyond doubt that he too was a born leader. Rajiv Gandhi came from the family of eminent freedom fighters such as Motilal Nehru, Jawaharlal Nehru, Indira Gandhi who fought for the independence of India. Obviously, Rajiv Gandhi cultivated the leadership qualities right from his

---

childhood as he grew under the influence of such great leaders. Rajiv Gandhi's father Ferozshah Gandhi who was a leading journalist played an important role during the struggle for India's independence by writing articles in the leading journals. He was a disciplined and hard workingman. Rajiv Gandhi’s mother Indira Gandhi too was a freedom fighter and a social worker like her father Jawaharlal Nehru. She was also the most courageous leader the country had ever seen. The entire country for their selfless service, discipline and courage knew Rajiv Gandhi's parents. He inherited all the qualities of his parents and his grand father such as discipline, courage, inspiration etc., and emerged as an able leader.

Apart from his family influence Rajiv Gandhi came also under the influence of a Dane by name “Anna” in his early days. He grew up under the care of “Anna” as his mother was busy with attending the dignitaries at Teen Murthi Bhavan, the official residence of Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru that became the hub of political and administrative activities of the country soon after the independence. Anna who had a rare combination of unique characters, served the leading personalities of India. Commenting on the qualities of “Anna” Krishna Hatheesing said that “She (Anna) was a strict disciplinarian, an ardent believer in cold showers, sunbathing and exercise a vegetarian”.63 It was this Dane under whose care Rajiv Gandhi had to grow and spend his fruitful childhood. The

atmosphere in the house enabled Rajiv Gandhi to learn discipline, cleanliness and strictness right from his early days. This greatly helped Rajiv Gandhi mould his future personality. Later on young Rajiv Gandhi proved himself a strict disciplinarian and Mr. Clean when he assumed the office of the Prime Minister of India.

Rajiv Gandhi studied in the Wellham School, which is known by name Doon school and is one of the prestigious schools in the country. The Doon school is known for its academic quality, and has produced a number of Generals, Politicians, Bureaucrats, Scholar's etc. Rajiv Gandhi also happened to be one of the products of such an esteemed institution. Rajiv Gandhi, who enjoyed the company of such eminent students, emerged as one of the complete personalities.

Another “trait” often associated with leadership is charisma. “Max Weber used the term to mean the “gift of grace”. Charisma has almost supernatural qualities, which are difficult to describe and may be impossible to study. Weber felt that a leader’s charisma is especially evident in times of crisis and that situational events seem to “draw it out”. Further, charisma can also be used to describe the magnetic pull, which certain leaders appear to have. This theory is more relevant in the case of Rajiv Gandhi who was a charismatic leader like Jawaharlal Nehru. In a short span of time he proved himself an able leader soon after his entry into the Congress party.

---

His charisma was tested, when he contested the by-election to the Lok Sabha in June 1981, from Amethi, once represented by his brother Sanjay Gandhi. Due to his popularity and charismatic qualities he got elected with thumping majority by defeating his nearest Lok Dal candidate. Commenting on his victory and attractiveness, R.Venkatraman, the then Defence Minister said, "Rajiv has achieved what Jawaharlal Nehru could not achieve in his lifetime. All his opponents lost security deposits".65 It is an indication of Rajiv Gandhi's popularity as the youth leader of this country who had the quality of influencing the common masses of this country. Indeed, the emergence of Rajiv Gandhi on the Indian political horizon, that too, as a leader of the Congress party has marked the beginning of a new era in the modern Indian politics, particularly in the life of the youths.

Rajiv Gandhi became a source of inspiration and model to the youths, and it was under his leadership that the youths began to organize all over the country. He, being a charismatic leader, took the initiative to organize the youths and motivated them to fight against the burning issues of the country such as poverty, illiteracy, unemployment etc. He even became a source of inspiration to the modern youths, and it was under his leadership that the youths began to organize themselves all over the country. He, being a mass leader, made tremendous impact on the economic and political

---

development of the country. He had the quality of influencing and inspiring the people of this country, especially the young turks.

**Behavioural Theory of Leadership:**

The emergence of leadership can also be studied on the basis of behavioural patterns of the leaders. Behavioural theories of leadership do not seek inborn traits or capabilities. Rather, they look at what leaders actually do. In other words, this approach emphasizes what a leader actually does and how he behaves in carrying out his leadership work. According to the theory, an individual who displays an appropriate behaviour will emerge as the leader in whatever group situation he is. Thus McGinnie summarized that "leadership is the result of effective role behavior and it is shown by a person more by his acts and behaviour than by his traits". McGinnie's behavioural theory of leadership is relevant in the case of Rajiv Gandhi's leadership. He was a humble leader who always concerned about the establishment of world peace and elimination of nuclear weapons, which endangered the human life on the earth. Therefore, it is because of Rajiv Gandhi's ardent efforts that the world could be saved from the nuclear holocaust. His unique behaviour was not only a model to the entire country but even to the world as well. He was a man of action and never tolerated injustice against the oppressed and suppressed people of the world community. As a result, he waged a relentless war against

---

the inhuman practice of apartheid prevailing in South Africa against the Blacks. In fact, in his struggle against apartheid Rajiv Gandhi inspired the world leaders in getting their moral and material support and mobilizing the opinion against the dreaded practice of apartheid. Rajiv Gandhi was also a humanist to the core. This was proved when he ventured into mobilizing the funds to help South African frontline countries in their struggle against colonialism and imperialism. It is because of Rajiv Gandhi that South African frontline countries were to see economic prosperity and independence of Namibia. This obviously earned him good dividends from the world community. Therefore, Rajiv Gandhi’s leadership was recognized by way of his courageous acts, which opposed all types’ of domination, oppression, hegemonies, racial discrimination and proliferation of nuclear weapons etc.

According to Tannenbaum, “the behavioural approach emphasizes what the leader is leading. An important contribution of this theory is that a leader neither behaves the same way nor does he take identical actions in every situation he faces. He is flexible, to a degree, because he feels he must be to take the most appropriate action for handling a particular problem. This suggests a leadership continuum whereby the leader’s actions and amount of authority used for related to the decision making freedom or participation available to the subordinates".67 The theory expounded by

Tannenbaum aptly applies to Rajiv Gandhi's behavior who applied different techniques to deal with different situations while formulating foreign policy against a particular country. For example, while dealing with Sri Lankan ethnic problem he adopted altogether a different approach wherein his involvement was direct i.e. participatory role than the mediator role, unlike the Chinese border issue and, normalizations of relations with USA. However, in respect of ethnic problem, he entrusted the task of preparing the groundwork for India-Sri Lankan Accord to J.N.Dixit, the then Indian High Commissioner to Sri Lanka. Apart from this he also sent special emissaries such as Bhandari, the then Foreign Secretary, P.Chidambaram and K.Natwar Singh the then Ministers to deal with the Tamil situation in Sri Lanka. Indeed, the signing of the Indo-Sri Lankan Accord, the brainchild of Rajiv Gandhi, is being considered an important action taken by him to end the ethnic violence in Sri Lanka.

Further, Tannenbaum’s leadership continuum concept, which deals with the amount of authority and freedom to subordinates, is also made applicable to Rajiv Gandhi’s leadership. Rajiv Gandhi who intended to give a free hand to the subordinates in formulating the foreign policy decided to constitute a Policy Planning Committee. Accordingly, a committee under the Chairmanship of G.Parthasarathy “was constituted for the first time nearly 15 years ago both to assess the security environment in the world, especially in the immediate neighbourhood, and make suggestions for
tailoring India's foreign policy to meet new stresses and strains and to exploit new opportunities". This clearly shows that Rajiv Gandhi had given an opportunity to his subordinates while framing the foreign policy of India by appointing G.Parthasarathy as Chairman of the Policy Planning Committee. Therefore, he was instrumental in constituting the PPC and giving a free hand to various agencies of the Policy Planning Committee to frame the foreign policy of the country. As head of the foreign policy mechanism, he used to take guidance, suggestions from the bureaucrats of the External Affairs Ministry, including the Minister at the time of framing the foreign policy. He even took into confidence his fellow colleagues and bureaucrats while taking the final decision on foreign policy matters. However, Rajiv Gandhi had the final say in so far as the decisions on the foreign policy matters were concerned.

**Situational Leadership Theory:**

After increasing disillusionment with the “great man” and trait approaches to understanding leadership, some researchers turned their attention towards the study of situational factors, which are responsible for producing a leader. According to Fred Luthans a situational approach was initially called *Zeitgeist* (a German word meaning ‘spirit of the times’); a leader is viewed as a product of the times and the situation. The person with the particular qualities or

---
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traits that a situation requires will emerge as the leader".69 "Most of the psychologists have found out that the situational leadership theory can help to predict the emergence of a type of leadership".70 Koontz and O'Donnell have also found out that "a large number of studies have been made on the premise that leadership is strongly affected by the situation from which the leader emerges and in which he or she operates".71 According to Fiedler, people become leaders not by only because of the attributes of their personality but also because of various situational factors and the interaction between the leaders and the situation".72

The situational theory can very well be connected to Rajiv Gandhi's leadership who emerged as a leader due to the situational factors. Basically, he was not interested in politics as he had love for flying. However, the situation was created in such a manner that he had to give up his pilot's profession and to join politics against his will and wish. All this all happened when Rajiv Gandhi's younger brother Sanjay Gandhi who was projected as the legal heir to the Nehru-Gandhi family and the future Prime Minister of India, died "in an air crash on 23rd June 1980".73 Therefore, Indira Gandhi persuaded Rajiv Gandhi to fill the vacuum created by Sanjay Gandhi and this obviously made him quit the job of a pilot and join

---
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politics. Therefore, once Rajiv Gandhi, while replying to the debate on the Thakkar Commission Report in the Lok Sabha said that "She (Indira Gandhi) called out to me in her loneliness. I went to her side. At her instance, I left my love for flying. At her instance, I sacrificed my family life. At her instance, I joined her as a political aide". It was due to Mrs. Indira Gandhi that Rajiv Gandhi entered the politics and soon became the leader of the Congress party when the situation demanded. Hence, Rajiv Gandhi emerged as the leader due to the situation.

**Participative Theories of Leadership:**

This theory involves other people in the leadership process. However, the leader retains the right to give or deny the subordinate a say in the leadership process. Rajiv Gandhi as Prime Minister provided an opportunity to the people of India to take active participation in the democratic process of the country. He was responsible for introducing the Panchayat Raj system in the country with a view to decentralizing the powers, which were concentrated in the system. Taking part in the democratic process Rajiv Gandhi was able to reach the gross root level people, and made them recognize his leadership. As the leader of the Congress party, he travelled extensively, every nook and corner of the country, to spread the ideals of the Congress party and the government.

---
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