CHAPTER – III

FOREIGN POLICY POSITION OF INDIAN POLITICAL PARTIES

"There is an integral relationship between domestic politics and foreign affairs of a country."¹ The existence of a symbiotic relationship between the two cannot be snubbed. The confluence of the domestic environment and the international milieu will determine the pattern of policies formulated by a country to deal with the affairs at home and abroad. The capability of a country to counter global challenges largely depends on its domestic strength.

"A country, which faces turmoil in domestic politics, cannot withstand the turbulence of world politics."² The domestic strength of a country presupposes the existence of a sound economy, stable polity, strong military, sound socio-political institutions and an enlightened civil society. The position of a country in the realm of world affairs will mainly rest upon the constructive role played by its domestic variables functioning in the polity. On the other hand, the domestic politics of a country is not sequestered from the influence of the factors active beyond territorial limits. The changing international situations affected by strong global forces have deep-rooted repercussions on the internal affairs of a country. The external variables such as international organizations, big power politics,
international economic order, major international crises and relations with neighbours have a major bearing on the conduct of domestic affairs in a country. A country's foreign policy indicates the state of its international affairs. It is not only a product of international situation but also influenced by domestic politics. Hence, "Foreign policy of a country is the projection of domestic policy, the policy makers are linked with the internal and international environment. Foreign policy and domestic politics have become increasingly inter-related." The inter-connection between domestic and international politics has snow balled in recent times. The globalisation of national economy and the subsequent decline of State sovereignty endorse our observation. The distances and barriers between the countries have been circumvented. According to Stanley Hoppmann: "The dichotomy between international and domestic politics is getting eroded."

Thus the nexus between domestic politics and foreign affairs is obvious and the nature of linkage between the two has undergone a qualitative change, after the global structural changes, like the end of cold war. It appears that the systemic changes in the world order have concretized the ligament between domestic and international politics. As aptly pointed out by James N. Rosenau: "The students of global politics have not begun to take account of the transformation at work within the societies. Global structural changes in the post cold war
era would certainly affect the functioning of the domestic political system."^5

Foreign policy is an instrument by which a country manages its international affairs and it reflects the country's national interest. The position of a country in the international arena is determined by the nature of its foreign policy. Lack of strength and vigour in the country's foreign policy amount to negation of its role in the vortex of global affairs. Foreign policy is a set of principles and objectives formulated by a country in pursuit of fostering the communality of interests with its fellow members in the family of nation. Modelski viewed: "The foreign policy problem is essentially a question of adjusting the actions of States to each other."^6

Foreign policy of a country does not operate in isolation. It functions in a matrix of internal and external forces. In this study foreign policy is a dependent variable which is influenced by several independent variables stemming out both the domestic environment of the polity and the international milieu surrounding it. The integral connectivity between domestic and international environment forms one of the primary determinants of the nature of a country's foreign policy. The domestic variables operating in a political system will play a momentous role in moulding its foreign policy.
Some Theoretical Dimensions

For a broader understanding of the nature of foreign policies from the viewpoint of diverse political systems, it is felicitous to understand the complex interaction between the domestic environment and the foreign policy making process in a political system. The domestic environment comprises several variables which play a momentous role in shaping the foreign policy of a country. They include the economic position, military capability, constitution, political structure, mass media and public opinion, political parties and interest groups and leadership. The scope and direction of foreign policy is delineated by the creative and constructive contribution of all those domestic situational variables. It will be a demanding task if an attempt is made to identify the most important of all these variables. The significant role played by any of these factors in fashioning the foreign policy of a country cannot be undermined. In this regard it can be said that political parties are one of the most significant institutional variables which have a dominant role in the process of moulding a country’s foreign policy in a democracy. The political system which is regarded as the sub-system of international system, comprises several components. The political parties which constitute a party system is recognized as one of the most important sub-systems of a political system. The process of democratization has facilitated the emergence of political parties as significant institutional set up of a political system and their scope and
importance has rapidly grown in spite of the fact that they are extra-constitutional entities. It can be said that political parties have a very influential role in the political process of a polity which includes the formulation of foreign policy. Political parties constitute an important component of the structural mechanism involved in enacting a country's foreign policy. But it is lamentable that the field of foreign policy studies, dealing with the interface between political parties and foreign policy, has been suffering from impoverishment, because of the lack of contribution from the scholars of foreign policy to analyze the complex and inevitable interaction between political parties and foreign policy. Marcel Merle observes: "Political science and international relations have become separated by a gulf into which the question of the connection between political parties and foreign policy seems to have fallen into oblivion."  

Political parties are considered the soul of modern democracies. Political parties not only activate a political system but they democratize the political process of a polity. Thus a stable and well-knit party system is one of the necessary preconditions for the progress of modern democracy. Party system is the most influential sub-system of a political system and due to its popular character, it exerts more influence on the process of policy formulation than any other institutions of political system. The political parties are an integral part of the political affairs of a polity and they determining, its responsive capability. The effectiveness of political system to
counter internal and global challenges hinges to a large extent upon the existence of a healthy party system. Hence, political parties are an indispensable element of a democratic system and the growing significance of political parties for democracy has led some scholars to describe democracy as partycracy. Political parties reflect man's nature of sociability. The sociability of individuals prompts them to involve themselves in different groups and they take crucial decisions after discussion. In this regard party politics is an important activity in a democratic polity depicting man as a social animal. Hence, the nature of his socio-economic and political life in a democracy is to a considerable margin molded by their involvement in the activities of political parties.

In this context, it can be said that one of the cardinal principles required for an effective functioning of a democratic political system, is that there should be citizens' greater participation in the process of policy formulation, through their indulgence in the course of discussions relating to premier foreign policy issues. But the geo-physical limitations of modern nation States and their societal complexities obliterate the feasibility of direct participation of the entire civil society in the process of policy formulation. In this regard, political parties, as organized structures of a political system, act as a bridge between a civil society and a government and on behalf of the citizens, they take part in the process of settling major policy matters. They democratize the process of foreign policy formulation.
It can be said that the process of foreign policy formulation can be democratized through the active engagement of the political parties. So the relation between political parties and foreign policy is significant.

There are various methods to analyze the nexus between domestic politics and foreign policy in a democracy. Conceivably one of the most expedient ways to comprehend this interconnection is to study the perception and role of political parties in the process of formulation of foreign policy. Since political parties are a fundamental component of the political process of a polity, they have a greater leverage for determining the foreign policy position of every polity. The stance of political parties over foreign policy greatly depends upon their perception, and the same is fashioned by the domestic and international milieu. The changing domestic scenario and the dynamics of international situation have a major bearing on the attitude of political parties towards policy issues. There exists a discrepancy in the perception of different political parties of the domestic and international environment. This will lead to the emergence of differences in policy alternatives of different political parties. Apart from this, the parliamentary position of the political parties has an impact on the parties' role in the foreign policy making process.

Foreign policy makers are influenced by the way in which political parties perceive international situations, policy choices and
the consequence of various policy alternatives. The reactions of political parties to various policies executed act as a feedback to policy makers. On the other hand, political parties including the ruling party, formulate broad policy guidelines on the basis of their ideology, principles, programmes and electoral promises. As a democratic government is constituted by political parties, the policy makers are bound to be an integral part of the ruling party and there is a conspicuous impact of their ideology, principles and programmes on the elites concerned with the enactment of foreign policy. The policy makers also come under the impact of opposition parties while formulating their foreign policy. The opposition parties contribute to the process by their constant engagement in debates and discussions of various issues of foreign policy. The members of the government are in a direct interaction with the opposition parties on the floor of parliament. The comments and criticisms on any foreign policy initiative of the government and the questions on acute issues will influence the foreign policy makers. Above all, the ruling and opposition parties are at mutual interaction, when the ruling party consults all other parties for bringing a consensus on a critical foreign policy matter. Political parties apprise the government regarding the impact of a proposed policy. On the whole, the political parties influence the foreign policy makers either by their criticism about the evaluation of international situation, policy alternatives and the execution of foreign policy decisions, or by their advice on these matters. The foreign policy objectives and the needs of people are
correlated. The foreign policy must be devised in such a manner that it should boost the potency of the political system to fulfill people's needs. Due to time constraints the foreign policy makers may not be able to go down to the grass root levels to comprehend the wants of people. Political parties bridge the gap between the government and public. They perform the task of interest articulation and interest aggregation and enlighten the policy makers about the needs of people. This integral connection between the political parties and foreign policy makers denotes the pertinence of the study of perception and the role of political parties in the process of foreign policy formulation. George Modelski indicates: "Political partys' importance for the study of foreign policy lies in the fact that they are generally speaking nation-wide in scope and reflect a variety of interests."  

The nature of party system has a major bearing on the foreign policy position of political parties. The texture of the foreign policy is mainly determined by the kind of party system, which a political system possesses. The party system is one of the significant subsystems of political system, and the type of party system within which parties function, will to a large extent, determine the manner of its role and influence in the process of making a foreign policy. The most popular taxonomy of party systems is being made on numerical basis. That is a party system is classified on the criterion of the number of parties it comprises. According to this, party systems can
be grouped under four categories, the one party system, the two party system, the multi-party system and the one party dominant system. The objectives and direction of the foreign policy of a polity are moulded by the pattern of interaction among the political parties in a party system. In turn, the nature of inter-party interaction depends on the type of party system. Hence, it is pertinent to analyze the impact of the pattern of party system on the perception of political parties on issues of foreign policy. The perception of political parties will again rest upon the ideology and principles of the party. The ideological predilections of political parties will differ from each other and this diversity will have a phenomenal impact on the foreign policy of a political system. But the question of ideological divergences must be analyzed in the framework of different types of party systems, because the extent of the role of ideology in shaping a polity’s foreign policy can be measured on the basis of the type of party system.

Finally, it can be said that the political parties are one of the most influential variables of a political system having a vital role in the foreign policy making process in a polity. The correlation of political parties and foreign policy is inevitable for a democratic political system. In view of this, the study of inter-relationship between political parties and a foreign policy attains supreme importance. The research in this area is important because of the dynamic nature of the subject. This is due to the reason that political
parties change their policy stances periodically owing to the impact of changes in domestic and international milieu, which counsel for an unstinted examination of dynamics of the field. Summing up the significant role played by the political parties in the process of foreign policy formulation, Marcel Merle observes viewed: “The role played by the political parties in the formulation of foreign policy should be a particularly active one. By virtue of their relations on the one hand with those in power and on the other hand with public opinion, the parties find themselves at the crossroads of the interaction between them and the external affairs.”

With this background of some theoretical dimensions of linkage between democratic politics and foreign policy, it is pertinent to understand Indian political parties’ understanding of India-Pakistan relations.

Indo-Pakistan relations have assumed paramount importance in the realm of foreign affairs of both India and Pakistan. The nature of the foreign policy of India and Pakistan is determined, to a considerable extent, by the climate of their bilateral relations. The defence and strategic policies of both the countries are governed by the atmosphere of their relations, which will, in turn, decide the texture of their foreign policy. By and large for India and Pakistan, their relation is one of the key components of their defence and foreign policy. In view of this, Indo-Pakistan relation is an important subject of interest for the people of both the countries. Even after five and half decades of their independence, their bilateral relations are
unstable as they are marred by their mutual antagonism. Regardless of the four wars and several agreements between the two countries, their relation does not seem to improve. Though there appear compromises, they are temporary and ephemeral. Hence, Indo-Pakistan relation is a subject still left with a lot of scope for cogitating curative measures in order to discover methods for establishing lasting peace between the two.

In India, Indo-Pakistan relation occupies a position of pre-eminence in the ambit of its international relations and it constitutes a pivotal element of the country's defence and foreign policy. The field encompassing Indo-Pakistan relations, has magnetized the cognizance of a wide range of segments in the Indian society comprising of scholars, journalists, interest groups, political parties and even the common public. All have made an attempt to explore the probable ways for resolving the nettled problem and have played their own part in the evolution of India's foreign policy towards Pakistan. They constitute a major domestic situational variables and their suggestions and recommendations have been one of the primary sources for deciding the fabric of India's foreign policy towards Pakistan.

For the elites concerned with the enactment and execution of India's foreign policy, structuring a sagacious foreign policy to deal with this perplexed issue in the ambit of India's external affairs, poses a serious challenge. It can be opined that Indo-Pakistan relations engross a pronounced position in the policies and programmes of
Indian political parties. Political parties as institutional mechanisms of the Indian political systems have played a vital role in determining the texture of India's foreign policy towards Pakistan. The political parties determine the potency of responsiveness of Indian polity to counter challenges. India has to confront a lot of problems due to its ruffled relations with Pakistan. Here political parties' perception of the major issues of Indo-Pakistan relations is responsible for demarcating the scope and dimension of India's foreign policy towards Pakistan. The foreign policy position of India is to considerable extent decided by the nature of its Indo-Pakistan relations. In this regard, the way in which political parties perceive the issues and problems of Indo-Pakistan relations will decide the capability of India to discover counter measures for instituting peaceful relations with its important neighbour. Thus it is pertinent to understand and analyze Indian political parties' perception and evaluation of the issues and problems of Indo-Pakistan relations. In this chapter an attempt has been made to analyze the foreign policy position of the major Indian political parties with special reference to Indo-Pakistan relations.

Foreign Policy Position of the Indian National Congress

The foreign policy position of the Congress party is the result of a long evolutionary process. It is not the outcome of an abrupt reactionary action. Congress party's foreign policy was formulated in the pre-independence period. History is a primary source of India's foreign policy which was moulded by prominent Congress leaders like,
Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Nehru, who laid down the fundamental tenets of India’s foreign policy shaping India’s world view. The views of these leaders were conditioned by India’s rich cultural heritage and its glorious history running into five thousand years. The nature and content of Congress’s foreign policy can be traced back to its attitude towards various international issues expressed in the pre-independence period. Then the Congress party passed several resolutions articulating its views regarding various affairs of the British Indian government outside the jurisdiction of India’s cartographic limits. These resolutions not only delineate India’s world views, but also mark out the primary objectives and principles of India’s foreign policy such as non-alignment, anti-imperialism, anti-racialism and anti-colonialism.

The Congress came to power after independence and played an important role in determining the fundamentals of India’s foreign policy. The main framework of Congress’s foreign policy is shaped by its strong adherence to the principle of non-alignment. Holding that India played a pivotal role in the non-alignment, the Congress [1] views: “The Non-alignment was born out of the aspiration of achieving national self reliance and delineated precisely the perceptions about the security requirements, within the broad perspective of securing a just and equitable world order.”

Further analyzing the overall performance of India’s foreign policy the Congress opined that India was potent enough to
comprehend the turbulence in world politics ushering in the end of a cold war. The Congress [I] holds the view: "India took note of the changed world scenario in the 1990s and has evolved meaningful initiative to position the country in such a way that we maintain the continuity of our foreign policy."¹¹

The Congress [I] is of the view that despite the end of cold war, the significance of non-alignment policy still holds good. It states: "The end of cold war increases rather than reduces the imperatives for fashioning a world order that will secure, the freedom of all States, sovereign equality of all, non-interference in the internal affairs of others, democracy in international relations, peaceful co-existence and opportunities for the full flowering, through mutual co-operation of the potential of the member States and the human family."¹²

The Congress pleads for reforming the UN. The party is of the opinion that for the complete realization of the ideals of India’s foreign policy, it has to seek a strong and more effective role in the UN. For this the organization should be strengthened and democratized by adequately giving representation to the third world countries. Regarding nuclear disarmament the party favours the emergence of a nuclear weapons free world. Further, it holds that the question of nuclear disarmament is a global one and it opposes any attempt to regionalize or sub-continentalise the issue. Regarding the SAARC, the Congress [I] recommends the establishment of a non-legislative parliament for South Asia along the lines of European
parliament, which can become an effective forum for discussing various issues of common interest in the region. Hence with this, the Congress believes that the association could be strengthened. The party welcomes the progress made by the SAARC by setting up of the South Asian Preferential Trading Arrangement [SAPTA] and the South Asian Free Trade Area [SAFTA]. The Congress is in favour of an increased South South co-operation and it believes that India's status of a full-dialogue partner in the Association of South East Asian Nations [ASEAN] will provide great avenues for an added role in world affairs. The Congress [1] holds that in spite of divergences between India and the US on the issues such as the CTBT and NPT, the US occupies a prominent position in India's foreign affairs as it is the largest trading partner. Further, the party holds that there should be a process of constant dialogue with the US on a variety of issues of mutual interest and efforts must be made to institutionalize the dialogue. The Congress holds the view that the traditional tie-up with Russia must be consolidated. As for China, the party views that the major issue in Indo-Chinese relations is the existence of border dispute and the same should be solved with good faith. The party opines that India must take measures to build closer political, economic, commercial, educational and cultural ties with China. On the whole, the Congress's view on India's foreign policy is being summed up as follows: "For fifty years the Congress ensured a durable national consensus on foreign policy. This consensus has
been of late destroyed. The first task must be to restore the consensus.”¹³

Foreign Policy Position of the Indian National Congress Towards Indo-Pakistan Relations

The traumatic cleavage of the sub-continent was commensurate with the independence of India and the birth of a new nation Pakistan. But the people of the sub-continent achieved their cherished dream of liberation, not before they had suffered a considerable amount of anguish. They had to undergo the agony of partition of the culturally coherent, geographically contiguous, ecologically and economically similar entity, after thousands of years of organic existence. The division of the sub-continent was expected solve a political impasse. However, the apportionment of the sub-continent and the ensuing geopolitical and anthropological problems countered by the two newly emancipated nations, rather than ending their problems increased them. Immediately after the independence the Indian National Congress formed the national government and the most urgent foreign policy problem it faced was from partition. The institution of Pakistan which was supposed to end communal bellicosities, unfortunately led the new country to become a hostile neighbour, and Indo-Pakistan relations became a major issue in India’s foreign policy right from the beginning. Speaking about the implications of India’s partition, India’s first prime minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said: “The main thing to remember is that we have been suffering in India not only in
Bengal but also in other parts and probably in Pakistan also, from a fever, a sickness which did not begin with the partition, but with the partition certainly aggravated."14

Though Indo-Pakistan relations have been estranged, the traditional cultural bonds between the people of the two countries have not been dismantled. There existed even after the partition, a deep rooted inter-relation between the citizens of the two countries. But on the political front the intense rivalry never seems to get attenuated. In this context Pandit Nehru viewed: "A large number of people in Pakistan have their friends and relatives here. Similarly, people in India have friends and relatives in Pakistan. When people come over from the other side and meet their old friends they embrace one another. They forget for a moment the new barriers that have sprung up between them and talk of old times with nostalgia."15

The Congress has blamed Pakistan of bringing a cold war to the gate of South Asia by joining the US sponsored military alliance. The party is of the opinion that due to Pakistan’s secret military nexus with China, the security of South Asia is in jeopardy. In this regard, a former Congress president K. Kamraj Nadar pointed out: "It is unfortunate that our neighbour Pakistan has thought fit to indulge in the game of fishing in troubled waters."16

The Congress party holds that the short spell of Lal Bahadur Shastri’s leadership of the nation was a defining time in the history of
bilateral relations between India and Pakistan. His abrupt departure proved to be a great loss to the peace making process with Pakistan. The party opined: "The short, yet eventful and memorable stewardship of the nation by Lal Bahadur Shastri, strengthened the sense of self-confidence in Indian masses which, in fact, was instrumental in leading the country to victory against the aggression of Pakistan in 1965."\[17\]

The party has hailed India's victory against Pakistan in 1971 as a path breaking event in the history of South Asia, for which the towering leadership of Mrs. Indira Gandhi was responsible. The party viewed: "In December 1971, Mrs. Gandhi helped the democratic forces smarting under oppression of the military rulers in East Pakistan to assert themselves, which led to the liberation of Bangladesh as a new nation."\[18\]

The Congress party holds that Pakistan has violated the basic spirit of Shimla Agreement by indulging in attempts to internationalise the Kashmir issue. In this context, a senior Congress leader and the present foreign minister in the UPA government Natwar Singh said: "India wanted to have good relations with the neighbouring country. Shimla Agreement was the basis for having good relations but the government of Pakistan was bent upon internationalizing the Kashmir situation."\[19\]
According to the Congress, the Kargil crisis was the result of deliberate callousness on the part of the BJP led coalition government. The party condemned senior leaders of the BJP led ruling establishment that they were a party to a catastrophe, for which their criminal negligence is responsible. The party commented: "The attitude of Shri Vajpayee led to a lack of vigil on our borders. While Shri Vajpayee slept, the invaders were occupying the treacherous heights from Drass to Chorbatla."²⁰

In the opinion of the Congress, Indo-Pakistan relations are characterized by extreme uncertainties. The nature of their relations has become so perplexed that attainment of cordiality and maintenance of sound diplomatic links seems to have become hard-boiled. According to the editorial of the Congress Sandesh: "If one were to sum up the state of Indo-Pakistan relations, I would do so by recalling the titles of two novels by Charles Dickens, Hard Times but not Great Expectations."²¹

Even after more than five and a half decades of their inception, India and Pakistan have not found any amicable solutions for settling their deep rooted dissonance. Hence the situation becomes dubious. In this regard, a senior Congress leader Natwar Singh believes: "Indo-Pakistan relations are accident prone, so one has to be extra cautious when dealing with this particular diplomatic dynamite".²²
According to the Congress, an amicable solution to the Indo-Pakistan disputes can be achieved only through a constant process of constructive engagement in bilateral dialogue on all outstanding issues including the vexed issue of Jammu and Kashmir and the dialogue should be carried out within the framework of Shimla agreement. Defining its position the Congress opines: "The Congress is committed to a meaningful bilateral dialogue with Pakistan on all issues including Jammu and Kashmir within the framework of the Shimla agreement of 1972."23

The Congress repudiates any third party interference in the process of talks between India and Pakistan. In the party's view: "According to the Shimla agreement no one else can participate in the talks. It has to be just India and Pakistan."24

In the ultimate analysis the view of the Congress on Indo-Pakistan relations are being expressed by the AICC: "The AICC believes that the people of Pakistan sincerely desire friendly relations with Indian people with whom they share much of the history and culture of this sub-continent. However, the rulers of Pakistan have given a totally negative response and have aggravated the relations between the countries by sponsoring terrorism in Punjab, Kashmir and in other areas."25

An analysis of the view of the Congress on Indo-Pakistan relations reveals the idea of the party indicating a sense of acceptance
that partition of the sub-continent was inevitable. But again it has a sense of nostalgia as a great party leader like Pandit Nehru recollects the traditional bonds, which existed among the people despite the political wrangles ushered in after the break up of the sub-continent.

The Congress has expressed its opinion that Indo-Pakistan relation is a very complex issue and it is a major challenge confronted by the makers of India's foreign policy. According to the Congress a viable solution to the vexed issue can be discovered only through a constant process of bilateral dialogue to be conducted within the framework of the Shimla agreement. However, it appears that the dynamic nature of Indo-Pakistan relations and the turbulence in world politics, vitiates strict adherence to a particular strategy in dealing with this tempestuous issue. Hence, it can be opined that the Shimla Agreement must be given a fresh look and it has to be revitalized in the light of the changed circumstances specially after the structural changes that have occurred in the post-cold war epoch. Indo-Pakistan relation has not remained alienated from the global changes. Thus any understanding of the texture of the bilateral relations and the major issues between the two countries and the discovery of amicable solutions to their protracted dispute entail the foreign policy makers to comprehensively conceive the nature and dynamics of global politics and evolve new strategies and policies in accordance with situational variations.
Bharatiya Janata Party

Before analysing the approach of the Bharatiya Janata Party, it is pertinent to understand the approach of its predecessor Bharatiya Jana Sangh.

Foreign Policy Position of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh

According to the Bharatiya Jana Sangh, India's foreign policy must be guided by the factor of enlightened self-interest that is the national interest which includes the welfare and progress of the nation. "This concept of enlightened self-interest means to the party, recognition of China, recognition of Formosa, recognition of Dali Lama's émigré government, liberation of Tebate, joint military pact with Pakistan, and direct association with western block."²⁶

The party is in favour of maintaining a harmonious relationship with all the countries and the party seeks to work for establishing world peace and mutual friendship between India and other countries. The party is of the opinion that Bharat's membership of the commonwealth has not been beneficial to India because of the pro-Pakistan predilection depicted in the British policies. The Jana Sangh expresses its unflinching co-operation with the UN and it is in favour of bringing necessary amendments to the UN charter so as to make the organization potent enough. So that it can become the real representative of the people and function more effectively as an instrument of world pace and co-operation. The party further states:
“It will try to get a permanent seat for Bharath in the security council.”

This being the broader objective of Jana Sangh’s foreign policy, it vociferously claims Kashmir issue to be a major issue in India’s foreign policy. Apart from this, the party feels that, to baffle the danger posed by India’s hostile neighbour China, India should befriend those countries that face a similar threat because they will become India’s natural friends. The Jana Sangh opines that India should strengthen its relationship with countries like Japan, Australia, Malaysia, Thailand and Formosa. This will enable India to put up a joint military front to counter the security threats from China. According to the party, a country’s position in the realm of international politics depends upon its economic and military strength. “It is the confirmed view of the Jana Sangh that permanent peace is not possible so long as there exist, political slavery, economic exploitation, social discrimination and selfish lust for power.”

Viewing from the strength of its prognosis that China and Pakistan are India’s natural enemies, the party holds that a country must mould its foreign policy in accordance with the attitude of its neighbours. Hence, India’s foreign policy must be fashioned as a response to the behaviour of China and Pakistan. Emphasizing that defence and foreign policy are closely inter-twined, the party holds that India should strengthen its defence in the light of the perils posed by its two immediate and hostile neighbours. The party strongly
favours more budget allocation for defence and it holds that India must go in for nuclear weapons. According to the Jana Sangh, non-alignment becomes extraneous in the light of the hostile character of Sino-Indian relations. Hence, the party felt that India should adhere to an independent foreign policy based on its national interest. The party criticized the ruling Congress for not practising the principles of non-alignment in its genuine purport, because the Congress exhibited some proclivity towards a particular block while dealing with some international questions. Hence, the whole concept of non-alignment becomes irrelevant and needs re-examination. M.L. Sondhi viewed: “India can ill afford the kind of rigid and dogmatic world outlook, which has come to be associated with the policy of non-alignment.”

Further, Sondhi observed: “Although it is often paraded that it has contributed to the Indian diplomacy, in fact the non-alignment cult has resulted in depriving India a flexibility in the choice of means in a rapidly changing world situation.” Criticizing the way in which India’s foreign policy has been conducted, the Jana Sangh described: “The foreign policy that India had been pursuing all these years, is based on platitudes and slogans.”

In its approach towards international relations and foreign policy, there appeared a section within the Jana Sangh, having pro-American proclivity. The forerunner of this segment was Balraj Madhok. Mohammad Ali Kishore opined: “Jana Sangh also contains
a pro-Western group among its ranks, of which chief spokesman is
Balraj Madhok he supports almost all the moves of the US.”

Thus, an analysis of the view of the Jana Sangh towards India’s
foreign policy shows that the party expresses a radical view on the
major issues of India’s foreign policy. On the one hand, its extreme
emphasis on Pakistan and China can be visualized and on the other,
there is a fierce criticism of the way in which the principle of non-
alignment was practised by the Congress government. An emphasis is
laid upon the need for the re-examination of this fundamental
principle of India’s foreign policy. Overall the position of the party
on India’s foreign policy can be summed up in the words of Shyama
Prasad Mukerjee, the first president of the party: “Regarding foreign
policy our party believes that it should be more realistic, the primary
condition being the advancement of the cause of our own country in
the maintenance of pace and goodwill in the international sphere.”

Bharatiya Jana Sangh’s Approach Towards Indo-Pakistan
Relations

The essence of Jana Sangh’s approach towards Indo-Pakistan
relations lies in its vitriolic criticism of the Congress government
foreign policy, particularly its policy towards Pakistan. Congress
government was heeding on significant issues concerning Indo-
Pakistan relations such as the border dispute, infiltration, and the
problem of minorities and Kashmir. The party criticized Pakistan for
provoking proxy war and augmenting tension in the border. The Jana Sangh stated: “Indo-Pakistan relations have been strained since the day Pakistan was established as a separate State. In fact, this estrangement is inherent in the circumstances in which Pakistan was born.”

The party considered: “Both communist China and Pakistan are India’s natural enemies.” The Jana Sangh elaborated the idea that the ultimate and permanent solution of the ills of Indo-Pakistan relations is the unification of the two countries and the emergence of an integrated India. Defining its position the BJS believed: “The number of people who are beginning to realize that annulment of partition is essential for the well being of the country and for the maintenance of world peace is daily increasing both in Bharath and Pakistan.”

The BJS catered to the notion that a peaceful foreign policy aimed at gratifying Pakistan has not yielded any advantage to India. Hence, the party called for a structural reorientation of India’s foreign policy towards Pakistan. As Pakistan has always followed a hostile policy towards India, India’s foreign policy should be made more stringent in order to counter the belligerent policy of Pakistan. The BJS held the opinion: “The policy of appeasement that has so long been followed has not changed the mentality of the leaders of Pakistan, on the contrary it has strengthened it. The Jana Sangh is against giving any concessions to Pakistan.”
An analysis of the position of the BJS towards the foreign policy of Indian governments, depicts the fact that like all opposition parties the party displayed a sense of reprehension. The party has made capricious suggestions to deal with various issues of Indo-Pakistan relations.

The Jana Sangh holds that the only solution for the various problems of Indo-Pakistan relations like the Kashmir issue, minorities problems and the border disputes is the integration of the two countries and the creation of a united India. This is an ambitious, philosophical and idealistic viewpoint. If we consider the divergent ideological convictions affirmed in India and Pakistan, integration seems to be preposterous. The Jana Sangh's proposal that unification is the solution for all the problems of Indo-Pakistan relations is credible. But again it is hazardous to unflinchingly adore to the persuasions of the BJS considering the Hindu nationalistic disposition of the party. The Hindu fundamentalist ideological predilections of the party poses an insecure base for the non-Hindu neighbours as aptly pointed by Geet Puri: "In the literature of Indian politics, political parties and party system in India, the Bharatiya Jana Sangh had been described variedly as reactionary, communal, Hindu revivalist, ultra rightist, militant nationalist in its ideological orientation and organizational behaviour."
Foreign Policy Position of the Baharatiya Janata Party

Foreign policy position of the BJP bears in itself the traces of the ideology and principles laid down by its predecessor the Bharatiya Jana Sangh. The BJP assigns the top most priority to national security and the party criticized the former Congress governments for not giving proper attention to the crucial issues of national security and for attenuating the significance of consensus on foreign policy. Defining its position the party expresses: "The security of the nation is our paramount duty. In fulfillment of this sacred duty we will ensure that the neglect of defence preparedness by the previous governments shall be corrected." 

Like the Jana Sangh the BJP has been critical towards the way in which the principle of non-alignment has been defined and practised by the Congress government. Hailing the Janata party government for conducting India's foreign policy purely on the lines of non-alignment, the party calls for a re-evaluation of the principle of non-alignment in the light of changing international situation. In this regard the BJP holds the view: "Need of genuine non-alignment, without making any changes in the basic postulates of our foreign policy. Janata government conducted in a manner that all misapprehensions of our tilting towards a super power, were removed and our image abroad brightened."
The Bharatiya Janata party is of the opinion that there is an absence of a rational foreign policy and hence the country is still in search of a sagacious foreign policy, which will be potent enough to fulfil the requirements of our defence and security needs. In this regard, a senior BJP leader and former finance minister Jaswant Singh remarked in the Lok Sabha: “We are really in search of a foreign policy. In the absence of foreign policy, an identifiable and an intelligible foreign policy.”

Further criticizing the Janata Dal government for inadequate budget allocation for defence Jaswant Singh reiterated the party’s stand that defence must be given top priority, because defence and foreign policy are inextricably linked with each other. Jaswant Singh throws light upon the concept of security. He said: “I, however, mentioned defence and foreign policies, because there is an inbuilt inter-relationship. But that inter-relationship is now a great deal wider, much wider in fact. The whole concept of security is much wider concept. That covers not simply of military security, there is an aspect of economic security, there is the aspect of energy security and there is the aspect of food security.”

The BJP condemned the hegemonistic politics practised by the super powers at the time of cold war. The party is of the view that due to the politics of interventionism followed by the super powers, the world experienced a situation of heightened tensions and a ghastly arms race and there was a re-incarnation of the cold war in the 1980s.
The party opines: “We firmly reject the myth that there is any super power exclusivity in the giving of direction to world events.”

The BJP is of the opinion that the condition of the people of Indian origin settled abroad is pathetic, as they have become hapless victims of racial discrimination and oppression. The people of Indian origin are being suppressed in spite of their being in a majority. The party notes with regret that the government of India did not formulate any comprehensive policy in order to free the people of Indian origin from their plight. The party holds that: “The Bharatiya Janata party demands that the government of India should formulate a clear policy in regard to people of Indian origin settled in foreign countries so that effective steps may be taken to solve their problems satisfactorily.”

The BJP interprets India’s foreign policy in the first three decades after independence in terms of cold war politics. The party holds that the nature of India’s foreign policy was moulded by the antecedents emanating from the turbulence in world politics due to cold war. Further, the party states that the direction of India’s foreign policy was determined by the texture of its relationship with the two cold war rivals, US and USSR. A senior BJP leader, L. K. Advani considers: “India’s foreign policy framework was based primarily on three facts the cold war between USA and USSR, an ensuring relationship with the USSR which suited both the parties and a fluctuating relations with the United States, who stood committed to
Pakistan, because of the perception that it was a dependable bulwark against the spread of communism.\textsuperscript{45}

The BJP is of the opinion that qualitative changes have occurred in the international relations after the cold war. The party further holds that the new scenario not only presents new challenges to India, but also it has opened new vistas for India’s development. Defining its position the BJP opines: “Curtain has finally been drawn over the cold war which has dominated world for most part of the current century. The new situation is a challenging one, at the same it is pregnant with several fresh opportunities to enlarge India’s role in global affairs.”\textsuperscript{46}

The BJP welcomed the end of communism in the Soviet Union and the establishment of democracy in Russia. Recollecting the cordial relationships between India and the USSR for the last four decades, the party is in favour of strengthening India’s relations with the new republics emerged after the disintegration of USSR. In this regard the BJP says: “The end of communism and advent of democracy in the Soviet Union are welcome developments. India and Soviet Union have developed and nurtured their friendship and co-operation for nearly four decades. It is in India’s interest to continue to develop friendship and co-operation with the Soviet Union as also with the republics.”\textsuperscript{47}
The party is of the opinion that in the changed global order, wherein structural changes have taken place in the nature of international relations, the country's foreign policy must be re-oriented. So: "Our diplomacy must be more vigorous and active bilaterally in order to explain our point of view to seek understanding and support on matters of vital interest to us. Economic diplomacy must be integrated with the conventional diplomacy." 48

The BJP is of the opinion that India's foreign policy must be oriented in such a manner that pro-active steps can be taken in order to strengthen relations with neighbours like China. Such a policy must be fashioned in such a manner that our action will not be detrimental to the territorial integrity of the nation. The party further states that a rational strategy must be formulated to improve relations with China - one of India's most important neighbours. The party opined: "We must take vigorous efforts to remove irritants in our relations with our neighbours. We must consciously strive to normalize relations between India and China." 49

Further the BJP views that India's foreign policy in the past had been penchant, because it was tilted towards the West. Hence, the BJP calls for the re-structuring of India's foreign policy, so as to make it more global in order to reach the untouched areas specially the East. In this regard the party has evolved a new strategy called the look - East policy. The party is the view: "So far India has mainly looked to the West for political, economic, commercial and
cultural contacts. It is about time that we turn our attention to the East.\(^5^0\)

The party is of the opinion that the optimistic signs brought about by the end of cold war is being proved to be farcical. International conflicts seem to be unending and there is a re-incarnation of colonialism and imperialism in a new form. In this regard the party position is: "The end of cold war brings no peace. It was the fond hope of the people of India, that the end of cold war would usher in an era of peace, co-operation and the all round development of friendly relations among the nations of the world. This hope has been belied and there is still conflict and tension in many parts of the world."\(^5^1\)

The party is of the opinion that India's relations with the US must be based on the principles of equality and mutual benefits. Further, the party reiterates that the policies of the US towards this region lacks direction. The party opines: "Our relations with the US will be based upon mutual respect and a congruence of interests. We note however that the US policy towards this region continues to suffer from lack of vision and we find that it disregards India's political and security interests."\(^5^2\)

Further, the party stated in its election manifesto of 1996 Lok Sabha elections: "The BJP will launch a vigorous campaign for a permanent membership for India in the UN Security Council."\(^5^3\) The
party further states that there should be a structural change for the effective functioning of the UN, because the existing system in the UN is advantageous to big powers. The BJP believes: "We believe that the existing arrangements in the UN are tilted in favour of certain countries to serve their narrow interests. We are committed to the reform of the UN." 54

The BJP which claims to assign top most priority to national security declared, in its election manifesto of general elections 1998: "We are committed to establish a national security council to constantly annualize security, political and economic threats and render continuous advice to the government."55 It can be noted that the BJP has kept up its words and after the BJP led coalition government came to power at the center in 1998, a national security council was established.

The foreign policy position of the BJP in its initial days was entrenched in the framework of the ideology of its predecessor the Jana Sangh. But the position of the party on the foreign policy issues was liberated from the shackles of the principles of Jana Sangh and the approach of the new party towards the issues of foreign policy witnessed qualitative changes in due course of time. This change in the approach arose due to the dynamic nature of international relations in order to adopt itself to the rapidly changing scenario of international relations and to give a foreign policy prescription which will be abreast to the changing circumstances. The party has revised
its stances upon various foreign policy issues. For example, the BJP which had expressed its unflinching faith in the principle of NAM, stated that after the end of cold war, it had lost its relevance and it has to be re-oriented if it had to retain its significance, in accordance with changed circumstances.

**Foreign Policy Position of BJP Towards Indo-Pakistan Relations**

Since its inception the BJP held a critical standpoint towards various issues involved in the ambit of Indo-Pakistan relations. The relations with neighbours have a major bearing upon a country's defence and foreign policy. It is very significant to have peaceful relations with neighbours. A country which has more neighbours on its borders must evolve a rational foreign policy in order to maintain sanctity in the region. The BJP states: "It has been the party’s view that our national interest is best served by creating an environment of peace and harmony in our neighbourhood. But this can only be done on the basis of mutual benefit and co-operation."56 The BJP holds that Pakistan is the most important neighbour of India, and relations with whom commends great strategic relevance and the effectiveness of India's foreign policy depends upon its potency in fostering India's national interest when there is a bargain with Pakistan. Following the footsteps of the Jana Sangh the BJP regards Pakistan as India's primary enemy. The BJP commented: "We have today exceptionally good relations with all our neighbours except the very hostile Pakistan."57
The BJP is of the opinion that the bilateral relationship between India and Pakistan must be re-oriented putting behind what has happened in the past. It is the party’s view that it is not just the question of improving the mutual relationship between the two nations, but it is also to the benefit of India if a stable and prosperous Pakistan emerges. A senior BJP leader and the former prime minister A. B. Vajpayee explained in the Lok Sabha: “I have already said on the floor of both the houses and I would like to reiterate that a secure and prosperous Pakistan is in India's interest. We must not remain mired in the past and prisoners of old contentions.”

The party holds that there should be an agreement between the two countries upon the non-use of force. In view of the deadly arms race going on between Indo-Pakistan, the party viewed: “The BJP is of the view that Pakistan must not stay rooted in the prejudices of the past. It must abjure from the established pattern of over arming and commenting on India’s internal affairs.”

The Bharatiya Janata Party states that after the end of the cold war the American policy towards South Asia may witness a qualitative change. But it has not happened so far and the pro-Pakistan tilt in the American policies towards South Asia continues. The BJP says: “The BJP cannot but express its shock and resentment, that despite the end of the cold war there continues a pro-Pakistan tilt in the American policy towards the Indian sub-continent.”
Thus, an analysis of the BJP approach towards Indo-Pakistan relationship, indicates the fact that its views have been largely influenced by the position taken by its predecessor the Jana Sangh. But even though BJP's approach towards Indo-Pakistan relationship finds its genesis in the policies and programmes of the Jana Sangh, in due course of time, the BJP's views on Indo-Pakistan relationship began to get divorced from the fundamental principles of the Jana Sangh. This aspect is demonstrated by the stand taken by the party regarding the fundamental nature of the problem in Indo-Pakistan relations and the probable solutions for the problems. For instance, the Jana Sangh had stated that the only solution for the ills of Indo-Pakistan relations was the creation of a united India and the annihilation of the partition. But contrary to this, the BJP leaders express totally divergent views. A. B. Vajpayee remarks: "History can be changed but not geography."\textsuperscript{61}

**Foreign Policy Position of the Janata Party**

In short stint at the center, the Janata party efficiently conducted its foreign affairs within the framework of the fundamental principle of India's foreign policy, that is Non-alignment. The Janata party views that international situation is a dynamic variable. The party holds that: "The primary task of foreign policy is to respond to the challenges as well as opportunities thrown up by it."\textsuperscript{62} The Janata party viewed that a strict adherence to the principle of non-alignment is beneficial to India's national interest. The hostilities of the cold
war could be morally and justifiably countered by an unflinching faith in the principle of non-alignment. This position of the Janata party was highlighted by the then foreign minister in the Janata government, A. B. Vajpayee: “Non-alignment to most people provided the answer to the dilemma between as it were, thesis and antithesis between the containment of communism and the burial of capitalism.”

Ultimately, it can be stated that the foreign policy of the Janata party rested on the plank of one significant principle that is the conduct of foreign affairs on the basis of genuine non-alignment.

**Indo-Pakistan Relations**

The Janata party believed in a mutually beneficial relationship with all the neighbours of India. The party further states that Pakistan assumes a top place among all the neighbouring countries and normal relations with Pakistan will be in the interest of India. In this regard, the visit of Janata party government’s foreign minister, A. B. Vajpaee to Pakistan indicated the keenness of the government to normalize its relations with Pakistan. Really Vajpayee’s visit went a long way in the maintenance of a cordial relationship with Pakistan. M.S.Rajan points out: “It was very astute on the part of Mr. Vajpayee to have made the gesture of a personal visit to Islamabad and having given personal assurance to Pakistan government of the continuation of the earlier policy of speedy normalization of relations.”
The Janata party remained in the main stream of national politics only for a short duration. Hence, there is a paucity of literature regarding the policies and programmes of the party, but from whatever is available, it can be summed up its foreign policy was based on the twin principle of pursuit a genuine non-alignment and emphasis upon the cordial and mutual relationship with its neighbours.

**Foreign Policy Position of the Janata Dal**

At the outset, the Janata Dal viewed that India’s foreign policy has become important at a crucial time of intense turbulence in the international arena. The party expressed its view: “At a time of a grave and traumatic international change, India’s foreign policy is conceptually paralysed and operationally dormant, amounting to feeble knee-jerk response to earth shaking events leading to taking a back seat in the comity of nations.”

The Janata Dal states that India’s foreign policy must be re-oriented in the light of emerging challenges of a dynamic world order. The party holds that India’s foreign policy must be shaped in such a manner that it should be potent enough to serve the domestic requirements and facilitate to achieve a better role for India in world affairs. The Janata Dal holds that the end of cold war is an icebreaking event in the history of world affairs. The party further states that India must take full advantage of the emerging structural changes which will lead to the ushering in of a new era of global
peace and to carve out a global role for itself. The party is of the opinion that in the changed global scenario, the UN has a central role to play in determining the texture of world affairs. For increasing the effectiveness of the UN, the party suggests the greater democratization of this world body. The Janata Dal observes: “India should vigorously join the international enterprises to build the world without conflicts and confrontation, making the United Nations, the pivot of regional and international security.” The Janata Dal holds that non-alignment, the cardinal principle of India's foreign policy has not lost relevance due to the end of cold war. The NAM has a significant role not only in the preservation of world peace, but also it has to play a vital role in the sphere of economic development by promoting South South co-operation. The party holds the view: “Non-alignment as an ideology of independence and dignity of the new nations is, at all times, relevant. But it must find its new creative dimension clearly and unmistakably in favour of world peace and co-operation on equal terms.”

The Janata Dal holds that India's relations with the US must be based on the principle of equality and mutual benefit. In the election manifesto of 1996, the party made a solemn resolve to strengthen relations with the US without compromising the sovereignty and dignity of India. The party is in favour of revitalizing India's relations with Russia after the collapse of the USSR and strengthen its relations with Commonwealth countries, European countries and
Japan. Further, the party is in favour of greater co-operation among the countries of South Asia and for promoting this, the party states that the SAARC must be institutionally strengthened. Janata Dal criticized the interference of the US in the affairs of South Asia in the name of maintenance of balance of power. Further, the party holds that the border dispute with China must be solved at the political level on the basis of equality and mutual benefit. The Janata Dal notes: “The joint boundary commission could be raised to higher political status and joint expert bodies could identify the border with the latest technique of cartography and begin to resolve the border sector to mutual satisfaction.”

The party further holds that India and China being two of the largest countries of the world are capable of making a significant contribution to world peace and with this co-operation in South Asia can be strengthened. For this the Janata Dal views that India and China must involve themselves more in the process of constructive engagement in order to improve the relationship between them.

Finally the Janata Dal criticized that the governments have forgotten the importance of consensus among all the parties on issues of foreign policy. With this the process of formulation of foreign policy becomes undemocratic. A senior leader of the Janata Dal leader and former prime minister I. K. Gujral viewed: “The main point I am trying to say that, consensus is the strength of India, consensus is the...
strength of the party. But I say with a great deal of regret that, even now, I do not see the process of consensus emerging."

Thus an analysis of the foreign policy position of the Janata Dal depicts the point that the fundamental framework of the parties’ foreign policy rests upon the plank of the principle of non-alignment. The party is in favour of strengthening India’s relations with major powers of the world on the basis of the principle of equality and mutual benefit. For instance, an analysis of the party’s views on the Sino-India relations, it appears that the party upholds the principles of Panchsheel for improving the bilateral relations between the two countries. And finally, like all parties, the Janata Dal underlines the significance of consensus in the process of formulation of India’s foreign policy.

**Indo-Pakistan Relations**

The Janata Dal seems to give a top priority to India’s relations with the neighbours in its foreign policy. The Gujral doctrine evolved by its senior leader I. K. Gujral which elucidates the significance of India’s following an accommodative attitude while dealing with its neighbours, explains, to some extent, the nature of Janata Dal’s foreign policy position towards India’s neighbours. The party defines its position: “India’s external relations under the UF government has been guided by what is known as the Gujral doctrine. Under this
doctrine India has strengthened its ties with the neighbours in South Asia on the basis of generosity and non-reciprocity."  

The party is of the opinion that the SAARC can act as an effective mechanism to strengthen co-operation among India and her neighbours. For this the party feels that the association must be strengthened through incorporating more provisions in the constitution of the association for strengthening co-operation in the field of trade and fiscal affairs.

With respect to India's relations with Pakistan, the party said that India's policy must aim at:

"(1) making it abundantly clear to Pakistan through diplomacy, public relations and adequate security measures, that it cannot seize Kashmir from India and that the low intensity conflict is a double-edged weapon which can hurt Pakistan equally if not more."  

The Janata Dal is of the opinion that the on-going Indo-Pakistan tensions must not be an impediment for the promotion of people to people contact between the two countries. The party favours more people-to-people contact between the two countries. When the party was in power at the center, it had announced various steps to boost people to people contact. I. K. Gujral remarked in the Lok Sabha: "To promote people to people relations, we have decided to permit Pakistani tourists to visit India in groups."
An examination of the view of the Janata Dal in Indo-Pakistan relations shows that the party attempts to view Indo-Pakistan relations from the perspective of Gujral doctrine. The party's view on Indo-Pakistan relations hinges upon the principle of equal treatment to Pakistan as a sovereign nation and as a bigger country. India must make some concessions to Pakistan as a smaller neighbour as envisaged in the Gujral doctrine and build a peaceful relation with it. The Janata Dal's views on Indo-Pakistan relations indicate that the party favoured the conduct of India's relations with Pakistan on the basis of principles of equality and mutual benefit. The party favours normalizing of India's relations with Pakistan without recourse to military means. In the ultimate analysis, it appears here that the views of Janata Dal on Indo-Pakistan relations resemble to some extent the policy framework of the Janata party.

Foreign Policy of the Communist Parties

The Communist parties in India assign top most priority to the issues relating to foreign policy, because their policy is shaped by the international Communist movement. The Communist party of India [CPI] since its beginning holds that imperialism is a major threat to world pace and considers the US as an imperialist country and criticizes it as an enemy of world peace. The foreign policy position of the CPI rests upon its support to world peace, non-alignment, disarmament, anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism and friendship with all, specially the socialist countries. The CPI viewed that at the time
of cold war, it was the efforts of Soviet Union which led to the emergence of a situation of détente between the US and the USSR and the CPI sees the changing international situation: "By underlining the activation of new thinking by Gorbachev leadership which brought about fundamental changes in international relations for the better."73

The CPI viewed that the collapse of the USSR and the socio-economic system in Eastern Europe cannot be regarded as the failure of socialism. But this is a failure of a particular model of socialism. It failed in the Soviet Union because, there it was distorted and perverted. The CPI views that socialism in the USSR was having anti-democratic and bureaucratic characters. In view of this the party is of the opinion that there has to be a re-orientation of the principles of Marxism in order to suit Indian conditions: "We have to integrate our Marxist theory with the specific conditions in India and the legacy and heritage of Indian culture, traditions and social developments and to chalk out our own course for democratic and socialist transformation."74

The CPI is an ardent proponent of creating a world without wars. Criticizing the US action in the Gulf as imperial, it holds that due to the hegemonistic politics of the US, which it demonstrated by invoking the US trade law 301 against India, because of which, the process of North South Co-operation collapsed. The CPI opines that to counter the US hegemony, international institutions like the UN,
NAM and the SAARC must be strengthened. Through these institutions the third world unit can be created to counter any such international challenges. The CPI states: "India must uphold its independence, pursue anti-imperialist foreign policy and strive for strengthening the role of the UN in the world affairs and in cooperation with the like minded, wage a consistent struggle for a new international economic order." 

The CPI is of the opinion that non-alignment has not lost its relevance despite the end of cold war. It further states that the non-aligned countries can come together for promoting the socio-economic development of the third world countries. The CPI believes in South South co-operation: "From this perspective, the NAM can play an important role in working out concerted measures." 

The CPI believes that India's relations with China must be revitalized. The party opines: "The unfortunate events of 1962 should not be allowed to become a permanent impediment to the restoration of normal Sino-Indian relations and the border dispute should be resolved on the basis of mutually agreed principles." 

An analysis of the foreign policy position of the CPI demonstrates that the party has been inconsistent in its approach to some of the issues in India's foreign policy and relations. This can be noticed in its inconsistent attitude towards the USSR. Initially the party supported the policies of the Soviet Union as constructive and
credited it by saying that the USSR has played a vital role in bringing world peace at the time of cold war. It further hailed the democratic policies of Gorbachev and said that it was responsible for bringing qualitative changes in the international affairs. But when there was the collapse of the Soviet Union, the party made a U turn and said that Soviet Union collapsed as its socialism was perverted and it had anti-democratic and bureaucratic features. Further, it can be said here that the party’s foreign policy position chiefly hinges upon two significant factors that is its criticism of US as an imperial power and its probable tilt in favour of China. All these tenets of the CPI’s foreign policy came to light after the end of cold war. Hence, it seems here that the foreign policy position of the CPI has undergone a structural change after the end of cold war. But this change particularly relates to its ideological predilections and approach towards socialism. Hence, the collapse of the USSR shoved away the party from the USSR and drove it closer to China. Hence, the post cold war foreign policy of the CPI can be described as a critique of anti-imperialist designs of the US, the policy of appeasement towards China and unflinching adherence to the policy of non-alignment.

The Communist Party of India [Marxist]

In view of the CPI [M], the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the collapse of socialist system in Eastern Europe have shifted the balance of power in favour of the imperialists. The reason for this the CPI [M] holds the view: “The dismantling of the socialist system in
Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, is the result of the accumulation, distortion and revisionist deviation in applying Marxist Leninist principles to building socialism and deformation in Socialist Democracy.  

The party has criticized that the US and other imperialist forces are exploiting the international situation which ushered in after the collapse of the socialist system and hence they are trying to establish their own hegemony and impose a world order which is favourable to them. The CPI [M] viewed that the hegemonistic politics of the US was demonstrated at the time of the Gulf war and the UN was impotent to curb the imperial designs of the US. For this the party blames the former Soviet Union for conniving with the US and supporting the resolution for a military action in the Gulf in 1990. The party has criticized India for co-operating with the Western powers. But the CPI [M] has hailed the role of Cuba which voted against the resolution and China for abstaining from voting.

The CPI [M] opines that the end of cold war brought about a very challenging international situation, because the US has begun attempts for a quixotic perpetuation of its hegemony and revising the world order for its advantage. In this deleterious situation, the CPI [M] holds that pursuance of an anti-imperialist non-aligned foreign policy will facilitate the restoration of world peace. The party believes that India's national interest both security and economic can be protected and India's urge for a prominent role in the world
politics can be accomplished by strict adherence to the principle of non-alignment. But the CPI [M] observes that India has denounced the principles of non-alignment and the government is co-operating with the imperialist forces in their machinations. In view of this the party criticized the Narasimha Rao government: "Instead of reviewing non-alignment and strengthening South-South co-operation, it sent troops to Somalia in the civil war to subserve the interest of US imperialism."79

The CPI [M] favours close and friendly relations with India's neighbours prominently China. The party opines that the strengthening of bilateral relations between the two Asian giants will be favourable in the protection of vital national interests of both the countries. According to the party, India and China together can play a vital role in world politics and preserve world peace by countering imperialist forces. The CPI [M] hailed Chinese stand on Kashmir issue as China held the position that Kashmir issue is purely a bilateral one and it has to be resolved within the framework of Shimla agreement.

The CPI [M] criticizes the discriminatory regimes like the CTBT and the NPT and opposes the US pressures mounted upon India to sign these agreements. It criticized Russia for coming under the US pressures and denying the sale of Cryogenic rocket engines to India. The party articulates that the US: "Got Russia to cancel the
agreement to sell cryogenic rocket engines to India and imposed sanctions on ISRO.\textsuperscript{80}

An overview of the foreign policy position of the CPI [M] demonstrates that unlike the CPI, the party has maintained a definite position on some of the issues concerning India’s foreign policy and relations. The CPI which initially supported the democratic reforms launched by the Gorbachev leadership that is the Perestroika and Glasnost, later on criticized the Soviet leadership that it had perverted the ideology of socialism, which brought about the collapse of socialist system in Eastern Europe and Soviet Union. Whereas the CPI [M] right from the beginning had criticized Gorbachev leadership for revising the principles of Marxism and Leninism. The attitude of the CPI indicates that the party suffers from a dilemma of choice between the Chinese communism and the Russian model. But the CPI [M] has had a firm inclination towards China. Overall it appears that both the parties do not have solid ideological inclinations in the ambit of foreign policy and the two Communist parties have attempted to dilute their ideological proclivities in order to modify their policy positions to express the views on foreign policy which will be within the purview of the fundamental doctrines of India’s foreign policy. Hence, both the parties have supported the principle of non-alignment as the most significant principle of India’s foreign policy. Further, the approach of both the parties towards India’s relations with world’s major powers and prominent neighbours are similar.
On Indo-Pakistan relations, the position of the Communist parties is identical based on their ideological predilections and the framework of their principles. At the outset the CPI views that Kashmir is the most significant issue in Indo-Pakistan relations. The nature and content of the bilateral relations between the two countries rests upon the single most important issue of Kashmir. The CPI has opined that Pakistan has made all kinds of efforts to solve the Kashmir dispute in their own favour and hence Pakistan government, in liaison with its main intelligence agency ISI, is waging a proxy war against India. These malign endeavours of Pakistan have been nurtured by the US imperialists for their imperial interests. The CPI comments: "Kashmir continues to be a major national political issue with its international dimension [Pakistan waging proxy war through ISI trained militants] and US imperialists are fishing in troubled waters to realize their own evil designs." 

The CPI has expressed a deep sense of concern regarding the increasing tensions between India and Pakistan. The party holds that due to the policy of military aggrandizement followed by both the countries on their borders, a war-like situation has developed in the region, threatening the security environment in South Asia. The party further states that this volatile situation has been exploited by the religious fundamentalists on both the sides for their self-centered purposes and this has worsened the situation. So an aura of uncertainty and insecurity prevails in the region. The party argues:
“The 18th Congress of Communist party of India expresses grave concern on the continued tension at Indo-Pak border and further deterioration of the relations between the two countries." In the ultimate analysis is that the CPI regards the issue of improving relations with Pakistan as of key importance. The CPI appeals to the democratic and anti-imperialist forces in Pakistan, not to fall a prey to the influence of the US to solve the Kashmir problem. It should be solved bilaterally without the intervention of outsiders.

According to the Communist party of India [Marxist], Indo-Pakistan relation is the most prominent antecedent that has the potency to determine the texture of geo-politics in South Asia. The party holds that a normal healthy and cordial bilateral relation between India and Pakistan is *sine quo non* for preserving peace and security. According to the party, the relations between the two countries are very complex and the complexity has deepened in recent years. The party believes that the problems between the two countries can be amicably solved by constructive bilateral engagement between India and Pakistan. The party underlines: “The key to peace and harmonious developments in South Asia lies in the complex web of India-Pakistan relations.”

Further, the party holds that the relations between India and Pakistan have worsened because of the blatant interference of Pakistan in the internal affairs of India by attempting to internationalize Kashmir issue. According to the party, the ruling elites in Pakistan...
have tried to internationalize Kashmir problem by patronizing the secessionist movement in Kashmir. They are doing this to divert the attention of their citizens from the discontentment prevailing in Pakistan due to lack of political stability and socio-economic development. The CPI [M] considers: “The relations with Pakistan have worsened. The ruling class of Pakistan are making Kashmir the central point.”

The CPI [M] has criticized the BJP led coalition government for coming under the US pressure while conducting its relations with Pakistan. The party opines that the diplomatic step that was initiated by the Vajpayee led government was basically done under the US pressure and with an intention to gain political mileage in the domestic politics. The party says: “Under American pressure and its anxiety to overcome international isolation after the Pokhran blasts, Vajpayee agree to go to Lahore for talks in February this year. The exaggerated claims of success of the Lahore bus trip of Vajpayee was made in the hope of making political capital in India.”

The examination of the view of the Communist parties on Indo-Pakistan relations indicates that both the Communist parties have not given adequate priority to the issues pertaining to Indo-Pakistan relations in their policies and programmes. This has happened because the foreign policy of the Communist parties is concentrated mainly to facilitate their search for an identity in the international communist movement and it is prominently based on their anti-
imperialist struggle. Though the views of both the parties on Indo-
Pakistan relations differ in content, they are embedded in similar
principles and ideological predilections. Both the parties have
accepted the inescapable fact that Indo-Pakistan relations constitute
one of the most significant factors in determining the geo-politics of
South Asia. The Communist parties have accepted the centrality of
Kashmir issue in Indo-Pakistan relations and the parties' view on
Indo-Pakistan relations reflect a tinge of anti-Americanism. Both the
Communist parties have been ardent critiques of American
interference in the affairs of Indo-Pakistan relations specially its role
in relation to Kashmir issue. The parties have also criticized that
some pro-capitalist sections of the ruling elite both in India and
Pakistan have facilitated America to exercise its influence over the
region. Hence, it can be opined that the foreign policy position of the
Communist parties on Indo-Pakistan relations has been a critique of
American role in the affairs of Indo-Pakistan relations and India's
subservience to American interests. This shows tendency of Indian
government to bow to American pressures while conducting its
relation with Pakistan.

An overview of the foreign policy position of the major Indian
political parties brings to the ultimate conclusion that there exists a
broad consensus among the major political parties, on significant
issues of India's foreign policy and relations. The political parties in
India have accepted the fundamental principles of India's foreign
policy like the non-alignment as the quintessence of India's foreign policy and they have not attempted to propagate for a fundamental change in these principles. All political parties have broad agreement over the key problems in India's foreign policy and relations. This means that the view of political parties on major issues of India's foreign policy such as national security, economic security, nuclear disarmament, foreign trade, neo-imperialism, etc. and India's relations with the major powers of the world like the US, UK and Russia or with prominent neighbours like China and Pakistan are not debatable and contradictory. Hence, it can be said that the foreign policy positions of the major Indian political parties do not differ in nature and content but they differ only in interpretation of the fundamental issues in India's foreign policy. It seems that in India no political party has strong ideological inclinations while formulating their foreign policy position and hence it can be said that issues rather than ideology is the determining factor of the nature and content of the foreign policy position of Indian political parties.

On Indo-Pakistan relations, the views of political parties again do not contain fundamental differences. All the major political parties have accepted the significance of Indo-Pakistan relations for India's foreign policy. There is a consensus among the political parties that the belligerent nature of bilateral relations between India and Pakistan, poses serious security challenges to India. All the political parties again have a broad agreement and there exists a tacit
consonance regarding the centrality of the problem of Kashmir in Indo-Pakistan relations. Thus, almost all the major Indian political parties counsel for establishing cordial bilateral relations between India and Pakistan. It seems that the only outstanding difference among the political parties is the view of the Communist parties. The Communist parties seem to express their view within the parameter of their anti-imperialist stance which reflects their ideological predilections and hence it appears that the communists are more critical than other political parties of the role of United States of America in the affairs of India and Pakistan and they have criticized the US that it is responsible for aggravating the problems between India and Pakistan by its hegemonic interference in their bilateral affairs. By and large the Indian political parties do not have uniformity of opinion regarding the probable solutions for the resolution of problems of Indo-Pakistan relations. For instance, political parties seem to differ in their view on policy for cross border terrorism. The party's perception of the nuclear issue in Indo-Pakistan relations also differs. If BJP insists upon the use of nuclear option in the light of security threats posed by Pakistan, the Congress and Janata Dal seem to have an ambiguous opinion in the matter and the communists are totally opposed to the nuclearisation of Indian defence mechanism. This notion of the left parties was demonstrated after the BJP led coalition government conducted nuclear tests at Pokhran in 1998 : "The CPI [M] expressed itself against the induction of nuclear weapons and said, it was a matter of great indignation that
prime minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee should keep the people of country in the dark about the reasons that led to the reversal of India's long established nuclear policy."

Similarly, "The CPI said that now that India has demonstrated its nuclear capability, there should be no attempt to induct nuclear weapons into our strategic or tactical arsenal."

Although there exists a broad consensus among the political parties on various problems of Indo-Pakistan relations, all have agreed that Kashmir, nuclear arms race and terrorism are the key issues in Indo-Pakistan relations. They have a unanimity of opinion that Indo-Pakistan relations implies some kind of problem for India's defence and foreign policy. But again, there is a divergent perception regarding these problems among the political parties and a difference of viewpoint exists regarding the means to tackle various problems in the realm of Indo-Pakistan relations.
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