Part III
CHAPTER 5
FOREIGN POLICY OF INDIA: A STUDY

5.1 Features of Indian Foreign Policy

The foreign policy of a country is the sum total of the principles, interests and objectives which it seeks to promote through its relations with other countries.\(^1\) It is also "for influencing and changing the behaviour of other states" and for 'adjusting' its own "activities to the international environment".\(^2\) So, "the conduct and formulation of foreign policy is governed by the interplay of numerous determinants, institutions, processes and personalities".\(^3\) It is a complex social process which consists of

(a) Policymakers
(b) Principles of foreign policy
(c) Policy aims, interests and objectives
(d) Power inputs and outputs, and
(e) The context of foreign policy.\(^4\)

The making of foreign policy is a complex and dynamic process because it is influenced by the changes in the domestic as well as international environment. The
'horizontal' and 'vertical' extension of international relations, epoch-making changes in the field of science and technology, more sophisticated tools and methods of influence-building and multiple and complex linkages between domestic and foreign policies add to difficulties. Another hurdle is the lack of the necessary infrastructure in the newly developing countries. However, India has been relatively lucky in this respect. The leadership of Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress provided the background for the formulation of India's foreign policy. The basic framework of India's foreign policy is intrinsically intertwined with Gandhiji's strategy and style of arriving at ends by adhering to 'truthful' means. The 'ideal of restraint' and the 'ideal of social service', which were manifest in Gandhiji's action were the bases of Nehruvian world politics. It created a reflective approach in the conduct of Nehru's foreign policy and endeavoured to diminish and discourage the use of violence as a method of solving international--social and political problems of India.

The various determinants of Indian foreign policy along with the political traditions are as follows.

(a) Idealist view of politics and power with emphasis on 'peace' and 'non-violence'.
(b) Idealist approach to internationalism.
(c) Anti-imperialism and anti-racialism.
(d) Asianism
(e) Rejection of both capitalism and communism.

The bases of India's foreign policy can be categorised into three.

1. **Historical basis**

The history of Indian foreign policy is short but active. It was after the establishment of Indian National Congress that the politicisation of the people and formulation of policy orientation had its origin. After the World War I the Indians led by Congress started taking more active interest in foreign affairs. In 1920 the Congress sent a message of sympathy to the Irish people who were struggling for their independence. In 1921 the AICC at its Delhi Meeting adopted a complete resolution on foreign policy and affirmed India's desire to establish friendly and peaceful relations with others. The Calcutta Conference of 1928 directed the All India Congress Committee (AICC) to open a foreign department for developing contacts and organizing the anti-imperialist movement of the dependent people. Nehru came to head this department and became the director of the foreign policy
of Congress. It was this experience that made him to act with precision and efficiency. So Nehru could rightly be called the 'architect' of independent India's foreign policy. However the historic declarations of the Congress were very fundamental in providing roots to the attitudes of anti-Cold War, anti-imperialism, anti-racialism, anti-power politics and peaceful relationships.

2. Philosophical basis

The philosophical basis of Indian foreign policy includes an account of such moral ideals and values of India. Mutual love and faith in national and international peace and friendship with other countries are regarded as possible and practical values by India.

In one of his characteristic expositions on foreign policy Nehru was of the opinion that there were several schools of thought on foreign affairs. There was, first of all, the Indian school which talked about negotiation through strength. Since this was also likely to be reciprocated by the other party, there was in effect the possibility of a stalemate. The school of 'learned confusion' talked learnedly of international affairs, but never got out of its confused state of mind. Finally, there was the school of ignorant confusion. India's
foreign policy belonged to none of these schools of thought. "It was clear, simple and straightforward policy which, of course, benefited her but which equally sought to promote the cause of world peace. It might not be full of wisdom, but was simple and innocuous". The cultural-philosophical foundations of India's foreign policy are, in fact, quite conspicuous. India has been the seat of a hoary civilisation and a meeting place of great cultures.

In view of such a cultural-philosophical tradition and its reflection on the personality of Nehru, the chief architect of independent India's foreign and domestic policies carry attention. It is but natural that India should prefer the golden mean or the middleway between the two competing international ideologies of the day--Western liberal democracy and Russian egalitarianism. Indeed as the then vice-President of India, Dr. Radhakrishnan said: "India is profoundly convinced that power politics at any time meant misery to mankind in a shrinking world, with disaster to humanity".  

3. Ideological basis

The Indian foreign policy derives strength from Gandhiji's ideals like liberalism, democratic socialism
and internationalism. All these 'isms' carry Gandhian perspectives. Gandhiji's ideas were based on the Indian philosophy of Vedanta which is a combination of spiritual and scientific thought. A deeper study of India's aforesaid policy known as a policy of non-alignment, clearly reveals its cultural-philosophical foundation. As K. S. Murthy points out, "ancient Hindu foreign policy was one of isolationism. There was a kind of Munroe Doctrine towards states outside India because Hindu thinkers expressly forbade aggressive wars on other cultures and states outside India". But there was also the individualistic philosophy of Sankhya and Advaita Vedanta, which exhort us to recognise our true nature and to pass through this world as detached spectators. India developed in the past an elaborate and carefully planned administrative system with well-defined rules and maxims for diplomatic and interstate relations.

5.2 Approach to Indian Foreign Policy

India's approach to foreign policy was characterised by a series of distinguishing features not all of them peculiar to India. The most important of these was the tolerance of differing views and attitudes and moderation. The former was imposed by the very fact of membership of international society by states of diverse ideologies and
interests. Moderation in the pursuit of policies and actions in international relations was also dictated because in the Indian view, truth and rightness did not always or wholly lie on one side or one party apart from the need to recognise existing facts and situations.

Two important approaches to interstate relations have existed in India since independence. The positivist approach is advocated, for instance, in the Arthasastra of Kautilya, as well as of Bharadvaja in the Manusmrithi, in some portions dealing with polity in the Mahabharata, in the philosophy of Sakhya, and in the teaching of the Panchatantra. The Indian spirit has shown an extraordinary capacity for survival and self assertion. But the ideas, ideals and institutions borrowed from the West, as also some contrary pulls and pressures of our times, clash with it and obstruct its flow at every turn. But like any current in similar circumstances, the Indian spirit has learnt to bypass the obstacles it cannot overcome.

To Nehru: "We seek no domination over any country. We do not wish to interfere in the affairs of any country domestic or other. Our main stake in world affairs is peace, to see that there is racial equality and that people who are still subjugated should be free". Thus
even while opposing certain evils in the world, such as colonialism, racialism, India refused to take up a crusading or vindictive attitude, as, for instance, many communist nations did. Our approach is not ruled by power or weakness. To quote Nehru, "we want to be comrades and friends of other nations and leaders none". Leadership is not what is assumed. It comes as a result of endeavour. It is functional. India is serving the world in the lessening of tensions. The efforts of India are not to make a name for herself. Nehru repudiated the criticism that India's approach to internal problems as a 'holier than thou' attitude when she expressed any views on any international issue.

While India was opposed to moralising other nations or being moralised by other nations, she was very keen on learning from other nations, in following her own independent policy suited to India's specific conditions and circumstances. India was equally opposed to imitations of other countries. But she is fully conscious of the need for coordination among states. India was opposed to a double standard, not merely in her foreign policy but in her domestic policy as well.

That the foreign policy of a country is merely a projection or reflection of that country's domestic policy
is a trite saying; but that is very true of India. As Nehru puts it: "to create the finest human beings is the avowed objective of India’s progress. The final things, were not factories or river valley projects or even universities. They would all be just brick and mortar if they did not lead to the achievement of the primary objective of making people happy". 21

Hence as an approach to foreign policy which is governed by the several considerations such as the above had the risk of being misunderstood as an idealist or ethical approach. The chief architect and spokesman of Indian foreign policy, Nehru has observed thus: "A policy must be in keeping with the traditional background and temper of the country. It should be idealistic aiming at certain objectives, and at the same time, it should be realistic. If it is not idealistic, it becomes one of sheer opportunism; if it is not realistic, then it is likely to the adventurist and wholly ineffective. He added that India's approach was dictated by every consideration of intelligent self-interest. 22 Thus India's approach blends idealism with realism. Nehru observed that the reason why India was so widely respected and her foreign policy was so much popular. India provides the hope and aspirations to millions of people that there should be, any more war or conflict in the world. 23
5.3 Goals of Our Policy

The goals of India's foreign policy were simple, clear and straightforward and they have remained constant during the first decade of independence. Violent methods solved nothing in the Indian view, and indeed they started a vicious circle of bitterness, hatred and violence. So the promotion of peace and security is the watchword of India's foreign policy. India's message to the world was insistence on peaceful methods to solve problems. Nehru echoes the same sentiment when he says: "The peace that India conceived of was not based exclusively upon the political arrangement of governments; such a peace would not secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples' of the world. It must be found, if it was not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind".  

Peace is the first and foremost goal of the foreign policy of India since independence and still it continues. To Nehru: "Peace creates a way of life and way of thinking and action". However, thinking of war and preparing for war are the greatest dangers of peace. To conclude, "when one wants peace, one must think of peace and prepare for peace, instead of thinking of war and preparing for war".
(a) Self-determination for colonial people

In the Indian view, suppression of the political aspirations of the colonial peoples is a violation of fundamental human rights and a persistent source of international conflicts. The age of colonialism has ended but in certain areas where colonialism continues and is trying to dig itself in, or sometimes changes its shape. Irrespective of the brand of colonialism, the only way to deal with them was by peaceful means. In India's stand on the issue, writes N. D. Palmer, "there is neither doctrinal fanaticism nor insistence on a "here and now" solution to colonial problems".\textsuperscript{28} India believes that peace and freedom are indivisible and the denial of freedom anywhere must endanger freedom elsewhere and lead to conflict and war. So India is particularly interested in the emancipation of colonial and dependent countries and peoples, and in the recognition in theory and practice of equal opportunities for all races. To quote Nehru: "We approach the world in a friendly way. We want to make friends with all countries".\textsuperscript{29} Hence this ancient land will attain its rightful and honoured place in the world and make its full and willing contribution to the promotion of world peace and welfare of mankind.
(b) Opposition to racialism

India's foreign policy is in opposition to racialism and support to the establishment of an egalitarian human society. India took this stand not only due to the reasons of humanity but also because racialism is one of the sources of conflicts in the world. Racialism is a standing threat to international peace and security. India's approach is to employ peaceful means to find out solutions for racial question—a gradual and pragmatic one compared to that of many other countries which were not any more strongly opposed to racial discrimination. India was also an ardent supporter of the United Nations Organisation for the adoption of the draft covenants on human rights. The policy of 'apartheid' as being practised by some nations, has been a matter of vital concern to India. India believes in equality of all races and totally opposes discrimination against the people of any race. Before her independence India opposed the Nazi doctrine of racialism. India opposes and rejects the doctrine of white supremacy. India supports the right to self-determination for all the people. Racialism, imperialism and colonialism are regarded by her as the instruments of oppression and exploitation which constitute big dangers to world peace.
(c) **Peaceful settlement of disputes**

The fourth important objective of India's foreign policy is peaceful settlement of international disputes and conflicts--the great emphasis being on peaceful solutions. In fact, it is the corollary to the major and primary objective of promoting international peace and security but so prominent a place did the question occupy in India's role in world affairs that it deserves to be treated as a separate goal in itself.

The Indian Government had no faith in the policy and attitude of some states of negotiation through strength and it was illogical for both the parties.30 (The United States and the then the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics). It would be simultaneously strengthening themselves and thus tended to neutralize the other party's strength. Furthermore, in the age of the atomic and hydrogen bombs, talk of greater strength had very little meaning. As Nehru pointed out, "the world had arrived at a stage when even if one party was relatively weaker, the effect on both was the same: they had reached a saturation point in regard to weapons of mass destruction".31 Under the influence of Gandhian virtue of purity of means, Indian foreign policy expresses full faith in peaceful means for the settlement of disputes. After having
achieved independence through peaceful and non-violent means India has been a firm supporter and follower of the principle of settling international disputes through pacific means.

(d) **Support of the Afro-Asian Community of Nations**

Another objective of India which came to have a major place in the foreign policy was to secure peace and security for the Afro-Asian countries in the world forums. India utilised every opportunity to promote their interests and influence, and their participation in the world decision making process; she took a strong stand whenever the claims of Asian countries were ignored or were sought to be suppressed. While being vigorously opposed to denigrating, ignoring or suppressing Asian views and influence by non-Asian powers, India did not at all support either "isolationism" or exclusiveness of Asian countries or any claims of superiority over the nations of other continuity.\(^{32}\) Hence India squarely stood for cooperation with the rest of the world; but on a footing of equality and dignity which has been denied to the Asian countries for long. In fact, the denial of these is one of the main dangers to world peace, in the Indian view.\(^{33}\)
(e) Support to international organisation

India is a staunch supporter of all international organisations including, especially, the United Nations Organisation (and most of its specialised agencies) even though she was not then independent. India played a considerable part in its success. India firmly believes that the UNO had an important role to play in all vital matters in international affairs, and therefore she was opposed to ignoring or sidetracking the organisation in the taking of vital decisions, particularly those concerning war and peace.

5.4 Application of Gandhian Ideals on the Foreign Policy

Gandhiji visualised a world order based on peace and non-violence. Both peace and security would be safeguarded if Gandhi's prescription is followed.\(^34\) Broadly, Gandhi's ideals are for the welfare of the humanity.

Some of the Directive Principles of the Indian Constitution\(^35\) are in accordance with and conform to the Gandhian way of life and fulfil the requirements of a predominantly non-violent state of Gandhi's conception. These principles enjoin that in the international field India shall strive:
(a) to promote international peace and security,\textsuperscript{36}
(b) to maintain just and honourable relations between nations,\textsuperscript{37}
(c) to foster respect for international law and treaty obligations,\textsuperscript{38} and
(d) to encourage settlement of international disputes by arbitration.\textsuperscript{39}

These principles find their fullest expression in the external policy of India and Prime Minister Nehru's doctrine of Panch sheel.\textsuperscript{40} So it helped to outlaw from the minds of the Heads of the great states the possibility of war.\textsuperscript{41} India's faith in coexistence, her advocacy of Panch sheel\textsuperscript{42} and acceptance of these lofty ideals of peace and mutual tolerance by the major countries of the world is the greatest contribution to peace which independent Indian can claim. Thus India has indeed, saved the world from disaster. Micheal Foot writes, "power corrupts and the world owes independent India an immense debt for helping to save us from the corruption of power on an international scale; which might so easily have led us to disaster."\textsuperscript{43}

"We have only one ambition" said Rajendra Prasad, addressing the Constituent Assembly at midnight on 14 August 1947, "and that is to make our contribution to the
building of peace and freedom for all". India has done so and still holds steadfast to this spirit which inspires the last of the Directive Principles, though herself a victim of imperialistic designs by Britain outwardly wedded to anti-imperialistic policy. From ancient times India has been a land where the tradition of peace and love of tranquility have pervaded the life of the people. Gandhi glorified this tradition through his principles of 'Truth' and 'Ahimsa'. The framers of the Indian Constitution enshrined it in the Constitution which they made and those noble ideals have ever since guided the statesmen who are responsible for moulding the destiny of India. So, the impact of Gandhiji's message was not merely confined to India but it influenced the course of events in many parts of the world. India has, however, been fortunate to receive an abundant measure of leadership and guidance of this great apostle of peace and non-violence in the cause of our political, economic and social emancipation. "... many nations that enjoy the fruits of freedom today draw inspiration from Mahatma Gandhi whose philosophy has indeed everlasting and universal appeal". In Gandhi's words: "The alphabet of ahimsa is best learnt in the domestic school, and I can say from experience that if we secure success there, we are sure to do everywhere. For a non-violent person the
whole world is one family". Thus "all the world over in every age, non-violence has been the method of settling family disputes. By his life-long researches, he made 'satyagraha', the moral equivalent of war and technique of solving group conflicts".

Gandhiji was a great internationalist. A country has to be free in order that it may die, if necessary, for the benefit of the world. To him, "My love, therefore, of nationalism or my idea of nationalism is that my country may become free, that if need be, the whole country may die, so that the human race may live". Thus Gandhi was in favour of "progressive internationalism" and it had influenced India's foreign policy. The world will live in peace only when the individuals composing it make up their minds to do so. Although Gandhi was not a "system builder" in the field of external affairs and foreign policy, he did stress some fundamental ideas on foreign affairs which shaped our foreign policy.

A broad study reveals the contention that India is a middle power with modest goals and it seeks to contribute, both politically and otherwise, to effect a gradual transformation of the existing unjust international order into a more just one. It is in this context that one can perceive the relevance of an evolving synthesis which can be furthered by a fusion between Gandhian spirit of moral
commitment and an endeavour to seek Indian solutions to Indian problems that have been created by the material progress offered by modern science and technology.

The progress in the domestic sector is a crucial prerequisite for India being able to play a strident international role. Unless and until that prerequisite is available, new dimensions and horizons in India's foreign policy are not likely to emerge. The foreign policy analysts are in a better position in this regard, in as much as, they can at least afford to create new visions and keep them alive.

All the same, in fairness to Gandhiji and to ourselves, confronted as we are with possible mass nuclear destruction, we must give non-violent resistance to aggression a reasonable trial in particular situation--even as conventional defence has been tried through many countries--before finally pronouncing on its effectiveness and viability or otherwise.

5.5 The Means of Foreign Policy

5.5.1 Methods of conciliation

India firmly believed that whatever the merits or origin of a dispute or situation, it was fully capable of
being settled by peaceful means. In her approach to a dispute or conflict or situation which threatened international peace, her emphasis was on the way it was solved. So India believes that negotiations are better than a deadlock in a tension ridden world. Hence if the parties to a dispute could find a basis of negotiations, it is possible to avert conflict. Today, international scenario is governed by fear and tensions. When fear walks in, reason walks out. The elimination of this fear is the main challenge of the world. This is not an easy process and one should not expect startling or quick results. Conciliation is a patient, gradual and is an unceasing endeavour. International disputes in a modern world should not be settled like wrestling bouts between nations. It did no good merely to go about condemning people, even if condemnation was deserved. We should rather try to win over the 'wrong-doer' by goodwill, at the same time adhering to principles that we consider important. Hence the means are as important as the ends and our approach should always be a friendly one. All this was well showed by the role India played in a series of issues. In respect of all disputes involving India, she also deliberately avoided the language of denunciation.
5.5.2 Peaceful co-existence and Panch sheel

The chief positive means by which India sought to achieve the goals of her foreign policy is by following the concept of peaceful co-existence of nations of diverse ideologies and interests. Independent India has sought to apply this concept and principle in the realm of foreign policy in the context of rival economic and social systems and ideologies. Early in 1954 this concept was given certain precision and formal recognition in what later came to be known as the 'Panch sheel' or five principles.

These principles were first formally enunciated in the India-China Agreement (1954). Speaking in Parliament on the agreement, Nehru observed that the major thing about the agreement was its Preamble, and added: "I imagine that if these principles were adopted in the relations of various countries with each other, a great deal of the trouble of the present day world would probably disappear." If these principles are applied in international relations, they would form a solid foundation for peace and security and the fears and apprehensions that exist today would give place to a feeling of confidence. The five principles were also incorporated in the Declaration on World Peace and Cooperation adopted by the Asian African Conference,
Bandung in April 1955 as well as in a resolution on principles of co-existence adopted by the Inter-Parliamentary Union at its Helsinki session in August 1955.\textsuperscript{55} It was a new application of an old idea, an application to a particular context.\textsuperscript{56} The concept of co-existence is a familiar old term in literature on communism which had a different and specific meaning of its own. The term Panch sheel is of ancient lineage in Buddhist literature and refers to the five principles of individual good conduct. However, the novelty of India's contribution lies in seeking to make these principles the basis of practical state policy and conduct in international relations.

In the atomic age, the alternative to co-existence is, as Nehru puts it, 'co-destruction'.\textsuperscript{57} But even as peaceful coexistence is wholly unavoidable, it did not mean surrender of one's convictions or appeasement or defeatism; it only meant readiness and willingness to understand and appreciate one authority's point of view in international relations. It is democratic in style. In the words of Nehru, "the person who rejects the idea of coexistence rejects basically the democratic outlook. One cannot live in compartments and be democratic inside a country and not so outside internationally".\textsuperscript{58} He added, "one had either to accept 'Panch sheel' and co-existence or conflict and co-destruction."\textsuperscript{59}
5.3 Opposition to Cold War

Another aspect of the Panch Sheel is opposition to cold war of postwar time. India was against the war of ideologies which Nehru said, "smacked of all the bigotry, fanaticism and intolerance which characterised the religious crusades of Europe".\(^6\) This state of "armed fear", as the then Vice-President of India, Dr. Radhakrishnan, puts it: "was not peace "but a precarious equilibrium in which discussion does not declare itself because of mutual fear".\(^6\) In fact, there was no logic in the cold war when once a 'hot war' is ruled out because of the likely results of such a war—destruction of the human race with the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons. It only resulted in keeping up an atmosphere of hatred and fear and the ever present danger of war. "It completely lacks sense", said Nehru: "but it is a wrong policy fundamentally. Logically, there can be no dispute about that". According to the Preamble of the UNESCO,\(^6\) war begins in the minds of men. India considered cold war to be totally harmful for international peace and security of the nations. As such, opposition to cold war became a fundamental principle of the foreign policy of India. That was one of the reasons why India opposed military pacts and alliances which
inevitably generated tensions and threatening postures towards nations against which they were aimed. For a similar reason, India is opposed to the continuance of the cominform which was not compatible with Panch sheel. Regarding India's role in world affairs, India is endeavoured not to succumb to the climate of war and fear generated by the cold war and to consider world problems, including those involving or affecting India, as dispassionately as possible. So India along with other Asian countries hoped to build an area of peace.

5.5.4 Non-Alignment: New Trend

The core of India's foreign policy is based on the policy of non-alignment. The positive characterisation of it is described as an 'independent policy'. The opening of doors of non-alignment to other nations so that they may participate in non-aligned conferences provided they fulfil the basic criteria, as laid down at the Belgrade Conference of 1961 is the signal contribution to the democratisation of an important segment of international politics.

The idea of non-alignment, the seed of which was sown by Nehru on September 1946, has not only blossomed into a sturdy tree, bearing the fruit of just and equitable
relationship between nations, but over the years, it has evolved into a way of life among civilised nations. The attitude of judging each issue of international politics on merits, without caring for the favours or frowns of the super powers, tends to invest the non-aligned country with self-respect, dignity and pragmatic flexibility; eventually that nation earns approbation of both the rival bloc of nations. Non-alignment itself is changing from a negative abstention from military alliances to a positive working together for a new international economic order. Non-aligned countries should strengthen their own political and economic co-operation with one another and develop further closer relations with other countries. It is pertinent to refer to the opinion of Indonesia's President Suharto who is the current chairman of Non-aligned Movement that India can play a vital role for developing co-operation among the members as also the nations of the South.

India's attempt is not to shut others out but rather to find ways to bring them in. The purpose of non-alignment policy is not to build new barriers but to weaken existing ones. So accustomed is the world to thinking in terms of compartments that this concept has often been misunderstood and erroneously described as the third bloc. Man today has the power not only to destroy
the world but to build it anew. He has the tools of science and technology. For, peace and justice cannot elude the collective will of the ordinary people the world over.

So in the contemporary situation, apart from its political and economic merits, non-alignment policy has become an ideal conduct for nations to adopt in their relations with one another.

5.5.5 Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)

The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) which plays an important role in contemporary world politics. It emerged as an influential force in the struggle for ceasing international tensions and stands for disarmament, peace, freedom and progress throughout the world. Nehru was the first to propose the Panch sheel principles as a political and legal foundation for the concept of non-alignment. He had also played an important role in the evolution of the non-aligned movement. Non-aligned countries should strengthen their economic co-operation and it is very necessary for the preservation of a peaceful atmosphere in the world.

Today the conference of non-aligned states has 107 members excluding observers and guests. This makes up
nearly two-thirds of the world community of nations. As compared to 1961, the non-aligned community is heterogeneous though the criteria of the Belgrade Conference still inspires most of its members. Militarily not one of the members is strong enough to defend itself unaided. All its members are dependent in varying degrees. Politically, the non-aligned conference because of its phenomenal growth and enormous diversity lacks organic cohesion. However, this lack of political cohesion has been counter-balanced to some extent by the sound method of arriving at decisions through a consensus which is always arranged by detailed negotiations, often beginning at dusk and ending at dawn. But the NAM is now a new factor of international relations, although there are (and could be) difference of opinions about its efficacy or influence in the conduct of inter-state relations. To quote M. S. Rajan: "it seems to me that the Movement, despite its limitations and infirmities in functioning, is as lasting as the policy of non-alignment which in my view, will remain valid as long as the sovereign-nation-system lasts, or until the system radically changes in the manner of its functioning, in particular, gives up great power hegemonism and operates on the basis of genuine equality, reciprocity and neutrality".66 And so, the policy and movement continue
to be relevant and valid for as long as one can foresee for the present. Many of the important objectives and demands of the NAM are of a long-term nature, such as establishing the New International Economic Order and the democratization of the international system and its functioning. India pioneered the policy of non-alignment and made a significant contribution to the traditional foreign policy choices available to states.

5.5.6 Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM)\textsuperscript{67}

Even after becoming a sovereign independent republic in 1950, India decided to maintain its membership of the Commonwealth of Nations. The chief aims of it are touching foreign, social, cultural, educational and trade links with other countries. But it has a character of informality and a tradition of co-operation and mutual peace.

Nehru was a passionate believer in the philosophy of the universal man and its widening of the human vision. In his thinking, nationalism and internationalism complimented and enriched each other, and long before it became a fashionable concept, he was sensitive to the realities of an interdependent world. Nehru saw clearly that every international body which fostered co-operation...
was an instrument for seeking out and enlarging areas of agreement and lowering barriers in a world still divided into fragments by narrow domestic walls. CHOGM has fostered a complex web of relationships between all its members. It has opened up many new avenues to them by providing an arena in which to act and interact, to help and be helped, above all, to listen and to understand. It is in this ability to understand, to accept ideas, that the Commonwealth has most fulfilled Nehru's aspirations. These aspirations were firmly rooted in India's culture, which recognises values as being more important than power. For centuries, India has proclaimed the ideal of tolerance, the philosophy that truth has many facets, and has shown that common endeavour can thrive in diversity. The Commonwealth conferences help India to voice its opinions on various international issues and problems. CHOGM with its global sweep and environment provides an easy window on the world and thus it helps India to maintain active and valuable contacts with a wide variety of nations--Asian, African, Caribbean and European. The member countries may vote on many current problems of the world. But they believe in the method of peaceful negotiations to settle disputes. CHOGM consists of sovereign independent states, 21 of which are republics. India became instrumental in helping the transformation of
British Commonwealth into the Commonwealth of Nations. Nehru justified the decision to remain in the Commonwealth as a member and aimed at maintaining and developing co-operation which was designed to serve India's national interests and peace.\footnote{68} Hence CHOGM is another platform in which India seeks a peaceful world scenario.

5.5.7 South Asian Association of Regional Co-operation (SAARC)\footnote{69}

SAARC has been one of the most important positive developments of the 1980s. Its organisation has strengthened the chances of increased socio-economic co-operation among the seven member states. Southeast Asia is also an area of significance for India. Most of the countries of this region have had relations with India going back to the days of Greater India. India's efforts to maintain peace and her help in ensuring independent status to Southeast Asian countries during the Nehru period is largely followed even today. India's relations with her neighbours was the topic of discussion at a seminar organised by the Society for Parliamentary Studies in 1972.\footnote{70} The seminar emphasised the crucial role of India in the preservation of peace and security in the region.
India has accepted the SAARC as a voluntarily organised association of sovereign states for consolidating and expanding regional peace and co-operation. India stands for peace in South Asian part with her limits and she firmly believes that the regional co-operation of states is preliminary for an international peaceful society. In this context there is no place for a big brother attitude of a particular member.

The SAARC countries must accept India's role as the biggest and relatively most developed country of South Asia which alone can serve as the nucleus for the development of SAARC and its role in the international scene. India has played a very positive and constructive role in floating South Asian Association for Regional Co-operation and making it to work as a dynamic association committed to consolidate and expand socio-economic-cultural co-operation among the South Asian countries.

5.5.8 India and the United Nations Organisation

On the eve of the San Francisco Conference, Mahatma Gandhi made a statement on April 17, 1945 in which he said: "The San Francisco Conference is announced to meet shortly. I do not know its agenda. Probably no outside knows it whatever it may the conference will have much to
do with the world to be after the so-called end of the war. I very much fear that behind the structure of world security sought to be raised lurk, mistrust and fear which breed war. Therefore, as a lifelong believer in peace as against war, it seems well for me to record my convictions in the matter. I reiterate my conviction that there will be no place for the allies or the world unless they shed their belief in the efficacy of war and its accompanying terrible deception and fraud and are determined to hammer out real peace based on freedom and equality of all races and nations. Exploitation and domination of one nation over another can have no place in a world striving to put an end to all wars. It is only in such a world that the militarily weaker nations will be free from the fear of intimidation or exploitation.  

Throughout his life Gandhiji was a man of action. His generosity of spirit and tolerance enabled him to love all people. It is indeed gratifying to note that this aspect of Gandhiji has appealed to United Nations Organisation which is celebrating Gandhi's 125th year of birth as the 'year of tolerance'.

According to Gandhiji the successful launching of the United Nations Organisation requires the following measures.
1. An indispensable preliminary to peace is the complete freedom of India from all foreign control not merely because it is a classic example of imperialist domination, but specially because it is a big, ancient and cultured country which has fought for its freedom since 1920 deliberately with truth and non-violence as its only weapon.

2. Freedom of India will demonstrate to all the exploited races of the earth that their freedom is very near and that in no case will they henceforth be exploited.

3. Peace must be just in order to be that, it must neither be punitive or vindictive. Therefore, fruits of peace must be equally shared. The effort then will be to turn them into friends.

4. It follows from the foregoing that there will be no armed peace imposed upon the forcibly disarmed. If there will be an international police, it will be a concession to human weakness, not by any means an emblem of peace.

The United Nations Charter embodies a commitment of the nations to promote world peace, friendship and co-operation through the development of international relations, and through collective participation in the drive to secure a world free from war and violence. There
exists perfect compatibility between the aims and objectives of both the United Nations Charter and India's foreign policy. This identity has always encouraged India's full and active participation in the activities of the United Nations Organisation.

C. K. Kochukoshy's monograph\textsuperscript{73} deals with the role and attitude of India in the different organs of the UN and the various activities and problems it undertook from time to time. Charles P. Schleicter and J. S. Bains in their study\textsuperscript{74} have examined the role of India in UNO and the interesting aspect of the study is that it deals with the administrative organisation and procedures of the various ministries particularly the Ministry of External Affairs for developing and administering policy of the UN and its agencies.

Swadesh Rana in an article writes that India's contribution to maintain peace through the UNO is the outcome of historical events that demanded similar leading role to be played by India. India has supported the UN not only for the preservation of world order and peace but also as an instrument for the creation of New International Economic Order (NIEO) by ensuring increased co-operation among its nations. Various UN documents also speak of the role of India but the study of this aspect of
India's foreign policy has rather remained and ignored for want of serious research.

The Security Council\textsuperscript{75} is the focal point for activity on reform. Deliberations on reform began at the 48th General Assembly, which was convened in September last year, with consideration given to increasing the number of permanent members and changing in council's structure. The council was formed when India was not free. Britain spoke for India when India was kept out of Security Council. Likewise, Germany and Japan--two most powerful nations of the present world were also kept out of Security Council. In this way Security Council formed in 1945 did not represents the true spirit of modern world. In today's world other nations look to India not with anticipation but with the demand that it fulfils its responsibilities in a way commensurate with its national strength.\textsuperscript{76}

Thus keeping in view the increasing importance of the UN forums for various types of interaction amongst states-bilateral and multilateral--the study of India's foreign policy and diplomacy, vis-a-vis the UN system may be observed comprehensively in the light of new political and economic realities in the international system.
India's present influence in Asian and world affairs is greater than the former days. This is due in part to the quality of her leaders and the prestige they gained during the struggle for independence, to her strategic position, to her membership in the world forums, and to the distinctive traditions and characteristics of her foreign policy. But it is due primarily to the nature of the present world struggle and to India's role as a leading spokesman of the so-called uncommitted world.

So the roots of India's foreign policy are to be found in the civilisations which cherished the country over many centuries. The Hindu, Buddhist, Christian and Muslim views of life and the stand of Indian National Congress were in favour of it. The Gandhian ideals especially, non-violence had a vital influence on India's foreign policy formulation. India's spiritualistic view of politics and power as reflected in the ideals of Gandhiji, Aurobindo, Rabeendranath Tagore, has been instrumental in making Indian foreign policy. Internationalism as an objective of Indian foreign policy too bears the influence of the Indian political thought.
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CHAPTER 6
INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY AND IMMEDIATE NEIGHBOURS

Foreign policy planning during the Nehru period (1947-64) was performed under the direct supervision of Jawaharlal Nehru. He was the brain behind every foreign policy decision. India's defence and foreign policies towards other countries have been formulated essentially within the framework of realism. In the field of international co-operation, India's record over the past years has been impressive both in the comprehensiveness of her activities and in the sustained interest she has taken in the socio-economic welfare of her neighbours. Promotion of friendship, co-operation and goodwill with others is the cardinal principle of India's external relations. Human beings live in this world of conflicts and yet the world goes on, undoubtedly because of the cooperation of nations and individuals. Even though there were some differences between Gandhiji and Nehru on certain matters, the foreign policy of India was shaped by Nehru in tune with the ideals of Gandhiji. During Nehru's lifetime, we worked tirelessly to build a world order based on the principle of the oneness of the world. Today people live on the verge of disaster. It would be a truer
picture if the co-operating elements in the world today were put forward and the humanity thinks that the world depends on co-operation and not on conflict.

India seeks the co-operation of all states beyond continental consideration. This trend is woven round four principles:

(1) Striving for friendship and amity with all nations, irrespective of their stand,
(2) Non-alignment and judging of international issues on merit,
(3) Forging of tangible co-operative links both in economic and political spheres, and
(4) Balanced and integrated perspectives in foreign ties.

"We are of Asia", Nehru said in September 1946, "and the people of Asia are nearer and closer to us than others". That is why Nehru worked for the economic and political link with India's neighbours. It does not mean that India keeps enmity with other world states. She has been following peaceful contacts with others.

In April 1963, writing in Foreign Affairs Jawaharlal Nehru, stressing the evolution of India's foreign policy said:
In spite of the long drawn out struggle that preceded Indian independence, freedom came in peace and goodwill. Suddenly, all bitterness of past conflict disappeared and a new era of peace and friendship began . . . . Thus, we entered the family of independent nations with a clean state without any inherited hatreds or territorial ambitions, but determined to cultivate friendly and co-operative relations with all countries.²

So, in conformity with the objectives of our foreign policy, India sought friendship with every nation. Next to the pursuit of friendliness to nations, non-alignment is the main motto of the Indian foreign policy. The policy pursued by India in her external affairs has injected a moral tone in world politics.

Foreign policy analysts has far too long been left to specialists of international power politics and strategic thinking. It is necessary to think beyond the confines of such specialists. For, the foreign policy of a country is an expression of its self-identity as a civilisation at a given point of its history. Before we come to the details of our political and geo-political development since independence; it is necessary to pose these larger issues. Only then can a detailed analysis of the present crisis in our international relations be put in a proper perspective.
India is keeping a foreign policy of mutual co-operation and understanding with any state, whether it is a European or African or Latin American or South Asian. Here the researcher has made a limited study of India and her neighbours for illustrating the point. Mere taking up of the neighbours' case does not mean that India's commitment is confined to neighbouring states only. But India is trying to maintain better relations with others, even with such distant countries as the USA, Japan or Germany. A case study follows regarding the relations of India with her immediate neighbours. To have friendly, co-operative and good neighbourly relations on the basis of 'sovereign equality of states' has been a cardinal principle of Indian foreign policy towards her neighbours.

6.1 Pakistan (Islamic Republic of Pakistan)

The partition of the subcontinent in 1947 generated bad blood between India and Pakistan. During the years after independence, the two countries developed some trade and economic relations. Unfortunately, the relation between the two countries was far from being cordial. While India retained her neutrality from power blocs, Pakistan chose to join the Western bloc, headed by the USA.
Indian foreign policy is open to the criticism that it lacks a coherent guiding principle or conceptual framework, that too often it seems to be episodic and reactive. To the extent that it has any conceptual underpinning at all, it is to be found in non-alignment. Independence of judgement, world peace, non-involvement in blocs are the chief aims of India's external relations. India's relations with Pakistan have widely been studied by the subcontinental scholars in regional focus and by western scholars in international focus, but theoretical formulation of India's Pakistan policy or Pakistan's Indian policy remain largely ignored. But a number of scholars have studied the developments in Indo-Pak relations during the troubled years of Sino-Indian and Indo-Pak wars. Balwant Bhaneja, in his study has confined his arguments to the "structural, continuities, intensities and trends of the areas of international politics describing the events of the 1961-71 decade. But Mohammad Ayoob in his article has substantiated the commonly held belief that Sino-Pakistan friendship had its roots in their enmity with India.

In early January 1966, Pak President Ayub Khan and Indian Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri reached an agreement at Tashkant which has come to be known as Tashkant Declaration. Pakistan accepted the then Soviet
Premier Kosygin's mediation. This declaration was widely discussed and debated in the Lok Sabha in India and National Assembly in Pakistan wherein various shades of opinions are to be found in their proceedings. M. S. Rajan has discussed the Declaration in historical perspective outlining the prospects of relationship it offers between India and Pakistan in the future. Article IX of the Declaration, "kindled a hope that mutual discussions will help to bring about normal relations between India and Pakistan". But Pakistan's approach at the conference did not seem to be sincere.

Strained political relations between India and Pakistan adversely affected the flow of trade and commerce between them. The various powers, particularly the western powers, have exploited Indo-Pak political conflict for furthering their own economic aims. This is another important aspect of Indo-Pak relationship has received rather casual attention of the scholars.

Kashmir has been a major bone of contention between the two neighbours right from their inception as independent countries in 1947. Kashmir dispute has conditioned the foreign policies of both the countries, particularly, that of Pakistan. Moreover, various countries have exploited Indo-Pak sensitivity over the dispute to their advantage.
Kashmir dispute--its origins and implications have found the favour of scholars over the years. Sisir Gupta, a well-known scholar on India-Pakistan relations, has analysed the various aspects of the Kashmir problem but his study ends, rather abruptly with 1964 debate.8 Pakistan continues to fear that India has hegemonous intentions in South Asia, particularly in relations with Pakistan.9

India prefers a comprehensive, a peace-friendship co-operation and treaty with Pakistan for promoting a solid foundation to the future course of their relations. India wants a treaty aimed at promoting beneficial bilateralism in all aspects of Indo-Pak relations. A mere 'no-war pact' can be no remedy to the irritants that characterise their relations. To T. N. Kaul: "Unless, therefore, Pakistan's rulers are willingly ready and sincere to enter into a long term agreement with Indian leaders to stop their subversive acts and encourage more peaceful and fruitful ventures, there is little likelihood of any lasting peace and friendship between the two countries. At the same time, it is necessary that any suspicion in the minds of the Pak people about India's intentions and motives regarding Pakistan be removed".10 So for Pakistan, India is its most important neighbour and the same is true for India.
India is pleased with the victory of Pakistan People's Party in the last general elections. The nation's pleasure has been articulated by the Government's official spokesman, who has expressed her readiness to cooperate with the new regime in Islamabad to improve the Indo-Pak relations. Under no circumstances should India try to play the role of a big brother; nor should India flaunt her maturity and moralistic greatness before her neighbour.

In the Indo-Pak relations as well as in the SAARC politics, the Indian tune should be on a very low key. In fact, she should lead greater importance to Pakistan and tactfully give even exaggerated credit to its new Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto. In the subcontinental scenario, India should play the role of persistent paramour playing to pamper the whims and fancies to a coquetish beloved (i.e., Pakistan) because humility and generosity in politics, many a time pay greater dividends than arrogance and display of power. It is axiomatic that Indo-Pak relations will have to be reoriented to the changing reality. The old paradigms that governed their bilateral contacts will have to be dismantled and a stable working relationship forged if they are to prevent their isolation from the rest of the world.
To remain relevant to the emerging world order India and Pakistan will have to take bold steps and entangle themselves in an embrace that both cannot wriggle out from. That alone will force ruling elites to shed their self-serving policies for the betterment of the common problems of the region.

The relations between India and Pakistan is vast, complex and is covered with a thick overlay of emotion, prejudice, preconceived notion, plain ignorance and deliberate misrepresentation. No facet of Indian foreign policy has probably undermined her international image, endangered her security, and thwarted her national development as her hostile relations with Pakistan. In fact, a good part of Indian foreign policy is based on Pakistan. Jawaharlal Nehru adopted a broad approach to national and international politics in which idealism and realism, the long view and the short, would be conciliated into an equilibrium. He tried to remain basically a realist—to develop a powerful state structure in India including a strong economic infrastructure, a stable and viable constitutional and administrative system, and to protect and promote India's national interest according to his best judgement. But at the same time the idealist influence of the recent Indian political traditions, in particular, that of Gandhiji, and his own philosophical
and ideological convictions impelled him to nurture and cherish a broader vision of international co-operation and world peace.

6.2 China (Peoples Republic of China)

The tone of India's relations with China and other great powers of the world was set in the first broadcast of Jawaharlal Nehru on foreign policy on the All India Radio on 7 September 1946 wherein he emphasised the need for close co-operation with big powers. The Sino-Indian ties are one of the best studied topics of Indian foreign policy. The chronological listing of the events to the Sino-Indian relations can be found in various publications of the Government of India and China. K. M. Panikkar provides an interesting insight into India's China policy during the transition period. G. N. Jain's analysis of the Panch sheel and the years that followed it, is an outstanding study of the years of "uneasy peace" and "Hindi-Chini, Bhai-Bhai era".

Sino-Indian relations have swung from one extreme of Hindi-Chini Bhai-Bhai to other extreme of fighting pitched battles in 1962. John Rowland has traced the history of Sino-Indian relations from the Manchu days. It gives a good account of Sino-British collusion in fencing off Russians in Central Asia.
Sino-Indian boundary dispute has been discussed according to the norms of international law. Studies of J. S. Bains and L. C. Green are outstanding contributions in this field and gave an account of Red China's short-term and long-term aims in South Asia much before the actual Sino-Indian war began. The "Lama-Revolt" and the flight of Dalai Lama from Tibet in 1959 brought India and China on a collusion course despite the visit of Premier Chou-en-Lai in 1960 to New Delhi to defuse the situation. Later the relations between these two countries became tough. In its culmination the Sino-Indian confrontation took place in 1962. It not only brought about the undesirable frigidity of relations between the world's most populous and potential great powers, but it also caused the emergence of "Sino-Pak Axis" on the one hand, and cooling off relations between the USA and its South East Treaty Organisation (SEATO) and Central Treaty Organisation (CENTO).

From 1962 to 1988 the Sino-Indian relations were frozen in the icy sea of hostility and suspicion. It was Rajiv Gandhi's statesmanship which produced a thaw. The visit of the then Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi to China in December 1988 had gained momentum with the visit of Premier Li Peng to India in December 1991. The year 1992-93 saw the consolidation and strengthening of friendly relations between India and China.
India and China have to live as neighbours and geography cannot be changed by either. Neither can dominate the other. A modus vivendi to live in peace, if not in friendship, will have to be evolved sooner or later. Neither the United States nor Russia can use India and China as pawns on the chessboard of super power rivalry. India and China can and will have to settle their differences themselves, bilaterally and peacefully. This appears to be the best available approach to these issues of establishing fully normal and friendly relations between these two countries.

The highlight of the year was the state visit by former President, R. Venkataraman, to China from 18 to 23 May 1992, the first such visit to China by an Indian Head of State since the establishment of diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China in 1950. The former president's discussions with Chinese leaders such as President Yang Shangkun and Premier Li Peng, confirmed the commitment of both the countries to the development of a positive momentum in Indo-Chinese relations and the desire of both the countries to further strengthen their friendly, good neighbourly and mutually beneficial relations.
6.3 Bangladesh (Peoples Republic of Bangladesh)

The emergence of Bangladesh on the world map as a sovereign independent state in 1971 was an event of historic importance. It produced a qualitative and far reaching change in the character of international relations of South Asia. The civil war which broke out in Pakistan after the attainment of independence by East Pakistan, and the atrocities committed by Pakistani army on the unarmed people of East Pakistan, shook the conscience of the whole world. India supported the cause of the people of Bangladesh and advocated political solution of the problem. In national perspective the phenomenon of internal colonialism has led to an autonomy movement in Bangladesh and it raised the issue of the US military aid programme, militarism and military bureaucratic statism in Pakistan.

In an article,\textsuperscript{15} T. V. Satyamurthy analysed the role played by India in the liberation of Bangladesh. It argues that with the establishment of normal relations between Bangladesh and Pakistan, a new phase has begun in the politics of the subcontinent. As a result, India would have to adopt a somewhat positive posture. The Farakka issue would be settled amicably, in view of positive and co-operative role played by the Indian Government during the liberation struggle in Bangladesh.
The initial years (1972-75 Mujib era) of Indo-Bangladesh relations were characterised by "deep understanding of the mutual needs, desires, objectives and goals and which in turn produced very fruitful bilateral co-operation between the two countries. However, the assassination of Mujib in 1975 ushered the country into an era of political instability involving short lived military dictatorships and which gave anti-India elements in Bangladesh.

Consequently, since 1975, Indo-Bangladesh relations, have been characterised with some irritants. The relations continue to be friendly and co-operative but these definitely lack the warmth and understanding that characterised these relations during the era 1972-75.

Both these countries are bound together by geography. So neither one can ignore or overlook the other. In his article, "Look at Indo-Bangladesh Ties" R. Menon has rightly observed: "Indo-Bangladesh relations differences notwithstanding, have been marked by a touch of pragmatism and goodwill even in worst times".

The main thrust of Indian foreign policy has been governed by the assumption that India can play an effective role in world politics. India is keen to
develop with its small neighbours warmly, friendly and co-operative relations based upon equality and mutual respect for each others sovereignty and integrity.

6.4 Nepal (Kingdom of Nepal)

In language, religion, belief, food and clothing; India and Nepal, have more in common with each other than with any third country of the world. It rightly reflects the strong bonds that bind India and Nepal. Both have been living as good and friendly neighbours and there never has been a war between them. Since her independence India has always been very keen to maintain and develop further, the friendship and co-operation with Nepal.

The politico-strategic importance of Nepal as a buffer between India and China has assumed special significance and it has a serious military implication for India, particularly after the inauguration of the Lhasa Kathmandu Highway across Himalayas.

The clash between India and China in 1962 had increased the strategic importance of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim (since Sikkim has now merged with India) as buffers between India and China. The Indian foreign policy makers started caring of these areas which have always remained varying of the Indian aims because of the incompatible
political structures. Therefore, a set of scholars have undertaken to study the importance of Nepal vis-a-vis between China and India.\textsuperscript{18} For instance, Mira Sinha has given an account of Nepalese role in fluctuating Sino-Indian relations from 1949-69.\textsuperscript{19} Likewise, V. K. Sharma has pointed out Sino-Indian rivalry in the Himalayan Kingdoms particularly in Nepal.\textsuperscript{20}

Nepal has also realised the importance of its relations with India. The close cultural links with India gives strength to the case for the development of friendship and co-operation with India.\textsuperscript{21} Hence they have been engaged in the process of building warm, friendly and co-operative and peaceful relations. India fully respects the sovereignty and independence of Nepal and regards 'Panch sheel', besides the common historical and cultural links as the basis of the relations of these two.

Braj Kishore Jha has studied the different phases of Indo-Nepal relations, and maintains that Royal Coup of 1960 and India's reaction led to the decline of India's influence in the Himalayan Kingdom.\textsuperscript{22} A. S. Bhasin's documentary compilation of Indo-Nepal and Sino-Nepal relations, is a useful source of information on the subject. Most of the works on Indo-Nepalese relations point out Nepal's dependence on Indian economic
co-operation. However, Nepal is likely to develop co-operative relations with India on the basis of co-equality, co-sharing, non-dominance and peaceful understanding. The only outstanding issue that needs careful handling is the Nepalese proposal for getting the status of a peace zone.

Nepal's peace zone proposal, to be precise, is the product of the peace-aspiring and heightened mind of Nepalese King. The peace zone concept is by now enshrined in the Constitution of Nepal and as such, symbolises the aspirations of the entire nation for the peace. The acceptance, recognition and ratification of this particular proposal would create for India the amount of goodwill of the entire Nepalese nation. The SAARC spirit has helped the two countries to develop their friendly and co-operative relations. Both Narasimha Rao, the Indian Prime Minister and the Nepalese Prime Minister Koirala have strengthened the political and cultural bonds between India and Nepal. So there is a greater desire among Indians to learn more about the past of the land of Everest.

6.5 Sri Lanka (Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka)

Indeed during the last 30 years Indo-Sri Lanka
relationship has been marked by a sort of ambivalence--an alternation between warmth, goodwill and co-operation on the one hand and fear, suspicion and political and territorial disputes on the other. Such a conclusion is fully supported by the facts of Indo-Sri Lanka relations since 1948. On the one hand they have been successful in reaching agreements and resolving disputes through peaceful means. Sri Lanka continues to regard India as a critical factor in the South Asian regional power system.

Both India and Sri Lanka got their independence from the British rule at about the same time, yet the objective was achieved in different ways and conditions. India attained independence from the yoke of Britain through a determined and strong national movement under Gandhiji's leadership. As against this Sri Lanka did not have to work that hard for securing its independence. It got independence because of the British decision to withdraw from South Asia.

After their liberations, both India and Sri Lanka decided to join the Commonwealth but on different grounds, India remained in the Commonwealth for maintaining co-operation. But Sri Lanka's membership in the Commonwealth was designed to be a means to protect her interests against the possible invasion from India. The defence
pact of Britain with Sri Lanka in 1951 and the acceptance of the US blessed peace treaty with Japan in 1951 were at variance with the doctrine of Panch Sheel and policy of non-alignment as propounded by Nehru. So the foreign policy of Sri Lanka and her international behaviour was totally different. But India followed strict non-alignment. Nehru regarded Sri Lankan policy as not a policy of real non-alignment. This differences in foreign policies of the two and certain other relative factors checked the development of Indo-Sri Lankan friendship and co-operation during 1948-56. But the differences in foreign policy perceptions and certain other factors kept the efforts limited. A progressive development took place when the then Prime Minister, Sirimao Bhandaranaike came to power. Hence there took place a welcome change in Sri Lanka's attitudes towards India's policy of non-alignment. This set up paved the way for the development of friendship and co-operation between Sri Lanka and India. India continued to favour a peaceful solution to the ethnic crisis in Sri Lanka within the framework of the unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Sri Lanka, through negotiations involving all those parties which have eschewed the path of violence.

During the year 1993, there was active interaction between the two countries in economic, commercial and technical areas. The meeting of the sub-commissions on
science and technology, and on social, educational and cultural matters, were held in Delhi in the first quarter of the year 1993.

The assassination of President Premdas of Sri Lanka by the forces of violence on 1 May 1993, was a grave loss not only for Sri Lanka, but for the entire SAARC region, as the President had played an active and significant role in promoting regional co-operation under the auspices of the SAARC. The new Government of Sri Lanka under President D. B. Vijetunga shares India's desire to continue the process of further strengthening the friendly relations between these two countries. Hence these two neighbouring states can play still a better and crucial role for securing the interests of the NAM and the rights of the developing states. On the ethnic question in Sri Lanka, India reiterated her considered and consistent view that the legitimate aspirations of the Tamil community should be fulfilled within the framework of a United Lanka through negotiations involving all parties which have eschewed violence. The Sri Lankan side briefed the Indian side about the present position and future prospects as seen by them.

6.6 Burma (Myanmar)

Burma is an important state among Southeast Asian
states on India's eastern borders. It has a long land border with India. India and Burma have close maritime boundaries. None of the two states as such can remain unaffected and unconcerned with the security situation with each other. The emergence of Communist China as a major power in the neighbourhood has been an important factor in the foreign policies of the two countries.

Till 1937, Burma was a part of India and as such there existed strong cultural and historical ties which provide a strong basis for the growth of Indo-Burmese friendship and co-operation. After independence Burma decided to base its foreign policy on the principles of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence just like India. Hence in 1948, the two countries found it quite convenient to embark upon the path of developing friendly and co-operative relations and it still continues.

In 1954 India propounded the Panch sheel and Burma became one of the first few countries to give full support to this doctrine. Speaking in the Parliament on 17 March 1953, Prime Minister Nehru observed: "I should like to say that Burma and our relation are very friendly. The House knows that Burma has had to face great difficulties, and has still to face them. There is disorder in parts of Burma. In the North East of Burma a tremendous problem
has existed for sometime because of the so-called Kuomindang troops having in, unwelcome as they were and squatting and creating mischief there. Burma has had to face all these grave difficulties and throughout this period our relation with Burma have hardly ever been quite so co-operative and friendly as they are now". 24

Both India and Burma (Myanmar) have developed a mature understanding of each other and are presently co-operating towards the achievement of a new international economic order. Burma has now expressed its readiness to rejoin the NAM. It withdrew from NAM when Cuba became the chairman of the NAM. However, the China factor, the desire of Burma to develop more co-operative relations with ASEAN, and the Indo-Burmese differences over the Kampuchean issue and Afghan crisis need careful handling by India. The strong cultural and historical links with Burma must be used to meet this need.

As the most influential member of the so-called neutralist group of nations India is especially interested in developing the closest possible ties with other Asian and African nations which share her point of view. Hence India disclaims any desire to act as a leader in Asia, but she is a leading champion of Asia's claims to a greater place in world affairs.
India continues to work hard for both securing an increased South-South co-operation. It is for securing global negotiations between the rich and the poor. The unity of the developing countries, and to work for securing New International Economic Order through North-South negotiations, are the goals which are very dear to India. Solidarity with the developing countries is a cardinal principle of Indian foreign policy. India believes that unless the developing countries can pool their resources, they will not be able to improve their life conditions. For this, India supports regional and sub-regional co-operation among the developing countries for achieving self-reliance.

6.7 Bhutan (Kingdom of Bhutan)

After independence, the Government of India concluded a fresh treaty with Bhutan on 8 August 1949. Under this treaty the Government of Bhutan agreed to be guided by the Government of India in regard to external relations and the Government of India undertook not to interfere in the internal affairs of Bhutan.

India has been successful in assuring Bhutan that its sovereignty and internal autonomic stand are acknowledged
and respected by India. India sponsored Bhutan for membership of the UNO and this put an end to all suspicions on India. Thus the relations between India and Bhutan became very close. So Bhutan fully realised that her security is closely linked with India. As King Wangchuk has on many occasions observed that "India is not only our close neighbour but our genuine friend". The past history of co-operation must be used as a basis for strengthening the relationship in the times to come. T. N. Kaul, in his book "Diplomacy in Peace and War", has beautifully examined the Indo-Bhutan relations with the broader context of India's policy towards her neighbours. He observes "We should avoid the mistakes as we made in Nepal and not take smaller countries for granted or act as their big brother. They are sensitive, even touchy, on small things, proud and easily hurt. We must respect their sensibilities, honour their national aspirations and win their trust and confidence. They are subject to many pulls and pressures, stresses and strains, internally and cannot bear these alone without understanding and respect of a friendly neighbour like India".

Hence, it is a matter of satisfaction that relations between India and Bhutan are friendly and are developing along the right lines. They could become a model relation
between a big country and a small. In the powerful words of Nehru:

Our country is a large one and our population is considerable. But we have no desire to interfere with any other country. We have no hatreds and we have been nurtured under the inspiring guidance of our great leader, Mahatma Gandhi, in the ways of peace. We want to be friends with all the world. We know our feelings and seek to overcome them, so that we might be of service to our own people and to the world".27

The world is so interrelated today that war anywhere affects not only the immediate combatants but equally other nations. As a founding member of the non-aligned movement and as a people who have been schooled in the thought of Gandhiji and Nehru, we stand firmly against the very concept of confrontation. We abhor violence and have always stood for total and universal disarmament. That is why India laid the utmost stress on peaceful co-existence to other states beyond their location, ideology or ethnicity.
6.8 India's Foreign Policy: A Gandhian Critique

After Gandhiji's demise, Nehru continued Gandhian crusade against imperialism, colonialism and racialism in the world even at the cost of Nehru's national interest. So Nehru's theory of non-alignment became an extension and application of the principle of non-violence. In one of his parliamentary speeches in 1950, Nehru said, "if the policy is completely idealistic then it smacks of hypocrisy because no foreign minister can ignore the ground realities obtaining at a particular time; if the policy is totally realistic, then it loses glamour, mass appeal and capacity to be effective on a wide international stage". Independence of judgement, world peace, non-involvement in blocs—all three essential elements of Nehru's foreign policy were included in this speech. His personality combined an intense nationalism with the pride and sensitivity of a young nation struggling to cope with the problems of modernisation under the heritage of an immediate colonial past.

Nehru's initiative towards the case of disarmament can be traced back to 1948 when he extended his sympathetic support to Russia's appeal for the prevention of nuclear weapons. So India led an upsurge of concern
against nuclear weapon under Nehru from the very beginning. Addressing the United Nations Organisation's General Assembly on the 'scourge of war' and "war, peace and disarmament" to the general conference of the UNESCO and a "world of unreality" and to the closed session of the "Afro-Asian conference on world peace and co-operation" and "peaceful co-existence" and on "the concept of Panch sheel", Nehru's adherence to the policy of peace is transparent. This was the result of the influence of Gandhiji and his ideals on Nehru. Gandhiji and Nehru were the toppers of "cosmopolitan humanism", sensitive to the sufferings of the weaker sections. In 'Hind Swaraj' Gandhiji found his mission of life and the vision of society, which sustained him throughout many ups and downs in his life. In this regard Gandhiji is one of the rare statesmen who did not enjoy power of an ordinary politician. In this context Gandhian idea of peace and equality is very much relevant. Deviation from truth in any form is un-Gandhian, be it in diplomacy, state craft, public administration or international relations. Gandhiji believed that the root of all social evils lies in individual and men must make himself free from the evils. So Gandhiji went on ceaselessly experimenting with truth and the search for it was a moral and spiritual endeavour. There is nothing objectionable or untenable in
such a search as far as it goes. But as a pragmatist Gandhiji preferred to initiate actions and had ended them whenever his conscience demanded.

Gandhiji stood for a social order based on the distribution of political power to an extreme degree. In society he did not see enemy, but he had only opponents. He called people opponents, who did not share his approach to the problems of life. But he has a faith in the inherent goodness of man. Very early in life he broke through his inhibiting surroundings and devoted himself to social service and worked with devotion and enthusiasm in a manner that rightly earned for him the title of Yugapurusha--the creator of the Age.

Gandhiji's philosophy of resistance to evil, basic humanism, optimism about man at the epicentre of his thought process have global relevance. His ideas have greater relevance today than ever. To Amlan Dutt: "Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants. We know more about war than we know about peace, more about killing than we know about living. We have grasped the mystery of atom and rejected the sermon on the mount".37 Hence the ideal way is to be friends with the world and to regard the whole human family as one. In order to save mankind from the horrors of total and complete
annihilation from our mundane earth, Gandhiji's method and approach of truth and non-violence should be adopted for the settlement of disputes. Indian society has been concerned with peace (shanti) and is fully conscious of the 'cosmic view of peace'\(^3\) as is illustrated by one of Gandhiji's famous shantipath talks concerning peace in the minds of the people, peace on earth, in outer space, on the seas and beneath the sea and earth. In the Indian concept of peace, an individual being at peace with oneself is considered to be absolutely crucial to peace on all fronts and in all places. Gandhiji was the staunch advocate of this view and his internationalism, according to J. S. Mathur, "has a far nobler mission to establish friendship and peace in the world. Peace cannot be established through mere conferences.\(^3\) Peace cannot be brought about by fine phrases and nice lectures, but by hardwork and sacrifice. Peace has its price. In the words of Gandhiji: "There is no half way between truth and non-violence on the one hand and untruth and violence on the other. We may never be strong enough to be entirely non-violent in thought, word and deed; but we must keep non-violence as our goal and make steady progress towards it. The attainment of freedom, whether for a man, a nation or the world, must be in exact proportion to the attainment of non-violence by each. Let those, therefore,
who believe in non-violence as the only method of achieving real freedom, keep the lamp of non-violence burning bright in the midst of the present impenetrable gloom. The truth of a few will count, the untruth of millions will vanish even like chaff before a whiff of wind". The evolution of individuals and societies depend on the extent to which they exercise self-restraint and abjure the use of force. While there is a search for a more equitable world order, force continues to be used to attain political ends and to promote national or global interests. India has consistently advocated for the reduction of arms as a means towards the establishment of peace in the world. Gandhiji offers more or less a comprehensive philosophy with a sense of empiricism. So for making a world of peace and well being of humanity, the realisation of Gandhian vision is the need of the hour with its full spirit. In this regard India has a crucial role to play in the contemporary world. In spite of all the differences and divisions in the world the spirit of non-violence and truth can find conditional but immensely significant embodiment in world institutions.

Gandhiji's solutions to problems are associated with leadership, professing and practising one of the powerful and attractive ideologies. To R. R. Diwakar, "on a deeper analysis, however, one finds that there is as
much newness in Gandhiji's thought as in the technique he evolved to fight all evil with soul force, moral force, or the weapons of love and non-violence.\textsuperscript{41} Gandhiji's assumption is that people having once seen and experienced the efficacy of the non-violent technique in one situation would easily accept the universality of ethical and the political technique.

In the light of the various insights from Gandhiji, it is possible to understand that the usual formulation of the problem of the relationship between non-violent moral principle and the non-violent political technique often distort in their relationships. If the universal ethics is invalid, the progressive development of the practical application of non-violent means will be meaningless in social and political fields. It will proceed to the point at which the supposed conflict between loyalty to the non-violent ethics and political practicality is dissolved in a more advanced synthesis. To quote Gandhiji: "The world is not entirely governed by logic. The life itself involves some kind of violence and we have to choose the path of least violence.\textsuperscript{42} Hence, the erosion of non-violence can be stopped only if we assume that non-violence not as an alternative to violence.
The root of our current problems and chaos lies in what is known in the Nyaya sastra as the Matsya nyaya. The stronger group of individuals subdue the weaker section in every sphere of life. But Gandhiji's ideal of non-violence recognizes the right of each living thing to survive.

In view of the increasing violence in society today and the failure of science and technology in solving the problems, the rationale of Gandhiji's teaching has become more imperative. To quote Rabindranath Tagore: "I hope the spirit of sacrifice will grow and also the will to suffer . . . . This is real liberty. Nothing is higher not even national independence. The West has belief in force and material wealth; therefore no matter how much it cries for peace and disarmament, its ferocity will cry still louder . . . . We in India must show the world that it is this truth which not only makes disarmament possible but transmutes into strength. The fact that moral force is a stronger power than brute force will be proved by unarmed people". To Gandhi: "Our object is friendship with the whole world. Non-violence has come to men and it will remain. It is the enunciation of peace on earth".

The peace of the world is far off. We have seen, during the course of centuries, the hypocrisy, the
cowardice and the cruelty of mankind. This does not prevent us from loving mankind and the way to peace leads through self-sacrifice. It is the core of Gandhiji's message. Because 'peace', as Gandhiji envisaged, "is far more than an absence of war and violence".46 Arnold Toynbee suggests: "If we do not abolish war, war is going to abolish us".47 The warning from Albert Einstein is also serious here: "I do not know about the Third World War but in the Fourth World War they will fight with sticks and stones".48 Gandhiji believes that the basis of public life is mutual love and confidence in the people. This is possible only when doubts and fears are dispelled. This can be possible only when the life of the people is based on non-violence as a value. Such a creative value can be attained only in social, political and economic fields which are grounded in mutual co-operation and in which the relation between individuals is maintained on a natural human level. This is the concept of ideal individual, ideal society, ideal state and ideal world set up in Gandhian vision.

Gandhiji advocates internationalism through non-violent national reconstruction and reform. He builds for enduring world peace from bottom upwards by two steps or stages:
(1) The discipline or training of the individual.

(2) The transformation and reconstruction of the political and socio-economic structure of the nations along non-violent lines.

And it is this pervasive and thorough-going character of Gandhiji's way to world peace that tends to distinguish it from most other approaches.

The international organisation envisaged by Gandhiji has the following traits.49

(a) The individuals and nations composing the world should be predominantly non-violent.

(b) All the nations of the world should be fully independent. There can be no place in such a world for colonialism, imperialism and race hatred.

(c) The distinction of big and small should be obliterated and every nation should feel as tall as the tallest. Each and every nation must be represented in the international organisation.

(d) It should be based on general disarmament. Failing that, someone nation, at least, should take the initiative and give a lead to the rest of the world. Its example may become infectious.
in course of time, even as the example of the non-violent individual becomes infectious.

(e) All disputes between nations should be settled peacefully and amicably by such methods as negotiation, mediation and arbitration.

(f) The international society should be a voluntary organisation of states for the common good in which every nation should be willing to sacrifice itself for all.

(g) There shall be a small international police force to keep order in the absence of complete and universal belief in non-violence.

However, the international society and organisation as depicted by Gandhiji may take time to evolve. Meanwhile, there may be cases of aggression by one state against another or sudden outbreaks of violence by war-like groups of men or tribes because Gandhiji's way to world peace does not seem to be a mere 'Utopia'.

Although the ideals of Gandhiji are essentially universal in character, the Indians at any rate cannot and dare not forget that he lived and died for humanity. To Louis Fischer: "The more I have thought of his (Gandhiji) life, the clearer becomes his relevance to the worries of the western world today". Gandhiji's importance lies in
having provided an alternative means of defence to that of physical warfare which owing to the terrible potentialities of nuclear armaments could today exterminate most of the human race. While addressing the Philosophy Club of Cambridge University in 1952, Arnold Toynbee had chosen to speak on the topic 'AD 2002'. Taking a long look into the shape of things in future, he felt that the world would get increasingly unified, physically, economically and militarily. The human spirit would rebel against this global unification and this rebellion will start in India. In his own words: "It is becoming clear that a chapter which had a Western beginning will have to have an 'Indian ending' if it is not to end in the self-destruction of the human race. A great war with nuclear weapons means--not improbably extinction of all life on this planet--a great war must therefore be prevented. For this reason, India has the opportunity to do a supreme service to mankind for which no other nation is equally fitted". Hence, if we want peace and harmony, we must have a culture of peace. Civilisation, in the real sense of the term, consists not in the multiplication but in the deliberate and voluntary reduction of selfish wants. This alone promotes real happiness and contentment and increases the capacity for services.
6.9 Towards a Better World of Peace: Gandhian Way

Gandhiji's Law of Love implied a love of humanity. So from the early days of his nationalist agitation, there was an effective support for internationalism. As he told the great poet of internationalism, Rabeendranath Tagore, at the speech of his second Non-co-operation campaign, "Indian nationalism is not exclusive, nor aggressive, nor destructive. It is health-giving religious and, therefore, humanitarian. India must learn to live before she can aspire to die for humanity". Consistent with this, Gandhiji was an advocate of a free world federation of nations. However, he showed considerable skepticism about the ability of the 'League of Nations' and its successor, the 'United Nations Organisation' to meet the peaceful life of humanity. The behaviour of the great powers at the Versailles Peace Conference led Gandhiji to hate the treaty as early as 1919.

Gandhiji's views regarding the League of Nations is indicated in the response to the appeal of two Muslims who had seen French violation of the mandate to Syria, and wished Gandhiji to send a cable in protest. So he told them that he saw no point in making appeals from weakness, for the League of Nations was dominated by France and Britain to whom it would be useless to appeal. But when
the first threat of aggression came against Ethiopia in 1935.\textsuperscript{57} Gandhiji was one of the first to appeal to the League to use its moral deterrence. Hence, contrary to the frequent accusation Gandhiji ignored the League of Nations. The impression of inaction may have arisen, incorrectly, when he later asserted that "Ethiopia's appeal to the League would be unnecessary if it were non-violent and unarmed, which was not of course".\textsuperscript{58}

Despite the weakness of the League of Nations Gandhiji attached great significance to international organisation. So he strongly advocated his views on a world federation of states to preserve peace and security. On the establishment of such a world federation disarmament would be practicable in all countries. An independent India would join such a federation and co-operate on an equal basis with other states as a solution for world problems.

Gandhiji's dislike of international military sanctions is one of the most widely misunderstood ideas for his critics. It was based upon sound philosophical and logical ground. Here Gandhiji used the supreme law of non-violence as a force which could meet national gangsters. In his own words: "For ultimately force, however, justifiably used, will lead us into the same
morass as the force of Nazism and Fascism. Rather than, rely on that orthodox 'Law of the Jungle' there would be an appeal to the heart, that is by love".\textsuperscript{59} It was the recognition of the reality of violence in the founding of the United Nations Organisation that led Gandhiji to comment after the war. To him: "United Nations could set out to fight Hitler with his weapons and ended by Hitlering Hitler".\textsuperscript{60}

Even before the United Nations was formally set up Gandhiji expressed his skepticism about its basic structure and role. Speaking a week before the Sanfrancisco Conference of 1945 he foresaw the roots of another conflict in the field of mistrust and fear. Gandhiji then elaborated four areas of his doubt.

(1) There will be no peace for the Allies or the world unless they shed their belief in the efficacy of war and the fraud and deception accompanying it.

(2) There must be true freedom and equality.

(3) The settlement must not be vindictive or punitive.

(4) The retention of an international police will be a concession to human weakness, not by any means an emblem of peace.\textsuperscript{61}
Although Gandhiji's apprehensions about the United Nations were justified, he never gave up his faith in world unity. Thus, by the advent of World War II, Gandhiji could speak with about twenty years of personal experience about the possibility of training illiterate, war-like persons of both sexes in non-violent defence. Therefore, his advice to the Ethiopians, Jews, Swiss, Czechs, French and British to defend themselves by non-violence is hardly as idealistic and impractical as commonly believed.

In the postwar period Gandhiji persisted in urging independent India to adopt non-violent defence, even though it had become apparent that the Congress had chosen the path of violence. How far India had already diverged from the Gandhian path may be understood by the fact that no effect was made to set up a non-violent corps. Gandhiji will be remembered for the success of such a path. His anti-imperialist campaign was the first demonstration of the efficacy of love against the greatest imperial power (England) in the world. Gandhiji's international realism recognized the reality of great power dominance and the counter-productivity of its violence against dictators. He placed before humanity the alternative of true international unity and the vision of a non-violent peace force. Thus Gandhiji provided the
theoretical and the practical basis for the elaboration of non-violent defence and the inspiration for the practical direction for the elimination of war.

Gandhiji was against violence and in favour of love, non-resistance and non-cooperation. To Gandhi: "For under Swaraj too I would not hesitate to advise those who would bear arms to do so and fight for the country". But it did not mean that he favoured military defence. Arms are the symbol of helplessness, not of strength. So he believed that democracy and the military way are incompatible with each other. For democratisation militarism should be avoided. The states that are today, nominally democratic, have either to become frankly totalitarian or, if they are to become truly democratic they must courageously be non-violent.

Non-violence is based on suggestion, imagination, sympathy, emotions, indication and creative power of trust. But these are simply acknowledgements of the probable course of events in the situation in which reliance was placed on military means. Hence, Gandhiji hoped: "Free India would present to the world a lesson of peace, not the lesson of hatred and violence of which the world is already sick unto death".
Gandhiji advocated unilateral disarmament without waiting for other side to reciprocate. He places the following methods for the same.

(a) The people would ask their leaders and/or the leaders would ask the people, to support a policy of unilateral nuclear disarmament.

(b) The head of the state to declare to the nation, and thus to the world, that it is embarking on unilateral nuclear disarmament.

(c) It would be for the nation to provide leadership in the United Nations Organisation to strengthen considerably, the peace making and peace keeping institutions for in the United Nations Charter.

(d) It would be for the nation to form, as other states announce a unilateral nuclear policy, and

(e) It would be for the nation to plan intentionally for civilian defence. This is a signboard to a peaceful better world.

To B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya: "Gandhism is not a set of doctrines or dogmas, rules or regulations, injunctions or inhibitions, but it is a way of life. It indicates a new attitude or restates an old one towards life's issues and offers ancient solutions for modern problems". Hence, the concept of non-violent peace is a cosmic concept.
because it opens up scope for harmonious co-existence of humanity. Gandhiji's mission is to convert every Indian and finally the world to non-violence for regulating mutual relations whether political, economic, social or religious.

In this regard it is worth referring to some of the features of India's foreign relations as outlined below:

(a) Preservation of India's sovereign independence,
(b) Pursuance of an independent foreign policy avoiding alignment with power blocs,
(c) Co-operation with all peace loving states and the United Nations Organisation for promoting international peace and security,
(d) Reduction of world tensions, and
(e) To promote unity and solidarity among states. For achieving these aims India follows the path of peaceful co-existence.
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