



INSTITUTE
OF DISTANCE
EDUCATION **IDE**
Rajiv Gandhi University



MAPOLS-406

Foreign Policy of India and world

MA POLITICAL SCIENCE
2ND SEMESTER

Rajiv Gandhi University

www.ide.rgu.ac.in

FOREIGN POLICY OF INDIA AND WORLD

MA [Political Science]

Second Semester

MAPOLS- 406



RAJIV GANDHI UNIVERSITY

Arunachal Pradesh, INDIA - 791 112

BOARD OF STUDIES

1. Prof. P K Panigarhi Department of Pol. Science Rajiv Gandhi University	Chairman
2. Prof. M N Das Department of Political Science Dibrugarh University Dibrugarh, Assam	Member
3. Mr. N N Hina Department of Pol. Science Rajiv Gandhi University	Member
4. Dr. Ashan Riddi Director, IDE	Member Secretary

Authors

Dr Sudhir Kumar Suthar, Ms Nidhi Shukla, Ms Shalza Singh: Units (1, 2.4-2.5, 4.4) © Reserved, revised edition, 2021

Miss Lianbol Vaiphei, Dr. Rajneesh Kumar Gupta, Pranav Kumar: Units (2.2-2.3, 3.3, 4.2-4.3, 5.2-5.3, 7.5-7.6, 9.2-9.3) © Reserved, revised edition, 2021

Dr M.D. Tarique Anwer: Units (3.4-3.5, 6, 7.2-7.4, 8, 9.4) © Reserved, revised edition, 2021

Vikas Publishing House: Units (2.0-2.1, 2.6-2.10, 3.0-3.2, 3.6-3.12, 4.0-4.1, 4.5-4.9, 5.0-5.1, 5.4-5.9, 7.0-7.1, 7.7-7.11, 9.0-9.1, 9.5-9.10, 10) © Reserved, revised edition, 2021

All rights reserved. No part of this publication which is material protected by this copyright notice may be reproduced or transmitted or utilized or stored in any form or by any means now known or hereinafter invented, electronic, digital or mechanical, including photocopying, scanning, recording or by any information storage or retrieval system, without prior written permission from the Publisher.

"Information contained in this book has been published by Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd. and has been obtained by its Authors from sources believed to be reliable and are correct to the best of their knowledge. However, IDE—Rajiv Gandhi University, the publishers and its Authors shall be in no event be liable for any errors, omissions or damages arising out of use of this information and specifically disclaim any implied warranties or merchantability or fitness for any particular use"



Vikas® is the registered trademark of Vikas® Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

VIKAS® PUBLISHING HOUSE PVT LTD

E-28, Sector-8, Noida - 201301 (UP)

Phone: 0120-4078900 • Fax: 0120-4078999

Regd. Office: 7361, Ravindra Mansion, Ram Nagar, New Delhi 110 055

• Website: www.vikaspublishing.com • Email: helpline@vikaspublishing.com

UNIT 1 EMERGENCE OF NEW WORLD ORDER: MAJOR DEBATES

NOTES

Structure

- 1.0 Introduction
- 1.1 Unit Objectives
- 1.2 Clash of Civilizations
- 1.3 Unipolar and Multipolar World System
- 1.4 Nuclear Disarmament—CTBT
- 1.5 Summary
- 1.6 Key Terms
- 1.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 1.8 Questions and Exercises
- 1.9 Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In the previous unit, you learnt about the concept of globalization in relation to the state, and the role of WTO in this globalized world.

World politics is entering a new phase, and intellectuals have not hesitated to proliferate visions of what it will be, the end of history, the return of traditional rivalries between nation states, and the decline of the nation state from the conflicting pulls of tribalism and globalism, among others. Each of these visions catches aspects of the emerging reality.

Yet they all miss a crucial, indeed a central, aspect of what global politics is likely to be in the coming years. It is my hypothesis that the fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or economic.

The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. Nation states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, but the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilizations. The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics. The fault lines between civilizations will be the battle lines of the future.

In this unit, you will be a part of the debate surrounding the emergence of the new world order.

1.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Interpret the debate on clash of civilizations
- Analyse unipolar and multipolar world system
- Discuss nuclear disarmament

About the University

Rajiv Gandhi University (formerly Arunachal University) is a premier institution for higher education in the state of Arunachal Pradesh and has completed twenty-five years of its existence. Late Smt. Indira Gandhi, the then Prime Minister of India, laid the foundation stone of the university on 4th February, 1984 at Rono Hills, where the present campus is located.

Ever since its inception, the university has been trying to achieve excellence and fulfill the objectives as envisaged in the University Act. The university received academic recognition under Section 2(f) from the University Grants Commission on 28th March, 1985 and started functioning from 1st April, 1985. It got financial recognition under section 12-B of the UGC on 25th March, 1994. Since then Rajiv Gandhi University, (then Arunachal University) has carved a niche for itself in the educational scenario of the country following its selection as a University with potential for excellence by a high-level expert committee of the University Grants Commission from among universities in India.

The University was converted into a Central University with effect from 9th April, 2007 as per notification of the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.

The University is located atop Rono Hills on a picturesque tableland of 302 acres overlooking the river Dikrong. It is 6.5 km from the National Highway 52-A and 25 km from Itanagar, the State capital. The campus is linked with the National Highway by the Dikrong bridge.

The teaching and research programmes of the University are designed with a view to play a positive role in the socio-economic and cultural development of the State. The University offers Undergraduate, Post-graduate, M.Phil and Ph.D. programmes. The Department of Education also offers the B.Ed. programme.

There are fifteen colleges affiliated to the University. The University has been extending educational facilities to students from the neighbouring states, particularly Assam. The strength of students in different departments of the University and in affiliated colleges has been steadily increasing.

The faculty members have been actively engaged in research activities with financial support from UGC and other funding agencies. Since inception, a number of proposals on research projects have been sanctioned by various funding agencies to the University. Various departments have organized numerous seminars, workshops and conferences. Many faculty members have participated in national and international conferences and seminars held within the country and abroad. Eminent scholars and distinguished personalities have visited the University and delivered lectures on various disciplines.

The academic year 2000-2001 was a year of consolidation for the University. The switch over from the annual to the semester system took off smoothly and the performance of the students registered a marked improvement. Various syllabi designed by Boards of Post-graduate Studies (BPGS) have been implemented. VSAT facility installed by the ERNET India, New Delhi under the UGC-Infonet program, provides Internet access.

In spite of infrastructural constraints, the University has been maintaining its academic excellence. The University has strictly adhered to the academic calendar, conducted the examinations and declared the results on time. The students from the University have found placements not only in State and Central Government Services, but also in various institutions, industries and organizations. Many students have emerged successful in the National Eligibility Test (NET).

Since inception, the University has made significant progress in teaching, research, innovations in curriculum development and developing infrastructure.

1.2 CLASH OF CIVILIZATIONS

NOTES

The dissolution of the Soviet Union (USSR) in December 1991 saw the United States of America standing as the reigning super power. This period also witnessed political scientists and thinkers proposing and rewriting theories on world power. In 1993, Samuel P. Huntington proposed that the future fault line will centre on culture and religion. His theory of the clash of civilizations in the post-Cold War era predicts alignments and wars among various civilizations — Western, Islamic, Chinese, Japanese, Orthodox/Russian, Hindu, African, and Latin.

It was Bernard Lewis who first used the term clash of civilization. In his article in the September 1990, Lewis had forecast war would break out among major civilization in 2020. His theory states that American troops would have left South Korea, which would lead to reunification of Korean and lessen the presence for US troops in Japan. Also, Taiwan and mainland China will reach an accommodation in which Taiwan continues to have most of its de facto independence but explicitly acknowledges Beijing's suzerainty, and with China's sponsorship be admitted to the United Nations on the model of Ukraine and Belorussia in 1946. He further predicted the oil issue in the South China Sea will lead to an attack on Vietnam by the Chinese troops, wherein the latter would avenge its humiliation in 1979. The US will also get involved in the war due to its economic interest in the oil fields, helped by Japan. In response, China will launch a military strike against the American task force. Negotiations for a ceasefire, led by the UN and Japan, would fail, resulting in Japanese neutrality and the latter denying the US to use its land as bases for the war. Despite the quarantine, the US uses the Japanese territory and is inflicted with serious damages to its naval facilities in east Asia. China continues the war from the mainland as well as Taiwan and occupies a major portion of Vietnam, including Hanoi.

To this theory, Huntington's hypothesis claimed the US will avoid escalating the war due to domestic pressure wherein the public would view it as American hegemony in Southeast Asia or control of the South China Sea. While China would be engaged in war, India would attack Pakistan, which would be joined by Iran on Pakistan's side. China's initial success will stimulate major anti-Western movements in Muslim societies, and pro-Western regimes in Arab nations and the Muslim youth bulge (males between the age group of 16 and 30) would oust Turkey. The anti-Westernism surge, prompted by the US' weakness will lead to a massive Arab attack on Israel, which the much-reduced US Sixth Fleet will be unable to stop.

China's military success will prompt Japan to change its stand from being neutral to pro-China and occupy American bases on its territory. Hence, the US will be forced to evacuate and declare a blockade on Japan. This in turn will lead to sporadic naval wars between the US and Japan. At the start of the conflict, China will offer a mutual security pact to Russia (vaguely reminiscent of the Hitler-Stalin pact), which the latter would reject. Fearing dominance of East Asia by China, Russia would take an anti-China stand and reinforce its troops in Siberia. This would lead to revolts by the Chinese settlers there, resulting in China occupying Vladivostok city, the Amur River valley, and other important regions of eastern Siberia. As the war between China and Russia spread to central Siberia, uprisings broke out in Mongolia, which China had earlier placed under a 'protectorate'.

Huntington's hypothetical hostilities, thus, far have been limited to east Asia and the Indian subcontinent. To expand Huntington's theory of hostility in a wider

About IDE

The formal system of higher education in our country is facing the problems of access, limitation of seats, lack of facilities and infrastructure. Academicians from various disciplines opine that it is learning which is more important and not the channel of education. The education through distance mode is an alternative mode of imparting instruction to overcome the problems of access, infrastructure and socio-economic barriers. This will meet the demand for qualitative higher education of millions of people who cannot get admission in the regular system and wish to pursue their education. It also helps interested employed and unemployed men and women to continue with their higher education. Distance education is a distinct approach to impart education to learners who remained away in the space and/or time from the teachers and teaching institutions on account of economic, social and other considerations. Our main aim is to provide higher education opportunities to those who are unable to join regular academic and vocational education programmes in the affiliated colleges of the University and make higher education reach to the doorsteps in rural and geographically remote areas of Arunachal Pradesh in particular and North-eastern part of India in general. In 2008, the Centre for Distance Education has been renamed as "Institute of Distance Education (IDE)."

Continuing the endeavor to expand the learning opportunities for distant learners, IDE has introduced Post Graduate Courses in 5 subjects (Education, English, Hindi, History and Political Science) from the Academic Session 2013-14.

The Institute of Distance Education is housed in the Physical Sciences Faculty Building (first floor) next to the University Library. The University campus is 6 kms from NERIST point on National Highway 52A. The University buses ply to NERIST point regularly.

Outstanding Features of Institute of Distance Education:

- (i) At Par with Regular Mode
Eligibility requirements, curricular content, mode of examination and the award of degrees are on par with the colleges affiliated to the Rajiv Gandhi University and the Department(s) of the University.
- (ii) Self-Instructional Study Material (SISM)
The students are provided SISM prepared by the Institute and approved by Distance Education Council (DEC), New Delhi. This will be provided at the time of admission at the IDE or its Study Centres. SISM is provided only in English except Hindi subject.
- (iii) Contact and Counselling Programme (CCP)
The course curriculum of every programme involves counselling in the form of personal contact programme of duration of approximately 7-15 days. The CCP shall not be compulsory for BA. However for professional courses and MA the attendance in CCP will be mandatory.
- (iv) Field Training and Project
For professional course(s) there shall be provision of field training and project writing in the concerned subject.
- (v) Medium of Instruction and Examination
The medium of instruction and examination will be English for all the subjects except for those subjects where the learners will need to write in the respective languages.
- (vi) Subject/Counselling Coordinators
For developing study material, the IDE appoints subject coordinators from within and outside the University. In order to run the PCCP effectively Counselling Coordinators are engaged from the Departments of the University. The Counselling-Coordinators do necessary coordination for involving resource persons in contact and counselling programme and assignment evaluation. The learners can also contact them for clarifying their difficulties in their respective subjects.

global context, we should look at his hypothesis that further states that China and Iran would, through a secret mission, deploy intermediate-range nuclear-capable missiles in Bosnia and Algeria to intimidate US' European allies from joining it.

This would have the opposite effect because before NATO can mobilize Serbia, which seeks to reclaim its historic role as the defender of Christianity against the Turks, would invade Bosnia. Croatia too would join her, and the two countries partition Bosnia, take control of the missiles and carry on with their 'task' of ethnic cleansing, which they were forced to stop in the 1990s. While Albania and Turkey try to rescue the Bosnians, Greece and Bulgaria invade Turkey. Meanwhile, a missile with a nuclear warhead, launched from Algeria, explodes outside Marseilles, and NATO retaliates with devastating air attacks on North African targets.

Huntington's hypothesis divides the global powers between two groups — the US, Europe, Russia, and India on one side, and China, Japan, and most of Islamic countries on the other. In case of another world war, the destruction would be substantial since both sides have nuclear capabilities. But if mutual deterrence is effective, mutual exhaustion might lead to a negotiated armistice. The West can defeat China by diverting its attention and supporting insurrections in Tibet, Mongolia, and by the Uighurs. Simultaneously, the Western forces along with Russia can move eastward into Siberia for a final assault on Beijing, Manchuria, and the Han heartland.

Huntington further postulates that the warring nations would eventually become economically, militarily and demographically weak due and the center of world politics would move southward to countries, such as, Latin American nations, New Zealand, Mynamar, Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Indonesia, and also India in case it survives major destructions despite its role in the war.

Some political thinkers agree to Huntington's war theory following the 9/11 attack on the World Trade Center in the US and subsequent American military action on Afghanistan and Iraq. But as we know, it was to protect its oil fields in Iraq and the interest of the Israel lobby that the US attacked Iraq in 2003, and not because of civilizational fault lines. In fact, there has not been any conflict on the lines of civilizational fault lines for the last century. It is economic greed more than any other factors that creates and maintains fault lines among nations and peoples and that drive wars.

It is to be noticed, there is no unifying cord among civilizations apart from Islam. In Islam, too, there is a great divide between the Shias and the Sunnis. Saudi Arabia, which is ruled by the Sunnis, has collaborated with its bitter enemy Israel to fight Iran, a Shia-dominated country. Although Muslims in Turkey, Pakistan, Indonesia, North Africa, and the rest of the Arab world are Sunnis, they have diverse viewpoints, and many are fighting internal conflicts and secessionists within their country; for example, the Kurds in Turkey, the Baluchs and Pashtuns in Pakistan, and the Aceh in Indonesia. These factors are unlikely to unify the Islamic countries.

Huntington's hypothesis of a bloody, cataclysmic clash between the Sinic and Western civilizations is, in fact, quite improbable. The Cold War and in particular the Nixon government's theory of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) vis-à-vis the Soviet Union are testimony that countries with nuclear power would not indulge in war leading to mass destruction. In the post-Cold War world, flags as well as other symbols of cultural identity, including crosses, crescents, and head gears reflect cultural acquaintance, which is of great importance to people. People discovered new but often old identities and marched under new but often old flags which lead to wars with new but often old enemies.

NOTES

SYLLABI-BOOK MAPPING TABLE

International Politics

Syllabi

Mapping in Book

UNIT 1

Emergence of New World Order: Major Debates
The Clash of Civilizations
Unipolar and Multipolar World System
Nuclear Disarmament- CTBT

UNIT 1 Emergence of New World
Order: Major Debates

UNIT 2

The Making of Indian Foreign Policy
Philosophy of Indian Foreign Policy
Determinants
Goals and Objectives
Decolonization, Peace, Security and Development
Non-Alignment

UNIT 2 The Making of Indian
Foreign Policy

UNIT 3

India and Major Powers
USA, Russia China and Japan

UNIT 3: India and Major Powers

UNIT 4

India and Regional Organization
ASEAN, SAARC, European Union & BRICS

UNIT 4 India and Regional
Organization

UNIT 5

Foreign Policy of Major Powers
USA, UK and Russia

UNIT 5 Foreign Policy of Major
Powers

Religion as the sole cause of the conflicts

NOTES

While Huntington's theory of clash of civilizations gives a compelling argument for the events that took place in the former Yugoslavia, the main argument that was set forth by him using religion as the sole cause of the conflicts in the region—in what he regards as 'fault line' wars—is erroneous. He did not regard nationalism as a legitimate cause. But the fact is, nationalism was one of the most important causes of the unrest in Yugoslavia, which finally led to its disintegration. The mechanisms of nationalism enabled political elites to mobilize ideology for conflict (Bieber, 1999).

For Huntington, a civilization is the foremost cultural grouping of people and the level in which people relate themselves with (Huntington, 1993). Religion is the dominant factor bonding groups in a civilization. But to understand his argument of civilization clash, one cannot do a generalization of people and nations. That is because in his groupings of civilizations, no civilization is entirely and exclusively homogeneous. No civilization is monolithic and he has failed to recognize this; nation-states in civilizations may have similar cultures and customs but they might have different political ideologies and governmental structures as well as different social structures.

In the former Yugoslavia, Huntington concluded, a cultural fault line existed within the republic, which separated the Christian Croats and Slovenes (Huntington, 1993) from the rest of Yugoslavia, which were Orthodox Christians, and Muslims.

He goes on to say that religious fundamentalism has more sway over ideology and fault line wars, which are based on religion, has been the most extended and violent ones. However, religion did have, in part, a role in the rise of nationalism.

Hence, classifying wars on the basis of 'fault line' is fallible. Numerous conflicts occur between states, but the most influencing instrument is usually ethnic nationalism. Similarly, religion cannot be regarded as the sole basis of civilizations in the Yugoslav conflict. Although Huntington grouped civilizations by religion, the cultural characteristics the people of Yugoslavia shared did not figure in his theory. Religion, however, divided the region into separate entities, which led to differences in language, territory and the questioning of ancestry (Bieber, 1999), but that was not the main cause. Political elites used factors, such as, ethnicity and religion to mobilize nationalist ideas.

Huntington thesis was that 'civilization consciousness' would amplify cultural differences and that is one of the causes of fault line wars. Unrestricted movement of people (along with capital) allows economic and political unity which in turn prevents wars. In the case of Yugoslavia, religion was the dividing factor as the people shared a common historical past, language and customs. Inter-marriage was prevalent, the rate was, especially high in Bosnia. Also, people were referred to as Yugoslav.

Huntington defined a civilization as a group of people having 'common objective elements, such as language, history, religion, customs, institutions, and by the subjective self-identification of people' (Huntington, 1993). Hence, his emphasis on the role of religion in establishing civilizations cannot be held accurate. The Yugoslavian example highlights that awareness of differences does not necessarily lead to conflict. Their fight was to assert political and economic independence in Europe, and create a South Slavic state. The Yugoslav idea of a united state did not mature due to rise of nationalism, which was rooted in ethnicity, and not because of 'cultural fault lines' as stated by Huntington.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

1-2

UNIT 6 EMERGENCE OF NEW WORLD ORDER: MAJOR DEBATES

117-133

- 1.0 Introduction
- 1.1 Unit Objectives
- 1.2 Clash of Civilizations
- 1.3 Unipolar and Multipolar World System
- 1.4 Nuclear Disarmament—CTBT
- 1.5 Summary
- 1.6 Key Terms
- 1.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 1.8 Questions and Exercises
- 1.9 Further Reading

UNIT 2 THE MAKING OF INDIAN FOREIGN POLICY

135-157

- 2.0 Introduction
- 2.1 Unit Objectives
- 2.2 Philosophy of India's Foreign Policy
- 2.3 Determinants of Indian Foreign Policy
 - 2.3.1 Internal (Domestic) Determinants
 - 2.3.2 External (International) Determinants
- 2.4 Goals and Objectives
- 2.5 Decolonization, Peace, Security and Development
- 2.6 Non-Alignment Movement
- 2.7 Summary
- 2.8 Key Terms
- 2.9 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 2.10 Questions and Exercises
- 2.11 Further Reading

UNIT 3 INDIA AND MAJOR POWERS

159-193

- 3.0 Introduction
- 3.1 Unit Objectives
- 3.2 India's Relation with the US
 - 3.2.1 United States and Containment of Communism
 - 3.2.2 Indo-China Border War of 1962; 8.2.3 India-Pakistan War of 1965
 - 3.2.4 Indira Gandhi and Indo-US Relations; 8.2.5 Crisis of Bangladesh
 - 3.2.6 Indo-American Relations after the Bangladesh Crisis
 - 3.2.7 Problem of Nuclear Non-Proliferation; 8.2.8 Indo-US Nuclear Deal
- 3.3 India's Relation with China
 - 3.3.1 Proposal to Open up the Nathula and Jelep Passes
 - 3.3.2 Acknowledgement of Arunachal Pradesh as part of India by the Asian Development Bank (ADB)
 - 3.3.3 Trade Relations between India and China
- 3.4 India's Relation with Russia
- 3.5 India's Relation with Japan
- 3.6 Summary
- 3.7 Key Terms
- 3.8 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 3.9 Questions and Exercises
- 3.10 Further Reading

NOTES

The ruling class put in use a combination of factors, such as, ethnicity, religion and nationalism in the form of ethnic nationalism to mould local sentiments in their fight. The frequent changes in border, territory and governance in former Yugoslavia created a cloudy political atmosphere that was key for the nationalist agenda to spread. This was one of the reason, in the period leading up to the dissolution of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Serbia did not wish for Yugoslavia to break up. Serbia wanted all Serbs to unit in a single state. This idea gave birth to a new type of conflict between the Bosnian Muslims and the Bosnian Serbs; the latter controlling about half of the territory in Bosnia (Republika Srpska). Moreover, civil nationalism could not grow since the Yugoslav model subverted political unity in states as it grew weak. This led to the rise of ethnic nationalism as propagated by the leaders of individual states.

Huntington's theory of fault line wars escalating into major world wars is based on, what he calls, the 'kin-country syndrome'. According to this, a country in war with another country, but of a different civilization, will gather support from within its own civilization. (Huntington, 1993). However, kin rallying did not happen in the former Yugoslavia during the 1992 Bosnian war, and there was no clear defined support for Kosovo when it seceded in 2008.

Most Albanian Kosovars are Muslim, yet not all countries in Huntington's Islamic civilization support Kosovo's independence. States support causes which are favourable to the nation, such as national interest, and, hence, kin support in a political atmosphere is not a natural move.

Taking the Bosnian case as an example, Huntington says the Islamic civilization is inherently faulty and can break into conflicts at the slightest touch. This is so due to a lack of any centralized authority. He, however, does not explain the role of America and NATO is bringing the war to an end.

Huntington's theory, seemingly, could be applied to the events and the eventual incidents that would happen to the Yugoslav state, but his classifications, criteria and reasoning in attempting to answer and predict future wars is simply too broad to be applied to Yugoslavia. Also, such rigid classification on the basis of civilizations cannot exist, especially, in a situation where free movement of people and capital is taking place.

In spite of all the arguments against Huntington's thesis above, he does have legitimate points throughout his thesis. While most of his ideas, on the surface, could be applied to the events and the eventual incidents that would happen to the Yugoslav state, his classifications, criteria and reasoning in attempting to answer and predict future wars is simply too broad to be applied to Yugoslavia. Again, such rigid civilizations simply cannot exist in Huntington's terms especially when the movement of people and capital started to pick up.

His assessment of Yugoslavia as the point in Europe where the cultural fault lines between three civilizations — Western, Slavic Orthodox and Islam — passes through and will create conflict is justifiable to an extent. But he has not factored in a crucial aspect — nationalism — as one of the reasons of the numerous conflicts in the region and accused Islam of being prone to conflicts and destabilizing. In this case, because of numerous fallacies in Huntington's clash of civilizations when examined in depth, it cannot be used to explain the events that happened in Yugoslavia.

Check Your Progress

1. What was the main theme of Huntington's theory?
2. China's initial successes against the US will stimulate major anti-Western movements in Muslim societies, Huntington's theory says. (True/False)
3. Huntington's hypothetical hostilities thus far have been limited to East Asia and the _____.
4. Religion plays the most important part in bonding a group together in a civilization. (True/False)
5. Huntington believes that _____ consciousness will amplify differences between cultures and this is one of the reasons as to why fault line wars happen.

UNIT 4 INDIA AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATION

195-206

- 4.0 Introduction
- 4.1 Unit Objectives
- 4.2 South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC)
- 4.3 Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)
- 4.4 European Union
- 4.5 Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (BRICS)
- 4.6 Summary
- 4.7 Key Terms
- 4.8 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 4.9 Questions and Exercises
- 4.10 Further Reading

UNIT 10 FOREIGN POLICY OF MAJOR POWERS

207-237

- 5.0 Introduction
- 5.1 Unit Objectives
- 5.2 Foreign Policy of the USA
- 5.3 Foreign Policy of the UK
- 5.4 Foreign Policy of the Russia
- 5.5 Summary
- 5.6 Key Terms
- 5.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 5.8 Questions and Exercises
- 5.9 Further Reading

1.3 UNIPOLAR AND MULTIPOLAR WORLD SYSTEM

NOTES

For about four decades since the end of World War II, the world was bi-polar—divided between the control and influence of the USA and the USSR. Collapse of the USSR saw the USA emerge as the only superpower. The question then emerged, will the world go back to the days of multi-polarity?

A unipolar world is a situation where a single country acts unilaterally with little or no assistance from other countries and manoeuvres international issues; other states or even a combination of states lack the power to prevent it from doing so. A multipolar world, on the other hand is one where alliances are formed among states to tackle international issues. A powerful coalition can resist as well as override stances taken by smaller groups or states.

A 'uni-multipolar world', is one in which resolution of important international issues call for action by a single superpower in coalition with other major state powers. However, the superpower holds the right to veto decision and actions taken by the remaining coalition partners.

The uni-multipolar world we have today has four principal levels. At the top is the US dominating the global powers economically, militarily, diplomatically, technologically and culturally. The next level comprises major regional powers whose extent of dominance is not as wide as the US. These countries have varied degree of dominance in different spheres; for example, the German-French condominium in Europe, India in South Asia, and Brazil in Latin America. The following level consist of regional powers who are less powerful and often compete with the major regional powers, such as Britain in relation to the German-French combination, Pakistan in relation to India, and Argentina in relation to Brazil. At the bottom exists the remaining countries, some of whom might have some regional importance but cannot be brought along in the existing power structure.

A key thread to this system is the relationship between the top level of the power structure and the next level, i.e, the superpower and the major regional powers. There is a constant conflict between the two as the superpower would prefer to have a unipolar world order, which is resisted by the major regional powers and the latter would like to believe that global politics was moving towards a multipolar world system. A uni-multipolar world, however, would find stability only if these conflicting pulls can be balanced. However, that may not be possible in the long term because increasingly it is evident that a unipolar world is not favoured by states in general and global politics is evolving towards a multipolar system.

A multipolar, multicivilizational world

A multipolar, multicivilizational world came into existence only after the Cold War period. Prior to this, contacts between civilizations were intermittent or nonexistent. In the modern era, beginning from AD 1500, global politics assumed two dimensions. For more than four hundred years, the nation states of Britain, France, Spain, Austria, Prussia, Germany, the United States, and others constituted a multipolar international system within Western civilization where they competed, traded and fought wars with each other. At the same time, Western nations also expanded, conquered, colonized, or decisively influenced every other civilization.

INTRODUCTION

The demise of the Soviet Union and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact drastically altered the global power balance in favour of the West. Consequently, there was a major change in the global paradigm in the post-Cold War world, in which the US has emerged as the sole superpower, with the European Union as its appendage. The present world order has been rightly described as 'a multipolar world with a unipolar disposition'. Today, the new world order is in the throes of a fast changing scenario and the coming years are going to witness re-alignments, which might seem quite sweeping as well as surprising. Friends of the Cold War days are strangers now, if not estranged, and enemies of yesteryears are becoming friends. To be sure, the era of exclusive relationships is over. Now, every major player on the international scene is interacting with everyone else. No wonder, Russia and the US are 'partners in peace' and no longer adversaries and both India and Russia are seeking extensive cooperation with the western powers led by the US.

This book explains complex details of international politics in a lucid style. It introduces the concept of international politics and its evolution as a discipline; theories in international politics and also deals with the concept of power and how it brings about international conflicts. It delineates the importance of foreign policy and balance of power.

This book —*International Politics*—has been designed keeping in mind the self-instruction mode (SIM) format and follows a simple pattern, wherein each unit of the book begins with the **Introduction** followed by the **Unit Objectives** for the topic. The content is then presented in a simple and easy-to-understand manner, and is interspersed with **Check Your Progress** questions to reinforce the student's understanding of the topic. A list of **Questions and Exercises** is also provided at the end of each unit. The **Summary**, **Key Terms** and **Activity** further act as useful tools for students and are meant for effective recapitulation of the text.

This book is divided into ten units:

Unit 1 Analyses the major debates surrounding the new world order. It looks into the arguments regarding theories, such as, clash of civilizations, and unipolar and multipolar world system. It also gives a brief insight to nuclear disarmament.

Unit 2: Studies the philosophy and factors which influenced the formulation of India's foreign policy, assess the process of decolonization, and non-aligned movement .

Unit 3: Discusses India's relation with major powers, such as, the US, the UK, Russia, Chin Covers the foreign policies of three great world powers— the USA, UK and

Unit 4: Describes India's relation with regional organization, such as ASEAN, SAARC, the European Union and BRICS.

Unit 5: Covers the foreign policies of three great world powers— the USA, UK and Russia.

NOTES

NOTES

During the Cold War, international politics was bipolar and countries were divided into three sections. There were two power camps divided on the lines of ideologies. The group led by the US, comprising the wealthy nations in a democratic social set up, was engaged in political, economic and military competition with a group of somewhat poorer communist societies associated with and led by the Soviet Union. The real conflict between these two groups took place in the 'Third World' countries, which were the resource points of the former. These 'Third World countries were usually poor, lacked political stability, attained independence recently, and claimed to be nonaligned.

The collapse of the USSR, brought to an end the political order of the Cold War era. In the new atmosphere people looked for cultural identity. People started defining themselves through their religion, language history, values, customs, and institutions. They identify with cultural groups: tribes, ethnic groups, religious communities, nations, and, at the broadest level, civilizations. Politics became instrumental not only in advancing people's interests but also in defining their identity.

Interestingly, nation states retain the position as the principal actors in global affairs. They are driven not only by the desire of gaining power and wealth, but also cultural preferences, commonalities, and differences. Today, international politics witnesses the play of seven to eight major civilizations, mostly from the non-Western societies. The East Asian societies, for example, are developing their economic wealth and creating the basis for enhanced military power and political influence. In the process of asserting their cultural values, these societies tend to overthrow the Western influence.

The 'international system of the twenty-first century,' Henry Kissinger noted, '... will contain at least six major powers—the United States, Europe, China, Japan, Russia, and probably India—as well as a multiplicity of medium-sized and smaller countries.' Six of these major powers belong to five very different civilizations. Also, there are important Islamic states whose strategic locations, populations, and oil resources make them important players in world affairs. In this new world order, local politics deals with ethnicity while global politics is the politics of civilizations. Hence, we can say the clash of the superpowers is replaced by clash of civilizations. The conflicts between the social classes, rich and poor and other economically defined groups is a story of the past; now people will fight for their cultural identity. Within civilizations, there would be more tribal wars and ethnic conflicts. States would wage wars against each other as would groups from different civilizations. There is potential threat of escalation of the civilization wars as groups would rally according to the 'kin-country syndrome'.

The clashes in Somalia among clans do not possess any threat of expansion. Similarly, clash of tribes in Rwanda will have limited consequences, till Uganda, Zaire, and Burundi but not beyond that. However, the clashes of civilizations in Bosnia, the Caucasus, Central Asia, or Kashmir would have greater impact. In the Yugoslav conflicts, Russia gave diplomatic support to the Serbs, and Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Iran, and Libya provided funds and arms to the Bosnians, not on ideological ground or economic interests, but due to cultural kinship.

'Cultural conflicts,' Vaclav Havel has observed, 'are increasing and are more dangerous today than at any time in history.' Agreeing to that, Jacques Delors says, 'Future conflicts will be sparked by cultural factors rather than economics or ideology.' And the most dangerous cultural conflicts are those along the fault lines between civilizations.

NOTES

What we have seen is that post-Cold War, culture has been a divisive as well as a unifying force. Despite ideological differences, people united on cultural ground, as did the two Germans. Societies united by ideology or historical circumstance but divided by civilization either come apart, as did the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, and Bosnia, or are subjected to intense strain, as is the case with Ukraine, Nigeria, Sudan, India, Sri Lanka, and many others. Cooperation among countries sharing a common culture is both economical and political. International organizations based on states with cultural commonality, such as the European Union, have witnessed greater success rates than those that attempt to transcend cultures. If the Iron Curtain was the central dividing line in Europe for forty-five years, today, the line has shifted towards the east. It is now the line separating the peoples of Western Christianity on the one hand, from Muslim and Orthodox peoples on the other.

Civilizations differ on philosophical assumptions, underlying values, social relations, customs, and overall outlooks on life. And the revival of religion throughout much of the world is reinforcing these cultural differences. Culture had and has an impact on politics as well as economics, yet different civilization has reacted differently on the development aspect.

East Asian economic success has its source in its culture, as do the difficulties these societies have had in achieving a stable democratic political systems. If we take the example of Islamic civilization, we see most of the Muslim countries have failed to achieve a democratic political system. Developments in the post-Communist societies of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union are shaped by their civilizational identities. Countries whose heritage lies in Western Christian have witnessed democratic polity and more economic development, while for countries with orthodox values, the development process is uncertain. The prospects in the Muslim republics are bleak.

The Western civilization is a powerful one which is now on a southward slope. It is confronted by non-Western societies, such as Confucian and Islamic societies, as it tries to assert itself and protect its interests, although some of the non-Western societies try to emulate or join the West. Hence, it can be said that the conflict is between the Western civilization against the non-Western ones. The predominant patterns of political and economic development differ from civilization to civilization. Cultural commonalities and differences shape the interests, antagonisms, and associations of states. International politics has become multipolar and multicivilizational.

Response to American hegemony

America's superpowerdom has had different levels of response, mostly negative. At one level, which is relatively low, there is resentment, envy and fear. At a little higher level, the resentment may turn into dissent, with other countries refusing to cooperate with it. There have been instances where resentment has turned into opposition, with countries attempting to defeat the US policies. The highest level of response would be collective counteraction, the formation of an anti-hegemonic coalition of major powers.

In an unipolar world, an anti-hegemonic coalition is not possible, because the remaining states are too weak to counter it. Similar is the case with multipolar world because no state is strong enough to provoke it. It is, however, a natural and predicted development in a uni-multipolar world.

The most important move toward an anti-hegemonic coalition antedates the end of the Cold War: the formation of the European Union and the creation of a common European currency. But why has there not been a more broad-based, active and formal anti-American hegemony coalition?

States may reject and resent US power and wealth but no doubt they benefit from it.

The international relations theory that predicts balancing under the current circumstances is a theory developed in the context of the Westphalian system established in 1648. The member countries in this system recognized the existence of a common cultural bond starkly different from the Ottoman Turks and others.

The tendency of a superpower to intervene to limit, counter, or shape the actions of the major regional powers in its region of influence is a major point of contention. While regional powers do not see it lightly, the secondary regional powers take the opportunity to unite against the threat they see coming from their region's major power.

Implications for the US

So, what does a uni-multipolar world mean to the United States? Americans should stop acting and talking as if this was a unipolar world. It is unnecessary for the US to expend effort and resources to achieve that goal. Since the US cannot create a unipolar world, it is in America's interest to maintain, for as long as possible, its position as the only superpower in a uni-multipolar world. In a multipolar system, the appropriate replacement for the global sheriff is community policing: devolving to the major regional powers primary responsibility for the maintenance of international order in their regions.

In the multipolar order of the 21st century, the major powers would compete, conflict, and coalesce with each other in various permutations and combinations. But this system would be devoid of the tension and conflicts between the superpower and the major regional powers, a defining feature of a uni-multipolar world. And for that reason the US could find life as a major power in a multipolar world less demanding, less contentious, and more rewarding than it has been as the world's only superpower.

This picture of post-Cold War world politics shaped by cultural factors and involving interactions among states and groups from different civilizations is highly simplified. It omits many things, distorts some things, and obscures others. Yet if we are to think seriously about the world, and act effectively in it, some sort of simplified map of reality, some theory, concept, model, paradigm, is necessary. Without such intellectual constructs, there is, as William James said, only 'a blooming buzzing confusion'.

Intellectual and scientific advance, Thomas Kuhn showed in his classic *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, consists of the displacement of one paradigm, which has become increasingly incapable of explaining new or newly discovered facts, by a new paradigm, which does account for those facts in a more satisfactory fashion. 'To be accepted as a paradigm,' Kuhn wrote, 'a theory must seem better than its competitors, but it need not, and in fact never does, explain all the facts with which it can be confronted.'

'Finding one's way through unfamiliar terrain,' John Lewis Gaddis observed, 'generally requires a map of some sort. Cartography, like cognition itself, is a necessary

NOTES

NOTES

simplification that allows us to see where we are, and where we may be going.' The Cold War image of superpower competition was, as he points out, such a model, articulated first by Harry Truman, as 'an exercise in geopolitical cartography that depicted the international landscape in terms everyone could understand, and so doing prepared the way for the sophisticated strategy of containment that was soon to follow.' World views and causal theories are indispensable guides to international politics.

For forty years students and practitioners of international relations thought and acted according to a Cold War paradigm of world affairs. This paradigm could not account for everything that went on in world politics. There were many anomalies, to use Kuhn's term, and at times the paradigm blinded scholars and statesmen to major developments, such as the Sino-Soviet split. Yet as a simple model of global politics, it accounted for more important phenomena than any of its rivals, it was an essential starting point for thinking about international affairs, it came to be almost universally accepted, and it shaped thinking about world politics for two generations.

Criticism of Unipolar and Multipolar World Orders

It was tradition to call the world bi-polar during the Cold War period. But since the disintegration of the USSR (on 26 December, 1991), according to Derek Kelly, the world had a unipolar order. Former French President Jacques Chirac gave a framework of the multipolar world order in his speech in November 1999 in Paris. According to him, a unipolar world is essentially unbalanced and the world must be re-balanced by a multipolar world order where a variety of powers balance or offset the power of the US.

On the other hand, in 'The National Security Strategy of the United States of America' report of 17 September, 2002, the US argued that unipolarity is a good thing and should be maintained, though not forever.

What we understand as a unipolar world is basically a pyramid where one country heads the power structure. In a multi-polar world, the existence of several major power balance out the concentration of power by a single state.

The debate on unipolar versus multipolar is still on. For obvious reasons, the US and some of its minor allies, like Britain, argue in favor of a unipolar world. This is opposed by the rest of the world arguing in favor of multi-polarity. Led by Chirac (France), powers such as Russia, China, India, Brazil, and a host of lesser powers are working towards a multipolar world. Even Charles Krauthammer, the cheerleader for the unipolar concept, says 'no doubt, multipolarity will come in time'. (*An American Foreign Policy for a Unipolar World*, 12 February, 2004).

On a more theoretical level, the constitutional foundation of the USA, and years of discussion by its founding fathers led to the formation of the new country. It was based on the realization that absolute power is misused and, if unchecked can lead to gross corruption.

Some thinkers perceive unipolarity as a form of narcissism. It is quite evident that the US is in the grips of a collective narcissistic disorder, led by a man with malignant narcissism – grandiose in claims, manipulating others for its own purposes, and believing its own press releases. Listen to Krauthammer, the leading apologist for the unipolar world:

This is now, he says, "*a unipolar world dominated by a single superpower unchecked by any rival and with decisive reach in every corner of the globe...This is a staggering new development in history, not seen since the fall of Rome...Even*

Rome is no model for what America is today,...because we do not have the imperial culture of Rome. We are an Athenian republic, even more republican and infinitely more democratic than Athens....[W]e are unlike Rome, unlike Britain and France and Spain and the other classical empires of modern times, in that we do not hunger for territory...We've got everything. And if that's not enough, we've got Vegas – which is a facsimile of everything. What could we possibly need anywhere else? That's because we are not an imperial power. We are a commercial republic. We don't take food; we trade for it. Which makes us something unique in history, an anomaly, a hybrid: a commercial republic with overwhelming global power? A commercial republic that, by pure accident of history, has been designated custodian of the international system.'

So, is there any power which can match the US? That may be difficult to answer. Marcel H. van Herpen argues that Chirac's argument in favor of multipolarity, for example, is based the assumption that France is a great power, but not as great as the US. France has nuclear weapons, so does North Korea, Pakistan, India, and Iran. France does not have the population or the acreage to be considered a world power. Others could speak in favor of Russia (or Eurasia) as a viable pole in a multipolar world. This, too, is an improbable proposition. With a declining population of 143 million people and a GDP of 1.3 trillion, Russia is inferior even to France.

So, is it India or Brazil or Nigeria or the Islamic states, over one billion strong, or Europe as poles in a multipolar world order? With at least three times the population and a 3 trillion dollar economy, India is not even close to competing on a level playing field with the US. Brazil with 184 million people and a 1.4 trillion economy is, again, not a competition. Neither is Nigeria with a population equal to Russia's but an economy less than Honk Kong's, with 7 million people. The combined population of the various Islamic states, of over a billion, and an economy based on oil cannot be a true competitor. Japan, which has a population of 127 million, a bit less than Russia, and a 3.5 trillion dollar economy, is basically a US puppet.

Can we then consider Europe, without England, with 456 million people and an equivalent GDP of 11 trillion dollars? This is a Europe similar to a free trade agreement with a hybrid English-like language as lingua franca, and 25 current states at many different levels of development. After thousands of years of wars, the warring European tribes emerged as nation states. But it would take several decades for the Germans and French to shake off their egocentricisms a truly unite as a union. In case Turkey is brought into the picture, it is highly unlikely that that a unified nation state will emerge from a merging of a secular Western civilization and Islam. It is, hence, doubtful that Europe will at any time soon develop as a pole in a multipolar world.

According to Huntington, China's growing economy is many times the economy of the USA in respect of buying power. China is the world's largest consumer country. It is also coping up with the USA in technology and defence equipment. Huntington visualizes a mutually assured competition, instead of a mutually assured destruction between a bloc comprising the US, Europe and Japan, and another comprising China, India and Brazil to the benefit of the whole world.

1.4 NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT—CTBT

A major irritant in the Indo-US relations was non-suspension or non-termination of nuclear programme by India. India decided that it would stop its nuclear programme

NOTES

Check Your Progress

6. A unipolar world is one in which a single state acts unilaterally but takes help of major coalition powers to resolve important international issues. (True/False)
7. _____ remain the principal actors in world affairs.
8. For forty-five years the Iron Curtain was the central dividing line in Europe. (True/False)
9. Developments in the post-Communist societies of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union are shaped by the civilization of the West. (True/False)
10. Unipolarity is, in fact, a narcissism, a collective personality disorder says Derek Kelly. (True/False)

NOTES

only if all the nuclear weapon states (NWS) made a strict commitment that they would, in course of time, also stop complete nuclear programme. This commitment should be time-bound so that the world knows by what time it would be free of nuclear weapons. However, these views of India were not taken seriously by the US. Meanwhile, India had not conducted any nuclear test since its only explosion in 1974. It was believed by the US that India's security could be ensured only if it gave up its nuclear programme.

The US had always wanted that both the neighbouring countries India and Pakistan should sign Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This policy was forcedly pursued by US Presidents Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton. Pakistan had already made it clear to former US President George Bush and later the Clinton Administration that it would sign NPT only after India signed it. India consistently refused to sign the NPT because it regarded it as discriminatory. India has always argued that three countries in its neighbourhood had nuclear weapons, so it could not give up its nuclear option unilaterally. India had continued on pressure not only to sign NPT, but also not to develop its missile programme by the US. India's decision to test Prithvi and Agni missiles provoked serious criticism in America and elsewhere. India did not make any compromise on its stand on the question of signing NPT and later on the proposed Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). In 1996, India opposed the CTBT at the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva and voted against it even in the UN General Assembly.

The question of NPT, CTBT, the missiles programme also the whole issue of Kashmir and human rights have been resulting in continuing of the Indo-US differences since 1997. However, for the first time in September 1997, US President Bill Clinton advised Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif that Kashmir question must be bilaterally solved by India and Pakistan themselves and the US need not mediate between the two countries. This development was welcomed by India. India's Prime Minister I.K. Gujral met President Clinton, on the latter's initiative during the UN General Assembly session in September 1997. In accordance with Gujral's wishes, President Clinton did not raise the issue of Kashmir. Later, the US Secretary of State Albright also said during a visit to these two countries that the US did not have any interest in mediating in the Kashmir question.

On behalf of the Clinton Administration, it was claimed that the US wanted to ensure stability in Indo-Pak ties, so that the tensions of the past could be lessened. The US was keen to strengthen friendship with all the countries of South Asia. It was felt by the US Administration that the Gujral Doctrine would be highly beneficial to the entire Asian region. The accords that were concluded in 1996 between India and Nepal, and India and Bangladesh were appreciated by the US and credit was given to the doctrine of developing good neighbourly relations with smaller nations advocated by the then Foreign Minister I.K. Gujral.

When the US President Clinton met both the Prime Ministers I.K. Gujral and Nawaz Sharif, in September 1997, for the first time, he made it clear that the US had no intention of mediating on the Kashmir issue. If both India and Pakistan could resolve their difference bilaterally, that would be the most-welcome development. At the end of 1997, there were clear signs of improvement in the Indo-US relation as both India and Pakistan were engaged in taking confidence-building measures. The seriousness with which both the Prime Ministers initiated a step to find the solutions on all outstanding bilateral issues was appreciated by the US, and the Clinton

administration was likely to re-examine its entire Asia policy. However, the problem is that the US interests appeared to be mainly limited to market operations.

The two states like India and the US began to start the strategic talks to reach an agreement on the US demand of India signing the CTBT and India's insistence on meeting its security requirement. Ten rounds of talks were held on the twin issues between the US President Clinton's envoy Strobe Talbott and Prime Minister Vajpayee's representative Jaswant Singh during June 1998–January 2000. India cleared that it would adhere to CTBT only if its security was ensured and steps were initiated for total nuclear disarmament.

The ties between the two largest democratic states of the world suddenly improved during and after the Kargil crisis. Credit for this development must be given: (i) to Pakistan for having created a muddle in Kargil, and for having given the evidence that it did not have respect for treaties and laws and that it has been giving assistance and encouragement to cross border terrorism against India; (ii) to India having acquired nuclear weapons and its bold and courageous stand against discriminatory non-proliferation regime and the CTBT and that India had the courage of conviction to announce unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests and the doctrine of no-first-use; and (iii) to the Clinton administration itself for having realized that India was soon going to be a power to be reckoned with and that Indian economy had become vibrant and stable that it could easily withstand not only economic sanctions but also the expenses in the Kargil War. Americans came to the conclusion that India could not be compelled, it could perhaps be persuaded.

Bill Clinton in March 2000 paid a visit to India. After 22 years, this was first visit of a US President. During his visit, a warm and friendly rapport was established by Clinton not only with Prime Minister Vajpayee but also with the whole lot of political leadership as well as common men and women. External Affairs Minister Jaswant Singh on the eve of Clinton visit, had said that both India and the US must put behind them the 'wasted decades' of the Cold War and look for a new relationship in the 21st century. Clinton said: 'India's economy is one of the ten fastest...in the world, its thriving high technology sector is one of the brightest spots in the new global economy'. He added, 'after 50 years of missed opportunities, it is time that America and India become better friends and stronger partners. We should find common ground in opening the global trading system in a way that lifts the live of rich and poor alike'.

A historic document called 'Vision for the 21st century' was signed by the two leaders and released, at the end of their Summit level talks between the President of US Clinton and the Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee. Taking pride in being the two largest sign democracies, India and the US declared: 'From vastly different origins and experiences we have come to the same conclusions that freedom and democracy are the strongest bases for both peace and prosperity, and that they are universal aspirations, constrained neither by culture nor levels of economic development'. The two countries pledged to be partners in peace and shared a commitment to reducing and ultimately eliminating nuclear weapons. 'They promised to work together to preserve stability and growth in the global economy, and to join in an unrelenting battle against poverty so that the promise of a new economy is felt everywhere and no nation is left behind.' The Vision Statement went on to state: 'Today, we pledge to deepen the Indian-American partnership in tangible ways, always seeking to reconcile our difference through dialogue and engagement. Therefore, the US President and

NOTES

NOTES

Indian Prime Minister should meet regularly to institutionalize the bilateral dialogue'. While the two countries drew closer on several issues, they agreed to disagree on the nuclear question. While the US reiterated its belief that 'India should forego nuclear weapons', India proclaimed its determination to 'maintain a credible minimum deterrent'.

ACTIVITY

Find out from the Internet, what is India's present stand on CTBT.

1.5 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- The theory, clash of civilization, was proposed by Samuel P. Huntington in the 1993.
- One of his hypotheses predicts a world war among the world's major civilizations in 2020. According to this hypothesis, American troops will have left Korea, which will lead to Korean reunification and a reduced presence for American troops in Japan.
- According to Huntington's hypothesis, the United States will refrain from escalating this war because domestic public opinion will regard it as a war for American hegemony in Southeast Asia or control of the South China Sea.
- China will occupy Vladivostok, the Amur River valley, and other key parts of eastern Siberia. As fighting spreads between Russian and Chinese troops in central Siberia, uprisings occurs in Mongolia, which China had earlier placed under a "protectorate."
- Huntington's hypothesis postulates a global conflict between two alliances—the U.S., Europe, Russia, and India on one side, and China, Japan, and most of Islam on the other.
- The 2001 attack on the World Trade Center and subsequent U.S. attacks on Afghanistan and Iraq have led political scientists to believe in Huntington's theory of the clash of civilizations.
- In the post-Cold War world flags count and so do other symbols of cultural identity, including crosses, crescents, and even head coverings, because culture counts, and cultural identity is what is most meaningful to most people.
- While Samuel Huntington's Clash of Civilizations presents a compelling argument for the events that happened in the former Yugoslavia, the main argument that was set forth by him using religion as the sole cause of the conflicts in the region—in what he regards as 'fault line' wars—is erroneous.
- In the former Yugoslavia, Huntington concluded that there is a cultural fault line running through the republic itself, which separated the Christian Croats and Slovenes from the rest of Yugoslavia, which were Orthodox Christians, and Muslims.

Check Your Progress

11. Which two US president forcefully persuaded the non-proliferation treaty with India and Pakistan?
12. India's decision to test Prithvi and Agni missiles was hailed by countries world over. (True/False)

- In the Yugoslav-era, everyone was referred to as a Yugoslav. Hence, Huntington's amplification of the role of religion in creating the civilizations in his thesis was inaccurate.
- Huntington thinks that fault line wars have the potential to escalate into major world wars. This is because of what he calls the 'kin-country syndrome', where one state that is in a war with another in a different civilization rallies up support within their own civilization
- A unipolar world is one in which a single state acting unilaterally with little or no cooperation from other states can effectively resolve major international issues, and no other state or combination of states has the power to prevent it from doing so.
- A multipolar world is one in which a coalition of major powers is necessary to resolve important international issues and, if the coalition is a substantial one, no other single state can prevent the coalition from doing that.
- In the post-Cold War world, for the first time in history, global politics has become multipolar and multicivilizational.
- During the Cold War global politics became bipolar and the world was divided into three parts.
- In the late 1980s the Communist world collapsed, and the Cold War international system became history. In the post-Cold War world, the most important distinctions among peoples are not ideological, political, or economic.
- Nation states remain the principal actors in world affairs. Their behavior is shaped as in the past by the pursuit of power and wealth, but it is also shaped by cultural preferences, commonalities, and differences.
- In this new world the most pervasive, important, and dangerous conflicts will not be between social classes, rich and poor, or other economically defined groups, but between peoples belonging to different cultural entities. Tribal wars and ethnic conflicts will occur within civilizations.
- In the post-Cold War world, culture is both a divisive and a unifying force. People separated by ideology but united by culture come together, as the two Germans did and as the two Koreas and the several Chinas are beginning to.
- In the multipolar world of the twenty-first century, the major powers inevitably will compete, conflict, and coalesce with each other in various permutations and combinations.
- A major irritant in the Indo-US relations was non-suspension or non-termination of nuclear programme by India.
- India decided that it would stop its nuclear programme only if all the Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) made a strict commitment that they would, in course of time, also stop complete nuclear programme.
- India's decision to test Prithvi and Agni missiles provoked serious criticism in America and elsewhere.
- The question of NPT, CTBT, the missiles programme also the whole issue of Kashmir and human rights have been resulting in continuing of the Indo-US differences since 1997.

NOTES

NOTES

1.6 KEY TERMS

- **Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT):** The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons obligates the five acknowledged nuclear-weapon states (the United States, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, France, and China) not to transfer nuclear weapons, other nuclear explosive devices, or their technology to any non-nuclear-weapon state.
- **Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD):** Mutual assured destruction, or), is a doctrine of military strategy and national security policy in which a full-scale use of high-yield weapons of mass destruction by two opposing sides would effectively result in the complete, utter and irrevocable annihilation of both the attacker and the defender, becoming thus a war that has no victory nor any armistice but only effective reciprocal destruction.

1.7 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. According to Samuel P. Huntington, the future fault line will center around culture and religion. His theory of the clash of civilizations predicts alignments and wars among various civilizations—Western, Islamic, Chinese, Japanese, Orthodox/Russian, Hindu, African, and Latin.
2. True
3. Indian subcontinent
4. True
5. Civilization
6. False
7. Nation state
8. True
9. False
10. True
11. Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton
12. False

1.8 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. What is a uni-multipolar system?
2. Why did India refuse to sign the non-proliferation treaty?

Long-Answer Questions

1. Analyse Huntington's theory of clash of civilization.
2. Derek Kelly has criticized the unipolar and multipolar world order. Discuss.
3. What are the main arguments of nuclear disarmament?

1.9 FURTHER READING

Huntington, S.P.; *The Clash of Civilizations?* Council on Foreign Relations, 1993.

Huntington, S.P.; *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. Simon and Schuster, New York, 2007.

NOTES

UNIT 2 THE MAKING OF INDIAN FOREIGN POLICY

NOTES

Structure

- 2.0 Introduction
- 2.1 Unit Objectives
- 2.2 Philosophy of India's Foreign Policy
- 2.3 Determinants of Indian Foreign Policy
 - 7.3.1 Internal (Domestic) Determinants
 - 7.3.2 External (International) Determinants
- 2.4 Goals and Objectives
- 2.5 Decolonization, Peace, Security and Development
- 2.6 Non-Alignment Movement
- 2.7 Summary
- 2.8 Key Terms
- 2.9 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 2.10 Questions and Exercises
- 2.11 Further Reading

2.0 INTRODUCTION

In the previous unit, you learnt about the debates regarding the new world order. We discussed the clash of civilizations, the unipolar and multi-polar world system and also nuclear disarmament—CTBT.

The foreign policy of India has always been based on the Non-Aligned Movement. Jawaharlal Nehru believed that it was better not to align with any one power bloc. He was in favour of formulating a policy that was based on the country's own principles and objectives. He firmly believed in the principles of Panchsheel and peaceful co-existence. This was hence, the reason for India to adopt a non-alignment policy. However, Jawaharlal Nehru's foreign policy for India has not always been appreciated. There have been times when it was also criticized, particularly, in the case of China and Kashmir. We will learn more about India's foreign policy in this unit, the philosophy behind it, the determinants, objectives and goals.

2.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Explain the philosophy behind India's foreign policy
- Interpret the internal and external determinants
- Analyse the goals and objectives
- Describe decolonization, peace, security and development
- Analyse non-alignment

2.2 PHILOSOPHY OF INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

NOTES

During the British period, India was surrounded by states like Afghanistan, Nepal, Sikkim, Bhutan and Tibet on its north and Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) to the south. The Partition of 1947 created two states—India and Pakistan. This division was based on religious, social, ethnic and linguistic entities. This disrupted the economic and cultural ties between both nations. The geographical partition of India was created out of the western and eastern parts of India, the western part was called West Pakistan (now Pakistan) and the eastern part was called East Pakistan (now Bangladesh). After Independence, the leaders of India tried to build a secular state in which national identity would supersede regional, religious or cultural identities.

The British colonial rulers regarded most of South Asia as a strategic unit and tried to exclude external powers from this region. To defend this strategic region, the British rulers set up a barrier of buffer states which surrounded India and tried to safeguard India from Russia and China, from the north side and used naval power to protect India from the South side. After Independence, the leaders of India adopted this policy by establishing a position in cultural as well as geographical perspectives. India's foreign relation was affected by this geo-strategic perception in three ways. First, India endeavoured by treaty, alliance or threats of force or economic embargo, to overthrow any move by its neighbours that is judged harmful to its own security interests, only Pakistan and China being its neighbours, have been able to resist Indian actions. India always itself regarded as a regional peace-keeper whose efforts were completely defensive, rather than as a regional enforcer who imposed difficult conditions on its neighbours by virtue of its size and military strength. Second, the intervention of extra-regional powers in South Asia threatened the security of India, although India already had the predominant position in the region. India opposed any attempt by powers external to the region, whether by invitation of New Delhi's neighbours or not, to involve themselves or to establish a presence in the region. Therefore, India always criticized Pakistan's alliance with China, the Soviet aggression of Afghanistan and the US military assistance to Pakistan and naval presence of the US on Diego Garcia. India never accepted Moscow's request of the Soviet navy base in the region in spite of the 1971 friendship treaty with the Soviet Union.

The programme of India to build its military strength to defend its territory was essential and security interests got intertwined in the foreign policy of India. India's nuclear programme strained its ties with Pakistan, China and the US. India's refusal to sign the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons stemmed as much from Pakistan's similar stance as from India's belief that the treaty discriminated against the development of peaceful nuclear technology by non-nuclear weapons states and failed to prevent the qualitative and quantitative vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons among the nations already possessing nuclear arms. In 1995, 174 other states approved an indefinite extension of the treaty. India continued to refuse to sign and condemned the treaty as 'perpetuating nuclear discrimination'.

Historical Background

Even before Independence, the Government of British India maintained semi-autonomous diplomatic relations. It had colonies, such as the Aden settlement, that sent and received full diplomatic missions and was a founding member of both, the League of Nations and the United Nations. After Independence it soon joined the

Commonwealth of Nations and strongly supported freedom movements in other colonies like the Indonesian National Revolution. The Partition and various territorial disputes, particularly disputes over Kashmir, strained its relations with Pakistan for several years. During the Cold War era, India adopted a foreign policy of not aligning itself with any major power bloc. However, India developed close ties with Soviet Union (now Russia) and received extensive military support from it. The ending of the Cold War significantly affected India's foreign policy, as it did for the majority of the world. The country now seeks to strengthen its diplomatic and economic relations with the US, the People's Republic of China, the European Unions, Japan, Israel, Mexico and Brazil. India has also close relation with the members of states of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the African Union, the Arab League and Iran. India continues to have military ties with Russia. Israel has emerged as India's second largest military partner, while India has built a strong strategic partnership with the US. The Indo-US civilian nuclear agreement signed and implemented in 2008 highlighted the growing sophistication of the Indo-American relations.

NOTES

2.3 DETERMINANTS OF INDIAN FOREIGN POLICY

India's foreign policy, like that of any other country, is an extension of its domestic policy and reflects the dominant domestic concerns. 'Our policy' wrote Nehru, 'will ultimately be governed by our internal policy'. Foreign policy is a product of interest, which are governed by a country's political, economic and social structure perceived through its history, culture and tradition. There are broadly two kinds of determinants, i.e., internal (domestic) and external (international).

2.3.1 Internal (Domestic) Determinants

Geography

Geographically, India is a very big country. India had to secure its borders on the Himalayan side from countries like Pakistan and China and the Soviet Union, which was not very far. Also India has common border with a number of countries like Pakistan, Bhutan, Nepal, Burma (now Myanmar), and Afghanistan. India's border runs a total length of 15106.70 km. Its borders with Pakistan and Bangladesh were delineated according to the Redcliffe Line, which was created in 1947 during Partition of India. Its western border with Pakistan extends up to 3,323 km; dividing the Punjab region and running along the boundaries of the Thar Desert and the Rann of Kutch. Both countries delineated a Line of Control (LoC) to serve as the informal boundary between India and Pakistan-administered areas of Kashmir.

India's border with Bangladesh runs a total length of 4096.70 km. It is estimated that there are 92 enclaves of Bangladesh on Indian soil and 106 enclaves of India on Bangladesh soil. The Teen Bigha Corridor is a strip of land formerly belonging to India on the West Bengal–Bangladesh border which has been leased indefinitely to Bangladesh so that it can access its Dehgram-Angalpotra enclaves.

The Line of Actual Control (LAC) is the border between India and China. It traverses 4,057 km along the Indian states of Jammu and Kashmir, Uttarakhand, Himachal Pradesh, Sikkim and Arunachal Pradesh. Both countries claim to the Aksai Chin region of northeastern Kashmir, which fell into Chinese control during the Sino-

Check Your Progress

1. The Indian elite regarded their country as a regional _____ whose efforts were completely defensive.
2. The Indo-US civilian nuclear agreement signed and implemented in 2010 highlighted the growing sophistication of the Indo-American relations. (True/False)

NOTES

Indian War of 1962. The border with Burma extends up to 1,643 km along the southern border of India's northeastern states. Located amid the Himalayan range, India's border with Bhutan runs for 699 km. The border with Nepal runs 1,751 km along the foothills of the Himalayas in northern India. The Siliguri Corridor narrowed sharply by the borders of Bhutan. Nepal and Bangladesh connects peninsular India with the northeastern states.

Indian Ocean is situated on the eastern part of India and the Arabian Sea is located on the western side. Both sides are considered important for trade, transport and defence for India. India is a gateway for Southeast Asian countries as well as the Middle East. In fact, it is surrounded with waters from three sides. Hence, India had to adopt a policy which could secure its border and keep the region of Indian Ocean free from the superpower rivalry. The politics of Indian Ocean also influenced India's ties with the countries of Southeast Asia. Most of the countries of Southeast Asia demanded creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region. Any foreign domination of Indian region could be injurious to its national interests. Vast coastline of India necessitates not only a powerful navy but also friendly relations with other naval power present in the Indian Ocean. The US as well as the UK has a powerful naval base at Diego Garcia.

India always wants to establish friendly relations with all neighbouring countries. There are other regional powers in Asia like Iran, Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia and Indonesian with whom India seeks to maintain friendly and conflict-free relations.

History and tradition

India has had a legacy of peace and internationalism. India has not launched a single aggression against any country. It has been a country of tolerance, devotion, mediation, assimilation and compromise. Its philosophy revolve around, non-violence, internationalism, peaceful settlement of disputes, justice, mutual love, peaceful co-existence and respect for one another. The traditional values instilled in us are from the scriptures like the *Vedas* and *Dharmashastra* and the writings of great men like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Swami Vivekanand, Rabindranath Tagore, Mahatma Gandhi, Bal Gangadhar Tilak and others. The humanistic and internationalist thrust in Indian thought and philosophy could not but be reflected in its foreign policy.

Again, the three values that have helped shaping India's foreign policy are:

- (i) tolerance, (ii) equation of means and ends, and (iii) non-violence.

(i) Tolerance

Tolerance is the essence of Indian tradition. It is not necessary that views of other be the same as one's own views. To respect the views of others is a great virtue. As Y Raghavan said, 'Tolerance is one of the most important, if not the most important, concepts which preserves invest the Indian traditional with a distinction and distinctness.'

Mahatma Gandhi, based on the teaching of *Rigveda*, had said, 'Hindusim tells everyone to worship God according to his own faith or dharma, and so it lives at peace with all the religions'. Inscription of Ashoka, the Great also advocated tolerance. This is evident from his rock pillars.

In our domestic policy, India is committed to secularism which is rooted in the above mentioned philosophy of tolerance. In 1954, Nehru and his Chinese counterpart signed the famous declaration of Panchsheel. Mutual non-interference and peaceful co-existence are the guiding principles of our foreign policy based on the tolerance of view of others.

(ii) Equation of means and ends

It is another important Indian tradition. Indeed, Mahatma Gandhi insisted on the purity of means to achieve noble ends. Because he was deeply impressed by Manu's *Dharmashastra* which says: 'One should not do a good thing by following a bad path'. Indian tradition thus is: 'To seek to further the welfare of the state by enriching it through fraud and falsehood, is like storing water in an unburnt pot and hoping to preserve it'. While the purity of means is the basic thrust of India's philosophy, there is no dearth of realistic approach either. Kautilya, in his book *Arthashastra*, had explained the view that what produces unfavourable results is bad policy. In the words of Kautilya, diplomacy was an art, not concerned with ideals but with achieving practical result for the state. A very important technique of this statecraft could not be ignored by India's foreign policy-makers. Thus, reconciliation between the 'purity of means' and 'reduce the enemy's men' had to be brought about. This is the reason why Nehru frankly admitted that moral principles could be followed in statecraft only to a limit. The action which India took in Goa in 1961 and in Bangladesh crisis in 1971 were in accordance with the leadership's perception of national interest even if it compromised with the principle of purity of means.

(iii) Principle of non-violence

Non-violence is not only an uncomprising faith of Mahatma Gandhi, but is also deeply rooted in Indian tradition. It does not only mean non-killing or abstention from doing harm to others, but indicates harmlessness in thought, word and deed and also promotion of bondless love in the entire universe. Perfect non-violence is not always possible because non-violence is a virtue. It was the view of Gandhi that the use of force by the democratic state or nation is immoral. Democracy and violence cannot co-exist at the same time. Gandhi would apply non-violence to international relations too. Acceptance of non-violence is an important means to ensure lasting world peace. The application of the tradition of non-violence in India's foreign policy was explained by Appadorai, as 'the deliberate acceptance of a method of approach to foreign policy problems which emphasized reconciliation, and the temper of peace, as opposed to a spirit of revenge and hatred'.

World peace has been committed by the Government of India and has also been included in Part IV of the Constitution as a Directive to the State to seek peaceful settlement of international disputes. British rule's impact on India and the influence of the national movement and freedom struggle has shaped India's foreign policy. According to Appadorai, the British rule in India had a threefold impact on India's foreign policy. First, it gave a stimulus to the national movement for freedom which in turn led to India's support for the freedom of dependent peoples. Second, racial inequality that existed during the British rule made India realize the evils of racial discrimination and, in turn, led to India's emphasis on racial equality in its foreign policy; and third, India voluntarily chose to remain a member of the Commonwealth

NOTES

NOTES

even after becoming a Republic. Based on these principles Nehru sought to redefine India's relationship between Britain and other sovereign members of the Commonwealth.

It will not be out of place to consider the ideals and values propagated during India's national movement. The movement progressed from Gokhale's moderate stand to Tilak and Lala Lajpat Rai's active demand for self-rule and reached its climax under Gandhi and Nehru. Ideals of truth and non-violence of Mahatma Gandhi was based on a peaceful struggle for India's freedom movement.

Gandhi directed Indian people not to hate the sinner but to hate the sin. Most of the leaders of freedom movement were educated in Britain. In accordance with the Western pattern of education, they valued liberty, equality and democracy. The foreign policy-makers of India valued these ideals. While cooperating with liberal democratic countries, India did not oppose the socialist countries either. Non-alignment policy is not only an outcome of keeping aloof from bloc politics but also in accordance with the goals and ideals of the Indian freedom struggle.

Through its foreign policy department, headed by Nehru, the Indian National Congress had clearly opposed dictatorship and racial discrimination. In 1946, Nehru had said, 'We repudiate utterly the Nazi doctrine of racialism wheresoever and in whatever form it may be practised'. Therefore, in 1949 in the Constituent Assembly, he declared 'one of the pillars of our foreign policy is to fight against racial discrimination'. The idea of the above discussion is to underline the fact that traditional values and historical developments have had distinct impact on India's foreign policy.

Culture

Culture is the most important factor or element of foreign policy. India is at a very advantageous position as far as culture is concerned. According to T.V. Paul and Baldev, 'Indian culture offers one of the most dynamic alternatives to Western cultural values'. India has had a long history of civilizational and cultural links with countries as far-flung as Iran and Rome. Its riches and splendour have attracted traders and travellers for thousands of years. Countries in Southeast Asia still have remnants of Indian traditions: the Angkor Wat temple in Cambodia, temples and pagodas in Thailand, Myanmar as well as the presence of several Sanskrit words in languages like Bahasa, Indonesia; prove the influence of Indian culture on these countries.

India's spirituality is much needed in these days of conflict and strife. India's tolerance for different religions and cultures is legendary. This is the land which has preached '*Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*' (the world is my family) and '*Loka Samaha Suktino Bhavanthu*' (let there be peace in the whole world). India's message of secularism which actually means different religions co-existing in harmony with one another, rather than the Western concept of separation of religion and the state, is a valuable lesson in these days when there is so much strife in the name of religion.

India's diplomats have also played a role, though how big it is cannot really be measured that being the nature of foreign policy itself, in the expansion of India's foreign policy. India's diplomats are trained in India's culture and values, communication skills as well as the work in the media and Indian Parliament. This helps them connect with governments as well as people of other countries. With increasing globalization in culture as well as the media, India's influence through its culture is likely to increase in the future.

Economic and military factors

India started with a weak economic base and it did not have technology or the military strength. Soon after Independence, India's trade and economic ties were limited to Britain and the Commonwealth countries. So, it was natural to have friendly ties with the Western liberal countries, economically as well as militarily. India was a poor country, and its aim was economic development through industrialization and modernization. The precondition of economic development was peace at home and generous economic and technical assistance from developed nations.

Nehru was very conscious of the fact that economic progress was and should be the root of foreign policy. Foreign aid was needed by a developing country like India whether in the form of capital or technology. However for this, India did not want to attach itself with a particular bloc—whether the capitalist or the socialist. Rather it wanted to keep its doors open to all sources of aid, whether Western or Soviet. Even in pursuing the path of economic growth, India neither adopted free trade capitalism nor did it go the communist way; but adopted a middle path of democratic socialism.

India decided to follow liberal democracy and evolutionary socialism. India adopted Soviet pattern of planned economic development, but not the Soviet type of government. India wanted aid and assistance from the both blocs and World Bank, but without entangling alliances with anyone. India desired a peaceful world order because only in that situation could India hope for its rapid development. A developing country could get from the developed countries a number of experts who would provide specialized training for development. Most of the developed countries cleverly avoided technology to transfer the Third World countries. In that circumstance, India tried to formulate her foreign policy in such a way that India gets foreign economic assistance without strings. Transfer of technology was easily made possible and that it received assistance both from the West and the East. But, America and her allies were in a far better position to provide assistance than the countries of the East.

This factor played its role in shaping India's foreign policy. In the early time, non-aligned India was said to be tilted towards the West. Such allegations were indirectly made by the Soviet media. But once India demonstrated strength of its will and independence of decision-making during the Korean and Suez crises, the Eastern bloc began appreciating its position. In 1971, war with Pakistan and Indo-Soviet Treaty of friendship and cooperation concluded, and the West became critical with its non-alignment and alleged pro-Soviet policy. But after the Indo-China War of 1962, Indian foreign and defence policy could not remain complacent. To buy weapons, the scope of market was broadened by India to train its defence personnel to meet any situation from any quarter. Within a short period of time, India's defence forces, using tanks and planes (made in India) successfully repulsed the Pakistani attack in 1965. Pakistani armed forces were mostly using American and other weapons obtained from the US as well as China. India did not seek any military alliance and followed the policy of non-alignment when it became self-sufficient. India took the decision to develop nuclear energy and told the world that India could soon become a nuclear power, if it chose to do so.

After keeping its nuclear option open (1974–98) for several years, India finally conducted five nuclear tests in 1998. The government's bold decision surprised the international community, but India exercised its sovereign right. Many countries,

NOTES

NOTES

including the US, condemned India but it was short lived and world powers came to terms with a nuclear India, whether or not, countries formally recognized India as a nuclear weapon state. Even after agreeing in 2005 on civilian nuclear deal with India, the US described India as a 'state with advanced nuclear technology'.

Ideological factor

Nehru was the founder of India's foreign policy and was deeply impressed by the liberal democratic ideology of the Western countries. He was also influenced by the Soviet Union's economic policies. Incorporation of a synthesis of the virtues of Western liberal democracy and the Soviet socialism was desired by Nehru. But he wanted to keep away from the evils of both. Therefore, he decided not of blindly following the principles of foreign policy of either of the two. In an indirect way, the policy of non-alignment was a result of the synthesis of Liberalism and Marxism. India's policy was also influenced by the Indian philosophy of humanism and universal brotherhood. During the Cold War era, this ideology got credit for India's attempts at friendship with both the power blocs. Gandhiji's ideals of truth and non-violence were also sought to be incorporated by Nehru while shaping India's foreign policy.

Pluralistic nature of Indian society

At a social level, India has been a pluralist society, consisting of different castes, classes, ideologies, languages, religions and races. Socially, economically, culturally and politically it was and continues to be a land of diversity. Hence, in order to consolidate the integrity of the state in unity in diversity, India had to adopt a policy which could satisfy the different nationalities and sub-nationalities. So even internationally, it had to pursue a policy of reconciliation and consensus among the community of nations, keeping our national interests in mind. Similarly, while India was deeply impressed by the liberal democratic tradition of the West, it was equally appreciative of the achievements of Marxist socialism. But India did not blindly follow either the West or the Soviet and adopted a middle path of liberal democratic socialism.

2.3.2 External (International) Determinants

When India gained Independence, the Cold War had begun and the world was divided into two hostile power blocs. The shaping of India's policy of non-alignment was direct impact to her. The process of decolonization began simultaneously with the Independence of India. The main focus of international milieu was anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism. India went in line with the efforts for acceleration of the process of decolonization and opposition to all forms of colonialism, imperialism and racial discrimination. The economies of several countries had been ruined by Second World War. Efforts were already initiated for economic reconstruction and development, India took advantage and decided on its rapid economic development. For this purpose after the end of Second World War, India freely sought help from the institutions like World Bank and International Monetary Fund. Ideological conflicts were responsible for disputes, aggressions and wars. Conflict between Fascism and Communism, between democracies and totalitarian states were replaced by ideological clashes between liberal democracy and Marxism. India opted to remain out of these ideological conflicts in post-War period.

With the end of the Cold War, a new international environment began to emerge with emphasis on liberalization in economies even of countries like China; India was

inspired to shift emphasis from the public sector and partially-controlled economy to liberalization, reduction of state control and encouragement to foreign investments in private and joint sectors. The process of reconciliation that began after the Cold War in areas such as Israel–Palestine, opened the doors for negotiation of bilateral disputes in different parts of the world. India also tried to accelerate resolution of its disputes with China, Bangladesh and even Pakistan. Thus, we can say that international milieu had, and still has, its impact on the shaping of India's foreign policy.

Indeed, there was direct impact on India's foreign policy of the events of 1990s. The disintegration of the Soviet Union into 15 independent republics after the collapse of communism, fall of socialist (communist) governments in East European countries and their transition to democracy; reunification of Germany; emergence of the US as the sole super power and end of bipolarity, influenced India's foreign policy. One of the major developments was India's veto to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) at Conference on Disarmament (CD), and later refusal to sign the CTBT as adopted by the United Nations General Assembly. Finally, India conducted five nuclear tests in May 1998 leading Pakistan also to conduct such tests.

DID YOU KNOW?

The founder of the Non-Aligned Movement was Yugoslavian strongman Josip Broz Tito who was trying to escape the iron grip of the Soviet Union, but he got Egypt, Ghana, Indonesia and India to join too. Leaders such as Nasser, Nehru and Nkrumah gave the movement considerable prestige in its early years.

2.4 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Objectives of India's foreign policy in 1947 were: a peaceful environment, strategic space and autonomy, no entanglement in Cold War conflicts or alliances, concentration on domestic tasks of integration and nation building. Indian nationalism has not been based on a shared language or common religion or ethnic identity. As it sought to build a plural, democratic, secular, and tolerant society of its own, it was natural that it would look for and promote the same values abroad.

Objectives of India's Foreign Policy

The goals of India's foreign policy are simple and straightforward. The primary and overriding goal has always been the maintenance and promotion of international peace and security. The ideals and objectives of its domestic as well as foreign policy are enshrined in the Constitution of India. A former foreign secretary of India, Muchkund Dubey, wrote; 'The primary purpose of any country's foreign policy is to promote its national interest, to ensure its security, safeguard its sovereignty, contribute to its growth and prosperity, and generally enhance its stature, influence and role in the comity of nations. A country's foreign policy should also be able to serve the broader purpose of promoting peace, disarmament and development and of establishing a stable, fair and equitable global order.'

Check Your Progress

3. Name the three values that have helped shaping India's foreign policy.
4. Who was the founder of India's foreign policy?
5. Gandhi's ideals of truth and non-violence were not incorporated by Nehru while shaping India's foreign policy. (True/False)

NOTES

The foreign policy-makers set out certain objectives before they proceed to lay down basic principles and formulate the policy. Several of these objectives are common though the degree of emphasis always varies.

After Independence, India had to determine objectives of its foreign policy under difficult situations. Internally, the Partition of British India created many economic problems, which were further complicated by the arrival of millions of Hindus and Sikhs who migrated from Pakistan.

India, very soon, was involved in a war in Kashmir that was imposed by Pakistan—backed tribals from the North-West frontier. The leftists organized strikes which further threatened the Indian economy. India had to tackle the 'gigantic problem' to provide its vast population with the basic necessities of life. On the military front, India was not strong. A hostile Pakistan compounded India's security problem. There was another problem. It was related to internal consolidation. When British left India in 1947, there were small pockets of French and Portuguese possessions. India's first efforts naturally were to negotiate with the two powers. After prolonged negotiations the French agreed to withdraw, but military action were taken in 1961 to liberate Goa and other Portuguese pockets.

The Cold War had begun and East-West ties were deteriorating very fast, and international situation was not very comfortable. In this situation, India decided that world peace would be a cardinal feature of India's foreign policy. India desired peace not merely as an ideal but also as an essential condition for its own security. As Nehru opined, 'India's approach to peace is a positive, constructive approach, not a passive, negative and neutral approach.' India's message to the world has been insistence on peaceful methods to solve all problems. Peace meant not only avoidance of war, but also reduction of tension, and if possible end of the Cold War. An effective United Nations is required for a world order based on understanding and cooperation. International peace is not possible until armaments are reduced.

A very important objective was to root out causes of war by measures such as liberation of subjects and the elimination of racial discrimination. In order to achieve this goal, India would pursue an independent foreign policy without being any big power camp follower. It would also require total faith; and support of the United Nations. A primary objective of the foreign policy meant pursuit of peace. Thus, India's goal of peace was not only directed by its self interest but also by Gandhian idealism.

Eliminations of want, disease and illiteracy were also regarded as important objectives of foreign policy. These are ills not only of Indian society but also the developing countries of Asia and Africa. While domestic policy of India was directed at removal of want and disease, it was closely related to the question of foreign aid and assistance. Besides, India cooperated with various international agencies for fighting disease, starvation, poverty, illiteracy and famine in various underdeveloped or developing countries.

Voluntarily, India has chosen to remain a member of the Commonwealth of Nations. This association of free and sovereign countries, who were colonies in the erstwhile British, Empire, now recognizes the British Queen only as Head of the Commonwealth, not as Crown of the Republic like India. Before 1949, only British Dominions were member of the British Commonwealth. All the dominions had the British Crown as their monarch too. After becoming a Republic, India did not want to

leave the Commonwealth and decided to accept the British monarch as the head of state. India considered the continued cooperation with the Commonwealth as mutual benefit to India and all other member countries.

India's objective is to maintain friendly relations with all, it avoided military alliances, pursued non-alignment as a moral principle, sought peaceful settlement of international dispute and promoted universal brotherhood and humanism by pursuing and advocating the five principles contained in Panchsheel. The ideals of non-interference and peaceful co-existence have faithfully been observed by India.

India has remained committed to peaceful settlement of disputes between states or nations. It has been seeking to pursue friendly relations with all countries, particularly with neighbours. That is why, India still wishes to work in pursuit of world peace, and in search of that it has been insisting on complete elimination of nuclear weapons and strengthening of the United Nations.

Principles of India's foreign policy

The basic principles of the Indian foreign policy are based on Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). The term 'non-alignment' was coined by Jawaharlal Nehru of India. Non-alignment means not aligning to any of two power blocs during the era of Cold War. It means that India is independent to pursue its own foreign policy. Again Panchsheel, the second most important principle of Indian foreign policy, was signed on 29 April 1954 between India and China.

(i) Non-alignment

India played an important role in the multilateral movements of colonies and newly independent countries that developed into NAM. The chief architects of the policy of NAM were Jawaharlal Nehru of India, Joseph Broz Tito of Yugoslavia and President Nasser of Egypt. Most of the countries of Asia and Africa were impressed by this policy and joined the movement. Today, almost all the countries of Asia and Africa are its members.

NAM is for peace, independence, and disarmament and is against imperialism, colonialism, and racial discrimination, etc. It succeeded in following its programme of support to countries struggling for their independence, cooperating and providing financial assistance to countries for their economic development and condemning any form of discrimination. NAM also supported disarmament.

The concept of non-alignment is neither non-involvement in world affairs nor neutralism therein. It is, in fact, an activist policy demanding taking up specific sides on merit of each case. This implies that issue-bound tilts in non-alignment are legitimate and the concept, therefore, does not imply equidistance from both the super powers. Non-alignment is the soul and substance of India's foreign policy. It is a policy of avoiding alignment with any power bloc. It signifies a deliberate detachment from either bloc or determination to judge every issue of international concern on its own merit. According to Nehru, non-alignment is freedom of action, which is a part of independence. It is a means of safeguarding national independence and contributing to world peace. On the other side, India's geographical situation—its location at the junction of Southeast Asia and Middle East and its strategic position in the Indian Ocean and as a neighbour of communist China in the North—made it imperative to keep away from military alliances.

NOTES

NOTES

(ii) Panchsheel and peaceful co-existence

With the end of World War II, movements of national independence and liberation blossomed in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Newly independent countries demanded the establishment of new patterns of international relations based on equality to maintain their national sovereignty and develop their economies. The five principles of peaceful co-existence were produced in response to this strong and common demand of newly independent nations. India and China, being two giants of Asia, established diplomatic ties on 1 April 1950. On 29 April 1954, the two nations signed an agreement on trade and communications between Tibet and India. The Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence were introduced into the preface of the agreement. The then Chinese Premier Zhou En-Lai visited India and Myanmar in 1954, at the invitation of the two countries and held talks with the then Indian and Myanmar counterparts, Jawaharlal Nehru and U Nu, respectively.

Consequently, in the 'Joint Declaration of Chinese and Indian Premiers' issued on 28 June 1954, and the 'Joint Declaration of Chinese and Myanmar Premiers' issued on the next day, the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence were officially announced as the basic norms guiding the Sino-Indian and Sino-Myanmar relations. The Sino-Indian joint declaration proposed that 'these principles not only be applicable to relations between nations but also to the general international relationship', while the Sino-Myanmar joint declaration expressed the hope that 'these principles will be observed by all nations'. After one year in April 1955, China, India and Myanmar initiated the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and a total of 29 newly independent countries from Asia and Africa held the historic 'Asian-African Conference' in Bandung, Indonesia. As a result of the common efforts of the participants, the conference adopted the 'Declaration on Promotion of World Peace and Cooperation' and formulated the 10 principles of the Bandung Conference.

These 10 principles, which contained all points in the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence, represented an extension and development of the latter. Since then, the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence have been recognized and accepted by more and more nations, international organizations and international meetings and have been incorporated into a series of major international documents, including declarations adopted by the UN General Assembly. The Five Principles were also reaffirmed in the documents of China's establishment of diplomatic ties with more than 160 states and in treaties as well as communiqués. The Five Principles mentioned in the preamble of the agreement were as follows:

- (a) Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty;
- (b) Mutual non-aggression;
- (c) Mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs;
- (d) Equality and mutual benefits; and
- (e) Peaceful co-existence.

The term 'Panchsheel' is found in ancient Buddhist literature and refers to five principles of good conduct of individuals. These are truth, non-violence, celibacy, refrain from drinking, and vow not to steal. The term 'Panchsheel' was so popular that Nehru called it an 'international coin'. By the end of 1956, many countries of the world including Afghanistan, Myanmar, Indonesia, Egypt, Nepal, Poland, USSR, Saudi Arabia and Yugoslavia had endorsed the Panchsheel. In 1959, the UN General Assembly also resolved to adopt the Five Principles. In 1955, Indonesian President

NOTES

Soekarno had announced Five Principles of Indonesian National Policy. These Five Principles called Panjashila were: faith in nationalism, faith in humanity, faith in independence, faith in social justice, faith in God. However, the Five Principles of Panchsheel declared in 1954 were neither principles of good conduct of individual nor of nationalism. These are principles of behaviours of sovereign states in their foreign relations. These are normal expectations from civilized nations in their behaviour with each other. To respect the territorial integrity of others and not to commit aggression are vital objectives of friendly international relations.

Within a few years when China began encroaching upon Indian territory by building a road in Aksai Chin area, Panchsheel was threatened. When China attacked India in 1962, it was a clear violation of 'mutual non-aggression'. The Fifth Principle, i.e., peaceful co-existence, emphasizes the importance of peaceful living by all nations irrespective of their ideology. A liberal democracy, India, and a communist state China, need not attempt to force their ideologies on the other. The principles contained in Panchsheel were, according to Nehru, a consequence of democratic outlook: 'The person who rejects the idea of co-existence rejects basically the democratic outlook'. If a country violated the principles of Panchsheel, Nehru had opined that it was 'likely to find itself in a quandary'. None other than China violated the principles of non-aggression. Despite the 1962 border war with China, India has remained firmly committed to the principles of Panchsheel.

(iii) Freedom of dependent peoples

Anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism has been a matter of faith with India's foreign policy-makers. India decided to extend full support to the cause of freedom of dependent peoples of Asia and Africa. The Dutch colony of Indonesia had been taken by the Japanese during the World War II. India opposed it even in the United Nations and cooperated with Indonesia in its efforts to get independence. India also supported the freedom struggles in Asian and African countries such as Indo-China, Malaya, Libya, Algeria, Tunisia, and Gold Coast (now Ghana). India also supported the cause of independence of the people of Namibia who were under prolonged colonial rule of racist South Africa. Promotion of self-determination of all colonial peoples was, thus, an important objective and principle of India's foreign policy.

In the context of Cold War, the Western view was that international communism was a bigger threat than colonialism. India did not agree with this view. In the words of Nehru, the real-question in Asia was that of 'colonialism vs anti-colonialism'. It was likely to encourage communism among the colonial people, if colonialism was not quickly abolished. Once Nehru said, 'Colonialism represents the biggest threat to Asia and Africa and leads to communism'. Both colonialism and communism are of European origin and India emphasized the end of colonialism.

In the present time, colonialism and imperialism have been terminated; one might think that there is no relevance of this principle any more. But, Western powers have not given up their efforts to dominate their former colonies. Most of Afro-Asian nations, including India, were being subjected to a new form of colonialism, commonly called 'neo-colonialism'.

In its new embodiment, colonialism seeks to dominate independent underdeveloped nations of Asia and Africa through various instruments of exploitation. India is determined to oppose neo-colonialism as this type of colonialism aims at

economic exploitation which may lead to political control. Various means such as economic assistance and multinational corporations are used for the promotion of neo-colonialism.

NOTES

(iv) Foreign economic aid and India's independent policy

Economic development of a nation was an urgent necessity. Soon after independence, India devoted its energies to a planned and rapid all-round development. The financial and technological help that India needed could come either from the US or the USSR. It was believed that the USSR would not help a non-communist country. The government as well as business community in India realized that the US is only country that could give substantial help to India. Still India did not want to compromise with the principle of non-alignment, independence and sovereignty. By 1949, India had come quite close to the United States, despite, its firm decision not to accept any aid with strings. Many sections of Indian industry were pressurizing Government of India to secure foreign capital as nationalization of industry was not practical. The success of communist China made India realize that there was a danger of communism raising its head in India also unless its economic development was initiated in a big way, with foreign aid. To avoid Chinese Communist type success in India, there was growing realization of urgent need in helping India, even in the US. Thus, the process of economic assistance began in India from the US.

India began accepting aid from the World Bank, and other countries, as the process of development was accelerated. In course of time, Soviet suspicion of India being a pro-West country was removed and India welcomed aid from Eastern bloc also. Then two new economic powers began to emerge as Soviet Union experienced difficulties. Germany and Japan have become industrially developed states and are gave aid to many states, including India. Unfortunately, the Western states have been unwilling to transfer technology to India and other developing states. India tried to maintain independence in decision-making and foreign policy. At times, it was charged with being pro-West and at other times clearly tilted towards the Soviet Union. However, India tried to maintain balance and pursue independent policy. Under Indira Gandhi's regime, India chose to go for large-scale nationalization. As socialism was made a goal of Indian economy (42nd Amendment, 1976), the Western nations began to disbelieve India's policy of independent decision-making and non-alignment. India decided to liberalize its economy in the mid-1991, and after the disintegration of Soviet Union, India's economy naturally moved closer to the capitalist world.

(v) Opposition to racial discrimination

India believes in equality of all human being. Its policy is aimed at opposition to all forms of racial discrimination. South Africa was the worst example of discrimination and exploitation of the coloured peoples, including people of Indian origin. It gave its full support to the cause of victims of social discrimination. Not only India had cut off diplomatic ties with South Africa in 1949, but also used its influence in the application of comprehensive sanctions against the white minority racist regime of South Africa. Any facility to the racist regime was not allowed by India, and it opposed the system, both inside and outside the United Nations, and stood by the demand of racial equality. Indian sportsmen boycotted racial discrimination and even its symbol, i.e., South Africa.

NOTES

In the early 1994, apartheid came to an end in South Africa and a majority government of the African National Congress and was elected under the leadership of Nelson Mandela. After achieving the goal, of racial equality in South Africa, India re-established its ties with the country. India has regularly supported the establishment of an egalitarian society in which discrimination based on colour, race, and class, etc., do not exist. India has also supported the UN efforts leading to adoption of covenants of human rights and the observance of fundamental freedom all over the world.

(vi) Support to the UN

India is one of the founder member of the United Nations and many of its specialized agencies. It has full faith in the international organizations and agencies. India also believes in international peace and security. It is also a prominent Afro-Asian member of the world body. India has sponsored and supported several progressive measures in the UN and its agencies.

India's Vijay Laxmi Pandit, was elected the president of the United Nations General Assembly in 1953. India has been a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council for a number of terms. Again, it has been elected for a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council. India's contribution in the cause of world peace has been universally recognized. To serve in collective security and peace-keeping efforts, India has enthusiastically responded to the call of the United Nations. India sent a medical unit in the Korean War and participated actively in the repatriation of prisoners of war after the Korean crisis. India has also sent help at the call of the United Nations to Egypt, Congo and Yugoslavia for peace-keeping.

In 1953, India held the chairmanship of the Neutral Nation Repatriation Commission (NNRC) for Korea and was charged with the custody and repatriation of the prisoners of war. In July 1954, India also chaired the International Commission for Supervision and Control for Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. During 1960-63, peace-keeping operations were organized in Congo by the Indian Independent Brigade. In 1992, the responsibility of heading the United Nations Protection Force in Yugoslavia was also entrusted to an Indian general.

India continuously supported the efforts of universalization of the United Nations. Many countries' applications for membership of the UN were being rejected in mid-1950s, as either the USSR or the U.S. used veto to bar their entry. At that time, Krishna Menon of India, used his diplomatic skill and with the support of many other like-minded countries persuaded the big powers to allow admission of sixteen new members in 1955. After the revolution in 1949, India was one of the first countries to recognize Communist China. India firmly supported application of People's Republic of China for representation in the UN and expulsion of Nationalist China. On the question of Chinese representation, India had taken a value based stand. Even after the Chinese invasion of 1962, its stand did not change. There are several other areas in which India has played significant role in the United Nations. For example, India played a firm, positive and energetic role in arms control and disarmament. In the field of human rights, issues which attracted India worked against racial discrimination and colonialism. India's contribution has also been significant in the areas of health, food, children's welfare and improvement in the condition of working people.

NOTES

(vii) Peaceful settlement of international disputes

Disputes among nations are unavoidable. There can only be two methods of setting international disputes—war through or peace. War has been the most commonly used method for deciding disputes since the pre-historic days. War was considered the legitimate means for deciding disputes. It resulted in the victory of one nation over the other. India's foreign policy goal is peaceful settlement of dispute—here the emphasis is on the term 'peaceful' rather than on 'settlement'. Thus, if India's goal is international peace, peaceful settlement of disputes is the natural means. The founding fathers of the Constitution of India were keen to remind all future governments that India as a nation desired peaceful settlement of international dispute. That is why Article 51 of the Constitution of India (in part IV, Directive Principles of State Policy) lays down that the state shall endeavour to seek peaceful settlement of international disputes. India does not believe in 'negotiation through strength' because that is illogical. As Nehru himself 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'. Thus, India has made it a matter of faith to seek peaceful settlement of dispute.

Generally, in nations like Britain, basic principles of foreign policy do not radically change whenever there is change of government. India has adopted this tradition and even when prime ministers and foreign ministers have changed, India's basic policy commitments have remained unaltered or unchanged.

(viii) The Gujral doctrine

The Gujral Doctrine is a set of five principles to guide the conduct of foreign relations with India's nearest neighbours as spelt out by I.K. Gujral, first as external affairs minister and later as the prime minister. Among other factors, these five principles arise from the belief that India's stature and strength cannot be divorced from the quality of its relations with its neighbours. It, thus, recognizes the supreme importance of friendly, cordial relations with neighbours. These principles are: (i) with neighbours like Bangladesh, Bhutan, Maldives, Nepal and Sri Lanka, India does not ask for reciprocity, but gives and accommodates what it can in good faith and trust; (ii) no South Asian country should allow its territory to be used against the interest of another country of the region; (iii) no country should interfere in the internal affairs of another; (iv) all South Asian countries must respect territorial integrity and sovereignty of one another; and (v) they should settle all their disputes through peaceful bilateral negotiations.

In the words of Gujral, these five principles, if thoroughly adhered to, would achieve a fundamental recasting of South Asia's regional relationships, including the difficult relationship between India and Pakistan. Further, the implementation of these principles would generate a climate of close and mutually favourable cooperation in the region, where India is regarded as an asset by these countries.

Gujral Doctrine advocated people to people contacts, particularly between India and Pakistan, to create an atmosphere that would enable the countries concerned to sort out their differences amicably. In late 1996, in pursuance of this policy, India concluded an agreement with Bangladesh, to draw in lean season, slightly more water than the Agreement of 1977 had provided. India and China in November 1996 agreed in confidence-building measures and efforts were made by the two countries to improve bilateral relations and freeze, for the time being the border dispute. In 1997, India

unilaterally announced several concessions to Pakistani tourists, particularly the elderly citizens and cultural groups, in regard to visa fees and police reporting, in forcefully pursuing Gujral doctrine.

The Gujral Doctrine, summed up in one sentence, as the policy of giving unilateral concession to neighbours and promoting people to people contact, is aimed at improving relations by friendly gestures or actions. India as a big country willing to unilaterally help the smaller neighbours is presented by Gujral Doctrine.

India and nuclear weapons

Nehru had initiated research in atomic energy. Homi Bhabha headed the Atomic Energy Commission as its first chairman. Though Nehru never said that he wanted India to ever acquire nuclear weapons, yet he did not specifically reject the idea. Initially, the idea was to develop and use the atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Later, at some stage, India began working on the nuclear power. After the Bangladesh crisis of 1971, when it became clear that China, an ally of Pakistan, could assist Pakistan to develop nuclear weapons; India seriously considered developing; nuclear weapons. China had exploded its first bomb in 1964 and became the fifth nuclear weapon state.

In view of evolving China-US Strategic relationship, India conducted its first nuclear test in May 1974. But in view of hue and cry in international community, India declared that the 1974 test was only 'peaceful nuclear explosion'. India had refused to sign the discriminatory Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 which recognized only five nuclear weapon states and bound the signatories not to proliferate nuclear weapons. Indira Gandhi for the time being had to abandon the idea of nuclear weapons, though India was getting enriched uranium and working on nuclear power, peaceful or otherwise. Successive governments maintained silence but indicated that India was keeping its nuclear options open.

India took the bold decision of ordering five nuclear tests in May 1998. The tests conducted in absolute secrecy enabled India to declare itself a nuclear weapon state. India boldly faced bombardment of criticism and severe sanctions imposed upon it by the US and its allies.

2.5 DECOLONIZATION, PEACE, SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT

As nationalism spread, demand of 'self determination' thrived at the global level. In fact, issue of self determination was in the forefront during World Wars. Aspirations of self determination and independence initiated process of decolonization-an occurrence that deeply affected international relations in the 20th century. It was anticipated that after obtaining independence from colonial masters newly independent states will have greater role in international politics and would get chance to developed and flourished through abandon resources available in their states. However, soon it was realized that in most of the cases those states have gained mere political independence. Ex-colonial masters still hold stake through various measures. In fact, many new tactics have been evolved by powerful states to exploit weak states. This has been studied with the perspectives of neo-colonialism. In this section you will learn about those aspects.

NOTES

Check Your Progress

6. India desired peace not merely as an ideal but also as an essential condition for its own security. (True/False)
7. India was pushed by the USSR to be a member of the Commonwealth of Nations. (True/False)
8. What does non-alignment mean?
9. _____ was elected the President of the United Nations General Assembly in 1953.

NOTES

Decolonization

Modern colonialism appeared on the political horizon of the globe as an outcome of industrialization in Europe. European nations like Great Britain, France, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Belgium, Holland and many others build their empires over Asia, Africa and Latin America. The European powers exploited the resources of what came to be known as the Third World countries and subjugated their people for about four centuries by their colonial and imperialist policies. The exploitation inevitably provoked its own contradictions in the form of nationalism and nationalist movements and that led to the process of decolonization. In general decolonization refers to the undoing of colonialism, the unequal relation of polities whereby one person or nation establishes and maintains dependent territorial governments over another. Thus, decolonization is the attainment of rights of self-determination and establishment of a sovereign government.

Subjugated people challenged colonial powers by continuous struggle as in Indian in 1857 and other forms of discontent. However, the actual progress in decolonization began only during the inter war period as 'right to self-determination' was stated a crucial reason. The process of decolonization was accelerated with the end of World War II and the establishment of the United Nations. United Nations constituted a 'Special Committee on Decolonization' and stated that there is no alternative to self determination. By end of the 20th century major parts of the world achieved 'self determination' (except territories mentioned in Table 7.1) and, thus, the process of decolonization is completed. However, the process of decolonization varied. Some nation achieved independence within the framework of liberal democratic movement (peaceful transition) while other attained it through violent struggle. A thorough study of effort of the United Nations and attitude of colonial masters also required to understand decolonization.

Table 7.1 Non-Self Governing Territories (as of 2006)

Territory	Administering Power
Africa	
Western Sahara*	
Asia and the Pacific	
American Samoa	United States
Guam	United States
New Caledonia**	France
Pitcairn	United Kingdom
Tokelau	New Zealand
Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean and Mediterranean	
Anguilla	United Kingdom
Bermuda	United Kingdom
British Virgin Islands	United Kingdom
Cayman Islands	United Kingdom
Falkland Islands (Malvinas)***	United Kingdom
Gibraltar	United Kingdom
Montserrat	United Kingdom
St. Helena	United Kingdom
Turks and Caicos Islands	United Kingdom
United States Virgin Islands	United States

NOTES

* On 26 February 1976, Spain informed the UN Secretary-General that as of that date it had terminated its presence in the territory of Sahara and deemed it necessary to place on record that Spain considered itself, thenceforth, exempt from any international responsibility in connection with its administration, in view of the cessation of its participation in the temporary administration established for the territory. In 1990, the General Assembly reaffirmed that the question of western Sahara was a question of decolonization that remained to be completed by the people of Western Sahara.

** On 2 December 1986, the General Assembly determined that New Caledonia was a Non-Self Governing Territory.

*** A dispute exists between the governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

Source: United Nations Department of Public Information, DPI/2448—07-22351—March 2007

Decolonization process

Colonialism was a means to exploit weaker states by the powerful ones. Colonies were established through deceit, war, annexations, and other means. Loosing territorial ownership and control over resources of those was of much painful for colonial masters. Therefore, the process of decolonization was not smooth and often linked violent means. In most cases, it began with a 'war of independence' and at times followed by a revolution. It is, however, a dynamic cycle which involves failed negotiations, frequent protests and processions, short-term upheavals, and suppression by authorities which lead to violent risings, deaths and more intense negotiations until independence is granted. The show of violence was a reaction to the iron-hand oppression by the ruling regime and its administration.

Very rarely did a decolonization process show signs of non-violence. In India under Mahatma Gandhi, the freedom movement took to the path of non-violence.

For example, war of independence in French Indochina began in December 1946 and ended in August 1957. In countries in west Africa (Francophone such as Senegal, Ivory Coast or Anglophone such as Nigeria and Ghana) the decolonization process was a combination of insurrections and negotiations. While in others, the intervention of international organizations such as the League of Nations and the United Nations was required. Mandated territories under the League of Nations such as Syria, Palestine, Lebanon, Iraq, Tanganyika, Rwanda, Burundi, Cameroon, and Pacific territories either became independent or were placed under the trusteeship council of the United Nations. The objective was to bring self determination among these countries that would eventually lead to independence.

The Portuguese colonies in Africa, such as, Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea Bissau, saw long-drawn armed struggle, but independence was not easy to come. It was only in 1974 when Portugal herself witnessed a democratic revolution that overthrew the military dictator Salazaar. The former French colony of Algeria too witnessed seven years of armed struggle, from 1954 to 1961. The fight was led by Ben Bella and Ferhat Abbas of National Liberation Front of Algeria (FNLA). Even Indonesia and Vietnam attained independence through violent struggle. However, countries like Morocco and Tunisia achieved independence with comparative ease.

Check Your Progress

10. The process of decolonization was accelerated with the end of First World War and the establishment of the League Nations. (True/False)
11. The process of decolonization was a smooth transition. (True/False)

2.6 NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT

NOTES

The Non-Aligned Movement, founded in 1961, was a product of the Cold War. A group of world leaders, India's first prime minister Jawaharlal Nehru; Indonesia's first president Sukarno; Egypt's second president Gamal Abdel Nasser; Ghana's first president Kwame Nkrumah; and Yugoslavia's president Josip Broz Tito, renounced the bi-polar division of the countries across the globe and advocated a middle path for the developing world. The phrase, used for the first time by V.K. Krishna Menon in 1953 at the United Nations, highlighted an ideological difference between the East and West camps. The end of the Cold War, with the fall of the USSR, erupted a wide debate on the relevance of the NAM in the contemporary scenario.

The debate

The last decade of the 20th century witnessed fiery debate on role and relevance of the NAM in change circumstances in the international arena. There were two main arguments. The first group held that the very purpose of the organization did not hold ground any longer and the political developments had altered the geography and character of the founding members. For example, Yugoslavia no longer existed and some of the countries had entered into strategic alliance with the United States, which had now become the only dominant power.

The second group argued that the movement's existence was important because justifications for its continuation are much more than those for its disappearance. They said its achievements could not be nullified and some of the challenges NAM stood for still existed.

Late Prime Minister P.V.N Rao had stated, 'The pursuit of a non-aligned policy is even more relevant today than ever before. Non-alignment basically consists of the espousal of the rights of nations to independence and development, regardless of the bloc phenomenon. Whether there is one bloc or more at a given moment, the urge of a non-aligned country would continue to be maintain its independence, to take decisions according to its rights, not tagging itself in advance to others.'

Relevance of non-alignment

It is, however, pertinent to discuss the relevance of the NAM in the present geo-political situation. NAM was not another political front opposing the two power blocs led by the US and the USSR. It represented different ideological and philosophical values advocating freedom, independence, development, and progress in the Third World. It is a legal framework that comprises countries with similar characteristics so that they could be a viable entity capable of contributing in shaping the new world order and outline its agenda. This is clear in the voting power of the movement members inside the United Nations.

In fact, the end of the climate of ideological polarization and the Cold War should act as an incentive to implement those values through new mechanism in accordance with the new world order.

As of 2012, the movement has 120 members and 17 observer countries. It still has great political, economic and strategic influence on international affairs. The movement holds conferences and summits through which the member countries presents their causes and issues of interest and address the world public opinion in a

bid to give the world countries an insight into the difficulties the NAM members are faced with. Interestingly, major powers have not been able to ignore the effect of NAM both within the framework of inter-NAM dialogue, or while examining issues and problems associated with the relationship between the North and South.

It may, hence, be said that those who advocate that NAM be dissolved, questioning the relevance in today's world politics, are unable to comprehend the objectives of the founders. The movement's presence is still a reminder to the world of an alternative to war and aggression and can stop any country from establishing its hegemony on a weaker state.

ACTIVITY

The last NAM summit was held in 2012. In your opinion, what is the relevance of NAM today? Give your arguments.

NOTES

2.7 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- India's foreign relation was affected by this geo-strategic perception
- India's foreign policy like that of any other country is an extension of its domestic policy and reflects the dominant domestic concerns.
- There are broadly two kinds of determinants, i.e., internal (domestic) and external (international).
- India has had a legacy of peace and internationalism. India has not launched a single aggression against any country.
- Culture is the most important factor or element of foreign policy.
- When India gained Independence, the Cold War had begun and the world was divided into two hostile power blocs. The shaping of India's policy of non-alignment was direct impact to her.
- The goals of India's foreign policy are simple and straightforward. The primary and overriding goal has always been the maintenance and promotion of international peace and security.
- A very important objective was to root out causes of war by measures such as liberation of subjects and the elimination of racial discrimination.
- The basic principles of the Indian foreign policy are based on Non-Aligned Movement (NAM).
- In the present time, colonialism and imperialism have been terminated; one might think that there is no relevance of this principle any more. But, Western powers have not given up their efforts to dominate their former colonies.
- Gujral Doctrine advocated people to people contacts, particularly between India and Pakistan, to create an atmosphere that would enable the countries concerned to sort out their differences amicably.

Check Your Progress

12. Who were the founders of the Non-Aligned Movement?
13. How many countries are members of NAM today?

- Modern colonialism appeared on the political horizon of the globe as an outcome of industrialization in Europe.

NOTES

2.8 KEY TERMS

- **Commonwealth of Nations:** Normally referred to as the Commonwealth and formerly known as the British Commonwealth, is an intergovernmental organisation of 54 independent member states. All members except Mozambique and Rwanda were part of the British Empire, out of which the Commonwealth developed.
- **Radcliffe Line:** It was announced on 17 August 1947 as a boundary demarcation line between India and Pakistan upon the Partition of India. The Radcliffe Line was named after its architect, Sir Cyril Radcliffe.
- **Line of Actual Control (LAC):** Also known as the MacCartney-MacDonald Line, it is the effective border between India and the People's Republic of China.

2.9 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. Peace-keeper
2. False
3. The three values that have helped shaping India's foreign policy are: (i) tolerance, (ii) equation of means and ends, and (iii) non-violence.
4. Jawaharlal Nehru
5. False
6. True
7. False
8. In the era of Cold War, non-alignment meant not aligning with any of two power blocs.
9. Vijay Laxmi Pandit
10. False
11. False
12. The founder of the Non-Aligned Movement were Yugoslavia's president Josip Broz Tito, India's first prime minister Jawaharlal Nehru, Indonesia's first president Sukarno, Egypt's second president Gamal Abdel Nasser and Ghana's first president Kwame Nkrumah.
13. As of 2012, the movement has 120 members and 17 observer countries.

2.10 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. What are the geo-strategic perceptions that affected India's foreign relation?
2. How has the pluralistic nature of Indian society shaped its foreign policy?

3. What is the historical background of India's foreign policy?
4. Explain the circumstances that led to the signing on Panchsheel.
5. What is the debate regarding Non-Aligned Movement?

Long-Answer Questions

1. Discuss the determinants of India's foreign policy.
2. Critically analyse the objectives of India's foreign policy.
3. Critically evaluate the basic principles of India's foreign policy.
4. Explain how self determination led to decolonization.
5. Discuss the policy of non-alignment as a tenant of India's foreign policy.

2.11 FURTHER READING

Baylis, J., Smith, S. & Owens, P.; *The Globalization of World Politics*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2008.

Goldstein, J.; *International Relations*, Pearson Education, Inc, New Delhi, 2005.

Morgenthau, Hans J.; *Politics Among Nations*, McGraw-Hill Higher Education, New Delhi, 2005.

Vandana, A.; *Theory of International Politics*, Vikas Publishing House. Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi, 1996.

NOTES

UNIT 3 INDIA AND MAJOR POWERS

Structure

- 3.0 Introduction
- 3.1 Unit Objectives
- 3.2 India's Relation with the US
 - 3.2.1 United States and Containment of Communism
 - 3.2.2 Indo-China Border War of 1962; 8.2.3 India-Pakistan War of 1965
 - 3.2.4 Indira Gandhi and Indo-US Relations; 8.2.5 Crisis of Bangladesh
 - 3.2.6 Indo-American Relations after the Bangladesh Crisis
 - 3.2.7 Problem of Nuclear Non-Proliferation; 8.2.8 Indo-US Nuclear Deal
- 3.3 India's Relation with China
 - 3.3.1 Proposal to Open up the Nathula and Jelep Passes
 - 3.3.2 Acknowledgement of Arunachal Pradesh as part of India by the Asian Development Bank (ADB)
 - 3.3.3 Trade Relations between India and China
- 3.4 India's Relation with Russia
- 3.5 India's Relation with Japan
- 3.6 Summary
- 3.7 Key Terms
- 3.8 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 3.9 Questions and Exercises
- 3.10 Further Reading

NOTES

3.0 INTRODUCTION

In the previous unit, you learnt about the principles and philosophies on which India's foreign policy is based. You were also introduced to the process of decolonization and the concept of Non-Aligned Movement.

After Independence, India did not want to be dominated by military blocs and wanted to use its resources for rebuilding and developing the country rather than spending it on arms. After World War II, two military blocs led by the Capitalist US and the Communist USSR dominated the world. The ideological differences between the US and the USSR led to tensions and rivalry between these two blocs. India has always believed in a policy of peace and non-violence, both in domestic and foreign affairs. India's foreign policy is based on the policy of non-alignment, i.e., not aligned to either of the military blocs.

In this unit, we would discuss in detail India's foreign policy and relations with the US, Russia, China and Japan.

3.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Describe India's relationship with the US in relation to the changing political atmosphere
- Explain India's relation with China
- Analyse the friendship India shared with Russia
- Interpret India's foreign policy towards Japan

3.2 INDIA'S RELATION WITH THE US

NOTES

Some foreign policy-makers believe that India's strong democratic tradition, although much younger than that of the United States, is an important ingredient in Indo-United States relations. Soon after Independence, India developed friendly ties with the United States. The democratic ideals of America fascinated the Indian leaders, especially Jawaharlal Nehru, and they tried to develop cordial relations with the United States. However, India's decision to pursue the policy of non-alignment was not favoured by US leaders and they considered it an unfriendly gesture towards their country. India's refusal to join the military alliances sponsored by the US and different stands taken by India on various international issues like grant of independence of Indonesia and recognition of the Communist China annoyed the leaders of the United States. On the other hand, the United States support to Pakistan on the Kashmir issue in the Security Council as well as grant of military aid irritated Indian leaders.

American Policy of Containment towards communist Soviet Union and China through military alliance was not approved by India and it sought to promote peaceful co-existence and cooperation by recognizing the difference between their political institutions. Despite these differences in the political sphere, the relations between the two nations in the economic, cultural and educational spheres continued to grow and the US provided valuable assistance to India under the Technical Cooperation Agreement of 1951. To tide over the problem of food-shortage facing India, the US also made available huge quantities of food grains. India also received enormous assistance from various private foundations like the Ford Foundations, Rockefeller Foundation and Carnegie.

India's ties with the US became much more cordial after the Indo-China border war of 1962. The US provided India with useful moral and material help during the war when India stood alone. At this juncture, the two states got very close and made a joint responsibility to check Communist China. Yet, after that the ties between the two nations deteriorated again when India condemned the US for use of gas in North Vietnam. After this incident, the US president postponed his visit to India in 1965. During the Indo-Pak War of 1965, the use of American arms by Pakistan further deteriorated the ties between the two countries. The US government had given the assurance that Pakistan would not use these arms against India. It also asked Pakistan to prevent the use of these arms against India. However, no concrete measures were undertaken by the US leaders in this regard. This was interpreted by the Indian leaders as a pro-Pakistan stand.

India's relations with the US continued to be far from friendly due to the former's consistent support to Pakistan on the Kashmir issue and the US' decision to give shelter to the Naga rebel leader Phizo in the United States in 1967. Relations between the two states bent on the antagonistic throughout the 1970s. After Nixon abruptly terminated \$82 million in economic assistance, India closed down a large United States Agency for International Development Programme. The flow of American scholars and students to India was also restricted by the government of India. India's criticisms of the United States policies in Vietnam and Cambodia increased, and it upgraded its representation in Hanoi.

When the United States expanded its naval base on the island of Diego Garcia and engaged in naval exercises with Pakistan in the Indian Ocean in 1974, India realized that its security was further threatened. An agreement in 1973 defused a

NOTES

dispute over the United States rupee holdings by writing off more than 50 per cent of the debt and directing use of the remainder to mutually acceptable programmes. In 1974, the Indo-United States Joint Commission was established to keep bilateral dealings in the fields of education and culture, economics, and science and technology, away from political controversy and to provide mechanisms for regular exchanges at high levels of public life.

During a series of meetings in the early 1980s, the personal rapport between Indira Gandhi and President Ronald Reagan was established and enabled the two countries to gradually improve bilateral relations. The Reagan administration reassessed its policy towards India and decided to expand areas of cooperation, particularly in the economic and scientific realms, as a means of counteracting Soviet influence in the region. New Delhi's status as the major regional power in South Asia was regarded by the Reagan administration. Indira Gandhi realized that India was unable to block the United States arms supply to Pakistan, but that was improved through a dialogue with the United States, which opened up other areas of interaction benefiting Indian interests. Indira Gandhi's successful visit to the United States in 1982 was followed by a series of high-level exchanges, including the visits of two US leaders, Vice President George Bush and Secretary of State George Shultz, to India. In addition to this, in 1982 the two sides also resolved their dispute concerning supplies of fuel and spare parts for the nuclear power plant at Tarapur. In 1984, it was decided that technology transfers to India by the US government would be expanded.

Again, the ties between New Delhi and Washington continued to remain cordial during the 1985–1987 when Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi regularly visited Washington. Furthermore, India's role as a force for stability in South Asia was appreciated by the US. Washington supported New Delhi's moves in Sri Lanka in 1987 and in Maldives in 1988. In the mid- and late 1980s, visits exchanged by the United States secretary of defense and the Indian defence minister symbolized a modest but growing programme of cooperation in military technology and other defence matters. In 1988, both the countries finalized an agreement to provide the United States technology for India's light combat aircraft programme and also agreed to transfer technology for the F-5 fighter. Cooperation between the two nations in a variety of scientific fields followed the signing of a bilateral agreement on scientific and technological exchanges in 1985. In 1987, India purchased a Cray supercomputer for agricultural research and weather forecasting. Furthermore, economic liberalization measure paved the way for increased trade and the United States investment in India. In 1988, the improved economic climate resulted in the conclusion of a deal for a Pepsi-Cola plant and the signing of a bilateral tax treaty. In 1989, the United States investment in India reached \$1 billion.

India and the United States committed in 1993 to improve relations and bilateral cooperation in spite of differences over India's refusal to sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and participated in discussions with various nations like the United States, Russia, China, and Pakistan for establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia. Nevertheless, Washington directed its efforts to create a climate of restraint between New Delhi and Islamabad in order to freeze their nuclear weapons programmes. India and the United States remained wary of each other's long-term strategy regionally and globally.

India decided to pursue the policy of friendship with all nations, but permanent alliances with none. In pursuance of non-alignment policy, it was natural that India not only maintained friendly relations with Britain, but also tried to develop cordial relations with super powers.

NOTES

In general, the two countries have maintained good relations between them, but there have also been periods of bitterness and virtual hostility. Such ups and downs are natural in the bilateral relations of any two large and self-respecting nations.

It is believed that the United States did not place Indo-US relations at the level of high priority for nearly five decades. The policy of the US changed in India's favour during the period of Chinese aggression on India in 1962. For some time, the Kennedy administration adopted pro-India posture. India as a country was generally given low priority by the US foreign policy-makers. The United States found it difficult to appreciate India's approach to international politics, and often dubbed its non-alignment as pro-Soviet policy. Since India's Independence, there have been several cases of tensions in their relations and often allowed opportunities to go out of their hands. Indo-US relations have been described as relations of 'unfriendly friends'.

Both India and the United States have had trade relations for over two hundred years. Indo-US trade began in the 18th century when the Yankee Clipper ships brought ice from Boston and reached Calcutta and returned to America carrying spices and textiles from India. Only limited diplomatic ties were established in 1790 when US President George Washington appointed a counsel at Calcutta. The freedom fighters of India, from time to time received friendly help and encouragement from the US. Inter-governmental exchanges, tourism and religious experiences promoted friendly relations between the two countries.

Relations between India and the United States during the Cold War period are no longer relevant or necessary as there is no point in going over the five decade-long estrangement between the world's most powerful democracies. The adoption of policy of non-alignment did not mean that India refused to play a positive role in international politics. It expressed positive opinion on the issues facing the world on the basis of merit. Although, India always wanted to have a balanced relationship with both the super powers, however, in this mission it could never succeed. India's ties with the US have pursued a zigzag course during the first 50 years (1947-1997). India's ties with three of the most important neighbours, like Pakistan, China and the Soviet Union, in particular and the policy toward Asia and Africa, in general, have been the most significant determining factors in the Indo-US relations.

Soon after Independence, India developed friendly relations with the US. However, as mentioned earlier, the US policy of containment of communism against Soviet Union and China through a system of military alliance was not approved by India, which irked the US. The United States was also irritated by various other factors like Nehru's mild stand on Chinese invasion of Tibet, not branding China as an aggressor in Korea and opposition to the US-sponsored Uniting for Peace Resolution of November 1950. India's attitude towards the Peace Pact between the US and Japan also caused bitterness. India did not even attend the conference convened by the US for the conclusion of US-Japan peace treaty.

Earlier, when Nehru visited the United States in 1949 he was given a warm welcome. During the period 1951-54, Indo-US ties were friendly and cordial. When Britain, France and Israel launched an invasion on Egypt in 1956, because Suez Canal had been nationalized, most of the countries in the world bitterly criticized these three aggressor nations. India did the same; India completely supported the US efforts to end the Suez conflict.

NOTES

3.2.1 United States and Containment of Communism

The Truman Doctrine (1947) in the context of Greece and Turkey and the Eisenhower Doctrine (1957) in regard to the Middle East had been opposed by India. Both these initiatives were aimed at opposition and containment of communism. India had described both the doctrines as provocative in the context of Cold War. The US intervention in Lebanon and Jordan had also been criticized by India, which increased tension in the Indo-US relations. The founder of India's foreign policy Jawaharlal Nehru and his approach was generally supported by Indian people. However, the Nehru government was bitterly criticized by Indian people in regard to its policy on the question of Soviet intervention in Hungary in 1956. The Soviet armed forces were sent to Hungary to crush the Hungarian people's uprising against Soviet domination over their country.

The aspirations and wishes of Hungarian people were openly suppressed by the Soviet army. The Soviet army destroyed Hungarian desire to pursue an independent policy. India was in no way concerned with this crisis. However, when a resolution was moved by the United States in the UN General Assembly condemning Soviet intervention in Hungary, India abstained from voting. This was an indirect way of supporting the Soviet Union and it was a totally unjustifiable action. India again took a wrong step when it voted along with the USSR to oppose the five-nation resolution calling for free and democratic elections in Hungary. It is impossible to understand why India voted against the proposal for democratic elections in Hungary. This pro-Soviet policy of the Nehru government naturally strained the already tensed Indo-US relations. Within India itself this anti-democratic action was criticized and opposed by a large number of people. Jayaprakash Narain led the opposition and a demand was made by Indian people and the media for the immediate recall of India's representation in the United Nations. The Indian representative, Krishna Menon voted on the side of the Soviet Union. Thus, a sharp difference was noticed between the two nations on several issues during the prime ministership of Nehru.

Liberation of Goa

In western India, Goa and four other small territories like Daman, Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, were under the Portuguese colonial rule for a very long time. It was expected that after the British left India, the Portuguese on the moral grounds would also withdraw forces from these small territories. However, despite numerous diplomatic efforts made by India, Goa could not be liberated from the Portuguese rule and therefore, could not be integrated into the Indian Union. The government of Portugal was not interested in cooperating with India. On the question of Goa, the United States policy was anti-India and the liberation movement of Goa was repeatedly criticized by the Americans. The United States had always been an opponent of imperialism. However, Goa's freedom from the colonial rule was not supported by the United States.

3.2.2 Indo-China Border War of 1962

The Indo-China conflict of 1962 introduced a new element in the Indo-US ties. A common element of China's hostility toward India and the US now introduced a new mood in the country. In January 1961, Kennedy took over as the president of United States and the prime minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru the paid a third visit to the US in the same year. India's foreign policy was generally appreciated by the Kennedy administration, except on the question of Goa. For the first time, US President Kennedy

NOTES

recognized the principle of peaceful coexistence and appreciated the fact that a country could remain neutral in the ongoing conflict between democracy and communism. The Indo-US relations, from then onwards, began to improve again. Speaking in the US Congress, Kennedy publicly praised Nehru's high ideals. Therefore, when following upon China's aggression of October 1962 India appealed for help, the unconditional support was given to India and the necessary war materials were sent by the United States. Voices were raised in India for an alliance with the US against China, and drastic modification for non-alignment.

Thus, Indo-US relations brightened during the Kennedy administration. Earlier, in May 1960, PL-480 agreement was concluded between the two countries, which enabled India to get large quantities of wheat from the United States. The air forces of India, Britain, Australia and the United States carried out joint air exercise in different parts of India in 1964. Again, an agreement was signed by the two countries in December 1964 which provided for American assistance to the tune of 80 million US dollars, which enabled India to set up a plant for nuclear energy at Tarapur. After Nehru's death in May 1964, Lal Bahadur Shastri became the prime minister. Despite the fact that Shastri did not have any experience in the field of foreign policy, he not only actively pursued the policy of non-alignment, but also led India to victory in the Indo-Pakistan war in 1965.

However, ties between India and the United States suffered a clear setback during Shastri's brief rule. Sardar Swaran Singh, as foreign minister of India, under Shastri government played an important role in world politics. During this period, the US had started heavy bombardment on north Vietnam. India was against this action of the United States, which resulted in strong anti-India opinion in America. As a result of India's views on the Vietnam crisis, the prime minister's scheduled visit to the United States in May 1965 was postponed, by president Johnson of the US on account of his 'busy schedule'.

3.2.3 India-Pakistan War of 1965

The Indo-China war of 1962 weakened India to a great extent. Furthermore, China convinced Pakistan that India's defence was extremely weak and that Pakistan could also easily defeat India and capture the state of Jammu and Kashmir. Therefore, Pakistan accelerated its conflict with India first in the Rann of Kutch, and then later in the state of Kashmir. After the border war of 1962 with China, India was engaged in a war with Pakistan in September 1965. During this war, the use of American arms by Pakistan further worsened the Indo-US relations. India protested against the American Government that its arms were being used in the war despite assurances. India asked America to prevent this immediately, but no action was taken in this regard by the US leaders and it continued to maintain a pro-Pakistan stand.

3.2.4 Indira Gandhi and Indo-US Relations

Both Indian Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri and Pakistani President Ayub Khan signed the Tashkent Agreement in January 1966 to normalize Indo-Pak relations. Within a few hours of signing of this agreement Shastri died at Tashkent. He was succeeded by Indira Gandhi. When Indira Gandhi became the Prime Minister in January 1966, her first visit was to the US, which took place in March 1966. Although, she was received warmly by President Johnson, yet a pressure was put on India in regard to India's relations with the Soviet Union.

3.2.1 United States and Containment of Communism

The Truman Doctrine (1947) in the context of Greece and Turkey and the Eisenhower Doctrine (1957) in regard to the Middle East had been opposed by India. Both these initiatives were aimed at opposition and containment of communism. India had described both the doctrines as provocative in the context of Cold War. The US intervention in Lebanon and Jordan had also been criticized by India, which increased tension in the Indo-US relations. The founder of India's foreign policy Jawaharlal Nehru and his approach was generally supported by Indian people. However, the Nehru government was bitterly criticized by Indian people in regard to its policy on the question of Soviet intervention in Hungary in 1956. The Soviet armed forces were sent to Hungary to crush the Hungarian people's uprising against Soviet domination over their country.

The aspirations and wishes of Hungarian people were openly suppressed by the Soviet army. The Soviet army destroyed Hungarian desire to pursue an independent policy. India was in no way concerned with this crisis. However, when a resolution was moved by the United States in the UN General Assembly condemning Soviet intervention in Hungary, India abstained from voting. This was an indirect way of supporting the Soviet Union and it was a totally unjustifiable action. India again took a wrong step when it voted along with the USSR to oppose the five-nation resolution calling for free and democratic elections in Hungary. It is impossible to understand why India voted against the proposal for democratic elections in Hungary. This pro-Soviet policy of the Nehru government naturally strained the already tensed Indo-US relations. Within India itself this anti-democratic action was criticized and opposed by a large number of people. Jayaprakash Narain led the opposition and a demand was made by Indian people and the media for the immediate recall of India's representation in the United Nations. The Indian representative, Krishna Menon voted on the side of the Soviet Union. Thus, a sharp difference was noticed between the two nations on several issues during the prime ministership of Nehru.

Liberation of Goa

In western India, Goa and four other small territories like Daman, Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, were under the Portuguese colonial rule for a very long time. It was expected that after the British left India, the Portuguese on the moral grounds would also withdraw forces from these small territories. However, despite numerous diplomatic efforts made by India, Goa could not be liberated from the Portuguese rule and therefore, could not be integrated into the Indian Union. The government of Portugal was not interested in cooperating with India. On the question of Goa, the United States policy was anti-India and the liberation movement of Goa was repeatedly criticized by the Americans. The United States had always been an opponent of imperialism. However, Goa's freedom from the colonial rule was not supported by the United States.

3.2.2 Indo-China Border War of 1962

The Indo-China conflict of 1962 introduced a new element in the Indo-US ties. A common element of China's hostility toward India and the US now introduced a new mood in the country. In January 1961, Kennedy took over as the president of United States and the prime minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru the paid a third visit to the US in the same year. India's foreign policy was generally appreciated by the Kennedy administration, except on the question of Goa. For the first time, US President Kennedy

NOTES

NOTES

recognized the principle of peaceful coexistence and appreciated the fact that a country could remain neutral in the ongoing conflict between democracy and communism. The Indo-US relations, from then onwards, began to improve again. Speaking in the US Congress, Kennedy publicly praised Nehru's high ideals. Therefore, when following upon China's aggression of October 1962 India appealed for help, the unconditional support was given to India and the necessary war materials were sent by the United States. Voices were raised in India for an alliance with the US against China, and drastic modification for non-alignment.

Thus, Indo-US relations brightened during the Kennedy administration. Earlier, in May 1960, PL-480 agreement was concluded between the two countries, which enabled India to get large quantities of wheat from the United States. The air forces of India, Britain, Australia and the United States carried out joint air exercise in different parts of India in 1964. Again, an agreement was signed by the two countries in December 1964 which provided for American assistance to the tune of 80 million US dollars, which enabled India to set up a plant for nuclear energy at Tarapur. After Nehru's death in May 1964, Lal Bahadur Shastri became the prime minister. Despite the fact that Shastri did not have any experience in the field of foreign policy, he not only actively pursued the policy of non-alignment, but also led India to victory in the Indo-Pakistan war in 1965.

However, ties between India and the United States suffered a clear setback during Shastri's brief rule. Sardar Swaran Singh, as foreign minister of India, under Shastri government played an important role in world politics. During this period, the US had started heavy bombardment on north Vietnam. India was against this action of the United States, which resulted in strong anti-India opinion in America. As a result of India's views on the Vietnam crisis, the prime minister's scheduled visit to the United States in May 1965 was postponed, by president Johnson of the US on account of his 'busy schedule'.

3.2.3 India-Pakistan War of 1965

The Indo-China war of 1962 weakened India to a great extent. Furthermore, China convinced Pakistan that India's defence was extremely weak and that Pakistan could also easily defeat India and capture the state of Jammu and Kashmir. Therefore, Pakistan accelerated its conflict with India first in the Rann of Kutch, and then later in the state of Kashmir. After the border war of 1962 with China, India was engaged in a war with Pakistan in September 1965. During this war, the use of American arms by Pakistan further worsened the Indo-US relations. India protested against the American Government that its arms were being used in the war despite assurances. India asked America to prevent this immediately, but no action was taken in this regard by the US leaders and it continued to maintain a pro-Pakistan stand.

3.2.4 Indira Gandhi and Indo-US Relations

Both Indian Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri and Pakistani President Ayub Khan signed the Tashkent Agreement in January 1966 to normalize Indo-Pak relations. Within a few hours of signing of this agreement Shastri died at Tashkent. He was succeeded by Indira Gandhi. When Indira Gandhi became the Prime Minister in January 1966, her first visit was to the US, which took place in March 1966. Although, she was received warmly by President Johnson, yet a pressure was put on India in regard to India's relations with the Soviet Union.

In 1966, India's currency (rupee) was apparently devalued by India due to the US pressure. The economic assistance to India, which was suspended by the US during the Indo-Pak war of 1965, now resumed, although it was much less than the earlier assistance. The early years of the Indira Gandhi period was marked by a major effort at aligning India and US policies as closely as possible. The first formal bilateral talks were held in 1968 and these talks took place in a changing political situation as well as international environment of the two countries.

For the first time an important American delegation visited New Delhi, without informing the Indians, to settle the Kashmir problem; however, the differences still remained wide. The Johnson administration was replaced by Nixon in 1969. Nixon stood for assistance to India and he also visited India in August 1969. It was the first trip of a US president after Eisenhower's visit of 1955. His visit helped clear some air, and certain differences. However, the Indo-American relationship reached a low point again during the June 1967 war in West Asia when Indira Gandhi supported the Arabs. This action of Indira Gandhi irritated not only President Johnson but also Jewish members of the US Congress. President Nixon then did not try to inject US into the seemingly irresolvable Kashmir question.

As India and the US could not resolve their differences, this sharp difference remained highlighted with the US arms supplies to Pakistan, the West Asian conflict and the war in Vietnam. The perception of India and the United States regarding their interests in Asia in particular, and the developing countries and the world in general had for most of the time, been fairly divergent. Whether it was Kashmir, the Indian Ocean, the question of colonialism or international political and economic order, their outlooks have always differed. India and the United States could never see eye to eye in issues like what steps should be taken for resolving problems in South Asia, Southeast Asia, West Asia (Middle East), Africa and other countries. However, above all, the US policy to the sub-continent, with its consequence for the political and societal interests of India combined with differing policies towards other important areas and issues to cool their relationship often led to a dispute between the two.

3.2.5 Crisis of Bangladesh

Indo-American relations during Bangladesh crisis were never as bad as they turned in 1971. This crisis was the domestic problem of Pakistan as it had started in Bangladesh. However, it soon developed into a major uprising and resulted into another Indo-Pak war in December 1971. During this war, the United States' President, Richard Nixon, had declared that US might intervene on the side of Pakistan, yet in practice it refrained from doing so. Pakistan had always been the bone of contention between Indo-American differences. Initially, Pakistan was not America's first choice; it was only after India refused to join the US sponsored SEATO. After India's refusal, Pakistan was invited to join the Western alliance system. Pakistan had already been receiving military assistance since 1954 from the United States. In spite of assurance given to India by United States, Pakistan used the American weapons against India in both wars. The United States now openly supported Pakistan during 1971 war. It was noticed that a strange cooperation in 1971 between Pakistan, China and the United States of America, took place, and Pakistan started receiving massive military supplies from the US even before the Bangladesh Crisis began. America had decided in 1968 that about 100 tanks of M-47 category will be sent to Pakistan via Turkey. India had made it clear at that time itself that the supply of these tanks would make Pakistan stronger than India, but the US administration did not stop the supply of the tanks.

NOTES

NOTES

The Bangladesh crisis of 1971 led to a confrontation between the two largest democratic nations of the world. You have already been explained the events leading to the 1971 crisis and its consequences. It was clear that anti-India Policy had been adopted by President Nixon of the United States. Owing to this confrontation between the two states, a strange tri-lateral combination of Pakistan, China and the United States emerged. Pakistan had regularly been receiving armaments from the United States.

Pakistan adopted a rigid attitude and refused to appoint Sheik Mujibur Rehman (whose party had won clear majority in Pakistan's National Assembly) as the prime minister. Due to this refusal, people of Bangladesh launched agitation for an independent state. When Indira Gandhi visited Washington, she was directed by President Nixon to resolve and support the position of Pakistan.

3.2.6 Indo-American Relations after the Bangladesh Crisis

India tested its first nuclear device in May 1974 at Pokhran in the deserts of Rajasthan. For this testing, India had made it clear that its nuclear programme was entirely for peaceful purposes. However, the United States highly criticized this step of India and felt that this explosion might lead to nuclear proliferation in South Asia. Serious doubts had also been raised by Pakistan about India's actual intention. Despite this, the Indo-US tensions were eased a little by American Secretary of State Kissinger's visit to New Delhi in October 1974. A 35-nation conference was held in Helsinki where countries of both American and Soviet blocs signed the final act of Helsinki in 1975. This was a remarkable achievement that brought about détente in the East-West conflict. However, again Soviet Union intervention in Afghanistan revived the new tension between the two rival Blocs and gave rise to the 'New Cold War' in 1979.

Meanwhile, both in India as well as the United States, governments had changed in 1977. In the United States, Jimmy Carter took over as the president in January 1977. In India, after Indira Gandhi's Congress party was defeated in the Lok Sabha election, a new Janata Party government led by Morarji Desai assumed the office. After some time, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was overthrown in a coup led by General Zia-ul-Haq in Pakistan, and Bhutto was detained. United States President Jimmy Carter visited India in January 1978 and Desai paid a return visit to America in June in the same year. These visits helped both nations in restoring of cooperation and friendship, though in a very limited way. America promised to increase economic cooperation to India. However, India did not agree to Carter's request to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which India had always asserted was discriminatory in nature. Carter had expressed his fear that if India did not sign the NPT, the US might stop supply of enriched uranium for the Tarapur nuclear plant. Therefore, despite Desai's refusal to sign the NPT, Carter succeeded in persuading the Senate to maintain the supply of uranium to India, but, this did not signify lasting friendship between the countries. The then foreign minister of India, Atal Behari Vajpayee, during his four-day state visit to the United States, discussed with the Jimmy Carter administration in Washington, the issues relating to the supply of uranium to India, the problem caused by Pakistan's attempt to develop nuclear bomb and the need to declare Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

In October 1981, the then Indian Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi met the then US President Ronald Reagan at the Cancun meeting of the developed and the developing countries. After the summit, Reagan realized a new insight into the Indian thinking and began re-examining its assumptions on which India's foreign policy had

NOTES

been based. The two assumptions of the US policy-makers had to be cleared before India. The US assumptions were, first, India's close relations with the Soviet Union necessarily meant hostility towards the west; and the second was good relations of India with one super power meant that the country would not have good relations with the other. As these assumptions were not valid; India tried to convince the US administration at that time.

When Indira Gandhi described her meeting with Reagan as an 'adventure in search of understanding and friendship' then the Indo-US ties showed signs of improvement and Reagan called it as a 'dialogue of discovery'. One result of Gandhi's visit to the US was the conclusion of an agreement between the two countries on the long drawn out problem of the supply of enriched uranium to the Tarapur nuclear plant. However, differences still persisted mainly with regard to three important areas.

- (i) Continued American military aid to Pakistan which was strongly resented by India
- (ii) American action in alerting Pakistan about an impending Indian strike against its nuclear installation
- (iii) Increasing militancy in Punjab and the US attitude towards the separatists who had strong organizational and financial links in the UK, USA and Canada.

However, a more amicable atmosphere was noticed in the Indo-US relations when Rajiv Gandhi assumed the office of prime minister, immediately after the assassination of Indira Gandhi. Rajiv Gandhi visited the United States in 1985 and tried to repair the extremely strained ties. Rajiv Gandhi said, 'We feel we can cooperate to reduce our difference and to work together for the common ideals of freedom and democracy.' But, later the euphoria gave way to disenchantment. Rajiv Gandhi's visit to Cuba and his air dash to Moscow in October 1985 were reasons for disenchantment of the United States. Again, both the leaders, Rajiv Gandhi and Ronald Reagan, met in November 1987 and signed an agreement on cooperation in high technology. The US also agreed to the transfer of high technology including the sale of high-speed computers and offered advanced military technology and weaponry.

With the end of the Cold War and the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991, India had considerably improved its relations with the United States. It was felt that India had an over-optimistic view about the future of the Indo-US relationship. As Inder Malhotra opined, 'Thanks to initiatives taken by Rajiv Gandhi and Ronald Reagan, military cooperation on a limited scale between the two countries had begun.' Joint exercises of the navies of the two states took place after a long time. During Gulf War in 1991, the American war planes flying from South East Asia to Gulf destinations were allowed to be refueled in India, for which US was very appreciative, though the then Indian Prime Minister Chandra Shekhar was criticized in many quarters for the facility provided to the United States.

Soon after the end of World War II, the Cold War had commenced that ended in 1989. The two super powers also gave up the path of confrontation, but the Soviet Union soon began to collapse. In December 1991, Soviet Union finally disintegrated. Like the rest of the world, India was not prepared for this development. This left the United States as the only super power in the world. It became necessary to review foreign policies and diplomatic activities for most of the countries of the world. It was natural that India's ties with the United States must also undergo a substantial change.

3.2.7 Problem of Nuclear Non-Proliferation

NOTES

A major factor in the Indo-US relations according to India was not whether it would suspend or terminate its nuclear programme. India had decided that it would stop its nuclear programme only if all the Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) made a strict commitment that they would, in due course of time, also completely stop their nuclear programmes. As per India, this commitment should have been time-bound so that the world knew by what time it would be free of all the nuclear weapons. However, these views of India were not taken seriously by the United States. Meanwhile, India had not conducted any nuclear test since 1974. According to the US, India's security could be ensured only if it gave up its nuclear programme.

The United States had always wanted that both the neighbouring countries, India and Pakistan, should sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. This policy was forcibly pursued by US Presidents Carter as well as Clinton. Pakistan had already made it clear to Bush as well as to the Clinton administrations that it would sign NPT only after India signed it. India consistently refused to sign the NPT because it regarded the treaty as discriminatory. India always argued that three countries in its neighbourhood had nuclear weapons, so it could not give up its nuclear option unilaterally. India not only refused to sign the NPT but also to develop its missile programme by United States. India's decision to test Prithvi and Agni missiles provoked serious criticism in America and elsewhere. India did not make any compromise on its stand on the question of signing of NPT and later on the proposed Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). In 1996, India succeeded in preventing the CTBT in the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva and voted against it even in the UN General Assembly.

Thus, on the question of NPT, CTBT, the missiles programme as well as the whole issue of Kashmir and human rights continued to be the major causes of the Indo-US differences. However, for the first time in September 1997, the US President Bill Clinton advised the Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif that Kashmir question must be bilaterally solved by India and Pakistan themselves and that there was no requirement of the US to mediate between the two countries. This development was welcomed by India. Again India's Prime Minister Inder Kumar Gujral also met President Clinton, on the latter's initiative, during UN General Assembly session in September 1997. In accordance with Gujral's wishes, President Clinton did not raise the issue of Kashmir. The US, till date, maintains its position that the Kashmir question should be bilaterally dealt with by both India and Pakistan. Later, US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright also said during a visit to these two countries that US did not have any interest of mediating in the Kashmir question.

The importance of the Asian region was admitted as well as considered by the Clinton administration. The US was willing to discuss the common interests of India and Pakistan. On behalf of the Clinton Administration it was claimed that the US wanted to ensure stability in the Indo-Pak ties, so that the tensions of the past could be reduced. The United States was keen to strengthen its friendship with all the countries of South Asia. It was felt by the US administration that the Gujral Doctrine would be highly beneficial to the entire Asian region. The accords that were concluded in 1996 between India and Nepal, and India and Bangladesh were appreciated by the United States and credit was given to this doctrine for developing good neighbourly relations with smaller nations.

When US President Clinton met both Prime Minister I.K. Gujral and Nawaz Sharif in September 1997, for the first time, he made it clear that the United States had no intention of mediating on the Kashmir issue. If both India and Pakistan could resolve their differences bilaterally it would be the most welcome development. By the end of 1997 there were clear signs of improvement in the Indo-US relation, as both India and Pakistan were engaged in taking confidence-building measures. The seriousness with which both the Prime Ministers initiated a step to find solutions to problems and all outstanding bilateral issues was appreciated by the United States, and it was likely that the Clinton Administration was going to re-examine its entire Asia policy. However, the problem was that the US interests appeared to be mainly limited to market operations.

The two states, India and the United States, initiated strategic talks to reach an agreement on the US demand of India signing the CTBT and India's insistence on meeting its security requirement. Ten rounds of talks were held on the twin issues between the US President Clinton's envoy Strobe Talbott and Prime Minister Vajpayee's representative Jaswant Singh during June 1998–January 2000. India cleared that it would adhere to CTBT only if its country's security was ensured and steps were taken for total nuclear disarmament.

The ties between the two largest democratic states of the world also improved much more during and after the Kargil crisis. Credit for this development must be given to (i) Pakistan for having created a muddle in Kargil, and for having given the evidence that it did not have respect for treaties and laws and that it had been giving assistance and encouragement to cross border terrorism against India; (ii) India having acquired nuclear weapons and its bold and courageous stand against discriminatory non-proliferation regime and the CTBT and that it had the courage of conviction to announce unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests and the doctrine of no-first-use; and (iii) the Clinton administration for having realized that India was soon going to be a power to be reckoned with and that Indian economy had become vibrant and stable that it could easily withstand not only economic sanctions but also the expenses in the Kargil war. Americans came to the conclusion that India could not be compelled; it should then perhaps be persuaded.

President of United States Bill Clinton in March 2000 paid a visit to India. After twenty two years, this was the first visit of a US President to India. During his visit, a warm and friendly rapport was established not only with the Prime Minister Vajpayee but also with other important political leaders. External Affairs Minister Jaswant Singh on the eve of Clinton's visit, had said that both India and the United States must put behind them the 'wasted decades' of the Cold War and look for a new relationship in the 21st century, Singh said that the Clinton visit would help set the 'direction' of a new relationship. Clinton said: 'India's economy is one of the ten fastest ...in the world, its thriving high technology sector is one of the brightest spots in the new global economy'. He added, 'After 50 years of missed opportunities, it is time that America and India become better friends and stronger partners. We should firm common ground in opening the global trading system in a way that lifts the live of rich and poor alike.'

A historic document called 'Vision for the 21st century' was signed and released by the two leaders, at the end of their summit level talks between US President Clinton and the Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee. Taking pride in being the two largest democracies, India and the US declared: 'From vastly different origins and experiences

NOTES

NOTES

we have come to the same conclusions that freedom and democracy are the strongest bases for both peace and prosperity, and that they are universal aspirations, constrained neither by culture nor levels of economic development.' The two countries pledged to be partners in peace and shared a commitment to reduce and ultimately eliminate nuclear weapons. 'They promised to work together to preserve stability and growth in the global economy, and to join in an unrelenting battle against poverty so that the promise of a new economy is felt everywhere and no nation is left behind.' The vision statement went on to state that, 'Today, we pledge to deepen the Indian-American partnership in tangible ways, always seeking to reconcile our difference through dialogue and engagement. Therefore, the US President and Indian Prime Minister should meet regularly to institutionalize the bilateral dialogue.' While the two countries drew closer on several issues, they agreed to disagree on the nuclear question. While the US reiterated its belief that 'India should forego nuclear weapons', India proclaimed its determination to 'maintain a credible minimum deterrent'

3.2.8 Indo-US Nuclear Deal

When Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh visited the United States on 18 July 2005, an agreement of far-reaching consequences was concluded between the two countries. This agreement is known as Indo-US Nuclear Agreement, which was aimed at the separation of India's civil and military nuclear facilities and at US resuming civil nuclear cooperation that was suspended after the first test conducted in 1974 by India. This agreement provides for civilian nuclear cooperation on certain conditions when India fulfils and US Congress approves changes in their domestic laws to enable this cooperation.

It was announced on behalf of the US that President George W. Bush had committed himself to work towards achieving 'full civil nuclear cooperation with India' on the grounds that 'as a responsible state with advance nuclear technology India should acquire the same benefits and advantages as other states.' The main points in the deal were spelt out and are discussed below. India will assume the same responsibilities as the other countries with advanced nuclear programmes, and that India agreed to:

- Identify and separate civilian and military nuclear facilities and programmes and file and IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency) declaration regarding its civilian facilities.
- Place voluntarily its civilian nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards;
- Sign and adhere to an Additional Protocol with respect to civilian nuclear facilities.
- Continue its unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing.
- Work with the US for the conclusion of a multilateral Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty.
- Refrain from the transfer of enrichment and reprocessing technologies to states that do not have them and support efforts to limit their spread.
- Secure nuclear materials and technology through comprehensive export control legislation and adherence to the Missile Technology Control Regime and Nuclear Suppliers Group.

The United States reciprocally promised that the administration will:

- Seek agreement from Congress to adjust US laws and policies.
- Work with friends and allies to adjust international regimes to enable full civil nuclear energy cooperation and trade with India.

- Consult with partner on India's participation in the fusion energy consortium and support India's part in work to develop advanced nuclear reactors.

When the United States President, Bush Junior visited India in March 2006, the deal and separation plan was announced. For this reason the leaders of India appeared to be happy that USA would cooperate with India's civil nuclear programme, and ensure supplies for this programme from 44-nation nuclear suppliers Group (NSG). The deal mentioned that out of the 22 thermal power reactors in India, 14 civilian units would be identified and placed under the IAEA safeguards beginning in 2006. This process in a phased manner would be completed by 2014. However, India would not place its prototype, Fast Breeder Reactor, under IAEA safeguards.

To permit civilian nuclear cooperation, certain changes in the American domestic law were required by the nuclear deal. In November 2006, this was approved by the US Congress but it did not completely address India's concern. The law enacted by US Congress is known as the Hyde Act.

Another agreement envisaged to enact the nuclear deal, which was being negotiated for over two years. This agreement is called 123 Agreement as it is an agreement to supply nuclear fuel and is essential under Article 123 of US Atomic Energy Act. After prolonged negotiations between the two nations this agreement was to be concluded, however, India was not interested in accepting the conductional ties of the Hyde Act providing that US would stop civilian's nuclear cooperation if India conducted another test. To accept this condition it would be a threat to the sovereignty of India. In any case, India had a self-imposed voluntary moratorium on further nuclear tests. Secondly, India was not willing to accept the condition that it cannot reprocess the used fuel. The agreement of 123 and seeking approval of Nuclear Suppliers' Group (NSG) were awaited in 2007. It was declared that India would seek safeguards from international Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) only after the conclusion of the Agreement 123.

During Clinton and Bush administrations, ties between both the nations blossomed primarily over common concerns regarding growing Islamic extremism, energy security and climate change. Some foreign policy experts opined that there was a slight downturn in Indo-US ties following the election of Barack Obama as the president of the United States in 2009. This was primarily due to the Obama administration's intension to increase the US ties with China and its protectionist options on dealing with the economic crisis. However, these concerns repeatedly have been dismissed by the leaders of both states.

Some scholars criticized the Indo-US deal on the grounds that India compromised with its sovereignty, however the fact is otherwise. All the international agreements must be analyzed in reference to the following two principles of the international law:

- Pact Sant Survanda: It means the treaties concluded must be observed in good faith. In reference to the Indo-US deal, it can be said that both the parties must respect the provision of the deal.
- Rebus Sic Stantibus: It means that the change of circumstances may allow the contracting parties to abrogate their treaty obligations. Thus, it is clear that if some emergency arises the parties are legally free to violate the provisions of the deal.

In the words of some analysts, the Indo-US ties have strained over the Obama administration in handling the Taliban insurgency in Afghanistan and Pakistan. The

NOTES

Check Your Progress

1. How did US ties with India change after the Indo-China war in 1962?
2. India approved of the American Policy of Containment through military alliance towards communist Soviet Union and China. (True/False)
3. When Nixon abruptly terminated \$82 million in _____, India closed down a large United States Agency for _____.
4. Cooperation between the two nations in a variety of scientific fields followed the signing of a bilateral agreement on _____ in _____.

NOTES

Obama administration for linking the Kashmir dispute to the instability in Pakistan and Afghanistan was also criticized by M.K. Narayana, National Security Adviser of India. He said that by doing so, President Obama was 'barking up the wrong tree.' The foreign policy too criticized Obama's approach towards South Asia saying that 'India can be a part of the solution rather than part of the problem' in South Asia and it was suggested by India to take a more proactive role in rebuilding Afghanistan irrespective of the Obama administration's attitude. Owing to growing confrontation between India and the US, it was suggested to decide not to accept a US invitation to attend a conference on Afghanistan. It was reported that since 2008 Mumbai attacks, the public mood in India has been to pressurize Pakistan in taking actions more aggressively against the culprits who were behind the terrorist attack. Consequently, the Obama administration may now find itself at odds with India's rigid stance against terrorism.

In the month of November 2010, the US President Obama visited India and he is the third US leader to set off on this quest in recent times. Obama's state visit to this country is all about rediscovering India. With his visit to India, the long shadow that the Cold War cast on Indo-US ties has been scattered. Despite a dismal past, the relationship has been recast and strengthened for the 21st century. From terrorism to the Security Council to trade, Obama not only checked off all the key phrases during the culmination of his visit, but also put them together in a forceful speech that impressed the Indian Parliament. Furthermore, the trade deals with the US amount to, over 10 billion US Dollars. Obama also reaffirmed the support of US to India's bid for a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. His emphasis on the interlinking of Indo-US economic and geo-strategic interests for the future is both timely and welcome. His condemnation of Pakistan backed terrorism and support of India's role in Afghanistan will soothe fears of Washington's softness towards Islamabad on these issues.

Check Your Progress

5. In May 1960, the PL-480 agreement was concluded between India and the United States, which enabled India to get large quantities of rice from the United States. (True/False)
6. The Indian Prime Minister _____ and Pakistani President _____ signed the Tashkent Agreement in January 1966 to normalize Indo-Pak relations.
7. India's decision to test _____ and _____ missiles provoked serious criticism in America and elsewhere.

3.3 INDIA'S RELATION WITH CHINA

Relations between India and China have always been extremely complex. Long ago, India and China enjoyed rich cultural links with each other; however, the border war of 1965 strained the relations between the two for a very long time to come.

The People's Republic of China (PRC) was founded on 1 October, 1949. India was the first non-communist country to establish its embassy in the People's Republic of China. After this, in 1950, diplomatic relations between the two countries were established. In 1954, India and China signed a joint agreement that was based on the Panchsheel, which is the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence.

The Indo-China conflict in 1962 led to a serious setback in bilateral relations. India and China restored ambassadorial relations in August 1976. Higher political level contacts were revived by the visit of the then External Affairs Minister, A.B. Vajpayee in February 1979.

At present, India and China share a cordial relationship. Indo-China political relations are enhanced and strengthened by various mechanisms. There is a close and regular interaction between strategic and foreign policy think-tanks. Dialogues are also being initiated between pairs of Indo-China academic organizations.

Sino-Indian relations, also called Indo-China relations, refer to international relations between People's Republic of China (PRC) and Republic of India. The

NOTES

economic and diplomatic importance of China and India, which are known as the two most populous states in the world and are among the world's fastest growing economies, in recent years, has increased the significance of the bilateral relationship between them. Ties between India and China date back to ancient times and these two countries are among the world's oldest civilizations and coexisted in peace in the ancient times. In ancient times, economic contact between the two regions existed through trade relations via the Silk Road. However, since the early 1950s, their relationship has been characterized by border disputes, resulting in military conflict, which led to the Sino-Indian War of 1962, the Chola incident in 1967, and the 1987 Sino-Indian skirmish.

India and China had very close relations with each other till the latter invaded India in 1962. In 1949, when communists overthrew Nationalist Government in China, India was one of the first few countries which established diplomatic ties with the People's Republic of China (Red China). India also strongly and continuously pleaded that PRC should be admitted as member of the United Nations and given a permanent seat in the Security Council.

In 1950, Chinese forces entered Tibet, which was then an autonomous region with a separate cultural identity. India did not cherish it but even then did not spoil its ties with China. Accordingly in 1954 both the countries concluded an agreement by which China's sovereignty over Tibet was accepted. This was much criticized by many in India. However, the bitterness that was created in 1954 gradually reduced and relations between the two countries slowly started becoming friendly. In 1954 China accepted Panchsheel principles by which it agreed not to interfere in the internal affairs of any other country. Both the countries cooperated with each other at Bandung. India also agreed to set up trade centres with China, one of which China would set up in Gangtok in Tibet.

The ties between the two states were strained in 1959 when China suppressed rising against it in Tibet. This forced Dalai Lama, the spiritual head, to leave Tibet and come to India where he was given asylum, which China did not appreciate. In an answer to this, China occupied Longju and 12,000 miles of Indian Territory in Ladakh. The tension between the two countries went on increasing. In order to ease the relations, the Prime Ministers of both the countries met in April 1960 in New Delhi. However, no solution of the problem could be found.

Both countries have in recent years successfully attempted to improve their diplomatic and economic ties and consequently, the two nations have come closer. At present, China is India's largest trading partner and has recently returned its stance on India's bid for a United Nations Security Council (UNSC) seat, when Chinese Foreign Minister Kong Quan formally declared that China will back UNSC bid of India. Currently, India is the main seller of Iron ore to China and fills the desperate requirements of natural resources for the nation. Both the countries have close economic and military ties as well. In 2005, the two states again announced a 'strategic partnership'. India and China continue to strengthen their ties and trade between the two countries has been steadily growing. Many have agreed that Sino-Indian relations have entered a maturity period.

The border between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India over Arunachal Pradesh and South Tibet reflects actual control, which means showing without dotted line.

NOTES

India and China are separated by the formidable geographical obstacles of the Himalayan mountain chain. The two nations today share a border along the Himalayas and Nepal and Bhutan, where the two states lying along the Himalaya range act as buffer states. In addition, India and China share the disputed Kashmir province border which is also claimed by Pakistan. That is why, Pakistan has tense relations with India and the unrest state of Kashmir serves as a natural ally to China.

Aksai Chin and Arunachal Pradesh are the two territories which are currently disputed between the People's Republic of China and India. Arunachal Pradesh is located in the far east of India, while Aksai Chin is located near the northwest corner of India, at the junction of India, Pakistan, and China. However, all the sides in dispute have agreed to respect the Line of Actual Control and this border dispute is not widely seen as a major flashpoint.

It was based upon Jawaharlal Nehru's vision of 'resurgent Asia', on friendship between the two largest states of Asia; Nehru's vision of an internationalist foreign policy was governed by the ethics of Panchsheel, which he initially believed was shared by China. However, he became visibly upset when it cleared that the two countries had a common interest only in Tibet, which had traditionally served as a geographical and political buffer zone and where India had inherited special privileges from the British Raj, as was believed by most Indians.

Initially, the foreign policy of both the countries was not focussed; they only concentrated on the internal development of their respective states. Their concern was not about one another, when the two states formulated their foreign policies.

On 1 October 1949, in a civil war, the People's Liberation Army defeated the Kuomintang (Nationalist Party) of China and established the People's Republic of China. On 15 August 1947, India became an independent dominion under British Commonwealth and became a federal, democratic republic after its constitution came into effect on 26 January 1950. Mao Zedong, the then Commander of the Liberation Army as well as Chairman of the Communist Party of China, declared Tibet as an integral part of the Chinese State. Mao was determined to bring Tibet under direct administrative and military control of People's Republic of China. He realized the Indian concern over Tibet as interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of China by the Indian Government. However, with India's support, Tibetan delegates signed an agreement in May 1951 to recognize PRC sovereignty but guaranteed that the existing political and social system of Tibet would continue. Direct negotiations between India and China commenced in an atmosphere improved by India's mediation efforts in ending the Korean War during 1950–1953.

In April 1954, the two countries signed an eight-year agreement on Tibet that set forth the basis of their relationship in the form of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence (Panchsheel). Although critics called the Panchsheel stupid, in the absence of a policy for defence of the Himalayan region, Nehru calculated that for the best guarantee of security of India was to establish a psychological buffer zone instead of the lost physical buffer of Tibet. Thus the catch phrase of India's diplomacy with China in the 1950s was *Hindi-Chini bhai-bhai*, which means, in Hindi, 'Indians and Chinese are brothers'. Despite border skirmishes and discrepancies between Indian and Chinese maps until 1959, Chinese leaders amicably assured India that there was no territorial controversy on the border though there is some evidence that India avoided bringing up the border issue in high level meetings.

In 1954, the Government of India published new maps that included the Aksai Chin region within the boundaries of India (maps published at the time of India's independence did not clearly indicate whether the region was in India or Tibet). When an Indian reconnaissance party discovered that a completed Chinese built road was running through the Aksai Chin region of the Ladakh District of Jammu and Kashmir, the Indian protests became more frequent and serious concerning border clashes between the two countries. In January 1959, Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai wrote to Nehru and rejected his contention that the border was based on treaty and custom and pointed out that the Government of China had not accepted the McMahon Line as legal, which was in the 1914 Shimla Convention which defined the eastern section of the border between India and Tibet. The spiritual and temporal head of the Tibetan people, Dalai Lama sought sanctuary in Dharmshala, Himachal Pradesh, in March 1959 and thousands of Tibetan refugees settled in northwest India, particularly in Himachal Pradesh. The People's Republic of China blamed India for expansionism and imperialism in Tibet and throughout the Himalayan region. China claimed 104,000 square kilometres of territory, which was indicated by India's clear-cut sovereignty, and demanded 'rectification' of the entire border.

This border dispute between the People's Republic of China and India took shape of a short border war, which began on 20 October 1962. The Indian forces which were unprepared and inadequately pushed back within 48 kilometres of the Assam plains in the northeast and occupied strategic points in Ladakh by China, until a unilateral ceasefire on 21 November was declared by China and it withdrew 21 kilometres behind its contended line of control.

When China suddenly attacked India in 1962, the latter was not prepared at all. China occupied large portions of Indian territories both in the North-East Frontier Agency (NEFA) and Ladakh, however due to the mounting world pressure on China led to a unilateral ceasefire on 21 November 1962. It was declared that China's aggression had far reaching consequences on India's Foreign Policy. It was then that India realized that China was its enemy and not friend. India had to be conscious of this enemy and in order to make its borders secure India had to equip its soldiers and keep them in a state of readiness. Thus, Indo-China relations became very bitter. Since India also had strained ties with Pakistan, therefore, China and Pakistan came closer to each other. Both China and Pakistan also concluded an agreement by which Pakistan gave a large part of Kashmir to China which belonged to India and which had illegally been occupied by Pakistan. In return, China extended monetary help, technical know-how and helped Pakistan in the development of nuclear technology. China also supplied arms and aircraft to Pakistan.

From this invasion, China also acquired a good portion of the Indian Territory in Ladakh and thus got the much needed link between Sinkiang and Southern China. There was a serious demand in India that the policy of non-alignment should be reviewed as it had not stood the test of the time.

In order to resolve Sino-India conflict, some Afro-Asian countries like Indonesia, Cambodia, Ghana, Burma, United Arab Emirate and Ceylon met at Colombo and urged both India and China to amicably resolve their differences. Where India accepted the Colombo Plan but China refused it and thus a deadlock between the two states continued. The Parliament of India then passed a resolution to get back the China occupied Indian territories.

NOTES

NOTES

A severe political split was now taking place in the Communist Party of India during the Indo-China border war. One section was accused by the Indian government as being pro-China and a large number of political leaders were kept in jail. Subsequently, CPI split into two sections: one, the Communist Party of India (CPI); second, the Communist Party of India (Marxist) or CPI (M), which was formed in 1964. CPI (M) held some contacts with the Communist Party of China in the initial period after the split, but did not fully embrace the political line of Mao Zedong.

The Sino-India Relations worsened further when in 1967 in China some Indian embassy officers were maltreated by a mob and one of them was declared a spy. This in turn evoked protests in India and demonstrations were held before the Chinese Embassy. The Government of India also expelled a Chinese diplomat. This embittered the ties between the two nations. However, in spite of all the bitterness India neither gave up its policy of non-alignment nor did it give up the efforts for securing a seat for Red China in the world body.

Ties between the two nations continued to deteriorate during the rest of the 1960s and the early 1970s as Sino-Pakistan ties improved and Sino-Soviet relations worsened. China backed Pakistan in its 1965 war with India. During 1967 and 1971, China built an all-weather road across territory claimed by India, linking Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of China with Pakistan; India could not do more than protest. China continued an active propaganda campaign against India and supplied ideological, financial, and other assistance to dissident groups, especially to tribes in northeast India. China also accused India of assisting the Khampa rebels in Tibet. A diplomatic contact between the two governments was minimal although not formally severed. The cultural flow and other exchanges that had started in 1950s completely ceased. The trade items like wool, fur and spice between Lhasa and India through the Nathula Pass, an offshoot of the ancient Silk Route in the then Indian protectorate of Sikkim, was also shaken. However, the biweekly postal network through this pass was kept alive, which exists till today.

When Pakistan invaded India in 1965 and 1971, China supported Pakistan on both the occasions and gave an ultimatum to India and extended military aid to Pakistan. In fact, in 1971 China was seriously thinking of invading India, when Soviet Union declared that it would not tolerate any intervention by a third party in the Indo-Pak conflict.

India signed its Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation with the Soviet Union in August 1971 and due to this the United States and the China sided with Pakistan in its December 1971 war with India. By this time, the People's Republic of China (PRC) had just replaced the Republic of China in the United Nations where its representatives denounced India as being a 'tool of Soviet expansionism.'

As the time passed, the bitterness created by Chinese attack over India began to fade. China also began to realize that enmity with India was not in its own interest. In April 1976, diplomatic ties between the two nations were restored. In 1978, trade delegations were exchanged. In 1979 the then foreign minister of India, A.B. Vajpayee visited China in a bid to normalize relations with that state though he had to cut short his visit.

The Chinese foreign minister then visited India in June 1981 and it was agreed that a meaningful dialogue should be started for setting border dispute and simultaneously ties between the two states should be improved. He also declared that

the Chinese government would allow Indian pilgrims to visit some holy places in Tibet and invited Indian Prime Minister to visit China.

Again, India and China renewed efforts to improve relations after the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in December 1979. China modified its pro-Pakistan stand on Kashmir issue and appeared to remain silent regarding India's absorption of Sikkim and its special advisory relationship with Bhutan. The Chinese leaders agreed to discuss the boundary issue, yet India's priority was to first broaden the relations between the two. After that the two countries hosted each others' news agencies, and Mount Kailash and Mansarowar Lake in Tibet, the mythological home of the Hindu pantheon, were opened to annual pilgrimages from India.

The Chinese Minister of Foreign Affairs, Huang Hua, was invited to India in 1981, where he complimented India's role in South Asia. The Chinese Premier Zhao Ziyang simultaneously toured Pakistan, Nepal and Bangladesh.

A plan to upgrade the deployment of forces around the Line of Actual Control to avoid unilateral redefinitions of the line in 1980 was approved by the then Indian Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi. India also decided to increase funds for infrastructural development in these areas.

Squads of Indian soldiers began to actively patrol the Sumdorong Chu Valley in Arunachal Pradesh (formerly NEFA) in 1984, which is north of the McMahon Line as drawn on the Shimla Treaty map but south of the ridge which India claims is meant to delineate the McMahon Line.

The then Foreign Minister N.D. Tiwari and Prime Minister of India, Rajiv Gandhi visited Beijing over the following months to negotiate a mutual de-escalation with Chinese leaders.

After Huang's visit to India the leaders of both nations held eight rounds of border negotiations between December 1981 and November 1987. These negotiations initially raised hopes that progress could be made on the border issue. However, in 1985 China tightened its position on the border and insisted on mutual concessions without defining the exact terms of its 'package proposal' or where the actual line of control lay. Between 1986 and 1987, nothing could be achieved from these negotiations, only the charges of military encroachment in the Sumdorong Chu Valley of the Tawang tract, on the eastern sector of the border, between the two countries were exchanged. A military post and helicopter pad was constructed by China in the area in 1986 and Arunachal Pradesh (formerly the North-East Frontier Agency) was granted statehood by India in February 1987 causing both sides to deploy new troops to the area, raising tensions and fears of the new border war. China relayed warnings that if India did not cease 'nibbling' at Chinese territory, it would 'teach India a lesson'. By the summer of 1987, however, both sides had backed away from conflict and denied that military clashes had taken place.

When Rajiv Gandhi visited China in December 1988, a warming trend in ties was facilitated. A joint communiqué was issued from both sides which stressed the need to restore friendly ties on the basis of the Panchsheel and noted the importance of the first visit by an Indian Prime Minister to China since Nehru visit of 1954. The two countries entered into an agreement to widen the bilateral relationship in various fields and come up with a mutually acceptable solution to the border dispute. Establishment of direct air links and cultural exchanges were some of the outcomes of the bilateral agreements signed by Rajiv Gandhi on science and technology

NOTES

cooperation on civil aviation. The two countries also agreed that their foreign ministers would consult annually and establish a joint ministerial committee on economic and scientific cooperation and a joint working group on the boundary issue.

NOTES

The Indian foreign secretary and the Chinese vice minister of foreign affairs led the latter group.

In mid-1990s, India's relation with China was visibly slow but was steadily improving. When the Chinese Premier Li Peng visited India in December 1991 and Indian President R. Venkataraman visited China in May 1992, top level dialogues continued between the states. The Indo-Chinese Joint Working Group on the border issue between December 1988 and June 1993 in which six rounds of talks were held, facilitated reduction of tension on the border. This was achieved via confidence-building measures, which included reduction of mutual troops, regular meetings of local military commanders and advance notification of military exercises. Border trade began again after a gap of over thirty years in July 1992. The consulates were reopened in Mumbai and Shanghai in the next two years. The two sides also agreed to open an additional border trading post.

The Defence Minister of India, Sharad Pawar visited Beijing in July 1992, the first ever by an Indian minister of defence. During his visit, the two defence establishments agreed to develop academic, military, scientific, and technological exchanges and to schedule an Indian port call by a Chinese naval vessel.

Substantial progress in ties continued in 1993. The sixth round joint working group negotiations were held in June in New Delhi but resulted in only minor developments. However, the long-standing border dispute was eased as a result of bilateral assurances to reduce troop levels and to respect the ceasefire line along the India-China border. Again, Indian Prime Minister Narasimha Rao and Chinese Premier Li Peng signed the border agreement and three other agreements on cross-border trade, on increased cooperation on the environment and on radio and television broadcasting during Rao's visit to Beijing in September. In December 1993, a senior-level Chinese military delegation made a six-day goodwill visit to India aimed at 'fostering confidence-building measures between the defence forces of the two countries'.

It would be realistic to say that instead of leading to a ganging up against a perceived adversary, the Jiang Zamin visit maintained the steadily ties between the two countries. In fact, the improvement in their ties was apparent in the tension-free and expanding contacts. No dramatic breakthrough in their dispute over the borders was near the horizon, but if the military deployment could be further minimized, it would be proof that China broadly accepted Indian assurance that it would not stoke the fire in Tibet by allowing the Dalai Lama to indulge in political activities in the country. It was also evident that India did not apprehend Chinese assistance to subversive elements in the northeast.

However, the visit came at a time when press reports revealed that, as a result of improved ties between China and Burma, and Burmese army, navy, and air force was receiving greater amounts of military material from China. China was also sending an increasing number of technicians to Burma. Nevertheless, movements continued in 1994 on troop reductions along the Himalayan frontier. Moreover, in January 1994 Beijing announced that it not only favoured a negotiated solution on the Kashmir issue, but also opposed any form of independence for the region.

Negotiations were held in New Delhi in February 1994 which aimed at confirming the established 'confidence-building measures' and discussions for clarifying the 'line of actual control', reduction of armed forces along the line, and prior information about forthcoming military exercises.

In 1993 the Chinese military general visited India which was reciprocated by the Indian army Chief of Staff, General B.C. Joshi. During talks in Beijing in July 1994, both sides agreed that border problems should be resolved peacefully through 'mutual understanding and concessions.'

In June 1994, India and China signed a trade protocol in New Delhi when China's minister of trade and economic cooperation visited India. In fact, both the states were then following the policy of maintaining peace and tranquillity along the border. In September 1994, the border issue was raised when Chinese Minister of National Defence, Chi Haotian, visited New Delhi for broad talks with high-level Indian trade and defence officials. Furthermore, talks in New Delhi in March 1995 by the India-China Expert Group led to an accord to set up two additional points of contact along the 4,000 km border to facilitate meetings between military personnel. Defining the McMahon Line and the line of actual control vis-à-vis military exercises and prevention of air intrusion were also carried out by both sides.

Negotiations in Beijing in July 1995 aimed at better border security and combating cross-border terrorism. In New Delhi in August 1995, additional troop withdrawals from the border made further progress in reducing tensions and improving ties between the two countries.

Further relaxation of the Sino-India ties was made possible in Beijing during the announcement in April 1995. After a year of consultation, the Taipei Economic and Cultural Centre in New Delhi opened up. The centre serves as the representative office of the Republic of China (Taiwan) and is the counterpart of the India-Taipei Association in Taiwan; both institutions have the goal of improving relations between the two sides, which were strained since New Delhi's recognition of Beijing in 1950.

Sino-Indian relations again hit a low point in 1998 due to the nuclear tests conducted by India in May that year. Indian Defence Minister, George Fernandez, declared that 'China is India's number one threat', hinting that India developed nuclear weapons in defence against China's nuclear arsenal. In 1998, when India gained entry into the nuclear club, China became one of the strongest international critics of India's nuclear tests as well as the entry into the nuclear club. From this act, the ties between India and China became strained again until the end of the decade.

During the last decade of the 20th century, both the states have been trying to develop extended and more cooperative economic trade and culture ties. In July 1994, the two countries agreed to cooperate in oil sector technology and for setting up joint ventures in Third World countries. During 1993-94, the trade level touched ₹16,365 million mark. The trade turnover has been increasing by nearly 20 per cent, which is considered a good sign. Yet, somehow slow and steady progress in political ties failed to accompany this economic cooperation, no really big and meaningful progress could be achieved between the states. At present, despite the suspected hand of China in making Pakistan nuclear and encroachments on Sino-India borders by the Chinese troops, ties between the two states are advancing normalization.

NOTES

NOTES

The visit of Indian President K.R. Narayanan to China in 2000 set the ball rolling for slow yet steady re-engagement of Indian and Chinese diplomacy. But disappointment set in the form of the 17th Karmapa, Ugyen Trinley Dorje, who escaped from Tibet to the Rumtek Monastery in Sikkim. Disappointed Chinese officials were in a fix on this issue. If they protested they would have only supported and improved India's governance of Sikkim, which the Chinese had refused to recognize. The Chinese Premier, Zhu Rongji, responded by visiting India in 2002 aiming to focus on economic issues. With Indian PM Atal Bihari Vajpayee visiting China in 2003—there was a visible improvement in the Sino-Indian relations. As the two countries made efforts to resolve their border issues, China officially recognized India's sovereignty over Sikkim.

In the early 1960s, communist China had used the policy of 'palm and five fingers' to express its faith. According to this theory, the palm is Tibet, while the five fingers are Bhutan (independent country) Nepal (independent country), Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh and Ladakh (three parts of India). China had claimed that since the palm (Tibet) is under her sovereignty, therefore, five fingers which are attached to the palm must also come within her sovereignty. But fortunately now, China does not support this theory.

3.3.1 Proposal to Open up the Nathula and Jelep Passes

The two countries proposed to open up the Nathula and Jelep Passes in Sikkim in 2004, which was considered to be mutually beneficial to both countries and was expected to be a witness to gradual improvement in ties between the two countries in the international arena. For the first time, Sino-Indian bilateral trade crossed the \$10 billion mark in 2004. PM Wen Jiabao came to India to visit Bangalore and improve India-China cooperation in the field of technology.

In a speech, Wen stated that, 'Cooperation is just like two pagodas (temples), one hardware and one software. Combined, we can take the leadership position in the world.' Wen further stated that the 21st century will be 'the Asian century of the IT industry.'

This high-level visit was also aimed to many agreements that could help strengthen ties between China and India that would benefit politics, culture and economy.

While the Chinese premier seems in favour of the idea of India's permanent seat in the UN Security Council, he took a neutral stand by the time he went back to his country. China was given an observer status in the SAARC Summit in 2005. While other member nations were willing to consider China for permanent membership in SAARC, India did not seem to wholeheartedly support the idea.

The energy required to feed their rapidly expanding industries, and their investment in oilfields in the Middle East, Central Asia and Africa, is one dimension that forms the foundation of the evolution of Sino-Indian relationship. While there is competition involved in such ventures, there is also a level of cooperation involved because the two nations have to inevitably confront bigger players in the international oil market.

On January 12, 2006, Mani Shankar Aiyar, the Petroleum and Natural Gas Minister, paid a visit to Beijing to sign an agreement that suggested that joint bids be placed by ONGC Videsh Ltd (OVL) and the China Petroleum Corporation (CNPC) for good projects in other locations.

The Nathula Pass, which was a flourishing trade route in ancient times and part of the Silk route, was re-opened by India and China. This pass that went through the Himalayas was shut when the Sino-Indian War broke out in 1962. In 2003, the re-opening of the trade route was initiated and finally a formal agreement was signed in June, 2006. The move was expected to reduce the economic isolation of the area by reopening border trade.

November 2006, saw China and India engaged in a verbal conflict over the control of Arunachal Pradesh, in the northeastern part of India. According to India, 38,000 square kilometres of Indian territory was being occupied by China in Kashmir while China claimed that the entire state of Arunachal Pradesh was its possession.

In May 2007, an Indian IAS officer in Arunachal Pradesh was refused a visa by China. Their argument was that since Arunachal Pradesh was part of China, the officer would not require a visa to visit his own country. In December, the same year, China granted a visa to Marpe Sora, a computer science professor born in Arunachal Pradesh. They reversed their own policy!

The following year, PM Manmohan Singh met President Hu Jintao and PM Wen Jaibao in China to have bilateral discussions on trade, commerce, defense, military and other issues.

3.3.2 Acknowledgement of Arunachal Pradesh as part of India by the Asian Development Bank (ADB)

Asian Development Bank in October 2009 formally acknowledged Arunachal Pradesh as part of India and a loan was sanctioned to India for a development project there. Earlier, China had exercised pressure on the bank to stop the loan; however India succeeded in securing the loan with the help of the United States and Japan. China expressed displeasure at ADB for the same.

Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao visited New Delhi in mid-December 2010 and emphasized that India and China were friends and not rivals. He said that 'China and India have shared interests and common views on the issue of UN Security Council reforms. We both maintain that priority should be given to increasing the representation of developing countries'. According to Wen, both countries have a long way to go and can cooperate because both face 'similar challenges'. On the sensitive border issues between the two countries, however, Wen said these have a 'historical legacy' and are not 'easy to resolve'. Nonetheless, measures should be taken to increase mutual trust and confidence step by step. The two countries decided to continue peaceful negotiations to resolve boundary disputes through the ongoing dialogue process undertaken by the special representatives that were appointed by India and China.

Six pacts were signed between the two nations again both sides decided to continue to promote and enhance cooperation in the field of trans-border rivers. India admired the flood-season hydrological data and the assistance in emergency management provided by China. In addition to data on the river Brahmaputra which China had already agreed to share earlier, India also convinced China to share flood data on the river Sutlej. During Wen's visit, the both sides made announcements regarding the establishment of an India-China Outstanding College Students Exchange Programme. The Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE) decided to offer Chinese as a foreign language in grade nine from 2011, this act was much appreciated by China. Critically, the Chinese bound India to consider the finalization of an agreement to mutually recognize each other's degrees. Now-a-days, hundreds of Indian students

NOTES

- (ii) However, the trade balance is tilted in China's favour, with India starting at a possible deficit of \$24 billion
- (iii) India wary of pulling down customs barrier because of the yawning trade deficit
- (iv) India wants more market access for its pharmaceuticals, agricultural products and IT services

Both countries had completed a joint study in March 2005, when India's trade deficit with China was \$1.5 billion, to examine the benefits of greater trade and economic cooperation. The joint group had recommended the governments for the appointment of a joint task force to study the feasibility and benefits of a possible China-India regional trading arrangement and also give recommendations on the contours of such a pact. The joint task force completed its draft report covering trade in goods, services, investments, trade, and economic cooperation.

DID YOU KNOW?

There are still some 26,000 nuclear warheads in the world, enough to destroy civilization many times over and destroy most life on earth. Nuclear weapons make humans an endangered species.

More than 95 per cent of all nuclear weapons are in the arsenals of the US and Russia.

The average nuclear weapon in the US arsenal is approximately eight times more powerful than the nuclear bomb that destroyed Hiroshima, immediately killing some 90,000 people.

There are currently nine countries with nuclear weapons (US, Russia, UK, France, China, Israel, India, Pakistan and North Korea).

3.4 INDIA'S RELATION WITH RUSSIA

The Indian subcontinent by virtue of its geo-strategic location and population has been a central area of the great powers struggle for influence. Soon after gaining Independence, Nehru through his policy of non-alignment wanted to keep the region away from the superpower rivalry where both the US and the USSR wanted to gain a foothold in the South Asia region. India and Pakistan, in the course of their foreign policy, utilized the superpowers rivalry to their advantage. For example, Pakistan's, willingness to accommodate the US interest not only brought the external powers into the subcontinent, but also strengthened its confrontationalist anti-India stance. Consequently, India was compelled to seek assistance from the USSR. Both the US and the USSR played a major role in South Asia in its political and economic development.

After Independence, both India and Pakistan had differences on the question of Kashmir. To answer the alleged Indian military strength, Pakistan continued to maintain relations with the great powers.

NOTES

Check Your Progress

8. What was Wen Jiabao's thrust during his visit to India in 2010?
9. Who was the Indian President in December 1991?
10. _____ was founded on 1 October, 1949.
11. Tension between India and China escalated when the latter occupied _____ and 12,000 miles of Indian Territory in Ladakh.
12. During the 1971 war, China supported India. (True/False)
13. Who was the first defence minister of India to visit Beijing?
14. _____ formally acknowledged in October 2009 that Arunachal Pradesh was a part of India.

NOTES

This was evident when in 1954, Pakistan joined as a member of a SEATO led by the US. From this act, the whole context of Indo-Pak ties changed. Pakistan provided military bases to the US for checking communism in South Asia and received both military and economic assistance from it. Indian Prime Minister Nehru was totally against of the external power's involvement in the regional issues so that the Cold War or politics would not be brought in this region. Therefore, Indo-Pak relations deteriorated with the assistance of the US arms to Pakistan. In response, India also began to purchase arms from the non-American sources. On the other hand, presence of the US bases in Pakistan's region encouraged the USSR in taking keen interest in the South Asian region with security perspective in India, although India was not interested to accept arms from Soviet Union. However, Pakistan was accepting US arm's aid.

The new leadership in the USSR, after the death of Stalin, soon realized that the policy of non-alignment was to their advantage and they presented themselves as champions of the non-aligned nations and their policy of anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism. Nehru paid a visit to the USSR and was appreciative of their policy of peaceful co-existence. And both agreed to cooperate with each other for mutual benefit and public welfare. Nehru's visit was reciprocated by the visit of the Soviet leaders Khrushchev and Bulganin to India, who declared that all conditions for bilateral trade and economic cooperation and development between India and the Soviet Union were made available on the basis of equality and mutual benefit. Soviet Union also accepted the Indian position on Kashmir as an integral part of India and protected Indian interest in the UN Security Council time and again. The two countries also adopted a common position on the Suez crisis, although India was hesitant in criticizing the USSR for its intervention in Hungary.

The Indo-Soviet relation coincided with the deteriorating Sino-Soviet and Sino-Indian relations. The Tibetan uprising in 1959 led India to buy transport planes and helicopters from the USSR. In October 1960, an Indian delegation went to Moscow to finalize a deal for the purchase of aircrafts and communication equipment. The Chinese attack in 1962 put the USSR in a delicate position because it was difficult for it not to support a communist state. Hence, it adopted a neutral position. The US gave some military help to India. On the other hand, in order to avoid dependence on one supplier for its military requirements, Pakistan gradually moved toward China. In March 1965, Ayub Khan visited China and secured both political support and military supplies for Pakistan. During the 1965 war, the Soviet Union adopted a neutral stand. Russia emerged as a peacemaker when the US was involved in Vietnam War.

Indo-Soviet relations consolidated during the 1960s. During this period, relations between Pakistan and China turned warm and friendly though Pakistan continued to be an active member of American bloc. At the same time, Sino-Soviet conflict was widening, so much so that China began describing the USSR as a revisionist power. However, the situation in the subcontinent worsened when millions of refugees began pouring into India because of the revolt that broke out in the East Pakistan. Pakistan decided to wage a war against India on the basis of the allegation that India was responsible for this unrest and was helping the Mukti Bahini to defeat the Pakistan security forces. Pakistan had full support of the US and China. India for its part, did need a strong partner in order to counterbalance the US-Pakistan and the Chinese-Pakistan strategic relations. In order to get military and economic help, India, entered into a Indo-Soviet Friendship Treaty in 1971 which gave India not only high military

technology, economic assistance, but also political support during the Indo-Pak War. The conclusion of treaty of 1971 with Soviet Union marked a change in India's foreign policy. It was the first political treaty concluded by India with any big power. In certain quarters, an allegation was made that this treaty was in violation of the principle on non-alignment. However, the Indian leaders asserted that this did not affect the non-aligned character of India's foreign policy.

It was more difficult for Indian authorities to handle the Indo-Soviet ties, in the wake of Afghanistan Crisis. However, the environment had suddenly changed with the commencement of the New Cold War due to the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan in 1979. At that time, India's policy towards Afghanistan was also criticized. India's support for the Soviet invasion was condemned by many countries. During the second tenure of Indira Gandhi, in January 1980, she adopted the soft-line policy which was strongly criticized as compromised, it with the policy of non-alignment and clearly shifted towards the Soviet Union. Undoubtedly, India opposed any foreign invasion into a non-aligned country like Afghanistan. India could not criticize Moscow in public as it had given economical and technological support to India. It was well understood by Indira Gandhi that Afghanistan was dominated by Islamic extremists and the US was not in favour of political and geo-strategic interests of India. Thus, she adopted a policy which consisted of three elements. First, the Soviet intervention was not publicly opposed by India. Second, India ignored the intervention, which was to be discussed during the bilateral meetings between the two countries. Third, India did not want to intervene in the internal affairs of Afghanistan to deal with any government, which was de facto in power of that country.

After the death of Indira Gandhi in October 1984, Rajiv Gandhi took over the office of Prime Minister of India. In the USSR, after two short leaderships of Andropov and Chernenko, Mikhail Gorbachev became General Secretary of the Communist Party in 1985. Indo-Soviet ties were further consolidated during this period. The two states had more or less identical views on international issues. Gorbachev understood that the old socialist experiment now could not be applied in the many USSR. So, he adopted the doctrine of 'Perestroika and Glasnot' which was more harmonious to East-West ties, and it was predictable to the end of the Cold War. This was direct significance of the Indo-Soviet ties in particular as well as the foreign policy of India in general. Rajiv Gandhi wanted to readjust India's relations with the two superpowers in foreign policy priority. He visited Moscow in May 1985. Rajiv Gandhi was assured by the Soviet leaders that they were aware of India's anxiety caused by Pakistan's nuclear weapon programme. Both the countries signed agreements for economic and technical cooperation whereby Soviet assistance to India was considerably increased. A significant Delhi Declaration was issued at the end of Gorbachev's Delhi visit. It was signed by Rajiv Gandhi and Gorbachev. On his arrival in India, Gorbachev had warned that if Indo-Pak disputes were not amicably solved then it could lead to serious consequences. There were four reasons of friendly ties with Moscow, viz., (i) maintaining a political counter-balance with China, Pakistan, and the US; (ii) acquiring Soviet inputs in the high-technological sector; (iii) obtaining Soviet defence supplies; and (iv) keeping up economic trade. However, India was of opinion to develop ties with Western states due to Soviet détente with the West. During the late 1980s, a policy of sustained and intensified Indo-Soviet ties was pursued by India, while slowly opening up lines with the West.

NOTES

NOTES

After the disintegration of Soviet Union, P.V Narasimha Rao became the Prime Minister of India. A policy of liberalization and privatization was adopted by India. Economic globalization was rapidly emerging. The three circles of Russian foreign policy were identified by the then foreign minister, Kozyrev of Russia; (i) the West, (ii) the immediate neighbourhood including the former Soviet republics; and (iii) the rest of the world. From this agenda, it was obviously showed that the new elite of Moscow were not interested to incline towards India as one of the preferential partners. However, India also did not necessarily feel obligated to keep up the traditional friendship with Moscow. In 1993, Boris Yeltsin, the Russian President visited India. He tried to remove the doubts that had arisen in Indo-Russian ties. Yeltsin's visit made it clear that Russia was in no mood to give up its trusted friend. Yeltsin further reiterated that Russia would support India on Kashmir issue. After the end of the Cold War, the Group of 7 (G-7), which were highly industrialized states, made a lot of noise in 1992-93 in favour of Russia.

Russia was subsequently admitted to the elite G-8, though it was disappointed with the West. Thus, Russia diverted its focus towards India and China. The renewal of 1971 Indo-Soviet Treaty had already affirmed Soviet commitment in 1993 to respect India's territorial integrity and security. After a year, a military cooperation agreement was signed. The economy of both countries underwent struggle due to the pressures of economic globalization. Hence, both the countries welcomed the revitalization of Indo-Soviet ties, and they were in need of a strategic partner to provide each with arms and technology. The two countries also reached an agreement for continued supply of spares for Indian defence equipment and promotion of bilateral trade. In January 1993, when the two countries resolved the protracted rupee-rouble exchange rate issue and signed a new treaty of friendship and cooperation, they pledged cooperation in economic, political and other fields. In recent times, Vladimir Putin the Prime Minister of Russia is being trying further strengthen to the relations of the two countries and it is considered an important strategic partnership for both the countries.

With the end of the Cold War, Indo-Soviet relations were seriously affected. So India had to re-establish its ties not only with its successor state, the Russian Federation, but also with the former Soviet Republics and the Eastern European countries. The new government of Moscow also reshaped its foreign policy and expanded its ties with the US and Western European states. However, it is important to note that the Indo-Russia ties and its role did not seem as strong as it was earlier. After a short connecting movement of a few years, the relation was renewed, and both India and Russia now play a very important role in each other's foreign policy agenda.

3.5 INDIA'S RELATION WITH JAPAN

Japan and India are partners in peace, with a common interest in and complementary responsibility for promoting the security, stability and prosperity of Asia as well as in advancing international peace and equitable development. At the beginning of the 21st century, Japan and India resolved to take their bilateral relationship to a qualitatively new level. The foundation for this was laid when Yoshiro Mori, Prime Minister of Japan and Atal Behari Vajpayee, Prime Minister of India agreed during the landmark visit of Mori to India in August 2000 to establish the "Global Partnership in the 21st Century".

Check Your Progress

15. Soviet Union did not accept India's position on Kashmir that it was an integral part of India. (True/False)
16. The conclusion of treaty of 1971 with _____ marked a change in India's foreign policy.
17. Indo-Soviet ties were further consolidated during the period of _____.
18. After the end of the Cold War, India moved towards the US. (True/False)

Today, India and Japan share a global vision of peace, stability and shared prosperity, based on sustainable development. Shared democratic values and commitment to human rights, pluralism, open society, and the rule of law underpin the global partnership between the two countries. The global partnership between India and Japan reflects a broad convergence of their long-term political, economic and strategic interests, aspirations, objectives and concerns.

Japan and India view each other as partners that have responsibility for, and are capable of, responding to global and regional challenges in keeping with their global partnership. A strong, prosperous and dynamic India is, therefore, in the interest of Japan and vice versa. In the above context and in view of the current international situation, it was decided to reinforce the strategic focus of the global partnership between Japan and India.

It was agreed during the visit of Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi in 2005 that the two countries would further strengthen their cooperation and pursue an all round and comprehensive development of bilateral relations, with a particular and urgent focus on strengthening economic ties, through full utilization of the existing and potential complementarities in their economies. It was decided that both countries would strive to develop closer dialogue and collaboration to secure peace, stability and prosperity in Asia, promote democracy and development, and explore a new architecture for closer regional cooperation in Asia. It was also agreed that the two countries would strengthen cooperation in diverse areas such as environment, energy, disarmament, non-proliferation and security, taking advantage of, and further building on, their strategic convergences.

The dynamic growth of this relationship is reflected in the number of high level ministerial and parliamentary exchanges that have been taking place at regular intervals. There is a parallel process of business and industry in both countries taking note of the opportunities which has led to a sharp increase in exchange of business delegations.

Annual summits

Annual Summits between the Prime Ministers of the two countries have been taking place since 2006. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh paid an official visit to Japan from 13-16 December 2006 during which a Joint Statement—"Towards India Japan Strategic and Global Partnership"—was signed by the two Prime Ministers.

Shinzo Abe, Prime Minister of Japan visited India from 21-23 August 2007 during which two Joint Statements on "The Roadmap for New Dimensions to the Strategic and Global Partnership between India and Japan" and on the "Enhancement of Cooperation on Environmental Protection and Energy Security" were signed. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh paid an Official Working Visit to Tokyo from 21-23 October 2008 when a Joint Declaration on "Security Cooperation" and a Joint Statement on the "Advancement of Strategic and Global Partnership between India and Japan" were signed. Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama visited India for the Annual Summit from 27-29 December 2009 during which a Joint Statement on "New Stage of Japan-India Strategic and Global Partnership" was signed. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh paid an Official Working Visit to Tokyo from 24-26 October 2010 for the Annual Summit and a Joint Statement "Vision for India-Japan Strategic and Global Partnership in the Next Decade" and a Joint Declaration on the India-Japan Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement (CEPA) were signed by the two Prime Ministers in Tokyo in October 2010.

NOTES

Prime Minister Yoshihiko Noda paid a State visit to India from 27-29 December 2011 and the two Prime Ministers signed a Joint Statement entitled "Vision for the Enhancement of India-Japan Strategic and Global Partnership" upon entering the year of the 60th Anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations.

NOTES

Bilateral Trade

In the financial year (FY) 2011-12, India-Japan bilateral trade reached \$18.43 billion, showing an increase of 34.33 per cent over FY 2010-11, when the total bilateral trade was \$13.72 billion. India's exports to Japan grew by 24.36 per cent as against the growth of 40.20 per cent in its imports from Japan in FY 2011-12. India's primary exports to Japan have been petroleum products, iron ore, gems and jewelry, marine products, oil meals, ferroalloys, inorganic/organic chemicals, etc. India's primary imports from Japan are machinery, transport equipment, iron and steel, electronic goods, organic chemicals, machine tools, etc. India has been the largest recipient of Japanese Official Development Assistance (ODA) since 2003-04. Cumulative commitment of ODA till September 2012 reached Yen 3587.302 billion on commitment basis.

Fifty-nine projects were under implementation with Japanese loan assistance. The loan amount committed for these projects is Yen 1214.811 billion. These projects are in the sectors of power, environment and forests, urban transportation, urban water supply and sanitation, rural drinking water supply, tourism, irrigation, agriculture, shipping, railways, renewable energy and financial services.

Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement

On 16 February 2011, the Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement (CEPA) was signed by Minister of Commerce and Industry Anand Sharma and Japanese Foreign Minister Seiji Maehara.

ACTIVITY

Analyse the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and write a report on it. Highlight the reasons for India's refusal to sign the treaty.

Check Your Progress

19. During the premiership of Atal Behari Vajpayee, Indo-Japanese relations reached a new high. (True/False)
20. In FY 2011-12, India-Japan bilateral trade reached \$18.43 billion, showing an increase of 34.33 per cent over FY 2010-11. (True/False)

3.6 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- Some foreign policy-makers believe that India's strong democratic tradition, although much younger than that of the United States, is an important ingredient in India-United States relations.
- India's decision to pursue the policy of non-alignment was not favoured by US leaders and they considered it an unfriendly gesture towards their country. India's refusal to join the military alliances sponsored by US and different stands taken by India on various international issues like grant of independence of Indonesia and recognition of the Communist China annoyed the leaders of United States.

- India's ties with US became much more cordial after Indo-China border war of 1962. US provided India with useful moral and material help during the War when India stood alone.
- Ties between New Delhi and Washington continued to remain cordial during the 1985–1987 when Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi regularly visited Washington.
- Relations between India and the United States during the Cold War period are no longer relevant or necessary as there is no point in going over the five decade-long estrangement between the world's most powerful democracies.
- The Truman Doctrine (1947) in the context of Greece and Turkey and the Eisenhower Doctrine (1957) in regard to the Middle East had been opposed by India.
- The Indo-China conflict of 1962 introduced a new element in the Indo-US ties.
- Ties between India and the United States suffered a clear setback during Shastri's brief rule. Sardar Swaran Singh, as Foreign Minister of India, under Shastri government played an important role in world politics.
- Indira Gandhi became the Prime Minister in January 1966 and her first visit was to the US took place in March 1966.
- Indo-American relations during Bangladesh crisis were never as bad as they turned in 1971.
- India tested its first nuclear device in May 1974 at Pokhran in the deserts of Rajasthan.
- Rajiv Gandhi and Ronald Reagan, met in November 1987 and signed an agreement on cooperation in high technology.
- A major factor in the Indo-US relations according to India was not whether it would suspend or terminate its nuclear programme.
- When Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh visited the United States on 18 July 2005, an agreement of far-reaching consequences was concluded between the two countries.
- During the tenure of the Clinton and Bush administrations, ties between both the nations blossomed primarily over common concerns regarding growing Islamic extremism, energy security and climate change.
- Relations between India and China have always been extremely complex.
- In 1954, India and China signed a joint agreement that was based on the Panchsheel, which is the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence.
- The India-China conflict in 1962 led to a serious setback in bilateral relations. The ties between the two states were strained in 1959 when China suppressed rising against it in Tibet. This forced Dalai Lama, the spiritual head, to leave Tibet and come to India where he was given asylum, which China did not appreciate.
- Direct negotiations between India and China commenced in an atmosphere improved by India's mediation efforts in ending the Korean War during 1950–1953.

NOTES

NOTES

- In 1954, the Government of India published new maps that included the Aksai Chin region within the boundaries of India (maps published at the time of India's independence did not clearly indicate whether the region was in India or Tibet).
- Border dispute between the People's Republic of China and India took shape of a short border war, which began on 20 October 1962.
- Relations between India and China worsened further when in 1967 in China some Indian Embassy officers were maltreated by a mob and one of them was declared a spy.
- One more effect of China's attack on India was that when Pakistan invaded India in 1965 and 1971, China supported Pakistan on both the occasions and gave an ultimatum to India and extended military aid to Pakistan.
- India and China renewed efforts to improve relations after the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in December 1979.
- When Rajiv Gandhi visited China in December 1988, a warming trend in ties was facilitated.
- In June 1994, India and China signed a trade protocol in New Delhi when China's minister of trade and economic cooperation visited India.
- Negotiations in Beijing in July 1995 aimed at better border security and combating cross-border terrorism.
- The following year, PM Manmohan Singh met President Hu Jintao and PM Wen Jaibao in China to have bilateral discussions on trade, commerce, defense, military and other issues.
- Asian Development Bank in October 2009 formally acknowledged Arunachal Pradesh as part of India and a loan was sanctioned to India for a development project there.
- The Indo-Soviet relation coincided with the deteriorating Sino-Soviet and Sino-Indian relations. The two countries also reached an agreement for continued supply of spares for Indian defence equipment and promotion of bilateral trade. In January 1993, when the two countries resolved the protracted rupee-rouble exchange rate issue and signed a new treaty of friendship and cooperation, they pledged cooperation in economic, political and other fields.
- Japan and India are partners in peace, with a common interest in and complementary responsibility for promoting the security, stability and prosperity of Asia as well as in advancing international peace and equitable development.
- The global partnership between India and Japan reflects a broad convergence of their long-term political, economic and strategic interests, aspirations, objectives and concerns.
- The dynamic growth of this relationship is reflected in the number of high level ministerial and parliamentary exchanges that have been taking place at regular intervals.
- In the financial year (FY) 2011-12, India-Japan bilateral trade reached \$18.43 billion, showing an increase of 34.33 per cent over FY 2010-11, when the total bilateral trade was \$13.72 billion.

3.7 KEY TERMS

- **Expansionism:** The belief in and process of increasing the size and importance of something, especially in a country or a business
- **NEFA:** The North-East Frontier Agency (NEFA), formerly the North-East Frontier Tracts, was one of the political divisions in British India and later the Republic of India till 1972, when it became the Union Territory of Arunachal Pradesh. Its administrative headquarters was Shillong (till 1974, when it was transferred to Itanagar).
- **1962 war:** The Sino-Indian War, also known as the Sino-Indian Border Conflict, was a war between China and India that occurred in 1962. A disputed Himalayan border was the main pretext for war, but other issues played a role.
- **Truman Doctrine:** It was an international relations policy set forth by US President Harry Truman in a speech on March 12, 1947, which stated that the US would support Greece and Turkey with economic and military aid to prevent them from falling into the Soviet sphere.
- **Pokhran:** Also spelled Pokaran is a city and a municipality located in Jaisalmer district in the Indian state of Rajasthan. It is a remote location in the Thar Desert region and served as the test site for India's first underground nuclear weapon detonation.
- **IAEA:** International Atomic Energy Agency is an international organization that seeks to promote the peaceful use of nuclear energy, and to inhibit its use for any military purpose, including nuclear weapons.

NOTES

3.8 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. During the Indo-China border war of 1962, the US provided India with useful moral and material help. But soon after that, the ties deteriorated when India condemned the US for using gas in North Vietnam. After this incident, the US president postponed his visit to India in 1965. During the Indo-Pak War of 1965, the use of American arms by Pakistan further deteriorated the ties between India and US.
2. False
3. Economic assistance, International Development Programme
4. Scientific and technological exchanges, 1985
5. False
6. Lal Bahadur Shastri, Ayub Khan
7. Prithvi and Agni
8. When Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao visited New Delhi in mid-December 2010, emphasized that India and China were friends and not rivals. He said both countries have a long way to go and can cooperate because both face 'similar challenges'.
9. R. Venkataraman was the President of India in 1991.

NOTES

10. People's Republic of China
11. Longju
12. False
13. Sharad Pawar
14. Asian Development Bank
15. False
16. Soviet Union
17. Mikhail Gorbachev
18. False
19. True
20. True

3.9 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Describe the relations between India and the United States during the Indo-China border war of 1962.
2. Write a short-note on the problem of Nuclear Non-Proliferation.
3. Explain the term 'Panchsheel'.
4. Write a short note on the liberation of Goa.
5. Give a brief description on Bangladesh war.
6. What is the Shimla Convention?

Long-Answer Questions

1. State the factors responsible for the straining of the Indo-US ties soon after India gained Independence.
2. In what ways did the Bangladesh Crisis affect the Indo-US relations? Explain in detail.
3. According to the Indo-US nuclear deal, what responsibilities would India have to assume? Explain any four.
4. Evaluate India's relationship with Russia.
5. Explain in brief the initial factors responsible for straining the relationship between India and China.
6. When did India and China sign an eight-year agreement on Tibet? How did it help relations between the two countries?
7. How do the energy requirements of both, India and China, help the relations between the two?
8. Assess India's relation with Japan.

3.10 FURTHER READING

Athwal, A.; *China-India Relations: Contemporary Dynamics*, Routledge, New York, 2007.

Smith, W.W. Jr.; *China's Tibet? Autonomy and Assimilation*, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, New York, 2008.

Saraf, V.; *India and China- Comparing the Incomparable*, Macmillan Publishers India, New Delhi, 2008.

NOTES

UNIT 4 INDIA AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATION

NOTES

Structure

- 4.0 Introduction
- 4.1 Unit Objectives
- 4.2 South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC)
- 4.3 Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)
- 4.4 European Union
- 4.5 Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (BRICS)
- 4.6 Summary
- 4.7 Key Terms
- 4.8 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 4.9 Questions and Exercises
- 4.10 Further Reading

4.0 INTRODUCTION

In the previous unit, you learnt about India's relation with major international powers, such as, the US, the UK, Japan and China.

Regional organizations are in a sense, international organizations, as they incorporate international membership and encompass geopolitical entities that operationally transcend a single nation state. However, their membership is characterized by boundaries and demarcations characteristic to a defined and unique geography, such as continents, or geopolitics, such as economic blocks. They have been established to foster cooperation and political and economic integration or dialogue amongst states or entities within a restrictive geographical or geopolitical boundary. They both reflect common patterns of development and history that have been fostered since the end of World War II as well as the fragmentation inherent in globalization. Most regional organizations tend to work alongside well-established multilateral organizations such as the United Nations. While in many instances a regional organizations are simply referred as international organizations, in many other it makes sense to use the regional organizations term to stress the more limited scope of a particular membership.

India has formal diplomatic relations with most nations and is a member of some of the important regional organizations. It has made steady progress in the India-ASEAN relationship. India became a sectoral dialogue partner of ASEAN in 1992, which was upgraded to full dialogue partnership in 1996. Regionally, India is a part of SAARC (South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation). Certain aspects of India's relations within the subcontinent are conducted through the SAARC. The European Union (EU) is another organization with which India has a long standing relationship. It is India's largest trading partner, accounting for 20 per cent of Indian trade. However, India accounts for only 1.8 per cent of the EU's trade and attracts only 0.3 per cent of European foreign direct investment, although still provides India's largest source for India.

This unit will enlighten you on India's relationship with regional organizations like SAARC, ASEAN, BRIC and the European Union.

NOTES

4.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Explain the evolution of SAARC and discuss its objectives
- Describe the origin of ASEAN and identify its purpose
- Analyse the criticism against ASEAN's performance
- Interpret India's relation with the European Union
- Assess the functioning of BRICS nations

4.2 SOUTH ASIAN ASSOCIATION FOR REGIONAL COOPERATION (SAARC)

The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) is an organization of the South Asian nations. It was founded in 1985 dedicating to economic, technological, social and cultural development and emphasizing for collective self-reliance. Its seven founding members are Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, the Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. Recently, Afghanistan became its member. The headquarters of SAARC is in Kathmandu, Nepal. The meetings of the heads of state are scheduled annually while the meetings of foreign secretaries happen twice annually.

Origin and development

The concept of SAARC was first adopted by Bangladesh during 1977, under the administration of the then President Ziaur Rahman. He mooted the idea of SAARC among the neighbouring states of South Asia when he visited during 1977–1980. In November 1980, a working paper on 'Regional Co-operation in South Asia' was prepared by Bangladesh and circulated among the South-Asian countries.

The ministerial conference meeting was convened in New Delhi, 1983, to set up the Committee for SAARC, and an Integrated Programme for Action (IPA) was launched. Under these agreements, cooperation in the following areas was agreed on:

- Education
- Culture and sports
- Environment and meteorology
- Health population activities and child welfare
- Prevention of drug trafficking and drug abuse
- Rural development
- Science and technology
- Tourism
- Transport
- Women in development

Objectives of SAARC

SAARC has been created with the following objectives:

- To promote the welfare of the people of South Asia and to improve their quality of life.

- To accelerate the economic growth, social progress and cultural development in the region.
- To provide all individuals the opportunity to live in dignity and to realize their full potential.
- To promote and strengthen collective self-reliance among the countries of South Asia.
- To contribute to mutual trust, understanding and appreciation of one another's problems.
- To promote active collaboration and mutual assistance in the economic, social, cultural, technical and scientific fields.
- To strengthen cooperation with other developing countries.
- To strengthen cooperation among themselves in international forums on matters of common interest.
- To cooperate with international and regional organizations with similar aims and purposes.

NOTES

Structure

SAARC, as a regional cooperation, has a structure according to which it seeks to function effectively. It is operated through the following structures:

- Meetings of heads of state or government
- The council of ministers
- The standing committee of foreign secretaries
- The programme committee
- The technical committee
- The secretariat

Political issues in SAARC

SAARC, as a regional cooperation, has discussed and deliberated on different political issues. It has stressed on the 'core issues' which are mentioned above. SAARC meetings are conducted on the margins of political dialogue. It has refrained from interfering in the internal matters of the member states.

The idea of regional cooperation in South Asia was again mooted in May 2001. It has deliberated on the different issues which are mentioned as follows:

- **Political issue-(terrorism):** One of the political issues that the SAARC countries has deliberated and discussed is on the topical theme of terrorism. During the 12th and 13th SAARC summits in 2004 and 2005 the body laid extreme emphasis on greater cooperation between the members countries to fight terrorism.
- **Economic issue-(free trade area):** SAARC countries focus on cooperation in economic sphere. They signed an agreement to gradually lower tariffs within the region, in Dhaka, 1993. After eleven years, at the 12th SAARC Summit at Islamabad, they devised the South Asia Free Trade Agreement as a framework for the establishment of a free trade area covering 1.6 billion people.

NOTES

- **Cultural areas:** One of the areas SAARC has focus on is cultural exchange. It has instituted the SAARC Youth Award in recognition to outstanding individuals from the SAARC region. The award recognizes and promotes the commitment and talent of the youth who give back to the world at large through various initiatives such as inventions, protection of the environment and Disaster relief and is based on specific themes designated every year.

The recipients who receive this award are the ones who have dedicated their lives to their individual causes to improve situations in their own countries as well as paving a path for the SAARC region to follow.

The recipients of the awards have been given to Md. Sukur Salek of Bangladesh for outstanding social service in community welfare in 1997, Najmul Hasnain Shah of Pakistan in 1998 for new inventions and discoveries, and MUSHFIQUL Alam of Bangladesh for creative photography: South Asian Diversity in 2001. In 2002, it was given to Masil Khan of Pakistan for his outstanding contribution to protect the environment. In 2003, it was given to Hassan Sher of Pakistan for his invention in the field of traditional medicine and in 2004 to Ajij Prasad Poudyal of Nepal for his outstanding contribution to raising awareness for tuberculosis and/or HIV/AIDS and so on. In 2010 it was given to Anoka Abeyrathne of Sri Lanka for her outstanding contribution for the protection of environment and mitigation of climate change.

4.3 ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS (ASEAN)

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations is commonly known through its abbreviation as ASEAN. It has been formed by the Southeast Asian nations. It is a geo-political and economic organization which was formed on 8 August 1967 by the Southeast Asian nations, namely, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. Since then, membership has expanded to include Brunei, Burma (Myanmar), Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam.

Objectives

The evolution of ASEAN can be traced back to the signing of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia. There are many fundamental principles which have been adopted from the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia. These have been included in the objectives of ASEAN. The principles are as follows:

- Mutual respect for the independence, sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity and national identity of all nations
- The right of every state to lead its national existence free from external interference, subversion or coercion
- Non-interference in the internal affairs of one another
- Settlement of differences or disputes by peaceful manner
- Renunciation of the threat or use of force
- Effective cooperation among themselves

ASEAN was established with certain aims and objectives. The Association seeks to accelerate the economic growth, social progress, cultural development among

Check Your Progress

1. Where is the SAARC headquarters?
2. The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation was founded by six South Asian nations. (True/False)

its members, the protection of the peace and stability of the region, and to provide opportunities for member countries to discuss differences peacefully. The objectives of ASEAN have been given as follows:

- (i) To accelerate the economic growth, social progress and cultural development in the region
- (ii) To promote active collaboration and mutual assistance on matters of common interest in the economic, social, cultural, technical, scientific, and administrative fields
- (iii) To collaborate more effectively for the greater utilization of the member states, agriculture and industries and expansion of the trade
- (iv) Study the problems of the international commodity trade in order to improve the transport and communication facilities
- (v) Raise the standard of living of the people.

NOTES

Origin and development of ASEAN

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations was formed in 1967 with the signing of the ASEAN Declaration at Bangkok, Thailand. It was established to create a framework for regional cooperation among the non-communist states of Southeast Asia by replacing the Association of South East Asia (ASA), which had been formed by the Philippines, Thailand and the federation of Malaya (now Malaysia). It was formed in 1961 to deal with economic and political matters. Later, Brunei joined ASEAN in 1984, Vietnam in 1995, Laos and Myanmar in 1997 and Cambodia in 1999.

ASEAN, as a region, spans over an area of 4.46 million km, with 3 per cent of the total land area of earth, with a population of approximately 600 million people, which forms 8.8 per cent of the world population.

On 15 December 2008 the members of ASEAN met in the Indonesian capital of Jakarta to launch a charter that has been signed in November 2007, with the aim of moving closer to 'an EU-style community'.

The charter turns ASEAN into a legal entity and aims to create a single free-trade area for the region encompassing 500 million people and also set forth the idea of a proposed human rights body which would seek to have the power to impose sanctions or punish countries who violate citizens' rights and would therefore be limited in effectiveness. The body was established in 2009 as the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR).

The charter has formulated certain fundamental principles which include the following as mentioned below:

- (i) Respect for the independence, sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity and national identity of all ASEAN member states
- (ii) Shared commitment and collective responsibility in enhancing regional peace, security and prosperity
- (iii) Renunciation of aggression and of the threat or use of force or other actions in any manner inconsistent with international law
- (iv) Reliance on peaceful settlement of disputes
- (v) Non-interference in the internal affairs of ASEAN member states
- (vi) Respect for the right of every Member State to lead its national existence free from external interference, subversion and coercion

NOTES

- (vii) Enhanced consultations on matters seriously affecting the common interest of ASEAN;
- (viii) Adherence to the rule of law, good governance, the principles of democracy and constitutional government;
- (ix) Respect for fundamental freedoms, the promotion and protection of human rights, and the promotion of social justice;
- (x) Upholding the United Nations Charter and international law, including international humanitarian law, subscribed to by ASEAN Member States;
- (xi) Abstention from participation in any policy or activity, including the use of its territory, pursued by and ASEAN Member State or non-ASEAN State or any non-State actor, which threatens the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political and economic stability of ASEAN Member States;
- (xii) Respect for the different cultures, languages and religions of the peoples of ASEAN, while emphasising their common values in the spirit of unity in diversity;
- (xiii) The centrality of ASEAN in external political, economic, social and cultural relations while remaining actively engaged, outward-looking, inclusive and non-discriminatory; and
- (xiv) Adherence to multilateral trade rules and ASEAN's rules-based regimes for effective implementation of economic commitments and progressive reduction towards elimination of all barriers to regional economic integration, in a market-driven economy".

Structures

The ASEAN has an organizational structure for effective functioning and implementation of its policies and programmes. The organizational structure of ASEAN consists of the following:

- Meetings of the head of Government
- ASEAN Ministerial Meetings
- ASEAN Economic Meetings
- ASEAN Standing Committee, and
- The Secretariat

Policies and summits

The chief projects of ASEAN involve economic cooperation, promotion of trade among the ASEAN nations and between ASEAN and the rest of the world. It also endeavors programmes for joint research and technical cooperation between the member states. It also seeks to develop the tourism as well as facilitate Southeast Asian studies through cultural, scientific, educational and administrative exchanges.

Among the policies ASEAN has sought regional cooperation in the "three pillars" of security, socio cultural and economic integration. The regional grouping has made the most progress in economic integration, aiming to create an ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) by 2015.

ASEAN: Economic cooperation

The ASEAN region has six major' countries which have economies that are many times larger than the remaining four minor ASEAN countries. The six major's

economies are based on IMF data and are in accordance to the GDP nominal 2010. These economies include Indonesia which has figures in GDP Purchasing Power Parity of 695 billions (1,027 billions), 312 billions (584 billions) in Thailand, 218 billions (412 billions) of Malaysia, 217 billions (291 billions) of Singapore, 189 billions (350 billions) of Philippines and 101 billions (275 billions) of Vietnam.

That is why, ASEAN emphasizes on economic cooperation and has sought to facilitate the following, namely:

- Free Trade Area
- Comprehensive Investment Area
- Trade in Services
- Single Aviation Market
- Free Trade Agreements with Other Countries

ASEAN as a cultural community

ASEAN also seeks to facilitate the cultural community in an attempt to further integrate the region. These include sports and educational activities as well as writing awards through the ASEAN University Network, the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, the ASEAN Outstanding Scientist and Technologist Award and the Singapore-sponsored ASEAN Scholarship, to name a few of them.

- Literary and educational activities
- Environmental protection
- Sports

Critiques of ASEAN

Non-ASEAN countries have criticized ASEAN for being too soft in its approach to promote human rights and democracy in the junta-led Myanmar. Despite global outrage at the military crackdown on peaceful protesters in Yangon, ASEAN has refused to suspend Myanmar as a member and also rejects proposals for economic sanctions. This has caused concern as the European Union, a potential trade partner, has refused to conduct free trade negotiations at a regional level for these political reasons.

International observers view it as a 'talk shop', which implies that the organization is 'big on words but small on action'. Head of the International Institute of Strategic Studies – Asia, Tim Huxley cites the diverse political systems present in the grouping, including many young states, as a barrier to far-reaching cooperation outside the economic sphere. He also asserts that in the absence of an external threat to rally against with the end of the Cold War, ASEAN has begun to be less successful at restraining its members and resolving border disputes such as those between Burma and Thailand and Indonesia and Malaysia.

During the 12th ASEAN Summit in Cebu, several activist groups staged anti-globalization and anti-Arroyo rallies. According to the activists, the agenda of economic integration would negatively affect industries in the Philippines and would cause thousands of Filipinos to lose their jobs. They also viewed the organization as imperialistic that threatens the country's sovereignty. A human rights lawyer from New Zealand was also present to protest about the human rights situation in the region in general.

ASEAN has been criticized, in the past, of being a mere talking shop. However, leaders such as the Philippines' Foreign Affairs Secretary, Alberto Romulo, said it would be a workshop not a talk shop. Others have also expressed similar sentiment.

NOTES

NOTES

Since the late 1990s, many scholars have argued that the principle of non-interference has blunted ASEAN efforts in handling the problem of Myanmar, human rights abuses and haze pollution in the region. Meanwhile, with the consensus-based approach, every member in fact has a veto and decisions are usually reduced to the lowest common denominator. There has been a widespread belief that ASEAN members should have a less rigid view on these two cardinal principles when they wish to be seen as a cohesive and relevant community.

DID YOU KNOW?

India is the biggest financial contributor to SAARC fund. It is 30.31 per cent, followed by Pakistan at 22.53 per cent. While Nepal, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka contribute 10.72 per cent each, Afghanistan, Bhutan and the Maldives contribute 5 per cent each.

4.4 EUROPEAN UNION

The European Union and India are two crucial poles in the emerging multi-polar structure. In view of this, many high-level visits and summit-level interactions between India and the European Union (EU) have taken place. Since India's engagement with the EU, research in the fields like defence and security, nuclear and space, trade and investment, energy, food security, climate change, science and technology, culture and education has been intensified and improved. Special envoys have been sent to every EU country to seek support for abandoning the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) for Civil Nuclear Cooperation with USA.

The Prime Minister of India, Manmohan Singh, and the leaders of several countries in Europe have met several times to discuss various issues. After the terrorist attack in Mumbai, in 2008, the leaders of EU and other members sent several messages condemning the attacks. Therefore, India and the European Union share a very cordial relationship and are actively engaged in several agreements.

Trade

The European Union is India's major trading partner. In total, the European Union accounts for 20 per cent of the Indian Trade. Whereas, India accounts for only 1.8 per cent of the European Union Trade and it attracts only 0.3 per cent of the European Foreign Direct Investment. In 2005, the trade between the European Union and India increased by 20.3 per cent. In 2000, the trade between India and the European Union amounted to 25.6 billion euros and was more than doubled in 2007 to 55.6 billion euros. It was expected to grow even more, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh had said, "We have agreed to achieve an annual bilateral trade turnover of 100 billion euros within the next five years," as per a report published in 2010, after China and Russia, India was the eighth largest trading partner of the European Union.

Technical and financial trade assistance to India by the European Union

In order to continue providing assistance to India so that it can integrate into the world economy and to ensure improvement in bilateral trade and investment ties, the European

Check Your Progress

3. The chief projects of ASEAN involve _____, _____ among the ASEAN nations and between ASEAN and the rest of the world.
4. Among the policies ASEAN has sought regional cooperation in the three pillars of security, socio cultural and economic integration. (True/False)

Union has ensured trade related technical assistance. 13.4 million euros were given via the Trade and Investment Development Programme (TIDP) funded from the Country Strategy Paper (CSP) 2002-2006. Currently, a follow-up programme to the TIDP is being formulated and the funds for the same will be provided by the Country Strategy Paper 2007-2013.

NOTES

4.5 BRAZIL, RUSSIA, INDIA, CHINA AND SOUTH AFRICA (BRICS)

BRIC is a widely used acronym in economics, which stands for Brazil, Russia, India and China. The acronym was coined by Jim O'Neill, a Goldman Sachs economist, in a 2001. In recent times, these countries have achieved the title of being large economies that equally contribute to the world economy by manufacturing goods and services and receiving capital. These countries are also considered potential consumer markets. All the four countries are considered at par with each other in terms of the size of their economies. Recently even South Africa has been added to this group. Currently, these five countries together envelop 40 per cent of the total world population. Furthermore, these countries make up approximately 25 per cent of the total GDP (gross domestic product) in terms of the PPP (purchasing power parity).

As far as the achievements are concerned every BRICS member can claim of various accomplishments in the field of agriculture. The use of superior agricultural technologies elucidated by the green revolution has extensively increased the food production in these countries and has enabled significant changes in the agricultural sector throughout the world. Due to the worsening situation of the agriculture and food sector and the climate change, the utilization of up-to-date agricultural technologies to guarantee security of food throughout the world has become necessary. The BRICS members have vowed to increase and enhance the exchange of improved technologies, human resources and advanced machinery to ensure that the agricultural technology capacity grows.

Several of the more developed of the N-11 countries, in particular Turkey, Mexico, Indonesia and Nigeria, are seen as the most likely contenders to the BRICS. Some other developing countries that have not yet reached the N-11 economic level, such as South Africa.

Goldman Sachs has argued that, since the four BRIC countries are developing rapidly, by 2050 their combined economies could eclipse the combined economies of the current richest countries of the world. These four countries, combined, currently account for more than a quarter of the world's land area and more than 40 per cent of the world's population.

Goldman Sachs did not argue that the BRICs would organize themselves into an economic bloc, or a formal trading association, as the European Union has done. However, there are some indications that the four BRIC countries have been seeking to form a 'political club' or 'alliance', and thereby converting their growing economic power into greater geopolitical clout.

On June 16, 2009, the leaders of the BRIC countries held their first summit in Yekaterinburg, and issued a declaration calling for the establishment of an equitable, democratic and multi-polar world order. Since then they have met in Brasilia in 2010, met in Sanya in 2011 and in New Delhi, India in 2012.

Check Your Progress

5. The European Union is India's _____ partner.
6. In 2005, the trade between the European Union and India increased by 20.3 per cent. (True/False)

NOTES

The BRICS Development Bank is a proposed development bank of the BRICS nations. Its establishment was agreed to by BRICS leaders at the 2013 BRICS summit held in Durban, South Africa on 27 March 2013. Among its goals is to provide funding for infrastructure projects, and create a 'Contingent Reserve Arrangement' worth \$100 billion which will help member countries counteract future financial shocks.

ACTIVITY

Find out how the BRICS Development Bank proposes to fulfill its goals.

4.6 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- Regional organizations are in a sense, international organizations, as they incorporate international membership and encompass geopolitical entities that operationally transcend a single nation state.
- SAARC was founded in 1985 dedicating to economic, technological, social and cultural development and emphasizing for collective self-reliance.
- The Association of Southeast Asian Nations is multi-polar geo-political and economic organization which was formed on 8 August 1967.
- ASEAN seeks to accelerate the economic growth, social progress, cultural development among its members, the protection of the peace and stability of the region, and to provide opportunities for member countries to discuss differences peacefully.
- International observers view ASEAN as a 'talk shop', which implies that the organization is 'big on words but small on action'.
- The European Union and India are two crucial poles in the emerging multi-polar structure.
- The European Union accounts for 20 per cent of the Indian Trade. Whereas, India accounts for only 1.8 per cent of the European Union Trade and it attracts only 0.3 per cent of the European Foreign Direct Investment.
- BRIC is a widely used acronym in economics, which stands for Brazil, Russia, India and China.
- As far as the achievements are concerned every BRICS member can claim of various accomplishments in the field of agriculture.

Check Your Progress

7. The establishment of BRICS Development Bank was agreed to by BRICS leaders at the 2013 Summit in India. (True/False)
8. The BRIC acronym was coined by _____ in a 2001.

4.7 KEY TERMS

- **ASEAN:** The Association of Southeast Asian Nations is commonly known through its abbreviation as ASEAN. It has been formed by the Southeast Asian nations. It is a geo-political and economic organization which was formed on 8 August 1967 by the Southeast nations, namely, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand.

- **BRIC:** It is an acronym in economics, which stands for Brazil, Russia, India and China, the countries which are all deemed to be at a similar stage of newly advanced economic development. These countries are also considered potential consumer markets.
- **Euro:** It is the currency used by the institutions of the European Union and is the official currency of the eurozone.
- **European Union:** The European Union (EU) is an economic and political union of 27 member states that are located primarily in Europe.
- **Nuclear Suppliers Group:** It is a body of 46 nuclear supplier states, including China, Russia, and the United States, that have voluntarily agreed to coordinate their export controls governing transfers of civilian nuclear material and nuclear-related equipment and technology to non-nuclear-weapon states.
- **SAARC:** An organization of South Asian nations dedicated to the economic, technological, social and cultural development of Asian nations

NOTES

4.8 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. The SAARC headquarter is in Kathmandu, Nepal.
2. False
3. Economic cooperation, promotion of trade
4. True
5. Trading
6. True
7. False
8. Jim O'Neill

4.9 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. What are the SAARC objectives?
2. Identify the objectives of ASEAN.
3. What are the political concerns of SAARC?

Long-Answer Questions

1. What does SAARC stand for? Discuss its programmes and objectives.
2. Explain the origin of ASEAN.
3. ASEAN has been criticized by non-ASEAN countries. Discuss.
4. Analyse India's relation with the European Union.
5. Describe the origin and evolution of BRICS.

4.10 FURTHER READING

NOTES

Sudhakar. E.; *SAARC: Origin, Growth, and Future*, Gyan Publishing House, New Delhi, 1994.

Lee, Yoong Yoong, (ed.), *ASEAN Matters: Reflecting on the Association of Southeast Asian Nations*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., Singapore, 2011.

UNIT 5 FOREIGN POLICY OF MAJOR POWERS

NOTES

Structure

- 5.0 Introduction
- 5.1 Unit Objectives
- 5.2 Foreign Policy of the USA
- 5.3 Foreign Policy of the UK
- 5.4 Foreign Policy of the Russia
- 5.5 Summary
- 5.6 Key Terms
- 5.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 5.8 Questions and Exercises
- 5.9 Further Reading

5.0 INTRODUCTION

In the previous unit, you learnt about India's relation with regional organization, such as ASEAN, SAARC, the European Union and BRICS.

The demise of the Soviet Union and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact have drastically altered the global power balance in favour of the West. Consequently, there is a major change in the global paradigm in the post-Cold War world, in which the US has emerged as the sole superpower, with the European Union as its appendage. The present world order has been rightly described as 'a multipolar world with a unipolar disposition'. Today, the new world order is in the throes of a fast changing scenario and the coming years are going to witness re-alignments which might seem quite sweeping as well as surprising. Friends of the Cold War days are strangers now, if not estranged and enemies of yesteryears are becoming friends. To be sure, the era of exclusive relationships is over. Now, every major player on the international scene is interacting with everyone else. No wonder, Russia and the US are 'partners in peace' and no longer adversaries and both India and Russia are seeking extensive cooperation with the western powers led by the US.

In this unit, you will learn about the foreign policies of three great world powers: USA, the UK and Russia.

5.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Explain the foreign policy of the USA
- Discuss the foreign policy of the UK
- Analyse the foreign policy of the Russia

5.2 FOREIGN POLICY OF THE USA

NOTES

The post-1945 period has been rightly described as American era of international relations. Undoubtedly, America occupies a central place in the continuum of world politics. Rather it is the heartland of international politics. 'America now bestrides the world. She is the 'colossus' of our own time. Whatever is said or done in the US may easily change the lives of unnumbered millions thousands of miles away'. To Henry Luce, 'The twentieth century to a significant degree is (was) an American century.' On all significant counts—in terms of industry, agriculture, finance, commerce, gross national product, per capita income, scientific discoveries, technological inventions, techno-scientific manpower, defence outfit and, above all, nuclear capability, the USA is a pre-eminent world power. In other words, she is at the top of major powers by virtue of her overarching military, diplomatic, political and economic assets. She evokes not only awesome fear but also well-deserved regard and admiration for her contributions. Parts of its history are main milestones in the march of mankind.'

American ideas, images and artifacts have fired the world's imagination and flooded markets. In short, America today represents the epitome of human achievement not only in material terms but also in the quest for knowledge in science, medicine and other fields of human endeavour. Now with the eclipse of the Soviet Union America remains the sole surviving superpower. The world order in the post Cold War period has conferred unparalleled power, clout, prestige and prosperity on the United States. In short, today the United States of America has become 'hyperpower', a 'unipolar globocop', dollar dictator and world's 'only indispensable nation'. No wonder, Washington happens to be the common denominator in almost every high-profile peace process.

The American people and their character

The American society, which accounts for six per cent of mankind (268 million) and possesses great economic, military and political strength is based on the principles of democracy and liberty. Americans regard their country as the 'goddess of liberty'. Their spirit of 'spread-eagaleism', their bumptiousness and exaggerated confidence in themselves, their blind optimism which together with their idealism tends to give them a false picture of the world and to lure them into moral crusades. They are at once aggressive, offensively self-assertive, optimistic, philanthropic and wasteful; they are at once moralists as well as hard-headed cynics. But they are soft-hearted people despite their apparent swagger. For Americans, in whom a progressive liberalism and faith in technology has combined to breed an almost casual self-confidence, little seems impossible. In other words, they have no philosophy of failure, for they don't live in the past but in the future. Hence, they believe in the cult of the future.

Decision-making in American foreign policy

Of all major countries, the USA has the most open decision-making process. There is a high degree of diffusion in the decision-making process. In his 'Presidential Power', Neustadt maintains: 'The Constitution has created not a government of separated powers but a government of separated institutions sharing power.' Both the executive and the legislature, thus, have a say in foreign matters. Though the Constitution assigns special power to the executive, the Congress alone has the authority to raise armies, to declare war, to make peace and to advise on the conduct in making of treaties and appointment of diplomatic representatives. Because of this sharing of power, serious frictions are

bound to occur between the president and the Congress, in spite of bipartisan tradition observed by the two major political parties. However, the executive has acquired a dominant position in foreign affairs since II World War until the mid-seventies—until passing of the War Powers Act (1973). The power of the president went on increasing along with American involvement in world affairs. Since the president's role as chief formulators has increased, so has the impact of bureaucracy on the foreign policy formulation process. Yet he does not exercise exclusive control in the foreign field. The control of money legislation, the power to confirm appointments by the Senate and ability to investigate and publicize executive branch actions represent important restrictions. Together, constitutional limits, Congress action, bureaucratic processes and the weight of past commitments constitute formidable potential constraints on any president. Thus, powers assigned to the president are initiative in character and those enjoyed by the Congress appear to be largely restrictive. However, the US President enjoys a good deal of initiatives. The Congress can only discuss, debate, defer or delay but it can rarely destroy them. But in the ultimate sense, the power of a president is the power to persuade.

NOTES

Role of political institutions

The formal foreign policy process is determined by five large institutions—(1) White House, (2) Department of State, (3) Department of Defence, (4) Central Intelligence Agency and (5) Congress—represented by the House and Senate Committees. The President is responsible to orchestrate interrelated groups that contribute with some autonomy to policy making, such as the Foreign Office, Bureaucracy, the White House, the Interested Committees of the Congress. Apart from these organs, the National Security Council also advises the President with respect to integration of domestic, foreign and military policies relating to national security. The NSC consists of the President, the Vice-President, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defence as statutory members. It is chaired by the President and its meetings are also attended by the Director of the CIA. The role of the House Staff, though significant, should not be magnified, because the President's men often tell what he wants to hear.

Role of public opinion

There are few countries in which public opinion counts as much as in the USA. At times the public opinion exercises limits on President's decisional latitude. To illustrate, the Cuban offensive missiles supplied by the Soviet Union were not strategically important but President Kennedy had to act under public pressure. Similarly, President Johnson had to agree to withdraw from Vietnam under the weight of public opinion despite the loss of face. However, the role of public opinion is generally negative and retrospective. Altogether, the American foreign policy is obliged to be public policy subject to public scrutiny, appraisal and approbation.

Principles of American foreign policy

It is often said that America does not have a discernible foreign policy. Priestly maintains that 'most powerful nation on earth seems to have no continuing foreign policy (tradition) to guide it.' But it is just a superficial view. Rather, it is more correct to say that 'throughout its history the United States has pursued a constant foreign policy.' Generally speaking, physical security, material wealth, international prestige—these and other tangible and intangible values actuate all foreign policies and so is the case with American foreign policy. In other words, American foreign policy has always been guided by certain traditions

NOTES

as defined by its national interest corresponding to its power status in the changing world order. That is why there is a certain uniformity about the US foreign policy, which focuses solely on what suits Washington's interests and eliminates nearly all non-essential elements. But, since the US policy has been changing in the light of new meaning given on its national interest by its leadership from time to time, some critics have remarked that America lacks any serious tradition to guide its foreign policy. The change in American foreign policy orientation from isolationism to total involvement and from 'non-entangling alliances' to alignment galore in the post-1945 period lend some support to their observation. At the same time, an element of idealism and a deep sense of 'historic mission' have always been an animating force in American foreign policy. To sample a few of these ideals, one can mention the idealism of Jefferson and Lincoln, American crusades like 'war to end all wars', 'war to make democracy safe', 'new world order' and 'internationalization of human rights', etc.

Determinants of American foreign policy

Like that of any other state, the US foreign policy, too, was shaped largely by geographical and historical considerations, by her political and social systems, by her economic strength and military power, by her relative power position, by the policies of other states and by the world environment.

Evolution of American foreign policy

The founding fathers believed that the US should remain aloof from European politics. They wanted to steer clear of 'entangling alliances' and 'ordinary vicissitudes' of European politics. The first phase of her foreign policy, therefore, was governed by the principle of isolationism and non-interventionism. It was designed to promote security, trade relations and general prosperity among states of America. This phase was marked by pan-Americanism. But by 1823, the policy of non-intervention moved a step further. It was based on the Monroe Doctrine. This Doctrine was originally directed against the Russian attempt to exclude non-Russian ships from north-east coast of America and the reactionary Holy Alliance of Russia, Prussia and Austria contemplating intervention in the newly created South American Republics. The Doctrine established a fundamental principle of American policy—implying two aims: (1) No territorial aggrandizement on American soil will be allowed and (2) No intervention in European politics. The ulterior motive behind this Doctrine, however, was to serve a warning to European powers that the American continents are henceforth not be considered as subjects for colonization and to assert hegemony over the whole Western Hemisphere. The Doctrine gave the US a vast hinterland in control, and South American bloc served both as a source of raw material and a captured market. With such 'natural colonies' the US had so little interest outside America. American isolationism was thus the political reflection of economic self-sufficiency. From its original concept the Monroe Doctrine was essentially defensive. But it became expansionist by 1840s, when the US became strong enough to implement it. Thus, the Monroe Doctrine became the cornerstone of American foreign policy. Although successive Presidents have modified it according to requirements, it has never been abandoned altogether and is still alive and kicking.

Beginning in 1898, the US embarked on a bolder course. This was the springtime of 'open door' and 'manifest destiny'. The President at the moment, Theodore Roosevelt, thought that America was entitled to exercise police power over the Western Hemisphere.

Beginning in 1898, the US embarked on a bolder course. This was the springtime of 'open door' and 'manifest destiny'. The President at the moment, Theodore Roosevelt, thought that America was entitled to exercise police power over the Western Hemisphere.

The foreign policy of America in the first decade of the twentieth century was characterized as participation in Asia, a sphere of influence in the Caribbean Sea and continued non-participation in European politics. But with the coming of the First World War, she acquired a new position in the changed world order. Though she participated in the First World War under the leadership of President Wilson and took a leading part in establishing an international organization—the League of Nations, but the Senate failed to ratify the Versailles Treaty along with the Covenant of the League of Nations. The reason was that America still retained the sense of physical security that underlay their isolationist past. Hence again for twenty years she sank into isolationism, until 1940. But it is to be noted that it was an act of self-denial in the political sphere and not from any internal weakness that the US leadership was not exercised. Even when the menace of Hitler and Mussolini was haunting Europe the Americans kept aloof and abandoned their traditional policy of freedom of the seas rather than risk war. American neutrality reached its nadir in the Neutrality Legislation of late 1930s. Thus, for almost a century after the declaration of Munroe Doctrine, America remained aloof from European political affairs, even though her economy had grown with leaps and bounds. Until the Second World War, she played only intermittently a central role and made only periodic forays into international politics.

For more than a century, her bountiful nature allowed Americans to hold belief that progress was to be found within the country and the Western Hemisphere. This natural abundance and sense of physical security permitted her leadership to remain away from the traditional world politics, and to make legalistic and moralistic declarations about external affairs from time to time. 'Protected from invasions by oceans and benign power of the British navy, and blessed with abundance of natural resources, the US was famously fortunate to limit its participation in international affairs to mercantile pursuits.'

Revolution in American foreign policy

However, this neutralism came to a final end with the attack on Pearl Harbour in 1941, and ever since she did not look back to the isolationist past. The shift from isolationist inclination to new internationalism took place somewhere between 1940 (fall of France) and the middle of 1945 when the Senate ratified the UN Charter. Reasons for this transition are: (1) Partly American involvement with European affairs which was a by-product of British efforts to resist the Nazis. In 1940, President F.D. Roosevelt agreed to exchange fifty destroyers in exchange for bases in the Western Hemisphere and (2) In the spring of 1941 the Lend-Lease Act passed to help Britain with supplies and munitions. The one action clearly marking a break with the past was the Atlantic Summit of August 1941 from which was enunciated the Atlantic Charter. The Atlantic Conference, indeed, marks the beginning of a revolution in the US foreign policy. In 1941, however, only few Americans wanted her nation to enter the war, as she was yet unprepared for it. The Atlantic Charter was an authoritative expression of the eight principles, some of which are as follows: (1) to seek no territorial gains, (2) to work for improving living standard of all peoples, (3) to protect nations to live under governments of their own choice, (4) to seek disarmament of the aggressive nations, etc. But there was yet no provision for international organization. It was only in 1942 that the United Nations Declaration was signed by 26 nations at Washington. The Atlantic Charter and the UN Declaration were important steps in the assumption of world responsibility on part of

NOTES

NOTES

America. The Atlantic Conference became the prototype for other such conferences in Casablanca, Cairo, Teheran, Quebec, Yalta and Potsdam. After Pearl Harbour attack by Japan on December 7, 1941 the US joined the War. By the time the War in Asia was nearing its conclusion, fifty nations signed the UN Charter on June 26, 1945, and the USA was the first nation to ratify it. Thus, in a course of a century and three quarters America shifted from a policy of non-involvement to one of active involvement taking upon herself a global responsibility.

The setting and course of post-war policy

By the end of World War II, Western Europe lay in smoking ruins. Germany had been reduced to a lumber landscape. The Soviet Union too suffered indescribable physical and human damage. Japanese industries were devastated. Only the United States remained unharmed. The War also brought a profound reassertion of Wilsonianism. Thus, by design and circumstances, America found itself at the apex of the new system that emerged following the collapse of the old international order.

Although she emerged as the mightiest power on the world scene as a result of the Second World War and had to occupy a leading and dominant role in the world affairs, she was ill-prepared for the new role. It was not easy for her to adjust to her new position and to the realities of a post-war world. Yet it was incumbent on her to assume a global responsibility. While writing at that time, Palmer and Parkins remarked: "There is ample evidence for concluding that she has not yet learned how to act like a world power or how to wield such tremendous responsibility." However, there was now a general acceptance among Americans of the policy of involvement in the world affairs. The post-War American policy was therefore, directed towards facing the challenge posed by post-war developments—challenge of communism, the growing power of the Soviet Union and power vacuum after withdrawal of the West from their former colonies.

The Truman Period (1945-53)

After the death of F.D. Roosevelt on April 12, 1945 Harry Truman took over as the 33rd President of America by right of succession. The foreign policy under the Truman Administration can be divided into four periods: The first period (April 1945 to July 1946) lasting for about one and a half years was one of cooperation and accommodation between the USA and the Soviet Union. It was highlighted by the emergence of the United Nations and peace-making efforts, post-War rehabilitation and reconstruction. But soon the short honeymoon period came to an end. Serious disagreement and suspicion began to erupt on issues relating to Germany, East Europe, Peace Treaties with Italy, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria and Finland, functioning of the UNO and Soviet pressure on Iran, Turkey, and Greece.

The second period (August 1946 to March 1947) was characterised as one of firmness and patience. The relations between the Superpowers became strained because of disagreements over the occupation of Germany, the unification of Korea, the Soviet demand on Turkey, her refusal to withdraw her forces from Iran and the engineering of communist revolution in Greece. By now, the US was confirmed of the fact of a divided world. As a result of these developments, the US foreign policy towards the Soviet Union underwent a revolutionary change.

Truman Doctrine

The third period (1947-50) was marked by the beginning of the Cold War and the subsequent policy of 'containment'. The Western powers had become unduly alarmed

at the Sovietisation of Eastern Europe and the Soviet pressure on Turkey and Greece. George F. Kennan, the author of the policy of 'containment' advocated the maintenance of force all around the Soviet bloc.

America's new role of policing the Continent was signalled by the Truman Doctrine and the Greek-Turkish Aid programme. In late 1947, Britain announced a deficit of \$ 350 million. Since she was confronted with the problem of cutting down expenditure, Britain began to prepare to abandon its historical and imperial commitments. Incidentally, for Britain the price of victory was the liquidation of the British Empire. In March 1947, the British government informed Washington of its inability to support Greek and Turkish governments in resisting communist attacks and infiltration, while both of them needed desperately outside support. Now Britain shifted its Atlantic responsibility to America. Truman knew that US support to Greece and Turkey will be a departure from her tradition and was aware that it was a costly obligation. But he said that freedom from aggression was the minimum requirement for peace in the world. The new departure in American foreign policy was dramatised by the Truman Doctrine. In his speech on March 12, 1947, he called for a programme of aid to Greece and Turkey and asked the Congress to grant 400 million dollars in economic and military aid to them. To quote Truman, "I believe it must be the policy of the US to support free people who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure." He declared: "wherever aggression direct or indirect threatens peace, the security of the USA was involved."

The significance of the Truman Doctrine lies in the fact that it was the first step in the direction of containment of communism—in fact, of the Soviet Union. It was a formal renunciation of American policy of isolationism. It confirmed the fact of a divided world and also the 'two-camp' thesis of Zhadnov. It also marked the final inauguration of the Cold War. Indirectly, it also implied the bypassing of the United Nations, as the US had decided to help Turkey and Greece directly and not through the world body. Virtually, it served a notice that the march of communism would not be allowed to succeed by default.

Marshall Plan

In pursuance of the policy of 'containment', the Truman Doctrine was followed by the Marshall Plan as its logical corollary. If the Truman Doctrine had political overtones, the Marshall Plan was the policy of containment on economic level. Kennan maintained that "a new programme based on economic, not military aid, will be more effective than the Truman Doctrine in securing Europe against infiltration and conquest." On June 5, 1947, the Secretary of State, George S. Marshall, in his address at the Harvard University, spoke in terms about Europe's need for help to rebuild her economy and initiated the European Recovery Programme. He said: "The US should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace." The Plan was apparently meant for all the European countries, but its underlying aim was to save Western Europe from the march of communism. The sixteen European nations (excluding communist countries) had concluded that their rehabilitation required 15 billion dollars over the next four years. Such a burden was no doubt staggering for American tax payers. Anyway, a bill was moved in the Congress for 17 billion dollars for 4 years. Mr. Vandenberg (a Republican) called the bill "a calculated risk to help stop the World War III before its start. The 'iron curtain' must not come to the ruins of the Atlantic either by aggression or by default." By the end of 1951, the Aid reached a total of 13 billion dollars. Indeed, the Aid was "like

NOTES

NOTES

a life line to sinking man,” as Ernest Bevin put it. It was meant to achieve a revival of a working economy so as to permit the emergence of political and social condition in which free institutions could exist. One unforeseen consequence of the Aid was closer economic integration of separate economies of Europe. The Marshall Plan was evidently a step further in carrying out the policy of containment. It was an economic counterpart of the Truman Doctrine. It was cold war by other means. However, this Aid pulled Europe out of the wreckage of World War and propelled it to prosperity. To Churchill, “it was the most unsordid act in history. Yet it was not simply charity, nor just a reconstruction scheme”.

Review of Truman Regime

On the whole, the Truman Administration acquitted itself quite creditably and beyond all expectations. The credit for making a water-shed departure in American foreign policy rightly goes to his regime. To quote Henry Kissinger, ‘Though Harry Truman knew little about foreign policy (to begin with), yet he laid the groundwork for a generation of successful foreign policy.’ However, Truman’s action of dropping atom bombs on innocent people of Japan will be recorded in future history of mankind as the greatest tragedy and shame for humanity and therefore a serious blot on his administration.

Eisenhower Period (1953-60)

With the departure of Truman, the long period of Democratic Presidency inaugurated in 1933 came to an end. The White House was again occupied by a Republican President, General Dwight Eisenhower after a lapse of 24 years. For some time, people were apprehensive that the new regime led by a General might be more war-like. But it was eventually proved that the Soldier-President had no disposition towards recklessness in word or deed, as feared. Instead, the Eisenhower Administration attempted to give a new look to American foreign policy.

The events of 1953-55 offered new hopes. On March 5, 1953 Joseph Stalin died giving place to leader who believed in following flexible and conciliatory policies. On June 27, 1953, the Korean war was brought to an end. These developments led to lessening of tension. The years of 1954 and 1955 are known for successful conferences. The Geneva and Berlin conferences were followed by the Austrian Peace Treaty of 1955. These were some positive developments which contributed a great deal to cold war relaxation. But there were some negative developments, too, which neutralised it to some extent. The Soviet explosion of a hydrogen bomb (1953), the communist China’s confrontation with America, forces in the Korean war, and its aggressive stance thereafter and the crisis of Indo-China forced the USA to adopt a tough stance in her foreign policy. The American foreign policy-makers led by foreign secretary, John Foster Dulles, were not prepared to tolerate communist expansion in South-East Asia. ‘But since the Soviet Union began to show conciliatory stance, the Eisenhower administration had to adopt a dual policy. The USA sought to develop ‘situations of strength’ on the one hand and to work for a peaceful world on the other. The Eisenhower administration not only gave up the policy of liberation (rolling back) and the policy of ‘brinkmanship’ hitherto advocated by Dulles, but put forward the Atom for Peace proposal in 1953.

The Kennedy Period (1961-63)

John F. Kennedy entered the White House on January 20, 1961 as the 35th President of America at the young age of 43. He was energetic, intelligent, good looking, inspiring, aggressive, dynamic and outspoken. “He was a man both cool and concerned, wily and

profound, profane and highly eloquent with a subtle mind and a passion for cutting through clichés." All in all, he was a highly gifted man of unusual charm and aristocratic distinction. His administration promised to seek a new approach towards world issues. The US, foreign policy in his regime sought new frontiers. Besides, Kennedy started with fresh faces and fresh ideas. For the first time, he associated learned professors not only for advisory role but for operational responsibilities.

Kennedy made a serious attempt to seek areas of cooperation with the rival Superpower. On a chance meeting with Khrushchev in June 1961, in Vienna, he accepted the latter's concept of coexistence, but at the same time he was firm where security interest was involved. Khrushchev also found the young Kennedy unyielding.

In his inaugural address, Kennedy declared: "Let us never negotiate out of fear but let us never fear to negotiate." He warned: "The world is very different now. For man holds in mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of the human poverty and all forms of human life... War appeals no longer as a rational alternative. Mankind must put an end to war or war will put an end to mankind." He cautioned: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to secure the survival and success of liberty."

Kennedy and the Cuban Crisis

The last days of October 1962 witnessed one of the gravest international crises since the Second World War. Paradoxically, this crisis was the most frustrating experience as well as the finest hour of Kennedy's regime. Cuba is an island state in the Caribbean Sea just 90 miles off from the American mainland. She has been virtually an American protectorate for a long time. In January 1959, Fidel Castro came to power by overthrowing a pro-American regime headed by Batista. The Castro regime being Marxist in character (the first of its kind in the Western Hemisphere) turned unfriendly towards America and became a close ally of the Soviet Union. Obviously, it was an intolerable situation for an American administration. Secret records show that there was a bumbling attempt to eliminate Fidel Castro. On April 17, 1961, the Cuban refugees, encouraged by American aid and abetment, invaded Cuba. But they were defeated at the Bay of Pigs. Undoubtedly, in this misadventure, the invaders had the blessing of the Kennedy Administration, which was misguided by the CIA. This 'Operation Mongoose' was, indeed, a great blot on his otherwise bold leadership. Since this attack was instigated by Washington, the relations between the US and Cuba have remained hostile to this date. As a sequel to this event, the Castro regime sought the support of the Soviet Union. With the result, in 1961, a Russian military mission arrived in Cuba, which was followed by the arrival of complete combat unit of Russian mechanised troops. Again, in 1962, some anticraft batteries equipped with ground-to-air rocket reached Cuba. The same year, launching equipments for medium range missiles also arrived. With this arsenal of arms and fire power deployed on America's next door, Khrushchev thought that, if required, he could afford a blackmailing threat the next time he pressed his demands on Berlin. Obviously, these developments alarmed the Kennedy Administration, and the US could no longer tolerate such offensive moves. In response, President Kennedy ordered a naval quarantine around Cuba and imposed restrictions on all ships carrying communist cargoes to the island.

The world learned with dread and horror the full gravity of the crisis when Kennedy broadcast on October 22, 1962, his government's counter-challenge. He warned: "any hostile move anywhere in the world against people to whom we are committed, including West Berlin, will be met by whatever action is needed." He added: "It shall be the policy

NOTES

NOTES

of this nation to regard any nuclear missiles launched from Cuba against any nation in the Western Hemisphere as an attack by the Soviet Union on the United States requiring a full retaliatory response on the Soviet Union." With this clear warning, Khrushchev had no reason to believe that Kennedy was just bluffing.

The Cuban crisis brought the world to the brink of Superpowers' showdown. To be sure, any invasion on Cuba could have led to nuclear conflagration. Indeed, it was a hair-trigger encounter. In Robert Kennedy's chilling words: "the world stared at the barrel of the nuclear gun." To quote Dean Rusk, "it had been a very near thing." Fortunately, sanity prevailed ultimately and the crisis was averted both by Kennedy's firmness and Khrushchev's unwillingness to challenge. Both displayed statesmanship of the highest order. Khrushchev was ultimately forced to blink in this eye-ball to eye-ball confrontation, for he agreed to withdraw Russian missiles and bombers from Cuba. But this he did after getting no-invasion pledge on Cuba from Kennedy. Besides, Kennedy gave Khrushchev a face-saving device by agreeing to dismantle American Jupiter missiles in Turkey. Kennedy's handling of the crisis was "a model of textbook diplomacy," as Dewis Healey put it. Khrushchev also felt that saving peace was more important than saving face.

Johnson Period (1963-69)

After the unfortunate assassination of Kennedy at the hands of a Texan goon, Lee Harvey Oswald on November 22, 1963, the then Vice-President, Lyndon B. Johnson succeeded as the 36th President of the USA. Though lacking the charm and vitality of Kennedy, Johnson also got the second term in November 1964 elections and continued till January 1969. On assuming powers, he announced to continue the policies of his predecessor abroad as well as at home.

Johnson and the Vietnam War

Johnson was obliged to carry on the logic of his inheritance. The initiation of an aggressive policy in Vietnam is rightly attributed to Kennedy. After the fall of Diem in 1963, the situation in South Vietnam further deteriorated. In December 1963, the US promised unlimited military assistance to South Vietnam. In August 1964, Johnson decided to bomb the strategic places in North Vietnam to control Vietcong guerillas. He ordered bombing on North Vietnamese coastal bases in retaliation for alleged attack on American fleet units (2 destroyers) in the Gulf of Tonkin. As a countermove, the Vietcong sped up their attack and inflicted heavy losses on military bases in South Vietnam. By December 1964, the US forces were further reinforced and their total touched 20,000. In February 1965, following the Vietcong attack against US installations, the US started bombing strategic places in North Vietnam. In March 1965, 3,500 US marines were sent to South Vietnam. Air attacks were also multiplied. Gradually the strength of American troops reached a total of 1,85,000. In the next few years, the US further increased its military efforts in Vietnam.

But by 1968, the American public opinion had become antagonised to Johnson's policy of war escalation in Vietnam. In February 1968, North Vietnamese troops launched fierce attack on strategic targets in South Vietnam. To meet this threat, the US command made a request for two lakh more troops (in addition to 5 lakhs already there). The communist 'Tet Offensive' of February 1968 was a major psychological turning point and led to reappraisal of Vietnam policy in America. The strategic victory of the communists played an important role in increasing war weariness among the American people and accelerating the beginning of the Paris negotiations.

In the United States, the vocal groups led by professors and students staged demonstrations against the policy pursued by Johnson and demanded that American troops should be withdrawn forthwith. "We want our boys back" was their buzzword. Senators liked Fulbright and Mansfield also voiced uneasiness. No doubt, the Vietnam war had surpassed in magnitude, devastation and savagery, even the Korean War.

Under the mounting pressure, Johnson on March 31, 1968 ordered cessation of bombing in North Vietnam and simultaneously announced his decision not to seek reelection for presidency. This paved the way for the peace talks at Paris, which were formally inaugurated on May 13, 1968. The four-party Paris Talks continued about four years, though intermittently, and culminated in a ceasefire agreement by the end of 1972 and the Paris Peace Accord on January 27, 1973. America acknowledged the failure of its policy in Vietnam. According to Henry Kissinger, "It was the incremental approach which doomed us in Vietnam."

Nixon Period (1969-74)

On January 20, 1969, Richard Nixon assumed office as the 37th President of the United States. After a lapse of eight years the White House was reoccupied by a Republican President. It is interesting to note if the earlier Republican regime of Eisenhower was faced with the task of bringing peace to Korea, the Nixon regime was confronted with the problem of securing peace in Vietnam.

In his famous inaugural speech, Nixon gave a call to communist bloc "to join the US in a peaceful competition not in conquering territory or extending dominion but in enriching the life of man." Nixon felt that the most fundamental interest of all nations lies in building the structure of peace; and that peace was more than the absence of war, because peace must provide a durable structure of peace. He added: "We seek an open world—open to ideas, open to the exchange of goods and people—a world in which no people, great or small, will live in angry isolation. We cannot expect to make everyone our friend, but we can try to make no one our enemy." After a period of confrontation, the Nixon administration did start an era of negotiable.

Nixon Administration and Vietnam Problem

The first task that invited Nixon's immediate attention was an honourable extrication from Vietnam. To be sure, the problem of Vietnam was not his creation. He got it in legacy from Kennedy and Johnson. Yet he was committed to resolve it. In fact, one of his election platforms had been the settling of Vietnam problem and gradual disengagement.

Nixon ushered in a departure from the earlier US policy in Vietnam. His new departure (a brainchild of Henry Kissinger) is known as Guarn Doctrine, which was enunciated in a speech at Guarn. It contained three key points. He declared: "(1) The US will keep all its treaty commitments, (2) We shall provide a shield if a nuclear power threatens the freedom of any ally or of a nation whose survival was considered vital to our security and the security of the region as a whole, and (3) In cases involving other types of aggression, we shall furnish military and economic assistance when requested and as appropriate. We shall look to the nation directly threatened to assume the primary responsibility of providing the manpower for its defence." The thrust of the Nixon Doctrine was to place the main burden of fighting on local population of South Vietnam and that the US would supply only tools. The Guarn Doctrine was meant to make Asians fight Asians; it aimed at Vietnamisation of war or de-Americanisation of Vietnam war.

NOTES

Nixon and Sino-American Reconciliation

NOTES

Since the establishment of People's Republic of China in 1949, the US had no relations, except inimical, with communist China. The US not only did not recognize the PRC but also blocked her entry into the United Nations. Instead, she managed to retain Nationalist China (Taiwan) as a permanent member of the UN Security Council upto October 1971.

“For twenty years the US policy-makers considered China as a brooding, chaotic, fanatical and alien realm difficult to comprehend and impossible to sway.” But in 1971, under the compulsion of new realities of power equation, America started reviewing her policy towards communist China. The need for reappraisal was provided firstly by failure of America in Indo-China and secondly by the worsening Sino-Soviet conflict. The Nixon administration was convinced that contact with one quarter of humanity could restore new perspective to American diplomacy. In fact, for quite a long time (about 15 years), Warsaw based ambassadors of the two nations had been carrying on Secret parleys in order to improve and normalise their relations. The talks became public only after the Sino-Soviet clashes (1969) at Ussuri and Amur river boundaries over the island of Chenpao (Damansky). Impelled by the obvious menace of the Soviet buildup (45 Divisions) on the 4,500 mile long common border, China wanted to reduce the number of its adversaries and to obtain another counterweight to Soviet pressure. She wanted strategic reassurance and some easing of their nightmare of hostile encirclement.

As a gesture of cordiality, in April 1971, an American pingpong team visited China and thus, began an era of what is called ‘Pingpong Diplomacy’. A realisation dawned on both the nations that it was mutually advantageous to come to an understanding with each other. The US felt it necessary to open normal diplomatic channels with China in order to sort out differences. In pursuance of this opening to China, Kissinger paid a secret visit to Peking via Rawalpindi in July 1971, and succeeded in snatching a formal invitation for his President to visit China. On July 16, 1971 President Nixon announced his decision to visit Peking.

Review of the American foreign policy

Ever since the Second World War the United States, which emerged as a Superpower, has tried to don the mantle of a planetary policeman. This was definitely an evangelical role. No wonder, in the process America had to pay a heavy price. The inordinate fear of communism led her to embrace any dictator or despot. From Baltics to Beijing and from Sarajevo to South Africa, America sided with the status quo. She propped, projected and promoted a good number of execrable tyrannies round the globe. Perhaps no other country has destabilized as many duly constituted governments and bolstered up barbarous dictators as the US. She tolerated and supported military juntas, corrupt oligarchies, repressive regimes and dictatorial dispensations. Some of these were Ayub Khan and Yahya Khan of Pakistan, Augusto Pinochet of Chile, Syngman Rhee of South Korea, Shah of Iran, Duvaliers of Haiti, Ferdinand Marcos of Philippines, General Mobutu Sese Sako of Congo (Zaire), General Suharto of Indonesia, etc. Successive Presidents from Eisenhower to Johnson, despite changing rhetoric, had the Dullesian objective of stemming the tide of communism. This entailed direct or indirect involvement on the side of client regimes, howsoever unpopular. In short, to borrow from Barnett, “America has been on the wrong side in former colonial world”. To substantiate, because of her crusade against communism, she got herself sucked deeper and deeper in the quagmire of Vietnam. It was this obsession with ‘containment’ which impaired American ability to understand

the modern Third World revolutions in China, Vietnam and Nicaragua. It was this kind of involvement in Vietnam which President Carter described "as the best example of intellectual and moral poverty."

Ultimately, it fell to President Nixon and Carter to give effect to a new sense of realism and to recognize that communism in Asia was not without its nationalist moorings. They also realized that the communist bogey has been the bane of American policy-makers for decades. No doubt, American policy in Asia has been littered with failures—Vietnam most spectacularly, Iran most damagingly, Afghanistan through neglect and default, and India through arrogance during Nixon-Kissinger period. However, this wide panorama of setbacks had a sobering effect on the American foreign policy by the end of seventies.

Buffeted by Vietnam and Watergate experience, the US foreign policy has undergone a crisis of confidence since the mid-1970s, and since then, she has rejected the old extreme of World policeman and isolationism. As a result, containment of communism is no longer the linchpin of her policy. That is why, following the collapse of communism, George Bush gave a new slogan — 'beyond containment'. Prof. Rasheeduddin Khan has identified five flaws in the US foreign policy—(1) faulty premises and erroneous assumptions; (2) baltant, pompous and unsuitable style of diplomacy, (3) irrational perception of communism, nationalism and liberation movements of China, Asia and Africa, (4) subordination of foreign policy to pulls and pressures of commercial - industrial lobbies and pseudo theoreticians as advisors, like Dulles, McNamara, and others.

But notwithstanding these critical comments on the American foreign policy, the fact remains that the policies initiated in 1947-48 ultimately achieved their fundamental objectives — containment and collapse of communism and the rival superpower — the Soviet Union, and thereby vindicated the victory of American ideology — liberal democracy and market economy. Now in the post-Cold War era America has emerged as the sole surviving superpower. Militarily, it remains the mightiest nation on earth, economically, it is the locomotive of world economy and diplomatically, it wields the greatest clout in world politics. Ironically speaking, contrary to Marx's prophesy, the spectre of anti-communism, and not communism is stalking all over the world.

Myth of Pax Americana

While few will deny that the twentieth century was the American century, many will doubt that the 21st century will also belong to the United States of America. No doubt, for about 25 years since 1945 America enjoyed a global position without any rival. Europe lay prostrate and Japan was exhausted and even the Soviet Union was far behind. America alone was left a paramount power. She alone had both carrot and stick, because its economic health was as sound as its physical health. But since 1970s the power of America went through a phase of steady decline, which continued till the end of 1980s. This relative decline as a global power resulted from technological challenge from Japan and Western Europe and military challenge from the Soviet Union.

Till in the 1980s Americans saw themselves as being in steady decline. America's economic growth was replaced by recession and stagflation, its dollar was found slumping. Its share of the global GNP had come down from 40 per cent (1995) to 20 per cent in 1993. Consequently, from a creditor country America became the largest debtor nation, with biggest budget and trade deficit in the world. For some time it seemed that the days of Pax Americana were over forever.

NOTES

NOTES

But America did recoup some of the losses of the seventies and eighties by launching diplomatic and military counter offensives, and succeeded in leaving her rival superpower (the Soviet Union) far behind in geopolitical terms. The "Operation Desert Storm" (1991) did give the signal of the return of American political and military hegemony on a global scale. From a certain measure of US restraints to strong armed bravado, from a degree of internal self-doubt to international adventurism, from a balance of terror to the America—directed new World order did characterize the year of 1991. Consequently, it did replace the Vietnam syndrome by the Iraq Syndrome. To quote Pran Chopra, 'with the crumpling of the bipolar system by 1991, the US emerged as an uncontested supreme global power, which found itself in the commanding heights, issuing prescription all over the world on the modalities of economic and political developments in conformity with its own brand of composite democratic pluralism as well as individualistic capitalism'.

In the 1990s, even in economic terms America surged forward as a leading economic power and now for the last several years it has enjoyed a continuous economic boom. No wonder, since the mid-1990s the US economy came to be called the "goldilocks economy". Thus, all the present indicators suggest the American edge over its possible rivals. Germany and Japan are still geopolitical pygmies and China and Russia are yet without economic clout. As a matter of fact, America today is the mover and shaker of world economy. According to Charles Krauthammer's prediction : "For at least a generation the US will continue to remain preeminent by virtue of its overarching military, diplomatic, political and economic assets." In a similar vein, Samuel Huntington has described the US as the "sole state with prominence in every domain of power — economic, military diplomatic, ideological, technological and cultural and with the reach capabilities to promote its interests in virtually every part of the world." Significantly, America's power continues to grow unabated. It is enjoying its longest economic boom in history even as the Information Age continually increases its global, political and cultural reach and the revolution in military affairs makes it military supreme. Surely, these are heady times for Americans and have prompted the former US Secretary of State Madelains Albright to call America 'the indispensable nation because we stand tall and hence see farther than other nations.'

It is undeniable that the US is the sole surviving superpower in the post-Cold War era. Militarily, it remains the mightiest nation on earth. Its lead in nuclear and conventional weaponry remains unsurpassable. Economically, it has become the locomotive of world economic growth. It is feared that if the US economic sneezes the world may catch pneumonia. Diplomatically too, it has the greatest clout. It is the US writ that resulted in finding answer to the chronic Arab-Israel conflict in 1993. Its writ also worked in managing the Bosnian feud and it was under the US auspices that the Dayton Accords were concluded in 1995. In short, America today happens to be the common denominator in every high profile peace process. Moreover, it is at the US initiative that the Uruguay Round Agreement could be negotiated, leading to the formation of the World Trade Organization. It was the US initiative that became instrumental in firming up the NPT in 1995 in its unconditional and indefinite extension as well as the MTC Regime. Even in relation to 'soft power', all indicators favour the US. The appeal of America — the temptation of the American way of life, the global reach of Hollywood, the US dominance of world computers and commerce have helped promote the American culture. In addition, now all the nations are trying to come to terms with the idea of liberal democracy and free markets, whose champion is none other than the US.

Thus, Pax Americana seems to be firmed up, for any change whatsoever in political and economic domain has to be made within the confines of the US conformism. Nevertheless, there are some writers who express their dissenting voice about the US supremacy. While agreeing with the view that the America is definitely the greatest of great powers and will remain the most dominant factor in world politics for some time to come, they point out that in terms of technological capacity, access of natural resources, population strength and economic determinant of investment opportunities and markets, the world is bound to be multipolar, with other power centres being European Union, Russian Federation, China, Japan, India and some regional arrangements. Similarly, an eminent social thinker, Samir Amin has also raised the question whether the US hegemony has entered its decline or has it begun a renewal that would make the 21st century also America's, and he has stated conclusively that the 21st century will not be America's century. It will be one of vast conflicts and the rise of social struggles that question the disproportionate ambitions of Washington and of capital.' In the same vein, G.F. Kennan, the father of 'Containment' theory of Truman times, while in one of his introspective and prophetic moods, has observed: 'I don't think that the US civilization of the last 40 to 50 years is a successful civilization. I think this country is destined to succumb to failures which cannot be other than tragic and enormous in their scope'.

NOTES

Did You Know?

- In 2011 US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton had said that Gaddafi was passing out Viagra to his troops so they could go out and rape dissidents en masse, and that the troops were indeed engaging in mass rapes. Of course, the compliant media was more than happy to spread such outlandish accusations. What the press was more reluctant to do was to publish Amnesty International's later report that there was absolutely no factual support for these accusations.

5.3 FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UK

Britain has been the greatest of imperial powers in history. For a long time, she had worldwide interests and commitments. Hence, the saying went: 'The sun never sets over the British Empire.' But all that glory has become history. Today, she is declining in terms of relative importance and international commitments.

Decline of the British power

The nineteenth century was known as the British century. However, the decline of the British power began in the last quarter of the 19th century itself. In the beginning, it was a gradual process. The causes of her decline were manifold. Technical advance modified her insularity, reduced her naval pre-eminence and diminished her industrial monopoly. The rise of Japan and America challenged her naval supremacy, and as a result, Britain lost the command of the seas—the main prop of Pax Britannica. Moreover, a unified Germany (1871) threatened the balance of power in Europe. Consequently, Britain lost the position of the holder of the balance—the 'laughing third' status.

Sunset over the British Empire

The Second World War marked a turning point in the history of Great Britain. She suffered a precipitous downfall in her power status because of this War. Though, a

Check Your Progress

1. What is the basis of American society?
2. How important is public opinion in America?

NOTES

nominal victor in the War, in winning it she lost her economic and military bases and consequently her status as a great power. The consequences of this decline was a drastic revision in her foreign policy—the dismantling of overstretched empire, the abandonment of unilateralism and the decision to seek much closer and paramount economic, military and other ties with other powers. With the disappearance of her empire and the emergence of two Superpowers—the USA and the Soviet Union, Britain became a second rate power or a middle power by way of comparison. “Today, very little of the once mighty empire remains, although Britain still aspires to have worldwide interests by virtue of her role in the Commonwealth of Nations, the Sterling area, the Colombo Plan and other associations or regional organizations.”

Foreign policy making process in Britain

In Britain—the mother of parliamentary democracy—foreign policy has been the responsibility of the Prime Minister and of the Cabinet. In contrast to the American political system, the policy making power here is not shared between the executive and the legislative organs of the government. Next to the Prime Minister, the Foreign Secretary holds a pre-eminent position in foreign affairs. However, unlike the American Secretary of State, the British Foreign Secretary occupies a more constitutionally defined office. The Parliamentary Under Secretaries assist the Foreign Secretary and the Prime Minister in handling matters on the floor of the Parliament and help in maintaining liaison between the Parliament and the Foreign Office. The Foreign Secretary is also advised by the permanent Under Secretary, the senior most civil servant in the Foreign Office. Other departments that have voice in foreign affairs include the Ministry of Defence, the Treasury, the Trade and Industry. Unlike the US Congress, the British Parliament has no special constitutional powers to regulate foreign commerce and consent to treaties. In Britain, “the Cabinet, not the Parliament, declares war. Express consent of the Parliament is not essential for ratification of treaties except those involving cession of territories or expenditure of funds, or those affecting the power of the Parliament. To illustrate, the Treaty of Maastricht (1992) required the approval of the British Parliament because it would undermine the parliamentary sovereignty of Britain.

Objectives of UK’s foreign policy since 1945

The major objectives guiding the British foreign policy since 1945 are: (1) to enrich and strengthen her economy; (2) to keep her military strength in proportion to her resources; (3) to have political influence in her ex-colonies, by large scale investment; (4) to support democracy and democratic institutions all over the world; (5) to stand for stability and order in world’s situation; and (6) to play a leading role on the Continent (Europe) and a prominent role in the European Community or EU.

Until the Second World War, Britain had been following her traditional “balance of power policy”, which, to quote Winston Churchill, “has been the unconscious tradition throughout the centuries.” She always relished the role of a holder of balance and acted as what Carl Frederick has termed ‘the laughing third’. Her approach to European politics was dual in the sense that she kept herself aloof from European affairs, but, at the same time, she had a keen concern with European politics. In fact, she joined the two World Wars only in the interest of maintaining the balance of power tradition, for Germany was attempting to become a dominant power. But in the bipolar system that followed the end of the Second World War, the role of a balancer was lost to her, for she was nowhere in terms of power to play this role any longer. Hence, after the world politics was polarized into two blocs, it was natural for Britain to join the US-led Western

Camp. For the sake of economic and security interests, she joined all the major military alliances sponsored by America, and accepted her economic assistance with open hands. Thus, in the post-War period, she abandoned her age-old policy of 'splendid isolation' and entered into peace-time alliances.

Since 1945, the British foreign policy-makers, whether Labourites or Conservativists, have followed Churchill's three circle strategy and accordingly, focused on three general areas, namely, (1) Special relationship with the US, (2) Commonwealth of Nations and (3) Western Europe.

Britain and the United States

A unique feature of international relations since the end of the World War II has been special relationship between Britain and the United States. Ethnic, cultural and linguistic ties apart, their close alliance during the War and their common participation of the post-War World has made Britain the most steadfast ally of America. In his 'Iron Curtain' speech (1946), Churchill had given a call for "fraternal association of English speaking peoples".

Again, in 1954, Churchill had observed that "the growth of ever closer ties with the US... is supreme factor in our future ...the whole foundation of our existence stands on the alliance and friendship and, if I may say so, an increasing sense of brotherhood with the US." The Britishers were fully aware of the contribution of America to Britain's survival before, during and after the Second World War. The Americans also remember the Britishers' magnificent spirit of 1940-41 (known as Dunkirk spirit) and their tremendous contribution to the cause of freedom and democracy. In the bipolar world that emerged in the post-War period, Britain, because of common political tradition, common language and common interest joined the American bloc. The common fear (though not as obsessive as with the Americans) of advancing communism also forced this choice upon Britain.

Britain readily accepted the Marshall Aid and received a lion's share under the Economic Recovery Programme. She fully subscribed to the Truman Doctrine (1947) and the policy of containment underlying it, and accordingly joined all the US-sponsored military alliances like NATO, SEATO and CENTO. She equally subscribed to the subsequent Eisenhower Doctrine (1957) for the Middle East, and even took action under this Doctrine during the Jordan Crisis of 1958. She also stood by the United States on the German question and the Berlin problem. Likewise, on the question of disarmament and arms control, she sided with America and signed the NTB (1963) and NPT (1968) as original signatory.

But this does not mean that Britain had no disagreement with America on certain international issues or had no independent policy of her own. Some of the main areas of disagreement between the two nations were: People's Republic of China, East Asia and West Asia. Despite the known and negative attitude of the US towards the PRC, Britain was the first nation outside the socialist bloc to have extended recognition to Mao's regime. Moreover, she carried on normal trade relations with communist China while America had placed embargo on trade. In fact, Britain's approach has been that the Far Eastern situation could be better normalized by the acceptance of the fact of Chinese power, admission of communist China to the UN and the realization of legitimate Chinese interests. The conflicting China policies adopted by the two countries continued to be the source of Anglo-American discord for decades. On the question of Korea and Vietnam, too, they had divergence of opinion. Britain often warned America against her growing involvement in Vietnam imbroglio, particularly the bombing of targets in Hanoi and Haiphong

NOTES

NOTES

in late sixties. In the Middle East, the Suez Crisis of 1956 made a serious breach in Anglo-American friendship. The US position on Anglo-French aggression in Suez had compelled France and Britain to withdraw their forces from the Canal. Naturally, Britain felt badly let down by her ally. Similarly, both Britain and America had some differences over Arab-Israel conflict as well. But despite differences with the US on certain issues, British policy on the whole remained firm on close collaboration with the US. The special relationship is still sustained despite occasional tiffs and altercations.

As a matter of fact, 'bilateral relationship is based on self-interest, personal chemistry and habit,' as David Owen has observed. It was because of personal chemistry that the two nations became still closer to each other when Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan were in power. Being ideological soul mates, they operated on the same wavelength. Britain became very much beholden to America for her open support on the Falklands War (April-June 1982) against Argentina, even though the latter was an OAS partner. Again, Thatcher's Britain was the first country to join SDI (Star War Programme) launched (1983) by Reagan's America. She also supported the US bombing of Libya (April, 1968). Subsequently, during the Bush period, Mrs. Thatcher had stated: "For us loyalty to the US is permanent." In fact, during Thatcher's time, the UK almost appeared as a subservient partner of America. The same kinship and special rapport continued between Clinton and Tony Blair (since May 1997). Both of them worked in tandem to advance each other's diplomacy. For instance, both stood together against Iraq, even supporting the US missile attacks against that country (Dec. 1998), and together engineered the North Ireland Peace accord. And the same special rapport is sustained between Blair and George W. Bush as well.

However, in times to come, Britain may base her policy towards the USA not on sentimental attachment but on a cool calculation of interests, for the British membership of the European community has added a new dimension in her foreign policy matters. Now Britain has much more in common with the European Community than with the USA. So far Britain has maintained a certain balance between the two complex relationships. While still closely tied to the US, "Britain knows that it can no longer be the neck that turns the American hand, let alone, 'a Greece to the American Rome'."

Britain and the Commonwealth of Nations

The Commonwealth of Nations is the second area of interest for Britain, though lately it has become the third arrow to her bow in international relations—next to American and European dimension of policy.

The Commonwealth of Nations is a unique achievement of Britain, whose members are sovereign yet bound with a link which is though invisible but real. It is comprised of states once part of the British Empire. It is significant to note that the former British colonies forming part of the British Empire, even after gaining their independence, decided to maintain their association with Britain through the Commonwealth. In fact, the old imperial conference formally turned into the British Commonwealth after the Second World War. Though the former colonies after decolonization were free to join or not to join the Commonwealth, but almost all of them opted for it. However, in 1949, the designation 'British' associated with the Commonwealth was deleted at the insistence of India. But the British Head of State (British Queen) is still recognized as Head of the Commonwealth. However, the Commonwealth of Nations is not just a symbolic prolongation of the Empire or a moral substitute of post-Imperial Club or just a ghost of the deceased, British Empire. As a matter of fact, it is a unique experiment in living together by many different peoples

who share common heritage of ideals and institutions. It is a form of free, uncommitted and non-binding association with the spirit of peaceful coexistence.

The Commonwealth, however, is neither a confederation nor a super-state. It has no constitution or charter. Members are not bound by any treaty as such. The alliance has no personality, can own no property except as a partnership, has no corporate conscience and has only a common will, when acting together after consultation and agreement in a definite transaction. However, there is a common Secretariat (since 1965) and the Commonwealth Heads (CHOGM) meet every two years.

The members of the Commonwealth come from all the five continents, stretching across the globe and widely differ in history, geography, religion, people and culture, race, state of development and form of government, yet they are linked together on the basis of common interests and aspirations. Although a few members have left the institution (Eire in 1939, Burma in 1948, Sudan in 1956, Somaliland in 1961, Cameroon in 1961 and the Republic of South Africa in 1961), its membership has been steadily growing. Today the 54-member Commonwealth brings together one billion people across the frontiers of race, religion, geography and political system and makes the association a multi-racial, multi-religious, multi-lingual and multi-purpose body. To be sure, it has become an increasingly heterogeneous and unwieldy association, whose members have often conflicting policies and interests. Nonetheless, though following different policies, they have learnt the art of consulting one another on different points of view. Indeed, the Commonwealth of Nations is an essay in coexistence.

Relevance of the Commonwealth of Nations

Although, vast changes are occurring within the Commonwealth and its future seems uncertain, the organization is still probably one of the most successful of all international groupings to date. The looseness of communication, informality of procedures, creative flexibility are the key to its survival. Above all, it has shown concern for all global issues. But primarily, it is a forum for a dialogue between the North and the South, between the rich and the poor. It is worth mentioning here that it has also promoted the cause of democracy by endorsing the suspension of military regime of Pakistan from the Councils of the Commonwealth pending the restoration of democracy at the Summit meet at Durban in November 1999.

But since the Commonwealth of Nations has ceased to be Anglo-centric, Britain has started losing interest in this organization. Though the Commonwealth sprang from the British apron strings, Britain now prefers to take a back-seat in this body. Though she still underwrites one-third of the expenditure of the Commonwealth Secretariat, Britain is losing her moral authority to lead the organization, because on several issues, she has stood on the wrong side of the majority position.

Britain and Western Europe

As has been pointed out earlier, the British interest in the post-1945 period has mainly focused on the USA, the Commonwealth, and Europe. The last is now predominant in what is called 'three circles' formula. In the post-War period, the central theme has been shaping the future of Britain as part of the gradually uniting Western Europe. Consequently, she has abandoned her traditional policy of aloofness and has reversed the policy of refraining from peace time alliances.

At the end of the Second World War, the war torn nations of Western Europe realized their relative insignificance in the world politics. They found themselves squeezed

NOTES

NOTES

between the two superpowers. They discovered that they were no longer shapers of their own destinies. To avoid this catastrophe, they felt that they should pool their resources and unite economically, militarily and even politically. The USA also encouraged the idea probably in her own interest. As far back as 1946, Churchill had advocated: 'We must build a kind of United States of Europe.' Accordingly, he gave the slogan—"Europe unite or perish." Interestingly, a nation which always maintained that 'a fog in the English Channel got the Continent isolated' was now frightened of isolation in a two-track Europe. The Labour party, which was in power from 1945 to 1951, was too eager for intimacy with the West economically, politically, and militarily. Of course, she was not in favour of a federation as such. In 1947, Britain concluded her first peace-time alliance treaty with France for a period of 50 years known as the Treaty of Dunkirk, directed against Germany. In March 1948, Ernest Bevin (Labour Foreign Secretary) delivered his famous West European speech and signed the Brussels Treaty along with Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and France. Later on, the Brussels Treaty Organization was expanded to include Italy and West Germany (1955) to constitute the West European Union. In 1949, Britain along with other West European countries joined the US-sponsored North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Earlier in May 1948, Britain had joined other West European powers to establish the Council of Europe as a step towards political union. But being a classical unitary state, Britain has little understanding of the notion of sharing of sovereignty. The strength and stability of the country's parliamentary system have made the Britishers extremely possessive of sovereignty. To illustrate, at the time of formation of the Council of Europe, Churchill had remarked: "We are with them, not of them." But later on, Britain also took steps towards collaboration in the economic field and played a leading role in the European Recovery Programme, and cooperated fully in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, which was set up in 1948 but converted into Organization for Economic Cooperation Development in 1960.

Britain and the European economic community

The history of British attitude towards European integration has been a chequered one. Conscious of its own position as a 'global' power along with the Superpowers, Britain was content to view Europe as only one of the three distinct circles of influence, in so far as her foreign relations were concerned. The two of her circles—special relationship with the US and the evolving links with the post-imperial Commonwealth enjoyed precedence over that of Europe. In the beginning, Britain remained somewhat hesitant as far as economic community moves were concerned. Accordingly, she kept herself away from the European Coal and Steel Community formed in 1952. Similarly, when the European Common Market was established in 1958 under the Treaty of Rome (1957), signed by six countries (France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg and Netherlands), Britain was unwilling to join it. She had several reasons for not joining the Common Market. Firstly, she had serious doubts about its success. Secondly, the Commonwealth partners were opposed to the idea of Britain's association with the Market. Thirdly, she was not prepared for joining any association without enjoying its leadership. Instead of joining the Common Market, Britain set up another parallel organization called European Free Trade Area. In May 1960, it was joined by Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden and Switzerland apart from Britain. It was meant to be a rival organization to the Common Market—the Outer Seven against the Inner Six. But very soon, it was revealed that the EFTA was no match to the ECM. Further, Britain was losing the market of Europe.

The British calculations about sustaining an independent world role through the three distinct circles' of influence went awry during the late fifties. Eventually, she realized the mistake and was forced to leave standoffishness. Faced with the prospect of being reduced to a political nonentity (after the Suez debacle), London opted for a radical change in its strategy. Thus was vindicated Jean Monnet's (father of European Community) prediction about the British reaction to European Community. "There is one thing you Britishers will never understand: an idea. And there is one thing you are supremely good at grasping: a hard fact. We will have to build Europe without you, but then you will come in and join us." Incidentally, it was a Conservative Prime Minister, MacMillan, who moved an application in 1961 for the membership of the Common Market. But two successive vetoes by France kept Britain in the waiting room for nearly twelve years. It was certainly a rude rebuff on the part of De Gaulle (France). Hence, only after the departure of De Gaulle (1969) that the veto was lifted, and Britain was finally allowed to take its place inside the Common Market, along with Denmark and Ireland (1973). But even after joining the Market, Britain remained a reluctant and at times a recalcitrant partner. For instance, in 1975, a referendum had to be held on the issue whether she would remain in the Market or leave it. The people, however, overwhelmingly voted in favour of continuing the membership.

Ironically, Britain now seems reconciled to its minor position in the European Economic Community in spite of occasional difference with other partners, though she is still not prepared to accept the Community as an embryonic European Super State. Now the 15-member European Community is heading towards political integration. There is already a directly elected Parliament with British willingness. As regards, Economic and Monetary Union by the end of the 20th century, as envisaged in the Treaty of Maastricht (1992), John Major agreed to it. He had declared that "Britain is at the very heart of Europe," and had clearly taken a pro-European position. The UK has affirmed its commitment to the Treaty but, at the same time, it has opted out of commitment in relation to EMU and Social Chapter.

Review of the British foreign policy

Since the close of the Second World War, British foreign policy has been an exercise in adjustment and search for a post-imperial role. Over the years, she has learnt to live with its reduced status—from a paramount power on the globe to just a partner position of the Anglo-American Alliance and the European Union.

It is interesting to note that just as it was the post-War Labour Government which took the first step in the liquidation of the British Empire, it was again the Labour regime that took the second step in further decolonization by deciding to relinquish the vestigial remains of imperial role in the late sixties. In a historical statement in the House of Commons, the Prime Minister Harold Wilson announced on January 16, 1968, his government's decision to withdraw the British forces from East of Suez by the end of 1971 and to cease to maintain military bases outside of Europe and the Mediterranean. Thus, she relinquished her role as a world keeper of peace and decided to face the facts of life and to search for a post-imperial rôle in the world. Wilson, however, added: "Britain will continue to think big but in a very small way." Again in 1976, as a measure of economy, the Labour government under James Callaghan decided to dismantle the air staging post in Guam and withdraw forces from Singapore, Maldives, Mauritius and Brunei. Now Britain has decided to maintain her status as a medium power, and to concentrate her resources in the NATO, the linchpin of British security.

NOTES

NOTES

But with the return of the Conservative regime, the 'East of Suez' policy was subjected to minor revision. In 1970, the Prime Minister Edward Heath reconsidered the East of Suez policy and decided to keep a modest presence. For instance, he took measure to reactivate the Simonstown Agreement of 1955, which provided for the protection of sea routes around South Africa, and to build a naval communication centre in Diego Garcia with American collaboration. Since Britain also wanted to be a partner in the Oil Strategy of the West, she decided to go for further withdrawal from the Persian Gulf. All these moves show that there is a persistent secret desire on the part of Britain to have "a finger in every pie". "In spite of the loss of her old position, the Britishers are in no mood to function solely as a tail to any power. Britain still continues to think in world terms, even though she is no longer a world power. Perhaps, this is so because she can ill-afford to exist without allies, without markets abroad, without substantial imports of food stuff and raw materials. Her position is dependent on her triple partnership—with the Commonwealth, the Western Europe and the USA. In a very special and vital sense, her general objective is to retain as much of her former prestige and power as possible." And to achieve this aim, a country long accustomed to playing a creative and balancing role, now wants to build up the European Community as a friendly rival to the US.

True, the country has considerably declined, but it is wrong to think that Britain is quite played out. Though, short of fangs and nails, the 'lion still roars'. The Falklands War (1982) amply proved it, for Argentina had to lick the dust when it tried to twist the tail of the old lion. But the Falklands glory notwithstanding, Britain is no more than a 'crippled giant' or a 'fallen mighty'. There is no denying the fact that Britain is not a major entity even within the European Community, and it is difficult to hold her own vis-a-vis West Germany and France, which have larger population and greater stability of the economy. With every passing year it is becoming difficult for Britain to compete in the international Market. All told, the importance of Britain has become greatly diminished. Whatever importance it still retains is due to the fact that it still has certain reservoir of experience, deftness, a stored up understanding of world affairs, pragmatic orientation, and a certain finesse in diplomacy.

5.4 FOREIGN POLICY OF THE RUSSIA

Today, the Soviet Union as a subject of international and geopolitical reality has ceased to exist. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is dismembered. But in spite of the collapse of the Soviet empire, a brief study of the Soviet foreign policy is called for in order to understand the post-World War-II developments, as the Soviet Union had been a key player on the international scene. Being an erstwhile superpower, her foreign policy had played a prominent role in shaping the post-World War-II politics. Before its liquidation, the Soviet Union was not only a military giant, her GNP was next only to that of the United States. Endowed with rich resources it ranked among the most advanced countries of the world.

Prior to its disintegration, the Soviet Union had been the largest intercontinental state in the world, spreading across the northern half of Asia and the eastern half of Europe and covering 15 per cent of the land surface (22.4 million sq kms) and extending over 11 time zones. 'It had the world's largest and most exposed frontiers bordering on 12 states and surrounded by small and large powers, nearly half of which had serious territorial claims, active or latent, against it.' Though highly centralized, the Soviet Union

Check Your Progress

3. What is considered the sunset over British Empire?
4. What is the connection between Britain and the Commonwealth of Nations?

was not a monolithic country. It had a heterogeneous; far-flung swathe of humanity (290 million) made up of about 100 ethnic groups speaking as many languages. In short, it was a 'prison house' of nationalities. In climate, culture and language, it had been the world's most varied state. But the Russian Federation has a population of 145 million only and its area has shrunk to 17,075,400 sq kms.

Character of the Russian people

National character, as elsewhere, is one of the factors that goes into the making of Soviet foreign policy. 'Elementary persistence, worship and obedience of governmental authority, and fear of the foreigners (xenophobia) are relatively stable attributes of the Russian national character'. The Russians see themselves as fighting for their existence in a hostile world. This is so because they have experienced successive invasions and conquests by Mongols, Turks, Swedes, Germans and Poles for a thousand years. In recent times also, they faced foreign interventions during the October Revolution (1917) followed by many years of outcast (pariah) status in the community of nations. There are, thus, plenty of precedents for their present paranoic suspiciousness and aloofness, for their calculated obscurantism, and for their intolerance and autocratic tendencies. Since both geography and fate had made Russia vulnerable to concerted attacks, they have to rely on authoritarianism on the one hand and expansionism on the other. Little wonder if they exhibit excessive concern bordering on collective paranoia with security.

One of the keys to the understanding of Russian history (which has moulded the Russian character) is the fact that for a thousand years (until the end of 18th century) Russia had been a frontier country. From the point of view of Russia's history, the decisive feature of her geographical environment has been the absence of natural frontiers. This has led both to the expansionism of the Russian people (conquest of Central Asia) and to a history of armed struggle against invaders. This explains why the Soviet Union behaved (even after becoming a Superpower) as if living under constant siege of hostile encirclement. Militarization of the Soviet economy, therefore, had not been an aberration but it has flowed naturally from the Russian history and psyche.

But at the same time, the Russian soul (Dosh) has always had a penchant for dreams, for a distant utopia. This explains why Marxism (the latest utopia) had a great appeal for the Russian people. It is true that the Marxian doctrine after the Bolshevik Revolution did bring about some change in the Russian character but it could not wipe out some of their old traits. Rather it reinforced them. It was, therefore, said that the Soviet people were nothing but the Tsarist bear in a red coat. The result was that they became simultaneously ethnocentric and ecumenical.

Objectives of the Soviet foreign policy

There are divergent views about the objectives of the Soviet foreign policy. If, on the one hand, statesman like Winston Churchill remarked— "The Soviet policy is unpredictable, inconsistent, a riddle wrapped up in mystery inside an enigma and I can't forecast to you the actions of Russians', on the other hand, Edward Crankshaw asserted 'In its distant objectives, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is less obscure and more coherent than that of any other country of the world; the objectives embrace the ultimate victory of the world proletariat under the leadership of Moscow.' In a way, there is a remarkable consistency in her foreign policy goals—maximum attainable security of the Soviet States and maximum feasible insecurity and instability in the capitalist world and colonial areas. However, in contrast to strategy, Soviet tactics has been remarkably flexible. To illustrate, the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact (1939), peaceful

NOTES

NOTES

coexistence and détente have been significant tactical moves. But tactics must not be confused with strategy which remained constant in the Soviet foreign policy till recently. In the opinion of Barrington Moore, 'If there is any central goal behind the policy of Soviet leaders, it is the preservation and extension of their own power, by any means whatsoever, rather than the spread of a specific social system or the realization of a doctrinal blue print.' Thus, the Soviet foreign policy can hardly be summed up as the fanatical pursuit of a single goal. According to Henry Kissinger, 'There does not seem to be any single underlying thread to Soviet foreign policy.' All told, her foreign policy, like that of any other country, was at once reactive and initiatory, defensive and aggressive and hence nothing unique. Whatever may be her professed ideology, she pursued a policy which could be explained only in terms of its national interest.

Basic determinants of the Soviet foreign policy

Like that of any other state, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union was inevitably shaped by a variety of factors: geographic and strategic considerations, historical traditions, general international situation, internal political problems, economic situation, morale and character of the people and the quality of leadership and other equally basic conditions, of course apart from ideology. However, it is not easy to say as to what extent the Soviet foreign policy was a continuation of the Tsarist policy, conditioned by the same geographic and strategic, historical and traditional factors, and to what extent, it was a product of communist ideology—Marxism-Leninism.

'Many historically minded observers point out that nearly all the policies followed by the Soviet Union since 1917 were natural and logical continuation of historic Russian policy. From the time of Peter the Great (1672-1725), the leaders of Russia have sought to consolidate and develop the resources, human and natural, of their vast landmass, to acquire windows to the West and to gain access to the oceans without abandoning their self-imposed isolation.' With largest sea-frontier along Arctic, she is essentially a landlocked country. Hence, search for warm water and windows towards the West had been the continuing trend of her foreign policy and this geopolitical position is a permanent base of her policy. Even the communist Russia showed the old tendencies to expansionism. It has been pointed out that since 1939 the Soviet Union expanded almost to the fullest extent of Tsarist aspirations (she annexed 490, 400 sq kms), with one outstanding exception of the Turkish straits, although even here her interest remained intact. In fact, during the Second World War, her territorial gains were enormous. She gained part of Finland, Baltic States, large parts of Poland, Rumania and South Sakhalin and Kurile islands. Thus, Russia has always been seeking to surround itself with a belt of friendly states or a ring of satellite states. However, she has shown preference for contiguous territories for her expansion. Even the invasion of Afghanistan was a logical extension of the historical Tsarist and Soviet drive towards the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf.

Nevertheless, both theoretically and practically, the Soviet foreign policy cannot be explained solely with reference to Tsarist traditions. The principles of Bolshevik Revolution had definitely guided her policy since 1917. In other words, the ideology of communism did give a twist to her diplomacy. Otherwise, one cannot explain the Soviet behaviour just after the Revolution. The USSR not only repudiated and dishonoured Tsarist debts and treaties, but also published the secret treaties of the Tsarist regime, made appeal to people rather than to governments, and sought interference in internal affairs of other countries by using the communist party of the concerned countries and also by using the Communist International as an instrument of Soviet foreign policy. Max Bloff rightly observes:

NOTES

'An explanation which dismisses the Bolshevik Revolution would seem to be an explanation which neither the facts nor Soviet writings warrant.' The Marxist-Leninist belief system did determine the Soviet leaders' perceptions and world-view. In fact, much of her foreign policy in the early phase had its intellectual and ideological roots in Leninism. Since communism at that time stood for world revolution, the Soviet Union used Comintern (1919-43) and Cominform (1947-56) as the coordinating agency of world communism.

The above mentioned facts, and their interpretations go to show that there was a fusion of communism and nationalism in the Soviet foreign policy. In other words, both Tsarist traditions and communist ideology were intermixed. It is evident from these facts that Soviet Russia used its control of world revolutionary movement as a de facto surrogate for other attributes of great power status and behaviour.

In balance, both ideology and historical traditions together shaped the character of the Soviet foreign policy, but with the passage of time, particularly after Stalin, the role of ideology was considerably attenuated or watered down. Finally, it was left to Gorbachev to get the Soviet foreign policy completely deideologised.

Review of the Soviet foreign policy

The balance sheet of the Soviet diplomacy in about seven decades shows an impressive range of accomplishment. Before the October Revolution, Russia lived as if in the medieval age. An outlaw state in 1917 governed by an outcast regime, beset on all sides by powerful enemies, rocked by convulsions and before she could consolidate and settle down to development, she faced a disastrous attack by Hitler's Germany—in the process twenty million lives were lost and incalculable damage was inflicted. Yet the same Nazi aggression consolidated the USSR into a well-knit sovereign state which emerged after the War as one of the two superpowers and stood in a few years as a modernized global power second only to the United States.

Until the close of Brezhnev period, the Soviet Union enjoyed stability, steady progress at home and a rich harvest of foreign policy successes. She had already achieved strategic parity with America. Thanks to the decade of détente, she had established her power presence in a zone running from north coast of Africa through West Asia and Indian sub-continent upto South-East Asia. She almost enjoyed an unrivalled leadership in the socialist world spanning four continents and accounting for twenty-five per cent of the human race.

However, the Soviet Union's foreign policy represented a blend of objective success and subjective failure. It was a resounding success when its achievements are measured against the traditional yardstick of power politics—but a conspicuous failure when measured against its ideological purpose—world communism. Interestingly, instead of transforming the world, the Soviet Union got itself transformed ultimately. Neither the domestic nor the foreign policy of the Soviet Union reflected the great ideals that inspired the October Revolution of 1917. The collapse of the Soviet Union symbolizes the failure of the Bolshevik Revolution. 'The rise, development and collapse of the Soviet Union was one of the most dramatic spectacle of the 20th century.' (Ponton)

Disintegration of the USSR and the Soviet empire

In the sixties, the Soviet leaders had boasted that Russia would be the world's leading economic power. But during the seventies, her economy showed a trend of clear decline. By the late 1970s the Soviet Union was already sinking into irreversible decline. Still its

NOTES

downfall was sudden. The failed 11-year-old war in Afghanistan, growing unrest in Eastern Europe and economic effects of prohibitively high expenditure on military power were all contributing to a widespread sense of social malaise at home and loss of prestige abroad. But it was left to Mikhail Gorbachev to honestly admit the gradual decline of the Soviet system. Of course, he tried his best to arrest the process of decline with the strategy of his revolutionary trinity—glasnost, perestroika and myshleniya (new thinking) but only the first worked fully, the second worked only partially and the third remained in a frozen pack as far as the domestic front was concerned. The strategy could well prove disintegrating as it did ultimately. Nevertheless, there is no denying the fact that Gorbachev played a historical role in changing the Soviet society and taking it towards openness, freedom, competition, political pluralism and decentralization. But the changes were too sweeping. No wonder, the Soviet people were overwhelmed and overreacted beyond expectation. They were bound to overreact with force when a little taste of freedom was known to them. Gorbachev on his part wanted to go cautiously with the changes, but the Soviet society, intoxicated by the taste of freedom, threw him in the backwaters.

Similarly, with the renunciation of the Brezhnev doctrine by Gorbachev, the Soviet satellites of Eastern Europe began to enjoy full sovereignty by 1989. Taking cue from them, the Baltic states too declared their independence and as soon as the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania) got independence, the other Republics of the USSR began to demand autonomous status. This brought the Soviet Union on the verge of disintegration. To save the situation, Gorbachev had hammered out a Draft Union Treaty ready for signature by the Soviet Republics on August 20, 1991, but the putsch of August 19, 1991 put an end to that endeavour. Gorbachev wanted the continuance of the Soviet states and Soviet citizenship through a loose confederation (a voluntary union of sovereign states) where the Centre would control defence, foreign affairs, common currency, leaving most of other subjects with the Republics. But the Republics were aspiring for exercising total sovereignty as independent states, seeking independent membership of the United Nations. Ultimately, ignoring all pleas of Gorbachev, they decided in favour of Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). To start with, leaders of the three Slavic States (Ukraine, Belarus and Russia) met in Belarus and announced the formations of CIS which was opened to all former Soviet Republics to join. Subsequently, eight more Republics joined the CIS. And thus a new entity—the Commonwealth of Independent States emerged out of the debris of the Soviet Union. With the formation of the CIS, the USSR ceased to exist. This development left Gorbachev no choice but to offer his resignation. Thus was buried the Behemoth that Lenin begot and Stalin battered. What a tragic irony it was that the first and the last executive President of the Soviet Union had to perform the unenviable task of dismantling the most powerful and enduring totalitarian regime in modern history.

While the Commonwealth of Mr. Yeltsin's vision became a reality in December 1991, comprising eleven former Soviet Republics, the fate of the Commonwealth is not free from many uncertainties. It is organizationally and substantially quite ambiguous and unclear. It is neither a Union, nor a Federation, nor a Confederation; and it has no legal status. Apart from this, the ethnic struggles and unrest still continue. The Soviet armed forces and its apportionment among the various Republics is still a bone of contention. The idea of a United Army is not going to command approval for long, as some Republics are clamouring for their own armies. Moreover, the present Republics are likely to be torn between conflicting trends: one towards unity and the other towards ethnic nationalism. The ethnic tensions have sparked secessionist movements inside as well as between Republics.

'An explanation which dismisses the Bolshevik Revolution would seem to be an explanation which neither the facts nor Soviet writings warrant.' The Marxist-Leninist belief system did determine the Soviet leaders' perceptions and world-view. In fact, much of her foreign policy in the early phase had its intellectual and ideological roots in Leninism. Since communism at that time stood for world revolution, the Soviet Union used Comintern (1919-43) and Cominform (1947-56) as the coordinating agency of world communism.

The above mentioned facts, and their interpretations go to show that there was a fusion of communism and nationalism in the Soviet foreign policy. In other words, both Tsarist traditions and communist ideology were intermixed. It is evident from these facts that Soviet Russia used its control of world revolutionary movement as a de facto surrogate for other attributes of great power status and behaviour.

In balance, both ideology and historical traditions together shaped the character of the Soviet foreign policy, but with the passage of time, particularly after Stalin, the role of ideology was considerably attenuated or watered down. Finally, it was left to Gorbachev to get the Soviet foreign policy completely deideologised.

Review of the Soviet foreign policy

The balance sheet of the Soviet diplomacy in about seven decades shows an impressive range of accomplishment. Before the October Revolution, Russia lived as if in the medieval age. An outlaw state in 1917 governed by an outcast regime, beset on all sides by powerful enemies, rocked by convulsions and before she could consolidate and settle down to development, she faced a disastrous attack by Hitler's Germany—in the process twenty million lives were lost and incalculable damage was inflicted. Yet the same Nazi aggression consolidated the USSR into a well-knit sovereign state which emerged after the War as one of the two superpowers and stood in a few years as a modernized global power second only to the United States.

Until the close of Brezhnev period, the Soviet Union enjoyed stability, steady progress at home and a rich harvest of foreign policy successes. She had already achieved strategic parity with America. Thanks to the decade of détente, she had established her power presence in a zone running from north coast of Africa through West Asia and Indian sub-continent upto South-East Asia. She almost enjoyed an unrivalled leadership in the socialist world spanning four continents and accounting for twenty-five per cent of the human race.

However, the Soviet Union's foreign policy represented a blend of objective success and subjective failure. It was a resounding success when its achievements are measured against the traditional yardstick of power politics—but a conspicuous failure when measured against its ideological purpose—world communism. Interestingly, instead of transforming the world, the Soviet Union got itself transformed ultimately. Neither the domestic nor the foreign policy of the Soviet Union reflected the great ideals that inspired the October Revolution of 1917. The collapse of the Soviet Union symbolizes the failure of the Bolshevik Revolution. 'The rise, development and collapse of the Soviet Union was one of the most dramatic spectacle of the 20th century.' (Ponton)

Disintegration of the USSR and the Soviet empire

In the sixties, the Soviet leaders had boasted that Russia would be the world's leading economic power. But during the seventies, her economy showed a trend of clear decline. By the late 1970s the Soviet Union was already sinking into irreversible decline. Still its

NOTES

NOTES

downfall was sudden. The failed 11-year-old war in Afghanistan, growing unrest in Eastern Europe and economic effects of prohibitively high expenditure on military power were all contributing to a widespread sense of social malaise at home and loss of prestige abroad. But it was left to Mikhail Gorbachev to honestly admit the gradual decline of the Soviet system. Of course, he tried his best to arrest the process of decline with the strategy of his revolutionary trinity—glasnost, perestroika and myshleniya (new thinking) but only the first worked fully, the second worked only partially and the third remained in a frozen pack as far as the domestic front was concerned. The strategy could well prove disintegrating as it did ultimately. Nevertheless, there is no denying the fact that Gorbachev played a historical role in changing the Soviet society and taking it towards openness, freedom, competition, political pluralism and decentralization. But the changes were too sweeping. No wonder, the Soviet people were overwhelmed and overreacted beyond expectation. They were bound to overreact with force when a little taste of freedom was known to them. Gorbachev on his part wanted to go cautiously with the changes, but the Soviet society, intoxicated by the taste of freedom, threw him in the backwaters.

Similarly, with the renunciation of the Brezhnev doctrine by Gorbachev, the Soviet satellites of Eastern Europe began to enjoy full sovereignty by 1989. Taking cue from them, the Baltic states too declared their independence and as soon as the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania) got independence, the other Republics of the USSR began to demand autonomous status. This brought the Soviet Union on the verge of disintegration. To save the situation, Gorbachev had hammered out a Draft Union Treaty ready for signature by the Soviet Republics on August 20, 1991, but the putsch of August 19, 1991 put an end to that endeavour. Gorbachev wanted the continuance of the Soviet states and Soviet citizenship through a loose confederation (a voluntary union of sovereign states) where the Centre would control defence, foreign affairs, common currency, leaving most of other subjects with the Republics. But the Republics were aspiring for exercising total sovereignty as independent states, seeking independent membership of the United Nations. Ultimately, ignoring all pleas of Gorbachev, they decided in favour of Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). To start with, leaders of the three Slavic States (Ukraine, Belarus and Russia) met in Belarus and announced the formations of CIS which was opened to all former Soviet Republics to join. Subsequently, eight more Republics joined the CIS. And thus a new entity—the Commonwealth of Independent States emerged out of the debris of the Soviet Union. With the formation of the CIS, the USSR ceased to exist. This development left Gorbachev no choice but to offer his resignation. Thus was buried the Behemoth that Lenin begot and Stalin batted. What a tragic irony it was that the first and the last executive President of the Soviet Union had to perform the unenviable task of dismantling the most powerful and enduring totalitarian regime in modern history.

While the Commonwealth of Mr. Yeltsin's vision became a reality in December 1991, comprising eleven former Soviet Republics, the fate of the Commonwealth is not free from many uncertainties. It is organizationally and substantially quite ambiguous and unclear. It is neither a Union, nor a Federation, nor a Confederation; and it has no legal status. Apart from this, the ethnic struggles and unrest still continue. The Soviet armed forces and its apportionment among the various Republics is still a bone of contention. The idea of a United Army is not going to command approval for long, as some Republics are clamouring for their own armies. Moreover, the present Republics are likely to be torn between conflicting trends: one towards unity and the other towards ethnic nationalism. The ethnic tensions have sparked secessionist movements inside as well as between Republics.

'An explanation which dismisses the Bolshevik Revolution would seem to be an explanation which neither the facts nor Soviet writings warrant.' The Marxist-Leninist belief system did determine the Soviet leaders' perceptions and world-view. In fact, much of her foreign policy in the early phase had its intellectual and ideological roots in Leninism. Since communism at that time stood for world revolution, the Soviet Union used Comintern (1919-43) and Cominform (1947-56) as the coordinating agency of world communism.

The above mentioned facts, and their interpretations go to show that there was a fusion of communism and nationalism in the Soviet foreign policy. In other words, both Tsarist traditions and communist ideology were intermixed. It is evident from these facts that Soviet Russia used its control of world revolutionary movement as a de facto surrogate for other attributes of great power status and behaviour.

In balance, both ideology and historical traditions together shaped the character of the Soviet foreign policy, but with the passage of time, particularly after Stalin, the role of ideology was considerably attenuated or watered down. Finally, it was left to Gorbachev to get the Soviet foreign policy completely deideologised.

Review of the Soviet foreign policy

The balance sheet of the Soviet diplomacy in about seven decades shows an impressive range of accomplishment. Before the October Revolution, Russia lived as if in the medieval age. An outlaw state in 1917 governed by an outcast regime, beset on all sides by powerful enemies, rocked by convulsions and before she could consolidate and settle down to development, she faced a disastrous attack by Hitler's Germany—in the process twenty million lives were lost and incalculable damage was inflicted. Yet the same Nazi aggression consolidated the USSR into a well-knit sovereign state which emerged after the War as one of the two superpowers and stood in a few years as a modernized global power second only to the United States.

Until the close of Brezhnev period, the Soviet Union enjoyed stability, steady progress at home and a rich harvest of foreign policy successes. She had already achieved strategic parity with America. Thanks to the decade of détente, she had established her power presence in a zone running from north coast of Africa through West Asia and Indian sub-continent upto South-East Asia. She almost enjoyed an unrivalled leadership in the socialist world spanning four continents and accounting for twenty-five per cent of the human race.

However, the Soviet Union's foreign policy represented a blend of objective success and subjective failure. It was a resounding success when its achievements are measured against the traditional yardstick of power politics—but a conspicuous failure when measured against its ideological purpose—world communism. Interestingly, instead of transforming the world, the Soviet Union got itself transformed ultimately. Neither the domestic nor the foreign policy of the Soviet Union reflected the great ideals that inspired the October Revolution of 1917. The collapse of the Soviet Union symbolizes the failure of the Bolshevik Revolution. 'The rise, development and collapse of the Soviet Union was one of the most dramatic spectacle of the 20th century.' (Ponton)

Disintegration of the USSR and the Soviet empire

In the sixties, the Soviet leaders had boasted that Russia would be the world's leading economic power. But during the seventies, her economy showed a trend of clear decline. By the late 1970s the Soviet Union was already sinking into irreversible decline. Still its

NOTES

NOTES

downfall was sudden. The failed 11-year-old war in Afghanistan, growing unrest in Eastern Europe and economic effects of prohibitively high expenditure on military power were all contributing to a widespread sense of social malaise at home and loss of prestige abroad. But it was left to Mikhail Gorbachev to honestly admit the gradual decline of the Soviet system. Of course, he tried his best to arrest the process of decline with the strategy of his revolutionary trinity—glasnost, perestroika and myshleniya (new thinking) but only the first worked fully, the second worked only partially and the third remained in a frozen pack as far as the domestic front was concerned. The strategy could well prove disintegrating as it did ultimately. Nevertheless, there is no denying the fact that Gorbachev played a historical role in changing the Soviet society and taking it towards openness, freedom, competition, political pluralism and decentralization. But the changes were too sweeping. No wonder, the Soviet people were overwhelmed and overreacted beyond expectation. They were bound to overreact with force when a little taste of freedom was known to them. Gorbachev on his part wanted to go cautiously with the changes, but the Soviet society, intoxicated by the taste of freedom, threw him in the backwaters.

Similarly, with the renunciation of the Brezhnev doctrine by Gorbachev, the Soviet satellites of Eastern Europe began to enjoy full sovereignty by 1989. Taking cue from them, the Baltic states too declared their independence and as soon as the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania) got independence, the other Republics of the USSR began to demand autonomous status. This brought the Soviet Union on the verge of disintegration. To save the situation, Gorbachev had hammered out a Draft Union Treaty ready for signature by the Soviet Republics on August 20, 1991, but the putsch of August 19, 1991 put an end to that endeavour. Gorbachev wanted the continuance of the Soviet states and Soviet citizenship through a loose confederation (a voluntary union of sovereign states) where the Centre would control defence, foreign affairs, common currency, leaving most of other subjects with the Republics. But the Republics were aspiring for exercising total sovereignty as independent states, seeking independent membership of the United Nations. Ultimately, ignoring all pleas of Gorbachev, they decided in favour of Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). To start with, leaders of the three Slavic States (Ukraine, Belarus and Russia) met in Belarus and announced the formations of CIS which was opened to all former Soviet Republics to join. Subsequently, eight more Republics joined the CIS. And thus a new entity—the Commonwealth of Independent States emerged out of the debris of the Soviet Union. With the formation of the CIS, the USSR ceased to exist. This development left Gorbachev no choice but to offer his resignation. Thus was buried the Behemoth that Lenin begot and Stalin battered. What a tragic irony it was that the first and the last executive President of the Soviet Union had to perform the unenviable task of dismantling the most powerful and enduring totalitarian regime in modern history.

While the Commonwealth of Mr. Yeltsin's vision became a reality in December 1991, comprising eleven former Soviet Republics, the fate of the Commonwealth is not free from many uncertainties. It is organizationally and substantially quite ambiguous and unclear. It is neither a Union, nor a Federation, nor a Confederation; and it has no legal status. Apart from this, the ethnic struggles and unrest still continue. The Soviet armed forces and its apportionment among the various Republics is still a bone of contention. The idea of a United Army is not going to command approval for long, as some Republics are clamouring for their own armies. Moreover, the present Republics are likely to be torn between conflicting trends: one towards unity and the other towards ethnic nationalism. The ethnic tensions have sparked secessionist movements inside as well as between Republics.

Russia and India

In the foreign policy concept that Kozyrev announced in 1993, India and South Asia ranked seventh in the list of priorities. But with the coming of Primakov as Foreign Minister in 1996, India's significance in Russian strategic perception increased immensely. While in India, Primakov had even mooted the idea of a Russia-China-India strategic triangle, which Putin, too, has endorsed.

Putin was the first President to visit India in eight years. During his visit (October 2000) India and Russia signed a strategic Partnership Agreement. It covers a whole range of bilateral concerns from defence and peaceful nuclear cooperation to trade and science and technology. It has opened new areas of cooperation in information technology, oil and natural gas exploration and civil aviation. Since both countries are equally concerned over international terrorism and religious extremism, leaders of both the countries agreed to forge a coordinated strategy to deal with Islamic militancy in Afghanistan. Besides, Russia is also providing India with technological expertise for two nuclear reactors in Tamil Nadu. The trade between the two countries which had fallen to 1.6 billion dollars in 1999 from 5.5 billion at the beginning of 1990s is expected to be improved in the coming years. Thus, it is definite that Russia has changed course in a qualitative way since mid-1990s. At the time of Putin's visit both the countries signed four defence agreements worth 3 billion dollars.

All these agreements go to show that Russia-India relations are at a higher level, despite differences on CTBT, NPT and Pokhran-II. However, Russia never opted to impose sanctions against India. It is even willing to supply Uranium for the Tarapur Plant.

To quote Nandan Unnikrishnan, 'The October visit signified a transparent attempt by Putin and his new administration to regain some of the mystique of the old bonhomie and a qualitative leap to capture the dynamic mood of the post-Cold War era in global politics.'

Russia today and tomorrow

In the opinion of Madeleine Albright, the former US Foreign Secretary, 'Russia's future course is uncertain. A flood of forces, many in opposition to each other, have been unleashed. Currents of enterprise and freedom compete with those of corruption and crime, impulse towards integration and openness vie with tendencies towards isolation and alienation. In recent years, Russia has moved from one critical point to another: The confrontation with Duma, the war in Chechnya and Dagestan, the rise of extremist nationalists, the resurgence of hard-line communists, the financial crisis.'

Although after years of dithering and delay important avenues of structural reform are beginning to move forward in Russia, but even now it continues to be in the throes of instability in both economic and political spheres. Debt repayment, if not rescheduled, may leave Russia bankrupt. Mercifully, Putin's active European diplomacy has found favourable response. London Club of creditor nations and Russia reached an agreement on rearrangement of debts, by which they agreed on a package of postponing of repayment, reducing principal and interests and lowering interest rate, a reduction of 16.6 billion dollars debts and an extension of repayment period for 30 years. However, Russia still owes about 150 billion dollars, mostly to Western corporations and governments, about a third of which was borrowed by the now defunct Soviet Union. This year alone (2001) Moscow is required to pay 12 billion dollars simply to service its

NOTES

NOTES

debt. It is estimated that in 2003 Russia's debt servicing will rise to 19 billion dollars — more than the entire projected state budget that year.

No doubt, Russia is facing a multidimensional crisis at the moment. But its potential is awesome, its reach is extensive. Even after the dissolution of the former USSR, Russia, with a population of 145 million, still straddles the Eurasian landmass as a major territorial entity, endowed with geostrategic importance, remains a major repository of natural resources and raw material and possesses a strong scientific and technological capacity. After all, Russia is still a first rank nuclear power. True, Russia is today a fallen superpower and a shackled giant, but given its enormous resources, strong scientific base, skilled manpower, geopolitical position, and history, Russia is sure to bounce back as a great power once again.

ACTIVITY

Compare India's foreign policy with any one of the given foreign policies, in terms of the details given here.

5.5 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- Undoubtedly, America occupies a central place in the continuum of world politics. Rather it is the heartland of international politics.
- The American society which accounts for six per cent of mankind (268 million) and possesses great economic, military and political strength is based on the principles of democracy and liberty.
- Of all major countries, the USA has the most open decision-making process. There is a high degree of diffusion in the decision-making process. The Congress can only discuss, debate, defer or delay but it can rarely destroy them. But in the ultimate sense, the power of a President is the power to persuade.
- The formal foreign policy process is determined by five large institutions—(1) White House, (2) Department of State, (3) Department of Defence, (4) Central Intelligence Agency and (5) Congress.
- Generally speaking, physical security, material wealth, international prestige—these and other tangible and intangible values actuate all foreign policies and so is the case with American foreign policy.
- For more than a century, her bountiful nature allowed Americans to hold belief that progress was to be found within the country and the Western Hemisphere. This natural abundance and sense of physical security permitted her leadership to remain away from the traditional world politics.
- By the end of World War II, Western Europe lay in smoking ruins. Germany had been reduced to a lumber landscape. The Soviet Union too suffered indescribable physical and human damage. Japanese industries were devastated. Only the United States remained unharmed.
- Ever since the Second World War the United States, which emerged as a Superpower, has tried to don the mantle of a planetary policeman. This was definitely an evangelical role. No wonder, in the process America had to pay a heavy price.

Check Your Progress

5. What are the most notable characteristics of the Russian character?
6. What were the main factors for the disintegration of the Soviet Union?

NOTES

- Britain has been the greatest of imperial powers in history. For a long time, she had worldwide interests and commitments. Hence, the saying went: 'The sun never sets over the British Empire.' But all that glory has become history. Today, she is declining in terms of relative importance and international commitments.
- In Britain—the mother of parliamentary democracy—foreign policy has been the responsibility of the Prime Minister and of the Cabinet. In contrast to the American political system, the policy making power here is not shared between the executive and the legislative organs of the government.
- The major objectives guiding the British foreign policy since 1945 are: (1) to enrich and strengthen her economy; (2) to keep her military strength in proportion to her resources; (3) to have political influence in her ex-colonies, by large scale investment; (4) to support democracy and democratic institutions all over the world; (5) to stand for stability and order in world's situation; and (6) to play a leading role on the Continent (Europe) and a prominent role in the European Community or EU.
- The Commonwealth of Nations is the second area of interest for Britain, though lately it has become the third arrow to her bow in international relations—next to American and European dimension of policy.
- Since the close of the Second World War, British foreign policy has been an exercise in adjustment and search for a post-imperial role. Over the years, she has learnt to live with its reduced status—from a paramount power on the globe to just a partner position of the Anglo-American Alliance and the European Union.
- Today, the Soviet Union as a subject of international and geopolitical reality has ceased to exist. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is dismembered. But inspite of the collapse of the Soviet empire, a brief study of the Soviet foreign policy is called for in order to understand the post-War-II international developments, as the Soviet Union had been a key player on the international scene.
- In a way, there is a remarkable consistency in Soviet foreign policy goals—maximum attainable security of the Soviet States and maximum feasible insecurity and instability in the capitalist world and colonial areas.
- Like that of any other state, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union was inevitably shaped by a variety of factors: geographic and strategic considerations, historical traditions, general international situation, internal political problems, economic situation, morale and character of the people and the quality of leadership and other equally basic conditions. The balance sheet of the Soviet diplomacy in about seven decades shows an impressive range of accomplishment.

5.6 KEY TERMS

- **Cold War:** It is often dated from 1947 to 1991, was a sustained state of political and military tension between powers in the Western Bloc, dominated by the United States with NATO among its allies, and powers in the Eastern Bloc, dominated by the Soviet Union along with the Warsaw Pact.
- **Pax Americana:** It is a term applied to the historical concept of relative peace in the Western Hemisphere and later the Western world resulting from the

NOTES

preponderance of power enjoyed by the United States beginning around the start of the 20th century.

- **Commonwealth of Nations:** An association comprising the United Kingdom, its dependencies, and many former British colonies that are now sovereign states with a common allegiance to the British Crown, including Canada, Australia, India, and many countries in the West Indies and Africa. It was formally established by the Statute of Westminster in 1931.

5.7 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. The American society which accounts for six per cent of mankind (268 million) and possesses great economic, military and political strength is based on the principles of democracy and liberty. Americans regard their country as the 'goddess of liberty'.
2. There are few countries in which public opinion counts as much as in the USA. At times the public opinion exercises limits on President's decisional latitude. For example, the Cuban offensive missiles supplied by the Soviet Union were not strategically important but President Kennedy had to act under public pressure.
3. The Second World War marked a turning point in the history of Great Britain. She suffered a precipitous downfall in her power status because of this War. Though, a nominal victor in the War, in winning it she lost her economic and military bases and consequently her status as a great power. This period is considered the sunset over British Empire.
4. The Commonwealth of Nations is a unique achievement of Britain, whose members are sovereign yet bound with a link which is though invisible but real. It is comprised of states once part of the British Empire. It is significant to note that the former British colonies forming part of the British Empire, even after gaining their independence, decided to maintain their association with Britain through the Commonwealth.
5. Elementary persistence, worship and obedience of governmental authority and fear of the foreigners (xenophobia) are relatively stable attributes of the Russian national character.
6. By the late 1970s the Soviet Union was already sinking into irreversible decline. Still its downfall was sudden. The failed 11-year-old war in Afghanistan, growing unrest in Eastern Europe and economic effects of prohibitively high expenditure on military power were all contributing to a widespread sense of social malaise at home and loss of prestige abroad.

5.8 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Explain the concept of Pax Americana.
2. Describe Russia's foreign policy towards India.
3. Explain Britain's foreign policy towards America.
4. What are the objectives of Soviet foreign policy?

Long-Answer Questions

1. Provide an assessment of the American foreign policy.
2. What are the principles and determinants of American foreign policy?
3. Explain the impact of disintegration of Soviet Union on Russia's foreign policy.
4. What have been the objectives of UK's foreign policy since 1945?

NOTES

5.9 FURTHER READING

Alan P. Dobson and Steve Marsh, *US Foreign Policy since 1945*, New York: Routledge, 2006.

Laurence Martin and John Garnett, *British Foreign Policy: Challenges and Choices for the 21st Century*, London: Cassell, 1997.

Jeffrey Mankoff, *Russian Foreign Policy: The Return of Great Power Politics*, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield, 2012.



INSTITUTE
OF DISTANCE
EDUCATION **IDE**
Rajiv Gandhi University

Institute of Distance Education

Rajiv Gandhi University

A Central University

Rono Hills, Arunachal Pradesh

Contact us:



+91-98638 68890



Ide Rgu



Ide Rgu



helpdesk.ide@rgu.ac.in



**INSTITUTE
OF DISTANCE
EDUCATION** **IDE**
Rajiv Gandhi University

Institute of Distance Education Rajiv Gandhi University

A Central University

Rono Hills, Arunachal Pradesh

Contact us:

 +91-98638 68890

 Ide Rgu

 Ide Rgu

 helpdesk.ide@rgu.ac.in