



M.A. Part - I
Political Science
Sub-Group-E-Indian Studies
Paper - I
Foreign Policy & Diplomacy with
Special Reference to India

Dr. Sanjay Deshmukh
Vice Chancellor,
University of Mumbai
Dr. Dhaneswar Harichandan
Professor-Cum-Director IDOL,
University of Mumbai

Programme Co-ordinator : **Shri. Anil Bankar**
Asst. Prof. cum Asst. Director,
IDOL, University of Mumbai

Course Co-ordinator : **Dr. Surendra Jondhale**
Head, Department of Civics and Politics,
University of Mumbai, Vidyanagari,
Mumbai - 400098.

Editor & Writer : **Dr. Shailendra K. Deolankar**
Associate Professor,
Government Vidarbha Institute of Science & Humanities,
Amravati - 4460

Course Writers :

Dr. Mohan S. Kashikar
Dept. of Political Science,
Rashtrasant Tukdoji Maharaj,
Nagpur University, Nagpur - 444001.

Dr. Parimal Maya Sudhakar
Researcher, Legislative, Action Wing,
201, Brahmaputra, Dr. B.D. Marg,
New Delhi - 110001.

Dr. Dhananjay Tripathi
Asstt-Professor, Dept. of International Relations,
South Asian University, Akbar Bhavan,
Chanakypuri, New Delhi - 110021

Prof. Vikas K. Jambhulkar,
Department of Political Science,
Rashtrasant Tukdoji Maharaj,
Nagpur University,
Nagpur - 440001.

Dr. Pranav Kumar
Asstt-Professor - Sr. Scale
Dept. of Geo Politics International Relations,
Old Tapmi Manipal University, Manipal,
Karnataka - 576104.

Reprint August 2015, M.A. Part -I, Political Science, Sub-Group-E-Indian Studies, Paper I, Foreign Policy & Diplomacy with Special Reference to India

Published by : Professor cum Director
Institute of Distance and Open Learning ,
University of Mumbai,
Vidyanagari, Mumbai - 400 098.

DTP Composed : Ashwini Arts
Gurukripa Chawl, M.C. Chagla Marg, Bamanwada,
Vile Parle (E), Mumbai - 400 099.

Printed by :

CONTENTS

Unit No.	Title	Page No.
1.	Determinants of Foreign Policy	01
2.	Institutions in the Foreign Policy Making	16
3.	Evolution of India's Foreign Policy	24
4.	India and South Asia	38
5.	India and China	55
6.	India and United States	71
7.	India-Russia Relations (Post 1991)	80
8.	The EU-India Relations	108
9.	India Relationship with the Developing Countries	121
10.	India and the United Nations	138
11.	India's Nuclear Policy	152
12.	India in the Emerging World Order	169



M.A. Part – I
Political Science
Sub-Group- E- Indian Studies, Paper - I
Foreign Policy and Diplomacy with
special reference to India

1. Nature, Objectives and Determinants of Foreign Policy.
2. Foreign Policy Process; Role of Legislature, Executive and Bureaucratic agencies, Political Parties, Pressure Groups and Media.
3. The evolution of Indian Foreign Policy (including the role of Nonalignment).
4. India and South Asia (focus on issues of dispute, efforts at normalization and SAARC).
5. India and China (focus on issues of dispute and efforts at normalization).
6. India and the United States (since the Reagan era)
7. India and Russia (post 1991)
8. India and Europe.
9. India's relations with south East Asia. Africa and Latin America.
10. India and the United Nations with special reference to the role in UN Peace Keeping.
11. India's Nuclear Policy.
12. India and the emergent world order since 1991, including political, economic and social issues.

Suggested Readings

1. Appadorai, A., Rajan, M.S., India's Foreign Policy and Belations, New Delhi, South Asian Publishers, 1985.
2. Beetham, David, Democracy and Human Rights, Cambridge, Policy Press, 1999.
3. Bhalla, V. K., Foreign Investment and New Economic Policy, New Delhi, Anand Publications Private Limited, 1994.
4. Blackwell, Robert D., Carnesale, Albert, (Ed.), New Nuclear Nations : Consequences for U.S. Policy, New York, Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1993.
5. Chaturvedi, Arun, Lodha, Sanjay (Eds.), India's Foreign Policy and the Emerging World Order, Jaipur, Printwell Publishers, 1998.

II

6. Dikshit, J.N., *Across borders : Fifty years of India's Foreign Policy*, New Delhi, Picus Books, 1998.
7. Donaldson, Robert H., Noguee. Joseph L., *Foreign Policy of Russia : Changing Systems, Enduring Interests*, Armonk, M.E. Sharpe, 1998.
8. Fox, Gregory H, Roth, Brad R. (Eds.), *Democratic Governance and International Law*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
9. Girard, Michel (Ed.), *Theory and Practice in Foreign Policy Making : National Perspectives in Academics and Professionals in International Relations*, London. Pinter Publishers, 1984.
10. Grover, Verinder (Ed.) *International Relations and Foreign Policy of India, Volumes 1 to 10*, New Delhi, Deep and Deep Publications, 1992.
11. Gupta, Sanjay, *Dynamics of Human Rights in Foreign Policy*, New Delhi, Northern Book Centre, 1998.
12. Haksar, P.N., *India's Foreign Policy and its Problems*, Delhi, Atlantic Publishers, 1993.
13. Hermann, Charles F. Kegley, Jr., Charles W., Rosenau, James N. (Eds.) *New Directions in the Study of Foreign Policy*, London, Harper Collins, 1991.
14. Kaminski, Bartlomiej, Wang, Zhen Kung, Winters, Alan L., *Foreign Trade in the Transition the International Environment and Domestic Policy*, Washington, D.C., World Bank, 1996.
15. Kapur, Harish, *India's Foreign Policy, 1947-92 : Shadows and Substance*, New Delhi, Sage Publications, 1994.
16. Klare, Michael, *Rogue States and Nuclear Outlaws : America's Search for a New Foreign Policy*, Delhi, Universal Book Traders, 1997.
17. Lai, David (Ed.), *Global Perspectives : International Relations. U.S. Foreign Policy and the View from Abroad*, London, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1997.
18. Mansingh, Lalit, Venkatraman, M., Lahiri, Dilip, Dikshit, J.N., (Eds.), *Indian Foreign Policy : Agenda for the 21st Century*, Volumes 1 and 2, New Delhi Konarak Publishers, 1997 and 1998.
19. Mathur, Krishan D., *Conduct of India's Foreign Policy*, New Delhi, South Asian Publishers, 1996.
20. Mohite, Dilip (Ed.), *India, USA and the Emerging World Order : Essays in History, Politics and International Relations*, Baroda, Department of Political Science, M.S. University, Baroda, 1995.

III

21. Paranjpe, Shrikant, Parliament and the Making of Indian Foreign Policy : A Study of Nuclear Policy, New Delhi, Radiant Publishers, 1997.
22. Rasgotra, Maharajakrishna, (Ed.), Rajiv Gandhi's India : a Golden Jubilee Retrospective : Volume 3 : Foreign Policy : Ending the Quest for Dominance, New Delhi, UBS Publishers, 1998.
23. Serfaty, Simon (Ed.), Media and Foreign Policy, London, Macmillan, 1990.
24. Svensson, Jakob, When is Foreign aid Policy Credible? : Aid Dependence and conditionality, Washington, D.C. World Bank, 1997.
25. Thakkar, Usha and Kulkarni, Mangesh, India in World Affairs : Towards the 21st Century, Mumbai, Himalaya Publishing House, 1999.
26. Thakur, Ramesh, Politics and Economics of India's Foreign Policy, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1994.
27. Vanaik, Achin, India in a Changing World : Problems, Limits and Successes of its Foreign Policy, Hyderabad, Orient Longman, 1995.
28. Williams, Howard, International Relations and the Limits of Political Theory, Houndmills, Macmillan, 1996.



DETERMINANTS OF FOREIGN POLICY

Unit Structure :

- 1.0 Objective
- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Definitions of Foreign Policy
- 1.3 National Interest and Foreign Policy
- 1.4 Objectives of Foreign Policy
- 1.5 Influential Factors in Foreign Policy Making
- 1.6 Let us sum up
- 1.7 Unit end questions
- 1.8 Reference

1.1 OBJECTIVE

We intend to get introduced to why any nation requires a foreign policy and some of the prominent definitions of foreign policy that are in discussion for many years. This chapter will look into some of the common factors that figure in foreign policy of all the countries in modern era. Similarly, there are common determinants, both internal and external, of foreign policy in almost each country, which we will discuss briefly here.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Development of *Nation-States* and increasing interactions among them has resulted into formation of foreign policy in the modern times. Establishment of United Nations and process of decolonization that has liberated many states into sovereign entities have further provided impetus to interrelationships among states. There is certain unanimity among scholars and statesmen on necessity of a foreign policy for each state, since no state will like to function in complete isolation from rest of the world. Feliks Gross said that *even a decision to have no relations with a particular state is also a foreign policy or, in other words, not to have a definite foreign policy is also a foreign policy*. For example, India's decision to have no diplomatic relations with Israel up to 1992 was integral part of its foreign policy. India wanted to continue good diplomatic

and trade relations with Israel's adversaries, i.e. the Arab states, whose support on Kashmir was crucial for India, along with access to crude oil.

A state without foreign policy will look like a team playing football without any strategy to post the goals, hence all eleven players being clueless about their role and functions on the playground. Thus, in a modern state that lacks foreign policy; the External Affairs Ministry will have no priorities in developing bilateral relations or participating in multilateral forums. The Defence Ministry will have no clear cut ideas about armed preparations of country's military, since no criteria have been set up before it to define friends and to recognize enemies in the international sphere. The Finance as well as Commerce Ministry will struggle to take stand on issues of import-export during bilateral or multilateral trade negotiations. A state without a foreign policy can be compared to a ship in the deep sea without knowledge of directions. As the radar on the ship navigates it towards land destination, foreign policy leads the state in fulfilling its national interest and acquiring rightful place among comity of nation-states. Therefore, it can be said that foreign policy will exist as long as sovereign states operate in international sphere.

1.2 DEFINITIONS OF FOREIGN POLICY

One comes across variety of definitions of foreign policy offered by different scholars. Scholars differ on definition of foreign policy; however, they are certain that it is concerned with behavior of a state towards other states. According to George Modelski, "Foreign policy is the system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behavior of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment..... Foreign Policy must throw light on the ways in which states attempt to change, and succeed in changing, the behavior of other states." (George Modelski, A Theory of Foreign Policy, (London, 1962) pp.6-7) Behaviour of each state affects behavior of every other state in one form or the other, directly or indirectly, with greater or lesser intensity, favourably or adversely. Function of foreign policy is to try to minimize the adverse effects and maximize the favorable effects of actions of other states. The objective of foreign policy is not only to *change* but also to *regulate* behavior of other states by ensuring continuity of their favourable actions. For example, Great Britain's stand on Kashmir was vague during cold war period. Here, Indian foreign policy attempted to change Great Britain's position in India's favour. On the other hand, the erstwhile USSR supported India on the Kashmir question for many years. In this case, Indian foreign policy's objective was to ensure continuity of USSR's favourable position.

Foreign policy is a complex and dynamic political interaction that a state gets involved in pursuing relations with other states and entities outside the purview of its own jurisdiction. As Joseph Frankel puts it, "Foreign Policy consists of decisions and actions, which involves to some appreciable extent relations between one state and others." (Joseph Frankel, *The Making of Foreign Policy*, p.1) It implies that foreign policy involves set of actions by the forces working within state's borders and intended towards forces existing outside the country's borders. It is a set of tools employed by the state to influence exercise of law making power by other states as well as actions of non-state actors outside the purview of its jurisdiction. It comprises of formulation and implementation of a set of ideas that govern the behavior of state actors while interacting with other states to defend and enhance its interests.

Huge Gibson says, "Foreign policy is a well-rounded comprehensive plan based on knowledge and experience for conducting the business of government with rest of the world. It is aimed at promoting and protecting the interests of the nations. This calls for a clear understanding of what those interests are and how far we hope to go with the means at our disposal. Anything less than this falls short of being a foreign policy." (Huge Gibson, *The Road to Foreign Policy*, p.9)

A doctrine of foreign policy can be simple and succinct; or it may be complicated and vague. One thing is sure that foreign policy is much more than meetings of diplomats, formal statements proclaimed by statesmen, and public statements of state leaders. On the other hand, foreign policy definitely includes current nature of state's objectives and interests and principles of self-perceived right conduct in dealing with other states. Padelford and Lincoln defines it as, "A State's Foreign Policy is totality of its dealings with the external environment.....Foreign Policy is the overall result of the process by which a state translates its broadly conceived goals and interests into specific courses of action in order to achieve its objective and preserve its interest." (Norman J Padelford and George A Lincoln, *The Dynamics of International Politics*, p.195) In view of such variety of definitions, we can conclude that core of foreign policy consists of achieving the national objectives through the available national means by interacting with other states.

Foreign policy can not exist in a vacuum. Foreign policy of a particular state evolves from historical events responsible for creation/strengthening of the statehood, principles and ideological foundations of nation-building, and purpose and interests of the State. Foreign policy can be comprehended only in the greater milieu of form of the government, economic situation, political conditions, geographical situation and general culture of the country. All the foreign policy decisions aim at achieving either co-

operation/co-existence or conflict or neutrality towards a particular state or group of states or rest of the world.

Check your progress

1. Elaborate with examples why do a nation-state needs a foreign policy?
2. Discuss at least 2 definitions of foreign policy.

1.3 NATIONAL INTEREST AND FOREIGN POLICY

In modern times, for consistency and continuity of a foreign policy, it has to gain legitimacy with domestic audience, i.e. citizens of a country. This is achieved by relentless pursuit of perceived national interest through country's foreign policy. National interests are needs, aims or desires conveyed to policymakers by the citizens of a country. Such aims, needs and desires vary enormously from State to State and time to time. State conducts its international relations for attainment of national interests, which are general and continuing ends. State seeks to achieve or protect national interest in relations with other states. National interest is defined in various terms such as *defence against aggression*, *developing higher standard of living* or *seeking rightful place at international organizations such as United Nations*. Charles Lerche and Abdul Said define national interest as, "The general long term and continuing purpose which the state, the nation, and the government all see themselves as serving." (Charles O. Lerche Jr. and Abdul A Said, *Concepts of International Politics*, (Engelwood Cliffs, 1963), p.6)

National Interests are divided into two categories; *vital* or *core interests* and *less than vital* or *secondary interests*. Vital interests are most important from the point of view of county's foreign policy. The state is most unwilling to make any compromise with vital interests and is sure to wage war in its defence. India says Kashmir is an issue of vital interest for it. China proclaims Taiwan and Tibet are of vital interests to it. United States considered toppling of Taliban regime in Afghanistan as an issue of vital

interest to it. Vital interests of a state are so basic that they acquire near-permanent place on its foreign policy agenda and often create emotional appeal among the masses.

On the other hand, *less than vital* or *secondary interests* are those aims of a state that they make efforts to fulfill, but refrain from going to war or creating animosity with other states. For India, a permanent seat at U.N. Security Council, or extradition of main accused of Bhopal Gas Tragedy are issues of national interests. But, India will not go to war to achieve these goals nor will it use any other kind of coercion to the extent of creating animosity with other states. Vital interests are termed as goals of foreign policy, while the secondary interests are termed as objectives of foreign policy.

Further, objectives can be divided into *specific* and *general* objectives. The specific objectives are concerned with each individual state and hence differ from state to state and time to time. The above stated objectives of permanent seat at U.N.S.C. and extradition of culprits of industrial accident are India's specific objectives rather than of every state's concerns. On the other hand, general objectives of foreign policy make sense with almost every state.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF FOREIGN POLICY

Following are some of the key general objectives that we can locate in foreign policy of almost every country:

1. A foreign policy protects unity and integrity of a country. For example, a major focus of India's relations with China is to ensure country's territorial integrity by rejecting Chinese claims on Indian terrains. It takes note of incorrect map of India issued by foreign countries and agencies, and asks to make appropriate amends in it.
2. A foreign policy defends interests of its citizens. For example, successive Indian governments keep in mind interests of farmers while negotiating bi-lateral and multi-lateral trade agreements. A primary interest of any country is in self-preservation and well-being of its citizens. In international arena, interests of various countries often clash with each other and the states have to protect their own interests vehemently. A foreign policy aims at promotion of economic progress of the country. In modern times, economic development is one of the key factors in determining state's international status. Thus, the treaties and agreements concluded with other states are drafted in a way to protect and promote economic interests of its own.

3. A foreign policy also protects interests of its citizens beyond the borders. For example, the External Affairs Ministry takes up issue of racial discrimination and harassment of Indian students in Australia with the Australian government in order to protect its citizens in that country.
4. A foreign policy also protects dignity and sentiments of the people of Indian origin throughout the world. For example, Indian government had asked its French counterpart to reconsider ban on Sikh's turbans in that country even though the Sikhs there may not be Indian citizens anymore and had accepted French citizenship.
5. A foreign policy tries to maintain contacts and develop good relations with all other states in order to enhance economic and technological co-operation with them with a view to promote its own interests. Indian government lost no time in recognizing newly independent African and Asian countries and immediately established diplomatic relations with them to create its sphere of influence and good will in those countries. On the contrary, diplomatic cut-off with a particular country on issues of ideology or national interest can also be part of state's foreign policy. India had not only boycotted the racist South African regime in the past, but also led the international imbroglio against it as a matter of its principled stand against racism in the world.

Although above mentioned examples are Indian foreign policy centric, foreign policies of almost all the states are full of similar examples.

Check your progress

1. What is relationship between *National Interest* and foreign policy?
2. Discuss with examples broad objectives of foreign policy.

1.4 INFLUENTIAL FACTORS IN FOREIGN POLICY MAKING

Like the *general objectives* of foreign policy, there are common determinants that can be applied to any state to assess its foreign policy. These determinants are of two types: internal and external.

Internal Factors

1. **Size:** Territorial size of a state influences its foreign policy in a sense that bigger the size greater role the state can play in international politics. India's ambitions to achieve great power status in world politics can be attributed to its size, which is 7th largest sovereign state in the world. Similarly, one of the major factors of importance of United States, Russia and China is their gigantic size. On the other hand, smaller countries generally do not get opportunities to perform *larger than life* roles in international arena. Smaller island countries in the Asia-Pacific region and in Africa continent do not play significant roles in world politics. Big size makes the geographical location of a state crucial in international sphere. India is geo-politically important in world politics because its vast size places it at the inter-junction of South-East Asia, Central Asia, West Asia, South Asian countries and China. India's huge population, if seen in terms of human resources, also provides strength to its foreign policy. No important country in the world can ignore such a vast size of people, and on the other hand, India needs co-operation from other states to fulfill growing needs of its population. Thus, territorial size, geographical location and population play important role in determining a state's foreign policy.

However, there are examples of smaller countries acquiring importance in international domain, either due to its substantial population, or geographical location, or superior economy. A case of Bangla Desh fits in the first scenario, while a land-locked country like Nepal becomes important due to its location between two emerging powers, i.e. India and China. Japan and South Korea have gained much superior status in world politics, in comparison to other countries of their size, due to their rich economic structures. Their substantial population within a small territory and geographical location in the Pacific Ocean adjacent to Russia and China are also the factors in their emergence at world stage. In the recent past, a small-size Britain dominated world politics for about two centuries due to its advance maritime, industrial and management skills. In today's world, comparatively smaller countries in the West Asian

region have acquired importance due to rich oil and gas resources. On the other hand, big size countries like Australia and Canada are not significant actors in international politics because of their isolated location and smaller population.

- 2. Geography:** A state's climate, fertility of soil, access to waterways, deposits of mineral resources, diversity of crops, availability of drinking water etc. affect and influence its foreign policy. Sufficiency of these factors makes the state self-sufficient, and thus, it can assert in relations with other states. It is observed that land-locked countries, countries in the tropic region and those bordering superpowers are more dependent on other states than the countries with access to warm ports, in the temperate region and at a considerable distance from superpowers. After independence, India could not be compelled to join either of superpower blocks and it could formulate its own policy of non-alignment because it had more than one ways of doing trade with other countries, it was confident of developing capacities to utilize natural resources and development of agriculture, and it was at a geographical distance from the then superpowers, i.e. U.S. and U.S.S.R.
- 3. History and Culture:** Historical experiences and cultural traditions of a state exert influence on its foreign policy. Generally, state with unified culture and common history finds it easier to formulate effective and consistent foreign policy. In such a case, overwhelming majority of people, who share similar experiences and common perceptions of historical events, support the state's foreign policy. On the other hand, country with divergent cultures and various historical experiences in its different parts, finds it difficult to formulate foreign policy in unison. Without a common anti-colonial legacy and deep-rooted culture of peace and co-operation in Indian society, it was not possible for the government to formulate country's foreign policy in post-independence era. Yet, of late, Indian government has been increasingly facing dilemma in its foreign policy on such issues as nuclearisation, strengthening relations with Israel, engaging Pakistan, atrocities on Tamils in Sri Lanka etc. It is, indeed, an enormous challenge before the policymakers in India to generate unanimity in the country on its foreign policy; given the vastness, diversity, different regions' geographical proximity with neighboring countries and lineages across the borders.
- 4. Economic Development:** Level of economic development influences state's foreign policy in more than one ways. Advanced industrialist countries play dominant role in world politics, and formulate their foreign policies to maintain such superiority. These countries have large resources at their

disposal to build military capabilities on one hand, and disperse monetary benefits on other states in the form of aid and loan. They remain in constant search of new markets for their products, access to raw and natural resources as well as skilled and unskilled labour. It makes pertinent on them to develop close diplomatic ties with other states and encourage people to people contacts among them. Developing countries, too, follow their suit to receive benefits of trade and technological breakthroughs. However, developing countries remain dependent on advanced industrialist countries to a large extent to get developmental loans, import of technologies and even food-grains to meet their ends. Accordingly, it has to adjust its foreign policy. Similarly poor or least developed countries orient their foreign policy to garner maximum support from rich nations, in the form of aid, technology, provisions of health-care and access to higher education etc. In recent years, we have witnessed that Germany is playing leading role in Europe's politics, despite not being permanent member of U.N.S.C. and being a non-nuclear state. Germany's increased weightage is entirely attributed to its economic development. Talks of emergence of China and India on world stage are based on their economic resurgence in recent years. On the contrary, in post-cold war period, Russia's influence waned to a considerable extent as its economic power has diminished after disintegration of U.S.S.R. In fact, one of the prominent reasons of collapse of U.S.S.R.-led communist block was said to be stagnant economic conditions prevailing for many years in those countries.

- 5. Technological Progress:** Economic development and technological progress are closely inter-wined with each other. As a result, economically developed countries have technological advantage too. The advance industrialized countries provide technological equipment and know-how to developing and poor countries, but can exert such leverage to mould their foreign policy. Technological breakthroughs in military sphere have further increased developing world's dependency on advance countries. Rosenau rightly says, "Technological changes can alter military and economic capabilities of a society and thus its status and role in the international system." (James N Rosenau, in Thompson and Boyd, (eds), *World Politics: An Introduction*, pp.21-22) However, developing countries can counterbalance advance countries technological dominance by producing semi-skilled, skilled and trained human resources. Today, Germany, South Korea and Japan are in a position to play crucial roles in international politics due to their technological excellence. On the other hand, India and China have gained currency in world politics because

of their capabilities in adapting to new technologies due to their technically skilled labour force.

- 6. Military Preparedness:** Capabilities of a state to defend its borders against armed aggression plays important role in its foreign policy. Militarily capable states exercise greater independence from external forces in formulating their foreign policy. Increased military preparedness of a country might result in change in its foreign policy. Indian foreign policy has acquired new dimensions after nuclearisation, as it attempts to gain the status equivalent to P-5 countries. Since country's pride is associated with military victories; in the case of defeat, state suffers international humiliation that negatively affects its foreign policy. India has undergone this experience after the 1962 boundary war with China, when its prestige declined among *third world countries*. India had regained the lost pride and prestige in 1971 when it decisively defeated Pakistan that resulted into latter's partition and creation of Bangla Desh.
- 7. National Capacity:** National capacity of a state is comprised of its economic development, technological progress and military capability. It exercises profound influence on state's foreign policy. In early 20th century, the United States changed its foreign policy from that of isolation to engagement, as its *national capacity* had seen tremendous increments during that period. Similarly, today, China is exerting its influence in international politics as it has become confident of its national capacity.
- 8. Social Structure:** Social structure influences, albeit indirectly, foreign policy of any country. It is true that it is difficult to measure divisions or homogeneity of a particular society, and more difficult is to judge its impact on foreign policy. However, it is certain that changes in social structure cause a change in the foreign policy in long term. A state divided on racial or religious or regional lines struggle to put forward its best possible foreign policy, as it becomes difficult for it to receive co-operation from all quarters of society. On the other side, a homogenous society produces more coherent, and even aggressive, foreign policy. In post-World War II era, nationalism and other ideologies were used to bridge the social differences to strengthen country's foreign policy.
- 9. Ideology of State:** A proclaimed ideology of the state comprehensively influences its foreign policy. In 1930s, Nazi Germany's emphasis upon superiority of Aryan race played important role in its foreign policy. Similarly, United States and U.S.S.R.'s stated objectives of promotion of democratic system and socialist system respectively dominated much of their

respective foreign policies during cold war period. Ideological preferences of the state reflect upon process of policy formulation as well.

State with democratic values of open debate and dissent tend to listen to the public opinion seriously. Under democratic set up, pressure groups, political parties with different shades of ideologies and press indulges in public opinion making that deeply influences foreign policy of a country. In 1970s, the United States government bowed to tremendous domestic pressure to withdraw from the Vietnam War. It is said that the United States actually lost that war within its borders than in Vietnam. On the contrary, there was no scope for building such public opinion in erstwhile U.S.S.R. due to its authoritarian set up, which had emanated from its ideological understanding of *Dictatorship of Proletariat*. In authoritarian systems, only government's positions on foreign policy issues are allowed to be published in the press. Electronic media is also monopolized with government propaganda on foreign policy. In democratic systems, press plays important role in discussing government's actions and inactions, and in the process determining its foreign policy. Thus, role of press becomes important in democratic systems in disseminating information and views on foreign policy of respective governments.

10. Spread of Internet: Internet, particularly social media websites, circulation of bulk e-mails, news portals and blogospheres have begun to influence state's foreign policy. Dissemination of internet services in any society, even if for commercial or scientific purposes, leads towards its emergence as a tool of public debate and opinion making. In China, even after governmental restrictions and vigilance, Internet has become a medium for people to express their opinions. During diplomatic crisis of bombing of Chinese embassy in erstwhile Yugoslavia and Japanese premier's controversial visits to war shrines, public opinion generated on internet sites created immense pressure on Chinese government to act decisively to defend country's sovereignty and honour respectively. In coming days, Internet is bound to play an increasing role in the state's foreign policy.

11. Form of Government: Form of government established in a state plays its role in a country's foreign policy. Totalitarian or authoritative forms of government, such as governments in one-party system or under complete control of military junta, are capable of quick foreign policy decisions. In such systems, decision-making is restricted to elite core within the government, making it easier to formulate foreign policy. However, it is observed that decision-making under closed system has often, if

not always, lead to country's isolation in international politics as happened with the regimes in North Korea and Myanmar. Dissenting voices are suppressed by oppressive methods like detention, censorship and promulgation of strict regulations.

On the other hand, within democratic systems, different forms of government act differently in formulating the foreign policy. In West-ministerial system, executives lead the decision-making process of foreign policy formulation. The legislature does debate government's foreign policy in parliamentary system, however, it is not necessary for the latter to ask for legislative consent for foreign treaties and agreements. Thus, governments in parliamentary system enjoy considerable autonomy of decision-making in foreign policy matters. Under the U.S. style presidential system, Congress' nod is essential for execution of any treaty or agreement with other states and foreign entities. The Congress can even initiate and pass legislations on foreign policy matters that are binding on the President of the United States for execution. In a bi-party polity, generally, the government of the day enjoys clear majority on its own, which makes it less susceptible to opposition or allies' pressure in its foreign policy. In a multi-party polity, coalition governments have to sort out conflicting view points and interests of two or more ruling parties. This may lead to avoidance or postponement of the decision on foreign policy.

12. Leadership: Leadership plays influential role in the country's foreign policy. Rosenau says, "A leader's belief about the nature of international arena and the goals that ought to be pursued therein, his or her peculiar intellectual strengths and weakness for analyzing information and making decisions, his or her past background and the extent of its relevance to the requirements of the role, his or her emotional needs and most of other personality traits these are but a few of the idiosyncratic factors that can influence the planning and execution of foreign policy." (James N Rosenau in Rosenau, Thompson and Boyd, (Eds), *World Politics: An Introduction*, p.28) Even though, government structure and societal realities constrain the qualities of a leader, during crisis time the leader shows the path to the government and society. Winston Churchill's astute leadership had steered the England to victory in second World war, while Indira Gandhi's apt decision-making in 1971 helped India not only to defeat Pakistan militarily but also to counter diplomatic pressures applied by the United States and China on the latter's behest. In recent years, AtalBihari Vajpayee's leadership played crucial role in breaking the self-imposed freeze on country's nuclearization.

External Factors:

1. **World Situation:** A prevalent framework of world politics plays decisive role in deciding the foreign policy of a country. When India became independent, world was divided into two hostile camp, which was much beyond India's capacity to change. In the bi-polar world dominated by military alliances, India sought its interest in maintaining distance from military alliances but forging ties with individual countries from both the blocks. In the subsequent years, as Pakistan moved closer to the western block and China became hostile to India, New Delhi forged closer comprehensive ties with the USSR. After the demise of USSR, India began to re-set its relations with the US as it remained as the only super power in world politics.

2. **Military Strength of Adversaries:** India had opted for peaceful world order and friendly relations with its neighbours at the outset of independence. However, disputes with Pakistan over Kashmir and conflict with China on border issues forced wars on India. Consequently, India had to adjust its foreign policy goals and embarked upon increasing military strength commensurate with the strength of its adversaries. This has resulted in India buying weapons and military technologies from various countries, and accordingly strengthening bilateral relations with those countries.

Thus, formulation of foreign policy is a result of complex internal and external factors. These are combined with country's long term aspirations as well as its leaders' ambitions to play a role on world stage that give final shape to country's foreign policy.

Check your progress

1. Discuss the internal determinants of foreign policy.
2. Discuss the external determinants of foreign policy.

1.6 LET US SUM UP

It is pertinent for a nation-state in the modern world to formulate their respective foreign policies to protect and enhance its

national interest. Since process of formulating and implementing of a foreign policy is complex and ever-evolving, the scholars have struggled to narrow down its definition, but without success. However, there is unanimity on broad objectives of foreign policy, which are i) protection of unity and integrity of the country, ii) promotion of safety and welfare of its citizens; iii) protection of security and interests of its citizens even when they are residing in any other country; iv) protection of dignity and sentiments of people of Indian origin throughout the world; and v) promoting good relations with all other countries to enhance trade and cultural, educational and scientific exchanges. Foreign policy of any country is shaped of multiple internal and external factors. The main internal factors influencing the foreign policy are: 1) size, geographical elements and population, 2) its history, culture and liberation and reformation struggles, 3) national capacity in terms of economic development, technological progress including spread of information technology and military preparedness, 4) social structure and form of the government, and 5) influence of ideologies and personality of leadership in command. At the same time, external factors such as existing structure of world politics and military strength of other countries shape the options and opportunities in the foreign policy making. These factors together work as pull and push elements and their fine-tuning or balancing produces the final print of a country's foreign policy.

1.7 UNIT END QUESTIONS

1. Why do a nation-state requires a foreign policy to protect its vital national interests?
2. What are definitions and objectives of foreign policy?
3. What are the main internal and external determinants of foreign policy?

1.8 REFERENCE

- Bandyopadhyaya, J, The Making of India's Foreign Policy, Allied Publishers Pvt Lmd, 2003, New Delhi
- Bandyopadhyaya, J, North Over South: A Non-Western Perspective of International Relations, South Asians, 1982, New Delhi
- Brecher, Miachel, India and World Politics: Krishna Menon's View of the World, OUP, 1968, London

- Chandra, Bipin and others, India Since Independence, Penguin Books, 2007, New Delhi
- Dixit, J.N., My South Block Years: Memoirs of a Foreign Secretary, WBSPD, 1996, New Delhi
- Jain, P.C., Economic Determinants of India's Foreign Policy: Nehru Years, Vitasta Publishing, 2012, New Delhi
- Mathai, M.O., Reminiscences of the Nehru Age, Vikas Publications, 1978, New Delhi
- Mattoo, Amitabh and Happyman Jacob, Shaping India's Foreign Policy, Har-Anand Publications, 2010
- Mishra, K. P. (ed), Studies in India's Foreign Policy, Vikas Publications, 1969, New Delhi
- Mukherjee, Amitaava and J. Bandyopadhyaya, International relations Theory: From Anarchy to World Government, Manuscript India, 2001, Howrah
- Nehru, Jawaharlal, India's Foreign Policy, Publications Divisions, 1962, New Delhi
- Panandikar, V. A. Pai and Ajay K Sharma, The Indian Cabinet: A Study in Government, Konark, 1996, New Delhi



INSTITUTIONS IN THE FOREIGN POLICY MAKING

Unit Structure :

- 2.0 Objective
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Let us sum up
- 2.3 Unit end questions
- 2.4 Reference

2.0 OBJECTIVE

Foreign policy is formulated through a chain of factors that contribute and shape its agenda. We will discuss the institutions and processes that are mainly responsible for foreign policy making. A constant interaction among many institutions results in prioritizing issues in the foreign policy, even though in a country like India powerful leadership always plays key role in decision-making with regard to external affairs. In this chapter, we will look into these factors that are instrumental in foreign policy formulations.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Process of decision making at various levels plays important role in foreign policy's formulation as well as execution. According to J. Bandyopadhyaya, "The rationality or otherwise of a political party depends upon the nature and extent of articulate public opinion and the manner of its expression, the institutions of the political parties concerned with foreign policy, pressure groups, Parliament, the Foreign Office, the Foreign Minister and finally the Cabinet." We can divide the institutions involved in the foreign policy formulations in two broad categories; informal institutions and formal institutions. The first group is comprised of ruling elite in the country, broader public opinion and pressure groups etc. The formal institutions include the Cabinet, Parliament, Political Parties etc.

Ruling Elite: The ruling elite play important role in formulation of foreign policy's goals and priorities. Their perceptions of domestic and foreign milieu and challenges persisting therein have important place in determining the course of country's external relations. It is well known that India's foreign policy was result of Jawaharlal Nehru's world outlook and his passions for peace and equality for the entire human being. Even though Nehru's views on foreign matters were mostly unchallenged for almost two decades after independence, he himself sought wise council of number of people such as Krishna Menon, Sardar Patel, Maulana Azad, Dr. Radha Krishnan, K. M. Pannikar, Swarn Singh etc. This elite coterie was instrumental in laying down the foundations of independent India's foreign policy in initial years. In the years ahead, few more scholar-politicians/bureaucrats joined this club, for example, Indira Gandhi, T. N. Kaul, D.P. Dhar, P. N. Haksar, Rajiv Gandhi, J. N. Dixit, Brajesh Mishra, Hamid Ansari, I. K. Gujaral, Jaswant Singh, AtalBihari Vajpayee and Manmohan Singh.

Public Opinion: In a democratic and republic country like India, the sovereignty rests with the people. Therefore, in all the policies of the government, whether domestic or related to external affairs, people's opinion and aspirations must found expressions. However, in a huge country like India, where poverty and illiteracy is widespread, common people do not take much interest in issues related with country's international relations as compared to their interests and demands in internal policies. They show interest in country's foreign policy only at the time of war or international crisis. The high level of illiteracy, accompanied by lack of means of communications, proved to be a major hindrance in people getting educated about nitty-gritty of international politics and foreign policy making. Thus, people's involvement in country's foreign policy is limited itself due to their interests and needs. Despite such a limited interest of people in the foreign policy, their moral outlook and principles of domestic politics reflect in their choices when it comes to taking stand on issues like racism, imperialism, terrorism and wars.

Pressure Groups: Unlike in western democracies, particularly in the United States, various pressure groups play less influential role in formulation and determination of foreign policy in India. However, of late, few of the pressure groups have begun to impart considerable influence in the policy circles. They include the business bodies, arms agents and Non-Resident Indians (NRIs). In recent years, investment by Indian industrialist groups has increased considerably in countries of Africa, Southeast Asia and West Asia, along with their increased cooperation with multinational companies from developed countries. Today, business interests of Indian companies form an important part of India's foreign policy, particularly with regard to African countries, Nepal, Myanmar as

well as the United States and European Union. Similarly, the NRIs influence the foreign policy in their own way, as they demand friendly relations with the countries where they are residing due to their own interests of security and prosperity. Post-1991, the well-being of NRIs has become an essential part of India's relations with the United States. The arms agents, in the context of ever-increasing arms race in the South Asian region, can influence the governmental opinion on deciding about the imports of arms. Accordingly, government may change its priorities with regard to selection of arms and the importer countries. There is significant change in India's arms import in last two decades as the United States and Israel have become two of the leading arms providers to Indian army. The new interest developed in these new dealings will like to see that such arrangements not only continue for longer period but their volume increases significantly.

The civil servants associated with the Foreign Ministry are always in a position to influence the foreign policy according to their ideological convictions or political orientation. In 1960s and 1970s, the officers oriented towards left ideology played significant role in bringing the Indian policy-makers closure to the USSR, while drifting them away from the influence of the United States. However, being bureaucrats, the Indian Foreign Service (I.F.S.) officers generally tend to follow the line drawn by the government of the day, while only the senior-most I.F.S. members with the ranks of Secretary and above play active role in advising the government in the capacity of the post they hold at that time. There exists Indian Foreign Service Association, but its primary task is to ensure safety and security as well as protection and promotion of economic interests of members of the Foreign Service.

Various foreign lobbies also try to influence foreign policy of the country. Such lobbies exist in the form of Friendship Societies, Cultural and Academic Exchange Groups etc. These foreign lobbies try to influence the elite members of the government, media, army and civil society in favor of the concerned foreign countries. They maintain intensive contacts with academicians, journalists, students and youth leaders, trade union leaders etc. They organize periodical seminars, symposia, cultural events etc. to engage with the policy makers and civil society members. It is said that India is one of the few countries where networking of such foreign lobbies is vast and extensive. However, it is difficult to determine the extent of influence exercised by the foreign lobbies on the foreign policy of India.

Parliament: As compared to the United States-like Presidential system, Parliament in India plays less active role in determining the foreign policy of the country. Issues concerning the foreign policy mostly come up for the discussion in the Parliament at either war or

war-like situations and international crisis. Unlike the United States, it is not mandatory for the government in India to approve the foreign treaties and agreements in the Parliament. However, Members of Parliament can enquire about state of country's external relations in the Question Hour in both Houses of Parliament, where the External Affairs Minister or the Prime Minister himself/herself has to answer the questions and supplementary questions. Members can also demand Prime Minister or Foreign Minister's statement on the floor of the House regarding any international issue having bearing on country's foreign policy. Similarly, the Prime Minister or the Foreign Minister can lay down a statement in the House regarding his/her foreign visit or visit of other country's diplomats/leaders to India. Members can give *Calling Attention* or *Special Mention* notices to the Speaker/Chairperson of the House to initiate discussion on foreign policy matters. Opposition parties can bring *No-confidence Motion* against the Prime Minister on any serious issues related to country's foreign policy. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru faced first *No-confidence Motion* on the issues of Chinese aggression and India's foreign policy in that context. In recent times, the Left Parties withdrew support to Manmohan Singh government on the issue of India-US Civil Nuclear Deal, thus, forcing the President of India to ask the Prime Minister to move *Confidence Motion* in Lok Sabha to prove majority of his government.

The Parliament also exercises considerable influence on the foreign policy of the country through various Parliamentary Committees. The Estimate Committee and the Public Accounts Committee exercise influence through its control of finances to the Ministry of External Affairs. In 1960-61, the Estimate Committee had recommended reorganization of the Foreign Office and the missions abroad. The Consultative Committee of Parliament on External Affairs holds regular discussions on various aspects of country's foreign policy, even though its conclusions or recommendations are not binding on the government. However, it makes the government answerable to Members' queries. Government tries to convince the Members about its point of view through these discussions so that Parliamentary debates would not become ill-informed or acrimonious. M. C. Chagla, India's Minister of External Affairs in Indira Gandhi's cabinet, observed, "The Consultative Committee is more of an agency for getting policies accepted and muting criticism than for influencing foreign policy." Overall, Parliament provides free hand to the Executive to formulate and implement country's foreign policy. However, it acts in rectifying the government's mistakes or identifying lacunas in the foreign policy. Government shows sensitivity to the opinion generated through Parliamentary debates and accordingly amends its actions or policies. Vajpeyee government's refusal to endorse the U.S.-led war in Iraq in the year 2003 was result of Parliament's

intervention in guiding the government to decide upon international issues. In sum, the Parliament has been able to check the foreign policy deviations on the part of the government, and has been quite successful in representing public opinion at the time of war and crisis through debates and deliberations that has often forced the government to modify its foreign policy.

Cabinet: Cabinet, which is expected, under Parliamentary system of government in India, to act as the highest and collective decision making body in respect of foreign policy, has been playing little role with that regard ever since the attainment of the independence. During the times of Nehru, Indira Gandhi, Rajiv Gandhi and Narsimha Rao, each of them respectively took major foreign policy decisions. While they often consulted the coterie in the policy-making circle, their cabinets remained aloof from any discussions on foreign policy matters. The coalition era in national politics resulted into somewhat increased importance of Cabinet in foreign policy making. Even then, with exception of Prime Ministership of AtalBihari Vajpayee, coalition leaders left it to the wisdom of the Foreign Minister to decide upon foreign policy matters. Thus, Vajpeyee enjoyed considerable autonomy in the Moraraji Desai's cabinet, in which he served as Foreign Minister from 1977-1979. Similarly, Indra Kumar Gujaral single handedly guided India's foreign policy during his tenures as Foreign Minister in V.P. Singh government in 1989-90 and H.D. Deve Gowda government in 1996-97. When I.K. Gujaral succeeded Deve Gowda as Prime Minister of short-lived United Front government, he retained the portfolio of External Affairs with him. In the government of Dr. Manmohan Singh too, the External Affairs Ministers so far have worked quite independently without any pressure from the cabinet or the Prime Minister. However, the Prime Minister exclusively determines India's foreign policy with regard to the United States, China and Pakistan. However, even today, Cabinet's role is neither overwhelming nor decisive in foreign policy making.

Ministry of External Affairs: The Ministry of External affairs plays important role in the formulation and implementation of foreign policy as it provides vital infrastructural base to the External Affairs Minister and the Prime Minister with regard to understanding nitty-gritties of world politics and carrying analysis of potentials for India in the existing or apparent situations. The far flung and highly complex nature of foreign policy making make it important for the Ministry to play key role in country's external relations. The Ministry not only provides all the details and information, but also makes necessary recommendations on the basis of the analysis of the available data.

The Ministry is headed by the External Affairs Minister as political representative and Foreign Secretary as chief of the staff.

He/she is assisted by number of Joint Secretaries, Additional Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries, *Attaches* etc. During the time of Nehru, there was also a post of Secretary-General, who was a senior officer. He headed the foreign office and was responsible for supervision and coordination of the activities of the Ministry and rendered advice to the Prime Minister on policy details. In fact, the Secretary-General was officially described as “the Principal official advisor to the Minister on the matters relating to foreign policy.” It should be noted that Nehru retained the External Affairs Ministry with him through most of his tenure. Therefore, he needed active council of such a competent person on regular basis. This post was abolished in the year 1964, when the then Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri appointed Swarn Singh as full time Minister of External Affairs in his cabinet.

In addition to normal hierarchical structure, several other institutions also exist in the Ministry of External Affairs that exercise considerable influence in foreign policy making. They are; Historical Division, Policy Planning and Review Division, Policy Advisory Committee which is successor of Policy Planning Committee etc. In Rajiv Gandhi’s premiership, members of I.F.S. began to play more active role in foreign policy formulation, with due encouragement from the Prime Minister. The national Democratic Alliance government of Atal Bihari Vajpeyee created the post of National Security Advisor, who provides vital inputs to External Affairs Ministry. However, NSA’s role is not limited to this lone ministry, but is overlapping with other ministries, particularly the Defense and Home Ministry.

It is clear from this analysis that sufficient attention has not been provided to the institutionalization and planning of foreign policy. However, in the changed context, wherein international relations has undergone a sea-change and become more complex and multi-dimensional, it is need of the time to create adequate institutional backing along scientific lines in foreign policy domain, so that the national interest can be best protected.

Check your progress

1. Discuss the role of leadership, pressure groups and public opinion in foreign policy making.
2. Discuss the role of Cabinet, Parliament and External Affairs in prioritizing foreign policy agenda.

2.3 LET US SUM UP

For a long time, India's foreign policy was a prerogative area for political elites, particularly of the ruling party leadership. In recent time, pressure groups have begun to exert influence on foreign policy agenda, specially on trade and business issues. The public opinion in India is very volatile on issues of national security, particularly since the 1962 India-China War. However, executive enjoys liberty in conducting a foreign policy in normal times as people are not much concerned about it. On the other hand, role of Parliament is neither clearly defined in the Constitution or *Statue Books* nor has it evolved substantially in last 65 years. As a result, foreign policy agenda figures in Parliament only when there is outcry of public opinion, thus Parliament acts as a mirror image of people's opinion. Even though, Cabinet is increasingly getting involved in external affairs issues, the Foreign Ministry needs to evolve proper channels with regular interactions to bring in more cohesion in India's External Policy.

2.4 UNIT END QUESTIONS

1. What are the institutions that are responsible for foreign policy making in India?
2. Discuss the complex interaction of government institutions and non-governmental factors in shaping the foreign policy in India.

2.5 REFERENCE

- Bandyopadhyaya, J, *The Making of India's Foreign Policy*, Allied Publishers PvtLmd, 2003, New Delhi
- Bandyopadhyaya, J, *North Over South: A Non-Western Perspective of International Relations*, South Asians, 1982, New Delhi
- Brecher, Miachel, *India and World Politics: Krishna Menon's View of the World*, OUP, 1968, London
- Chandra, Bipin and others, *India Since Independence*, Penguin Books, 2007, New Delhi
- Dixit, J.N., *My South Block Years: Memoirs of a Foreign Secretary*, WBSPD, 1996, New Delhi
- Jain, P.C., *Economic Determinants of India's Foreign Policy: Nehru Years*, Vitasta Publishing, 2012, New Delhi
- Mathai, M.O., *Reminiscences of the Nehru Age*, Vikas Publications, 1978, New Delhi

- Mattoo, Amitabh and Happymon Jacob, Shaping India's Foreign Policy, Har-Anand Publications, 2010
- Mishra, K. P. (ed), Studies in India's Foreign Policy, Vikas Publications, 1969, New Delhi
- Mukherjee, Amitaava and J. Bandyopadhyaya, International relations Theory: From Anarchy to World Government, Manuscript India, 2001, Howrah
- Nehru, Jawaharlal, India's Foreign Policy, Publications Divisions, 1962, New Delhi
- Panandikar, V. A. Pai and Ajay K Sharma, The Indian Cabinet: A Study in Government, Konark, 1996, New Delhi



EVOLUTION OF INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Unit Structure :

- 3.0 Objective
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Objectives of India's Foreign Policy
- 3.3 Framework of India's Foreign Policy
- 3.4 Foreign Policy in 21st Century
- 3.5 Let us sum up
- 3.6 Unit end questions
- 3.7 Reference

3.0 OBJECTIVE

India's foreign policy has been subject to various pulls and pushes since its inception. In this chapter, we will study the orientation of India's foreign policy, which was a product of the long drawn freedom struggle and Indian leadership's interaction with the outside world during that period. This chapter analyses the goals of the foreign policy and policy instruments adopted to achieve those goals. We will also discuss the new orientation of foreign policy in post-Cold War era and elements of continuity and change thereof.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In the first half of the 20th century, India was acting as a quasi-International entity under the British rule. During the First World War, Government of Britain made it a point to hold regular consultations with India and other dominions on matters related to defense and foreign affairs to ensure effective conduct of War. Since national leadership felt betrayed at the end of the World War for not receiving concrete assurance about self-rule, to placate them, Britain encouraged India's participation in war conferences in 1917-18. There began India's official engagements with other countries and international organizations. Thus, India was party to the Paris Peace Conference and signatory to the *Treaty of*

Versailles that brought the First World War to a close. India was also admitted as the original member of the *League of Nations* that was established in the aftermath of the War. Similarly, India became member of International Labour Organization and Permanent Court of International Justice. India's participation in such international forums was not symbolic but it was substantial. India played active roles in drafting of several important international conventions, for example, Opium Convention, Convention on Traffic of Women and Children, Slavery Convention, etc. After the Second World War, India became party to the San Francisco Conference and an original signatory to the Charter of the United Nations. India also took up issues of discriminatory policies towards Indians being followed up in many of the dominions of British empires. India established trade relations with many countries in pre-independence period, while remaining closely entangled with the trade practices in the British Empire. In 1931, India and Britain signed Trade Agreement at Ottawa to grant preferential tariff rates to each other. Thus, India gained substantial experience of international diplomacy in its pre-independence days, which proved helpful in quickly establishing relations with most of the countries on the globe.

During this period, India's nationalist leadership articulated national movement's position on various international issues. It came down heavily on European powers for dragging the world into second Great War in less than three decades time. Similarly, it expressed strong opposition to Britain's expansionist policies in India's neighbourhood, e.g. in Tibet, Afghanistan and Persia. Thus, basic tenets of India's foreign policy took shape during pre-independence period and the freedom struggle provided coherent vision to it. A resolution at Haripura Congress in 1938, i.e. on the eve of the outbreak of Second World War, precisely described India's objective in international politics. The resolution said, "The people of India desire to live in peace and friendship with their neighbours and with all other countries and for this purpose wish to resolve all causes of conflict between them.... In order, therefore, to establish world peace on enduring basis, imperialism and exploitation of one people by another must end." Thus, India showed readiness to burden the efforts to attain perpetual understanding, peace and co-operation among people of all nations. On 2nd September, 1946, i.e. after assumption of reigns of Provisional Government, Pandit Nehru made a categorical statement with regard to India's foreign policy. He said, "We hope to develop close and direct contacts with other nations and to co-operate with them in the furtherance of world peace and freedom. We propose, as far as possible, to keep away from the power politics of groups, aligned against one another, which have led in the past to World Wars and which may again lead to distress on an even vaster scale. We believe that..... denial of freedom anywhere

must endanger freedom elsewhere and lead to conflict and war. We are particularly interested in the emancipation of colonial and dependent countries and the peoples and the recognition in theory and practice of equal opportunities for all races.....We seek no domination over others and we claim no privileged position over other peoples. But we do claim equal and honourable treatment for our people wherever they may go, and we cannot accept any discrimination against them.” Nehru also displayed optimism when he said, “The world, in spite of its rivalries and hatred and inner-conflicts, moves inevitably towards closer co-operation and building up of a world commonwealth. It is for this One World that free India will work, a world in which there is the free co-operation of free peoples and no group or class exploits another.” Inherent in Nehru’s thinking was the understanding that India needed world peace for its economic development and it could contribute positively to build the peaceful international relations among all nations.

3.2 OBJECTIVES OF INDIA’S FOREIGN POLICY

The dominating ideology of India’s freedom struggle undoubtedly got reflected in its post-independence foreign policy. While formulating India’s foreign policy, the policy makers put the national interest at the core of it, along with the strategy to carve out an independent role for it in world politics. Accordingly, following objectives attained most important positions in its foreign policy:

1. **Preservation of Sovereignty and Independence:** At the time of India’s independence, world was divided into two hostile camps; a socialist block led by the USSR and a capitalist group led by the USA. The ideological rivalry between them had brought the world on the brink of the Third World War with the possibility of devastating consequences for the human race. Each block was cemented with military alliances among its member countries. What was of independent India’s concern was their rivalry in fetching newly free countries in their respective military alliances. This gave birth to what is now popularly referred as Cold War between the two superpowers where in both sides fought each other with all other means but the actual direct war. Free India wanted to preserve its hard own sovereignty and autonomy in decision making under such difficult international conditions prevailing at that time. Indian leadership was more than convinced that such a country of vast geographical proportion, huge population, rich talents and ancient living civilization had been destined to play a major role in world affairs. However, this role can be performed only by maintaining its independent voice in international relations. Also, developmental needs of newly free country demanded

preservation and promotion of peaceful international environment, which was threatened by the two rival factions in world politics. This understanding formed the crux of decision-making in the realm of formulating and navigating India's foreign policy in the post-independence years.

2. **National Development:** At the time of independence, India was underdeveloped in industrial production, while its agriculture was based on backward means. Vast number of its people had been lingering in perpetual poverty accompanied by ill-health and illiteracy. Therefore, the foremost task before the policy-makers was to ensure rapid development of industry and agriculture, which would result into reduction of poverty and increase in living standards of the masses. In this context, national development acquired prime position in its pursuit of relations with other countries. India was not only in the need of industrial products but sought the technology itself to produce them at home. Similarly, import of food grain was immediate need to feed the hungry stomachs, but vast increase in food production was planned and eventually implemented. Foreign policy was accordingly tailored to meet these needs and goals in the short and long terms.

India benefited from its relations with both the Superpowers as well as with European countries and Commonwealth nations. The food-grain imports from both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. eased the scarcity at home, while the U.S. and European countries helped India to usher into Green Revolution. The Soviet willingness to cooperate in building up industrial base ensured growth of Public Sector Units that formed the backbone of industrial development in India. Similarly, India consciously continued its membership of Commonwealth, which represented a group of nations under the British control. Since India's most of the trade in its pre-independence period occurred among Commonwealth countries, even on preferential basis, India's ejection from the group would have hurt its trade interests and ultimately the national development. As a result, India decided to remain the Commonwealth member even when it became sovereign and independent.

3. **Protection of Interests of People of Indian Origin Abroad:** India's foreign policy devotes much of its attention to protect interests of Indians settled abroad. During the 19th century, many Indians settled in various countries of Africa, Asia and Asia-Pacific region. They made valuable contributions in development of economy and modern society in those countries. However, in few such countries, they became victims of discrimination and government apathy. Indian government consistently attempted to protect their interests and rights, and

accordingly have been taking up such matters with the concerned government and in international forums if necessary. In 20th Century and onwards, many Indians settled in Western countries, Gulf countries and South-East Asian countries to pursue their education or career in respective fields, wherein they have become important part of those countries' economy in short span of time. Indian government takes up matters of any type of discrimination or violence against Similarly; Indian traders have been visiting several countries for business purpose, including not so friendly countries like China and Pakistan. It is an important aim of India's foreign policy to ensure safety and protection of their rights in those countries.

4. **Decolonization of Asia and Africa:** India had witnessed the misery and humiliation due to colonial rule for about two centuries. Therefore, it was natural for the Indian people to stand in solidarity with the nations that had been struggling to become free from the clutches of colonial powers. Indian foreign policy vociferously articulated this position and played active role in promoting decolonization of African and Asian nations. India realized that end to hegemony of few powers had become a pre-condition to world peace and development of all the people. The decolonization was a major step in that direction. Moreover, India was victim of colonization even after attaining independence as people in Goa continued to suffer under Portugal rule. India's plea for ending Portuguese rule in Goa felt on the deaf ears of western powers, who stood in support of Portugal. Ultimately, India responded to people's movement in Goa against the Portugal rule by sending in Police forces to get rid of colonial control. India's role in supporting and mobilizing world opinion in favour of independence of Indonesia, Vietnam, Congo, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco etc was commendable, even though it invited wrath of colonial powers. In the same spirit, India supported Palestine's struggle for statehood. In 1971, India militarily intervened in liberation of East Pakistan, which had waged a heroic battle against military rule of Pakistan against the wishes of their people.
5. **End to Racialism:** Racialism not only suppressed the rights of many people in the world but also threatened the world peace at large. Anti-Semitism in Europe, absence of civil rights to Afro-Americans in the U.S., apartheid in South Africa and suppression of Palestine's freedom etc. resulted in denial of basic human rights to vast number of people due to their color, race, belief or religion. People of Indian origin were also victim of racial policies in South Africa and many other dominions in African continent. Also, one of the major reasons of Second World War was racist outlook of Hitler's Nazism and Mussolini's Fascism. These were reasons enough for India to adopt

staunch anti-racial stand in world politics. Nehru clearly stated India's position in following words: "We repudiate utterly the Nazi doctrine of racialism wheresoever and in whatsoever form it may be practiced. We seek no domination over others and we claim no privileged position over other people. But we do claim equality and honourable treatment of our people wherever they may go and we cannot accept any discrimination." On 22nd March, 1949, Nehru told the Indian Councils in his speech that *if racial discrimination was to continue in the world, there was bound to be conflicts on a big scale because it is a continuous challenge to the self-respect of vast number of people in the world and they will not put up with it....And that conflict will not be confined to particular areas in South Africa or elsewhere; it will affect people in vast continents.* Accordingly, India highlighted the racial discriminations at international level. It had severely condemned The White regime in South Africa and initiated international sanctions against it by mobilizing world opinion in the United Nations. India also condemned racist policies in Rhodesia and expressed its solidarity with the civil rights movement in America.

Check your progress

1. Discuss major objectives of India's foreign policy
2. Discuss the international situation that shaped India's foreign policy in post-Independence period.

3.3 FRAMEWORK OF INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

In order to achieve the above stated objectives, Indian leadership formulated certain basic principles on which the framework of India's foreign policy was constructed. These could be termed as methods or means of India's foreign policy to achieve the stated ends. India's first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, was the chief architect of this framework, which was an amalgamation of India's principles and concrete realities in international arena.

1. **Panch-Sheel:** Jawaharlal Nehru recognized that sovereignty of nation-state is supreme in international arena and peace and

conflict revolved around it. In order to protect the sovereignty of each nation, all the nations need to acknowledge and respect each other's sovereign rights. India emphasized that sovereignty can't differ from nation to nation and every state in the world enjoys equal amount of sovereign rights with regard to its people, territory, institutions and decision-making processes. If these were acknowledged and not violated by each nation, hardly there would be international conflicts and threat to world peace. This could be observed by all the nations by following Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence, which were enthusiastically upheld and promoted by Nehru as *PanchSheel*. In Nehru's words, "I imagine that if these principles were adopted in the relation of various countries with each other, a great deal of the trouble of the present day world would probably disappear." In 1954, these principles were enunciated in bilateral agreement between India and People's Republic of China. They are:

- i. Mutual respect for each-other's territorial integrity and sovereignty;
- ii. Mutual non-aggression;
- iii. Mutual non-interference in each-other's internal affairs;
- iv. Equality and mutual benefit; and
- v. Peaceful co-existence.

The fifth principle in it, i.e. the Peaceful Co-existence was drafted keeping in view the then existing world situation, wherein the opposite camps of socialism and capitalism vowed to finish off each-other. Nehru propagated that nations based on different ideologies could co-exist and prosper if they follow the first four principles of *Panch Sheel* and believed in the fifth one. In 1956, Soviet leader Khrushchev famously announced Peaceful Co-existence as U.S.S.R.'s desired policy and the détente between the two superpowers in 1970s further demonstrated utility of this principle.

2. Non-alignment: Non-alignment has been the central pillar of India's foreign policy, which served its objectives and goals in international arena. Nehru realized that India was destined to aspire for its rightful voice in world affairs given its great civilization and gigantic geography in one of the prime regions of the world. Also, the recent hard-won freedom from colonial rule would be meaningless if India did not establish an independent voice among comity of nations. Thus, independent foreign policy was more of an imperative than a compulsion or a choice. Nehru's understanding was that India and other poor countries of Asia and Africa would not gain anything but lose out miserably by joining either of the military blocks of that time. According to him, instead of focusing on fight against poverty,

illiteracy and diseases, they would end up being used as pawns in the war of no relevance to them. India's interests was in expanding 'area of peace' and not of war or conflicts. Therefore, India neither joined any of the military pacts of capitalist countries, such as SEATO, CENTO, Baghdad Pact or Manila Treaty; nor the Warsaw Pact of the socialist block. India provided leadership to newly independent Asian and African nations in denying joining any of the military blocks that would have been tantamount to compromising their sovereignty. Nehru proclaimed, "We propose, as far as possible, to keep away from the power politics of groups, aligned against one another, which have led in the past to World Wars and which may again lead to disasters on a very large scale."

However, non-alignment was not merely staying away from the military blocks or ideological camps, but it was the freedom to decide each issue on its merits, to weigh what was right or wrong and then take a stand in favour of the right. To quote Nehru, "So far all these evil forces of fascism, colonialism and racialism or the nuclear bomb and aggression and suppression are concerned, we stand most emphatically and unequivocally committed against them We are unaligned only in relation to the cold war with its military pacts. We object to all this business of forcing new nations of Africa and Asia into their cold war machine. Otherwise, we are free to condemn any development which we consider wrong or harmful to the world or ourselves and we use that freedom every time the occasion arises." Nehru further explained, "..... where freedom is menaced or justice is threatened or where aggression takes place, we can not and shall not be neutral..... Our policy is not neutralist, but one of active endeavor to preserve and, if possible, establish peace on firm foundation." Thus, non-alignment was not a policy of isolation or inaction. In fact, it was a positive policy designed to promote national sovereignty and international peace.

There had been concrete instances where India adopted positions according to the merit of the concerned issue. For example, in recognizing West Germany and voting in the UN to declare North Korea as invader at the start of the Korean War, India looked like siding with the capitalist block. However, during the same period, India recognized the Communist government in China and disapproved the American-led counter-assault on North Korean territories. Also, it stood in solidarity with freedom struggles in various Afro-Asian countries and severely criticized colonial powers for their oppressive rules. In such instances, it shared positions with the Soviet Block. Thus, on each occasion, India took a stand against those threatening international peace and dishonoring people's wishes. The USSR was quick to shed its biases against India and comprehended its genuine positions

based on principles of non-alignment. The Western powers took it a long to understand genuineness of India's non-alignment policy. Nonetheless, India continued to develop relations with all the major powers and countries in both the camps. This has paved dividends in terms of receiving aid, military equipment and technological know-how from both the blocks. For example, India received all the technical assistance from the USSR in setting up its first steel plant at Bhilai, which was followed by German and British assistance respectively to set up next two Steel Plants. In arms purchases for its national security needs, India had spread its net wide open. Even though the USSR became India's single largest defense equipment supplier by mid-1960s, it also purchased substantial arms from UK, US and France. While India received the USSR backing in the UN Security Council on Kashmir issue, the US had supported it in its endeavor to usher in the Green Revolution to solve the food crisis in the country. Thus, suspicion about India's international positions eventually gave way to co-operation and friendship with countries from both sides of the divide.

The grand success of India's non-alignment could be measured from the fact that majority of the poor and developing countries from all parts of the world adopted the similar policy and all of them joined hands to constitute the Non-Aligned Movement against the hegemony of both the ideological blocks during the Cold War period. In 1961 in Belgrade, Nehru stood in unison with Egypt's Nasser and Yugoslavia's Tito to provide leadership to non-aligned countries in the world.

3. Promotion of International Understanding and World Peace:

Based on principles of *PanchSheel* and Non-alignment, India consistently emphasized on settlement of international disputes through dialogue and negotiations. India also laid great emphasize on purity of means. It had maintained that the means for the attainment of national interest must be pious. In order to promote international understanding and peace, Nehru had repeatedly spoke about futility of war and warned of ultimate disasters if Third World War would broke out. Even though such emphasize did not always result in success, it had certainly helped in reducing international tensions. Nehru realized that arms race, including deployment of nuclear weapons, would result in increased suspicions and mistrust among the nations. Also, the expenditure on arms would make the governments deprived of sufficient money required for upliftment of people from poverty. Therefore, India campaigned for disarmament in general and de-nuclearization in particular. At the same time, India maintained that onus of de-nuclearization rested on the shoulders of big powers, who must sacrifice their nuclear

weapons for the sake of world peace and future of human race. On this ground, India refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), terming it as exclusionary and discriminatory.

As a chief proponent of international dialogues and co-operation, India had extended full support to the system of United Nations. It had not only raised pertinent issues concerning international peace and freedom of the people in the United Nations, but also actively contributed military as well as other personnel for implementing decisions of the world body. India played remarkable role in resolving the Korean and India-China conflicts through the platforms of the United Nations. Similarly, it played commendable role in many other UN missions to restore peace and order in different parts of the world, such as in Lebanon, Gaza, Congo, Cambodia and in recent times in Bosnia-Herzegovina etc. India's contribution had resulted in strengthening the United Nations system in mediating and resolving the international conflicts. India has also been actively participating in various programs launched by the UN agencies such as ILO, UNICEF, UNESCO, FAO etc. India's approach has been to make the UN more effective instrument in preventing armed conflicts and ensuring international security. This could be ensured by participation and accountability of maximum number of states in the UN system, for which India has been consistently demanding further democratization of the world body including expansion of its Security Council.

4. **Indo-Soviet Friendship:** India's friendly relation with one of the super powers of the Cold War period, i.e. the USSR, was a result of multiple factors. The then Indian leadership was greatly influenced by the planning method of Soviet economy. Nehru made the Planning Commission central to India's economic decision making and adhered to the mixed economy with emphasis on creation of large scale public sector units. The USSR readily helped India in technical and technological terms in its industrial endeavors without any conditions. This was in sharp contrast with developed western countries whose reluctance was more than evident. Also, the USSR echoed India's zealous campaign for de-colonization and against racism, which resulted into creation of common global goals for both the countries. Further, a complexity of world politics; wherein western countries did not support India on Kashmir issue, Pakistan was lured into anti-Soviet military tactics, China became hostile to India and drift occurred in Sino-Soviet relations; led both the countries to forge friendly ties with each other. Realizing the necessity and potential of friendship with the USSR, the then Prime Minister of India, Indira Gandhi signed a 20-Years' Bilateral Treaty of Friendship, Peace and

Cooperation with the Soviet Union in 1971. This treaty helped India in strengthening its regional as well as world position without compromising its sovereignty. India steadfastly remained committed to policy of non-alignment and did not participate in or support any of the military campaigns of the USSR. India resisted pressures as well as temptations of supporting the Soviet Union when its military entered Afghanistan, even though India's arch-rival Pakistan was used as a frontline state by the US to counter Soviet presence in Afghanistan. On the other hand, India received consistent support from the USSR in the UN on Kashmir issue, along with technological and scientific exchanges. This treaty played a significant role during Bangla Desh Liberation War. The US wanted to help Pakistan at that time, but refrained from doing so as the USSR showed readiness to provide all kind of support to India. Thus, friendship with the Soviet Union was important frame of India's foreign policy doctrine.

- 5. Promotion of Regional Cooperation:** India seeks friendly ties with all its neighbours and co-operations among all the countries in South Asia. Therefore, SAARC receives big support from Indian establishment, which sees as a tool to promote regional trade, business and people to people exchanges. Since South Asia, which is nothing but an Indian subcontinent in geographical term, faces more or less similar problems in all of its countries; such as poverty, illiteracy, malnutrition, ill-health and gender disparity etc., India advocates joint efforts to get rid of these 20th century problems. However, rivalry between India and Pakistan along with suspicion of some of India's small-size neighbours about New Delhi's intentions, have prevented the intended progress of SAARC. India works overtime to make sure that bilateral problems do not become obstacle in the progress of SAARC. Apart from SAARC, India is seeking active cooperation with Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) as well as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and African Union (AU).

Check your progress

1. Discuss the prominent principles of India's foreign policy.
2. 'India pursues foreign policy of peace and development.' Justify this statement.

3.4 FOREIGN POLICY IN 21ST CENTURY

The post-Cold War situation has thrown up many new challenges for the Indian foreign policy. India is engaging with all other responsible nations to face new challenges. However, Indian foreign policy's framework of cooperation remains more or less same in this post-Cold War era. India remains committed to the policy of non-alignment, as its basic goal has been to defend country's independence and sovereignty and to prevent world politics on the terms of military alliances. Since India's basic policy of opposing hegemony in world politics and entering into military alliances against other countries has not changed, the non-alignment is still relevant for its foreign policy. Failure of Big-5, i.e. nuclearised states, to come up with effective and time bound measures for nuclear disarmament compelled India to opt for nuclearization taking into account its long term security challenges. However, India plays a responsible role as a nuclear weapon state as it has announced its 'No-First Use' policy along with demand for comprehensive and universal disarmament measures. India advocates nuclear confidence building measures with Pakistan and China to avoid nuclear mishap, and thus engages these countries in constructive dialogues. India extended hand of friendship towards the United States, European Union and Israel to balance its foreign policy in post-Cold War era and to make it resonate with its domestic economic policy. It has also expedited efforts to reach out to South East Asian, African and Latin American nations to fill the vacuum occurred due to demise of the mighty Soviet Union. India has opposed continuation of uni-polar world and joined hands with Russia, Brazil, China and South Africa to ensure emergence of multi-polar world. The BRICS and G-20 have become important tools of India's foreign policy in the new era, even though it has not abandoned time tested platforms of NAM and the United Nations. India is advocating reforms in the United Nations and IMF-World bank structures to make it more democratic and reflective of today's international politics. India seeks to address new challenges of terrorism and global warming in cooperation with all the countries and hence whole-heartedly participating in all the international deliberations on this issue. Ultimate goal of India's foreign policy to defend its independent and sovereignty, to seek friendly relations with all the countries and to promote peaceful just international order remain the same over last 60 years.

Check your progress

1. Discuss the post-1990 change in International situation.
2. Discuss India's priorities in the foreign policy in 21st century.

3.5 LET US SUM UP

Founding fathers of independent India also laid down solid framework of nations' foreign policy. The framework is based on principles of *Panch-Sheel*, Non-alignment, and promotion of World peace, Indo-Soviet friendship and regional cooperation. These principles helped India in protecting its national interests and borders, ensuring its economic development, protecting interests of people of Indian origins abroad, de-colonization of Asia and Africa, and to end the racialism. Thus, India not only promoted its own interests but also attempted to shape the world according to its ideology and principles. The structural changes in world politics after the end of *Cold War* forced India to adjust to new realities. Even then, basic framework of its foreign policy remained more or less the same.

3.6 UNIT END QUESTIONS

1. Discuss Jawaharlal Nehru's impact on India's foreign policy.
2. Discuss India's contribution to evolution of just and equal world order.
3. Discuss the change and continuity in India's foreign policy post-1991.

3.7 REFERENCE

- Chandra, Bipin and others, *India Since Independence*, Penguin Books, 2007, New Delhi
- Dixit, J. N., *India's Foreign Policy*, Picus Books, 2003, New Delhi
- Dutt, V. P., *India's Foreign Policy Since Independence*, National Book Trust, 2011, New Delhi

- Dutt, V. P., India's Foreign Policy in a Changing World, Vikas Publishing House, 1999, New Delhi
- Ganguli, Sumit, India's Foreign Policy, OUP, 2011
- Khanna, V. N., Foreign Policy of India, Vikas Publishing Pvt Ltd, 2010, New Delhi
- Pande, B. N. (ed) , A Centenary History of the Indian National Congress, 1990, New Delhi
- Raja Mohan, C, Crossing the Rubicon: The Shaping of India's New Foreign Policy, Penguin Books India, 2006
- Sisodia, N. S., and C UdayBhaskar, Emerging India: Security and Foreign Policy Perspectives, Bibliophile South Asia, 2005



INDIA AND SOUTH ASIA

Unit Structure :

- 4.0 Objective
- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 South Asia
- 4.3 India and South Asia
- 4.4 The Initiation of SAARC
- 4.5 SAARC : A mechanism for cooperation
- 4.6 SAARC - In Action
- 4.7 Achievements of SAARC
- 4.8 Let us sum up
- 4.9 Unit end questions
- 4.10 Further Reading

4.0 OBJECTIVE

- To give holistic picture of South Asian region
- To understand the complex nature of relations among South Asian countries
- To inculcate knowledge about SAARC as a regional organisation
- To create awareness about working and achievements of the SAARC
- To analyse the role of India in the South Asian context

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with the subcontinent called South Asia, which forms a part of larger continent of Asia. The chapter highlights the characteristics of the countries of South Asia, their bilateral relations and joint collaborative efforts, the areas of tensions and internal & external compulsions in the region, status of the South Asian countries in the world politics. Further the chapter explains the role of main actors in the region focusing on the areas of conflict and mechanism to resolve them. Lastly, the role of

SAARC is analysed with special emphasis on India as the leading country of the region. This chapter will enable you to understand the politics of South Asian countries and analyse the complex relations among them.

4.2 SOUTH ASIA

This region is the part of the Asian continent which comprises eight countries - Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. Geographically, South Asia forms a contiguous zone and almost a single land mass. It is situated just above the equator between 0° to 38° North and 61° to 93° West. The region is surrounded by the Himalayan ranges in the North and Indian Ocean on other three sides. The region forms a single eco-system, as well as, comes under one climatic zone. The geographical features have determined the structure of soil, nature of forests, nature of vegetation & agriculture and the life-style of the people. The life-style of the people of the region reflects diverse social features like race, ethnicity, religion, language, methods of dress, social norms and so on. But in spite of these diversities there is a common cultural thread running through, which is reflected in the composite and holistic outlook and philosophy of life of the people. This outlook is the outcome of thousand years' of exchange of ideas, mental churning and creative experiments and thus acts as a major binding force in the region today. The South Asian countries have common historical experience of colonial rule and freedom movements. Geographical and economic features have made these countries interdependent and complimentary. Economically, these countries are categorised as developing countries and have been the victims of global economic upheavals and political power-plays. The common sufferings and basic problems have further given a common platform to these countries.

4.3 INDIA AND SOUTH ASIA

India is the biggest country of South Asia in every respect - its area, population, economy, military capability, technological advancement and political & administrative establishment. The socio-cultural features of South Asia also carry glimpses of ancient Indian/ Hindu cultural traits. Till 1947, the Indian sub-continent comprising India, Pakistan and Bangladesh were under the colonial rule and freedom struggle here gave impetus and direction to the same in other parts of South Asia. After the collapse of colonial rule, independent India was looked upon as the regional giant and feared by the neighbours. India is centrally located country and boundaries of Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan & Afghanistan directly touch India. Historically, the North-western and North-

eastern parts were recognised trade routes with the rest of the world for centuries. The southern peninsula also encouraged sea trade. After the colonial rule tragedies struck the region resulting in bloodshed, political distrust and turmoil. The main cause was partition of the Indian subcontinent into two ideologically and politically distinct countries; India and Pakistan. Further, Bangladesh was also separated from Pakistan with the help of India in 1971. The towering and somewhat un-challenged personality of Nehru was also looked upon with awe in the region. The political distrust adversely affected the traditional trade in the region and prevented any fruitful collaboration in educational, cultural, scientific & technological fields. The leaders in South Asia also looked upon outside the region to enhance one's global image, forge cooperation through groupings and extract greater benefits. The South Asian politics was thus embroiled into the cold war politics and presented a diverse, heterogeneous and volatile picture. This can be understood better by studying the bilateral relations of India with her main neighbours as under.

(a) INDIA-PAKISTAN :

These two countries were carved out in 1947 after the colonial rulers left the continent. But the creation was not smooth. Seeds of communal feelings based on 'Two-Nation Theory' were sown during the colonial rule which flared up hatred and led to clashes between Hindus and Muslims when the time came for actual demarcation of boundaries and transfer of properties. India began a new era with a democratic constitution, federal government and parliamentary institutions based on fundamental rights and secularism. Pakistan adopted a Presidential form based on Islamic laws, but soon was taken over by the military. Since then it has been reeling under political instability due to power struggle between civilian elites and military elites. Hate-India Syndrome has been a tool of survival for any ruler in Pakistan. Also, since birth Pakistan has constantly harboured a feeling that India has not willingly accepted its creation and may retaliate anytime. This compelled Pakistan to move closer to the Arab world and superpowers. It also created a bogey of demand for Kashmir from India under the pretext that it is a muslim-majority part. Pakistan became member of SEATO and CENTO and also hobnobbed with the US to gain financial and military assistance. In 1948, it tried to annex Kashmir with the help of some mercenaries. Pakistan failed but India also lost some of its territory due to wrong strategies and till date Kashmir has remained a major irritant between the two countries. Pakistan again ventured another military attack in 1965, but had to retreat against India's military power. In 1971, It received a humiliating defeat, both militarily and politically, when India liberated Bangladesh. This decisive victory and further successful atomic explosion in 1974 boosted India's global prestige and

enhanced her clout as a mature, seasoned and responsible global power. This prompted a shift in Pakistan's India-policy, the architect of which was Gen. Zia. Realizing that direct and overt confrontation with India is not going to succeed, Pakistan encouraged a proxy war against India with the help of terrorists, Islamic jihadis and its own secret service. The strategy was to infiltrate terrorists into Indian territory, brainwash & train jihadis in India and mastermind bomb-attacks on sensitive establishments and public places. The intension was to destabilise India politically, provoke communal violence, weaken India's social fabric and disintegrate India. This indirect war has been a major challenge for India since 1980s. Indian and US secret agencies have proved with substantial evidence that Pakistani agencies are supporting the terrorist activities. Atomic explosion by India in 1998 and subsequent explosion by Pakistan threw this region into dangerous nuclear race and added to the existing tensions. These events have vitiated the relations between India and Pakistan. But, political realities of the region and global compulsions have led both to carry out constructive cooperation in non-political fields, while official rounds of dialogue continue on contentious issues.

(b) INDIA AND SRI LANKA :

India and Sri Lanka have relations since ancient times when Buddhist monks travelled to the island to spread Buddhism during Emperor Ashoka's period. These bonds were consolidated during British rule when Tamil workers from India were taken to Sri Lanka as workers on tea plantations. Political experiments in India and Sri Lanka have succeeded and both followed complimentary policies at global and regional levels. But a decision to make Sinhalese language as the official language created dissensions amongst Tamils. The clashes between Tamils and Sinhalese resulted in strong reaction in Tamil Nadu in India. There was also problem of citizenship for Tamils of Indian origin. An agreement was signed between India & Sri Lanka in 1964 whereby Sri Lanka agreed to give citizenship to 3 lakh Tamils and India agreed to take back 5.5 lakh Tamils. But still 1.3 lakh Tamils remained stateless. The issue became very serious when Tamils fled to India to save themselves from atrocities of army & people. India, under pressure from Tamils in India, took up the issue with Sri Lankan government, but declared that it will not compromise on the integrity & security of Sri Lanka. The issue became very serious in the 1980s when a hardliner group of Tamils formed Liberation Tigers of Tamil Elam (LTTE) and resorted to armed rebellion against Sri Lanka to carve out a separate Tamil state in the Northern parts of the island. This was an acid test for Indian diplomacy. On the one hand, there was growing sentimental reaction amongst Tamils in India and they pressurised India to intervene in the matter and, on the other hand, India had taken a moral stand true to its principles of foreign policy

that the issue was Sri Lanka's internal matter and she valued Sri Lanka's integrity. In 1986, under a pact between Rajiv Gandhi and Jayewardene, India decided to send a Peace-keeping Force of Indian Army to resolve the issue. It turned out that Indian troops were used to kill Tamils of Indian origin. The move proved to be a blunder. It also aggravated tension between the countries when opposition party came to power in Sri Lanka and India had to withdraw the IPKF. It also cost the life of Rajiv Gandhi, who was assassinated by some Tamil extremists. It also led to the assassination of Sri Lankan President Premadasa. The LTTE continued its agitation with greater vigour throwing the island nation into turmoil. Sri Lanka, however, remained politically stable and firmly dealt with the Tamil insurgency. In 2011, Sri Lankan army successfully eliminated LTTE and its leaders through a meticulously planned and swiftly executed action. Throughout, India also maintained her stand and did not allow any tension to surface in bilateral relations. There were some other irritants in Indo-Lanka relations like; one, permission granted to the US to use Trincomalee in Lanka as its naval base, and second; arrests and killing of Indian fishermen while fishing in the sea. These issues, however, were handled amicably and relations between the two countries remained cordial. In spite of the problematic issues, bilateral cooperation between the two has increased over the years. Bilateral trade witnessed 45% increase. India has granted assistance to Sri Lanka to construct Railway, Hospitals, Schools & Training facilities for police officers.

(c) INDIA AND BANGLADESH :

Relations between India and Bangladesh were set on a different footing. It was only because of India's active support and direct involvement that Bangladesh was carved out of Pakistan in 1971. Initial euphoria and spirit of bonhomie died soon and Bangladesh started suspecting possible economic domination by India. As a result it established close contacts with Nepal and Sri Lanka in the region and with the Arab World, the US, Japan, China, etc. outside the region. Many issues cropped up between the two like; infiltration from the border, migration of Chakma refugees, construction of Farakka barrage and distribution of waters. Bangladesh took a stubborn stand on many issues and opposed construction of barbed wire on the fence and refused to take back refugees. Transfer of Teen Bigha land was also a serious issue which was resolved in 2011. But Bangladesh continues to block transit facility to India to go to North-Eastern parts, called 'Chicken Neck' through Bangladesh territory. India and Bangladesh also claim jurisdiction over the sea waters in the Bay of Bengal. However, both the countries have continued dialogue on these matters. Bangladesh is a least developed country suffering from stark poverty and constant natural calamities further ravaging it.

India wholeheartedly gave all types of aid to it from time to time. Bangladesh, however, could not contain the atrocities on Buddhists & Hindus in that country and also the rise of Islamic fundamentalists who flared up communal tensions from time to time.

(d) INDIA-NEPAL :

Nepal is the Himalayan Kingdom having close and deeply rooted cultural ties with India since ancient time. The ruling monarchs of Nepal are descendants of Rajput Kings from North India. Important Hindu pilgrim centers are located in Nepal. During British period, Indian army had a battalion called Gorkha regiment, which continues even today. After independence, Indian government helped restoration of Monarchy in Nepal, who enjoyed tremendous powers and ruled through a system called 'Partyless Panchayat'. India helped Nepal mainly by granting transit facility to its trade by signing a treaty in 1952. India even managed postal and communication services of Nepal till 1959 and gave assistance to construction of highways and dams. Nepali students receive special scholarship to get higher education in Indian Universities. Major irritant between India and Nepal started after annexation of Tibet by China. This brought Chinese border very close to Nepal. China started wooing Nepali people & leaders by providing military assistance. Particularly Communist Party of Nepal became very active, which resorted to vigorous anti-India campaign and massive agitation was launched to bring democratic political system. A sudden and tragic massacre of Royal family including the King in 2001 turned the tide in favour of anti-India and anti-Monarchy groups. The charisma & aura surrounding the monarchy and popular support for them faded away throwing Nepal into political turmoil. Protest movements spread all over the country. The King was forced to gradually hand over the reins to peoples' representatives. A Constituent Assembly of Nepal was formed in 2007 which abolished Monarchy and declared Nepal a Federal Democratic Republic in 2008. In spite of the success of the popular movement, political stability in Nepal is not ensured mainly because of differences between Nepali Congress and Communist Party of Nepal. India adopted a considered silence during this period, fearing shooting up of anti-India feelings and allegations of interference. Official level dialogue on the issues of border-demarcation, trade modalities and other non-political matters continued. Cross-border migration of people and smuggling of goods, illicit trade of drugs & arms and movement of terrorists etc. have been major issues of concern for India. For Nepal, it wants more liberal approach and magnanimous gestures from India and concession in trade & transit of commodities. Nepal also wants India to stop encroachment of Nepali territory by Indian farmers along the rivers borders.

The above description explains the complex nature of bilateral relation in South Asia. It is mainly 'Indo-centric' and goes against any possibility of organised regional cooperation. All these countries believed in peaceful world, non-alignment, democratic polity, fundamental rights, etc. and they had realisation about their complimentary nature of economies, inter-mixing of cultures, geographical proximities and interdependent trade. Still lack of strong political will and mutual suspicion prevented them from coming together.

Check your progress

1. List the steps taken by respective governments to resolve issues between India and Bangladesh.
2. Narrate recent events in Nepal that have increased India's concern about bilateral ties.

4.4 THE INITIATION OF SAARC

The decade of 70s started with many favourable regional & global developments which gave impetus to the idea of South Asian cooperation. US had initiated a policy for cooperative regional security framework for South Asia. India looked upon it as an opportunity to wean away Pakistan from its western tilt. Pakistan too wanted to use it to enhance her regional prestige. At the same time, new rulers had taken over in India (Janata Party), Pakistan (Gen. Zia), Sri Lanka (Jayewardene) and Bangladesh (Gen. Rehman). They came with new global & regional approaches; new perceptions of each other and, moreover, wanted each others' help to consolidate their position in the region. A strong awareness of need for regional unity, deep realization of interdependence and keen desire to resolve common problems regionally had gripped the people & statesmen of South Asia. India's 'Big Brother' image had faded away and there was growing dissatisfaction about the World organizations and the big powers. The credit goes to Gen Zia-Ur-Rehman of Bangladesh who realized the pulse of the leaders of South Asian leaders and mooted the idea of South Asian Regional Cooperation in 1980. The proposal put up by Bangladesh was adopted by the foreign ministers of seven South Asian

countries in 1983 as the Declaration on South Asian Regional Cooperation (SARC). Later, the Heads of State or Government at their First SAARC Summit held in Dhaka on 7-8 December 1985 adopted the Charter formally establishing the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC). Initially, seven nations of South Asia became members of SAARC and Afghanistan joined as its eighth member in 2005.

Following are objectives enshrined in the SAARC Charter :

- To promote the welfare of the peoples of South Asia and to improve their quality of life;
- To accelerate economic growth, social progress and cultural development in the region and to provide all individuals the opportunity to live in dignity and to realise 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 interests; and
- To cooperate with international and regional organisations with similar aims and purposes.

The SAARC Charter also laid down following Principles of SAARC on which cooperation within the organisation is based :

- Cooperation within the framework of the Association is based on respect for the principles of sovereign equality, territorial integrity, political independence, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and mutual benefit;
- Such cooperation is to complement and not to substitute bilateral or multilateral cooperation;
- Such cooperation should be consistent with bilateral and multilateral obligations of Member States.

The SAARC follows General Provisions of working as under :

- (a) Decisions at all levels in SAARC shall be taken on the basis of unanimity;
- (b) Bilateral and contentious issues shall be excluded from the deliberations of the Association.

These provisions ensure that irrespective of the size or status of development, every member country has equal position and voice in the decision-making process. Unanimity guarantees wholehearted support by all the members in implementing the decision. Exclusion of contentious issues is a prudent and diplomatically wise decision. Because it was intended to bring the countries closer on non-controversial issues, so that it builds trust, creates a congenial atmosphere and forms a solid base for resolving other contentious issues in future. This was also a cautious approach as the leaders did not want the association to die prematurely before testing the fruits of cooperation.

Check your progress

1. Explain the factors that led to the formation of SAARC.
2. What are the objective of SAARC?

4.5 SAARC - A MECHANISM FOR COOPERATION

(A) The Secretariat -

South Asia was the last region of the world to have a regional organisations and following the footsteps of other organisations, SAARC also developed a mechanism for cooperation. First of all SAARC established a Headquarter for itself called the Secretariat in Kathmandu which became operational in 1987. It was headed by a Secretary-General and seven directors, besides other office staff. The Secretariat was depository of all official SAARC documents and its responsibility was to organise all the SAARC events & meetings of all levels, coordinate between all the SAARC committees & agencies, linkup between the governments, supervise the implementation of all SAARC projects & schemes and collect data and records of all the activities.

(B) The Summit -

This is the highest authority in the institutional set up of the Association. It consist of the Heads of State or Government of all member countries, who meet regularly at Summit level. They give final consent to the decisions of the SAARC. Till date 17 SAARC Summits have been held, the last being held at Addu City, the

Maldives, on 10-11 November 2011. Initially, the Summit was to be held every year, but later on it is being held every two years. A convention has been developed to have informal meeting of Heads of State or Government in a free and relaxed atmosphere on the sidelines of the Summit, where discussions can take place on contentious political issues. A Joint Declaration is issued at the end of the Summit, which reviews the progress so far and lays down goals for further actions.

(C) Council of Ministers -

This is the second body comprising the Ministers of Foreign /External Affairs of the Member States. It undertakes: formulation of policies of the Association; review of progress of cooperation under SAARC; decision on new areas of cooperation; establishment of additional mechanism under SAARC, as deemed necessary; and decision on other matters of general interest to SAARC. The Council is mandated to meet twice a year and also to hold its extraordinary session as and when deemed necessary.

(C) The Standing Committee -

The Standing Committee comprising the Foreign Secretaries of Member States is entrusted with the task of overall monitoring and coordination of programmes; the approval of projects and programmes and the modalities of financing; determining inter-sectoral priorities; mobilising regional and external resources; and identifying new areas of cooperation. Standing Committee is mandated to meet as often as necessary and submit its reports to the Council of Ministers.

(D) The Technical Committees-

The core activities of the SAARC were carried out under the Integrated Programme of Action (IPA), consisting of a number of Technical Committees on agreed areas of cooperation. The Technical Committees formulate specialised programmes and prepare projects in their respective fields under the IPA. They are responsible for monitoring the implementation of such activities and submit their reports to the Standing Committee through the Programming Committee. They also work to bring clarity and prevent overlapping of the work. At present following Technical Committees are operational :-

- Technical Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development
- Technical Committee on Health and Population Activities
- Technical Committee on Women, Youth and Children
- Technical Committee on Science and Technology
- Technical Committee on Transport
- Technical Committee on Environment

(E) Programming Committees -

Programming Committees are set up to assist the Standing Committee in matters relating to: Selection of regional projects, including their location, cost-sharing modalities among the Member States, and mobilisation of external resources; Inter-sectoral priority of Work Programme; and Review of the Calendar of Activities. It generally meets preceding the sessions of the Standing Committee. It is also mandated to convene on stand-alone basis to coordinate implementation of the approved SAARC programmes and activities.

(F) Working Groups -

Working Groups (WG) is a special arrangement to formulate and over see programmes and activities within the framework of SAARC to strengthen and promote regional cooperation in their respective areas. The WGs coordinate, monitor and evaluate programmes in this regard. In recommending target-bound programmes and activities, they would also propose mechanisms and sources of finance to implement them. Further, they would also carry out the directives emanating from SAARC higher bodies. Following WGs are in force at present :

- Working Group on Biotechnology
- Working Group on Energy
- Working Group on Information and Communication Technology (ICT)
- Working Group on Tourism

(G) Regional Centers -

The SAARC has developed a unique mechanism of Regional Centers to support the Secretariat. These are established in Member States and managed by Governing Boards comprising representatives from all the Member States, SAARC Secretary-General and the Ministry of Foreign/External Affairs of the Host Government. The Director of the Centre acts as Member Secretary to the Governing Board which reports to the Programming Committee.

- SAARC Agricultural Centre (SAC), Dhaka
- SAARC Meteorological Research Centre (SMRC), Dhaka
- SAARC Tuberculosis Centre (STC), Kathmandu
- SAARC Documentation Centre (SDC), New Delhi
- SAARC Human Resources Development Centre (SHRDC), Islamabad
- SAARC Coastal Zone Management Centre (SCZMC), Maldives
- SAARC Information Centre (SIC), Nepal
- SAARC Energy Centre (SEC), Pakistan
- SAARC Disaster Management Centre (SDMC), India
- SAARC Forestry Centre (SFC), Bhutan
- SAARC Cultural Centre (SCC), Sri Lanka

Check your progress

1. What is the function of Technical Committee in SAARC?
2. Explain the significance of Summit meetings of SAARC.

4.6 SAARC - IN ACTION

Since its formation SAARC has identified some core areas for its activities, which cover social, economic, scientific and cultural agenda of the association :-

1. Agriculture & Rural Development
2. Biotechnology
3. Culture & Sports
4. Education
5. Energy
6. Environment
7. Finance
8. HRD
9. Information, Communication & Media
10. Poverty Alleviation
11. Science & Technology
12. Security & Legal Issues
13. Social Development
14. Tourism & Transport
15. Trade

The above areas cover the basic issues of SAARC countries and extensive cooperation is needed in these areas. These areas are also non-political and non-controversial and hence constructive cooperation in these areas is possible. SAARC has initiated number of activities, projects, schemes under each of the above heads. Many agreements and conventions have also been signed to boost cooperation in various fields :

AGREEMENTS -

- Agreement for establishment of SAARC Arbitration Council
- Agreement on Customs Matters
- Charter of SAARC Development Fund
- Agreement on establishing the SAARC food bank

- Agreement on South Asian Free Trade Area (SAFTA)
- Agreement on the Establishment of South Asian Regional Standards Organisation (SARSO)
- Agreement on Avoidance of Double Taxation

CONVENTIONS -

- Convention on Combating and Prevention of Trafficking in Women and Children for Prostitution
- Convention on Promotion of Welfare of Children
- Convention on Mutual Assistance on Criminal Matters
- Regional Convention on Suppression of Terrorism and Its Additional Protocol
- Convention on Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances

SAARC FUNDS :

Apart from the individual contribution by the member states, SAARC has devised some mechanism to generate funds for its activities.-

(a) The South Asian Development Fund (SADF)

The basic objective of the SADF was to provide finances for industrial development, poverty alleviation, protection of environment and balance of payments support and for the promotion of economic projects in the region. The SADF was formally established in 1996 with the merger of the two existing Funds : the SAARC Fund for Regional Projects (SFRP); and the SAARC Regional Fund (SRF). SADF has three Windows for (i) identification and development of projects; (ii) institutional and human resources development projects; and (iii) social and infrastructural development projects.

(b) The SAARC-Japan Special Fund

The SAARC-Japan Special Fund was established pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding between the two sides in Kathmandu on 27 September 1993. The Fund, established with contributions of the Government of Japan consists of two components. Component-I is to be used to finance selected programmes/activities identified and managed by the Member States. Component-II is for the programmes/activities identified and managed by the Government of Japan. A number of seminars, workshops and training programmes have been held so far under the SAARC-Japan Special Fund covering a variety of projects relating to agriculture and rural development, health related issues, telecommunications, economic issues, science and technology, education, social issues and the role of media.

Check your progress

1. Narrate the progress of SAARC in the field of Poverty Alleviation.
2. How does the SAARC get financial assistance?

4.7 ACHIEVEMENTS OF SAARC

- (A) The greatest achievement of SAARC is that, for the first time, it brought together those nations, who distrust each-other the most; which are politically the most explosive and are at different levels of development. The counteracting forces were prominently controlling the situation, but it was strong desire for collective benefits and acute feeling of coming together that prevailed and SAARC was born.
- (B) SAARC has achieved significant success in economic field and has ventured into vital cooperation in the core sectors of Trade, Commerce, Finance and Money. The most important agreement, SAFTA, has led to abolition of double taxation, free movement of certain commodities across the border and preferential treatment to regional trade than trade outside the region. Most of the member countries have accorded 'Most-Favoured Nation' status to each other under the SAFTA. But Pakistan has not done so in case of India. Still, SAFTA is a positive step to free the regional trade totally and bring about a Economic Union in future. There is extensive collaboration between the stock exchanges and between Chambers of Commerce & Industries.
- (C) SAARC has gained lot of momentum in the fields of Education, Sports, Culture and media. South Asian University has become fully functional and there are scholarships & fellowships for research in various fields. Cultural exchanges are taking place through film festivals, literary seminars, cultural festivals, media programmes and food festivals, etc. Organised tourism of the region is getting boost through VISA exemptions & group tours. Special attention is given to the involvement of Youth through Youth Volunteers Programmes, SAARC Youth Award for constructive contribution and Sports Competitions.

- (D) In the fields of Science & Technology, meaningful & constructive exchanges have taken place in the areas which are relevant to South Asian economy. These include - Solar energy, Bio-fertilizers, Low-cost housing, Prawn Hatcheries, Electronics and Molecular Biology, Bio-Mass Gasification; Recycling of Waste Water and Development of Technologies for Pollution Control, Post Harvest and Food Technology; Renewable Energy Resources; Photovoltaic; Pesticides; Instrumentation, Maintenance and Calibration, Cultivation and Processing of Medicine and Aromatic Plants, Weather Forecasting, Radar Meteorology, Telecommunication and so on.
- (E) SAARC has also ventured into some controversial areas by signing a Convention on Terrorism, Convention on Drug Trafficking and Drug Abuse. These are very serious issues disturbing South Asia. SAARC forum created a positive atmosphere to conclude these important treaties.
- (F) Health & Population studies have also benefitted through SAARC. Intensive research and exchanges have taken place regarding children, population welfare and policy, maternal and child health, primary health care, disabled and handicapped persons, control and eradication of major diseases in the region such as malaria, leprosy, tuberculosis, diarrhea diseases, rabies, AIDS, and iodine deficiency disorder. Special attention is being given to Women and Girl Child and problem of feticide.
- (G) Agriculture & Rural Development have received maximum attention from SAARC as it is the backbone of South Asian economy. Seminars and training courses covering practically all aspects of rural development including regional planning, poverty focused development, rural energy, design of agricultural projects, local level planning, inter-country comparisons, appropriate technology, disaster management, rural child development, rural sociology, peoples participation, rural water supply, employment generation, social forestry, rural communication and development of agricultural markets have been conducted so far. Most important SAARC has created a data base that will be useful to all the members.
- (H) SAARC has spread its wings outside the region also and established collaboration with UNCTAD, UNICEF, UNDP, APT, UNDPC, ITU, ESCAP and countries like Japan, Germany. Observer status has been given to Australia, Iran, Mauritius, Myanmar, US, South Korea. This has enabled SAARC to negotiate jointly for region-specific schemes. This has also boosted global status of the countries.

INDIA & SAARC :

India is aware of its central position in SAARC and that any wrong move on its part might affect the progress of SAARC. So initially India adopted a cautious approach and let the smaller countries accept and digest the idea of SAARC. It is in India's interest that her neighbours cooperate for joint benefits than individually suffer due to political mistrust. India has taken soft or magnanimous stand on various occasions for the sake of SAARC. Indo-Pak relations has been the greatest stumbling block, but it has not let it affect SAARC. Since birth SAARC has progressed steadily and cautiously. It has neither achieved very substantial success nor failed miserably. There are hindrances which haunt SAARC. But member nations are conscious of the greater benefits of joint endeavours and know that they can survive together or perish separately. So SAARC will function like a toddler till political atmosphere is cleared of all suspicions and mistrust.

Check your progress

1. Explain SAARC relations with international agencies.
2. Point out the main features of SAARC Convention on Terrorism.

4.8 LET US SUM UP

First SAARC took many years to take birth and later also it has taken lot of time to take firm roots. In spite of best of intensions the progress of SAARC has been very slow. It has achieved some progress in non-political and non-controversial areas. But political and contentious issues still create obstacles in its progress. The political relation in South Asia is entwined with its history, its geography, its economy and culture. Their deep-rooted and basic economic problems have brought them together, but mutual distrust and suspicion keep them away from each other. The success of SAARC will depend on the nature of politics that takes shape in each country. It is also observed that SAARC has become slave of Indo-Pak relations. These two regional giants can make or break SAARC. It is time for SAARC to intensify cooperation in core economic areas. As a method SAARC has started on a sound footing and now it is upto the leaders to sustain the organisation.

4.9 UNIT-END QUESTIONS

1. Explain the commonalities in South Asia that led to the formation of SAARC.
2. Discuss the objectives of SAARC.
3. Why SAARC has kept political issues out of its purview?
4. Discuss the significance of Integrated Programme of Action of SAARC.
5. Collect information about any regional centre established by SAARC and analyse its achievements.

4.10 FURTHER READING

1. Kashikar, M.S. : "SAARC : Its Genesis, Development & Prospects"; Himalaya Publishing House, Mumbai, 2000.
2. The SAARC News Letter, SAARC Secretariat, Kathmandu, relevant issues.
3. "From SARC to SAARC : A Milestones in the Evolution of Regional Cooperation in South Asia"; SAARC Secretariat, Kathmandu, 1988.
4. Muni, S. D. and Anuradha : "Regional Cooperation in South Asia", National Publishing House, Delhi, 1984.
5. SAARC Summit Declarations, SAARC Secretariat Publication, relevant years.
6. Das, D. K. (ed.) : "Policies, Programmes and Perspectives : Study of Regional Cooperation in South Asia"; Deep & Deep Publishers, New Delhi; December-1992; ISBN: 81-7100-389-3
7. Dev Raj Dahal & Nischal N. Pandey (eds.) : "New Life Within SAARC" (2005); Institute of Foreign Affairs (IFA) & Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES)
8. Gupta, Anshuman : "SAARC : SAPTA TO SAFTA" (2002); Shipra Publications
9. E. Sudhakar: "SAARC: Origin, Growth and Future" (1994) Gyan Books Pvt. Ltd
10. Sharma, Suman : "India and SAARC", (2011), Gyan Book Pvt Ltd
11. Singh, Sudhir Kumar : "Handbook Of SAARC", (2011), Pentagon Press
12. Saurabh, B C Upreti : "Strengthening SAARC - Exploring Vistas from Expanded Cooperation" (2012) Pentagon Press



INDIA AND CHINA

Unit Structure :

- 5.0 Objective
- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 India-China Relations During Cold War Era
- 5.3 The Chinese stand on border issue
- 5.4 War on border issue
- 5.5 India-China Relations during Post cold war relations
- 5.6 Changing Chinese perspective towards India
- 5.7 Overlapping of interests: Indispensability of Collective efforts
- 5.8 Widening rift between US and China: Implications for India
- 5.9 Bottlenecks in India-China Engagement
- 5.10 Conclusion
- 5.11 Let us sum up
- 5.12 Unit End exercise
- 5.11 Reference

5.0 OBJECTIVE

This unit attempts to analyze India-China relations during the Cold and Post Cold war era while discussing thorny issues like border problem, Tibet, china -Pakistan nexus, India-china war among others. The main objective of this unit is to understand the post cold war transition in India-china relations from conflict to cooperation, overlapping of interests and growing engagements. At the same time the unit focuses on few gray areas and bottlenecks in India-china engagements. After studying this unit the student shall be able to understand the entire gamut of India-China relations and how the relations have evolved from conflict to cooperation

5.1 INTRODUCTION

India and china are the two largest countries of Asia and have potential for growth and development. India became

independent in 1947 whereas china became communist in 1949. For socio-economic and nation building both India and china adopted different paths. India adopted democratic process whereas china adopted communist process. India was among first handful countries that recognized communist china as an independent and sovereign country and expressed desire to cooperate with it. China and India established diplomatic relations on April 1, 1950. India was the second country to establish diplomatic relations with China among the non-socialist countries. In 1954, Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai and Indian Prime Minister Nehru exchanged visits and jointly initiated the famous Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. The doctrine underscores the principle of mutual respect for freedom and sovereignty and refrains from interfering each other's internal affairs.

5.2 INDIA-CHINA RELATIONS DURING COLD WAR ERA

During the cold war time India and china were apprehensive and hostile about each other's interests and objectives. China regarded India as an appendage of imperialism. India was concern about Chinese policy of expansionism in Asia. The relations between two countries continued to characterize by the legacy of conflict and distrust caused by a number of issues prominently unresolved border dispute, Tibet issue and Sino-Pakistan nexus.

A. Border Problem

The relations between India and china were seriously strained in 1950s on the highly complicated issue of border problem. The LAC is not clearly delineated physically on the ground and hence there are differences on several locations. In 1913-14 the representatives of then china, Tibet and Britain held a meeting at Shimla. As per the negotiations in the meeting, a border line of 890 KM was drawn up between the then British India and Tibet. The borderline is known as McMahon line. There is dispute over McMahon line, Aksai Chin and Sikkim between India and china. China claimed a sizable portion of India's north and north east territory-Ladakh, Sikkim and NEFA. the same time India is resented over the exchange of territory between Pakistan and china in the Karakoram region.

5.3 THE CHINESE STAND ON BORDER ISSUE

- The border between India and china has not been formally demarcated.
- The McMahan border line was an outcome of the British colonial time military attack on Tibet region.
- The McMahan agreement was concluded by the British colonial power and the then existing regime of independent Tibet and hence unacceptable to china.
- As the Tibet region had no longer remained independent and the region become part of sovereign china, the status of McMahan borderline become redundant.
- In the western sector China has claimed on Aksai Chin in and in the northeastern sector it has claimed on Ladakh District in Jammu and Kashmir
- China is in occupation of approximately 38,000 sq. kms of Indian Territory in Jammu and Kashmir.
- Under the so-called China-Pakistan "Boundary Agreement" of 1963, Pakistan ceded 5,180 sq. kms. of Indian territory in Pakistan Occupied Kashmir to China.
- China claims approximately 90,000 sq. kms. of Indian territory in Arunachal Pradesh and about 2000 sq. kms. in the Middle Sector of the India-China boundary.

5.4 WAR ON BORDER ISSUE

The border problem developed into a full fledged boundary dispute by the end of 1950s. The possibility of war appeared as the presence of Chinese troops on the border increased and they started frequent intrusions into Indian territory. China intervened in the Ladakh and Nefra region of Indian Territory which was opposed by India in strong words. China illegally occupied the large part of Indian Territory by the end of 1950s through more than thirty intrusions from 1955 to 1960. In 1960 china formally declined to accept the McMahan Border line between Indian and china. In 1961 china intruded into Sikkim, Ladakh and NEFA region of the Indian territory. The war broke out between India and china on the issue of border dispute. In this war china illegally occupied a large part of Ladakh territory of India.

After the war the bilateral relations remained strained until 1970-71. The diplomatic relations were reestablished in 1976. During Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's visit to china in December 1988 both the countries agreed to establish a Joint Working Group to work out solution on border problem. In 1993 an agreement on maintenance of peace and security on border was concluded. Although the border issue continued to remain a major irritant, the possibility of peaceful settlement has increased due to a series of confidence building measures developed through Joint Dialogue Committee since 1988.

B. Tibet issue

Tibet is the most sensitive issue between India and china and has caused bitterness in relationship. Because of Tibet issue the India-china relations deteriorated in 1950s. China embarked on expansionist policy after it becomes communist in 1949 and Tibet was first victim of it. China not only claimed on the territory of Tibet but also tried to establish military control over it. In October 1950 china send troops into Tibet and tried to control it militarily. The shocking Chinese attempt to intervene in Tibet militarily to gain control over the territory was opposed by India. Although India accepted Tibet as a part of china, it condemned the way china tried to settle the issue. India wanted the issue to be settled peacefully and through negotiations with the spiritual leader of Tibet, Dalai Lama. In May 1951, china forced an agreement on Tibet which converted Tibet into the region of china. In 1954 India formally recognized Tibet as an ingredient part of China through an agreement with china and tries to pacify the Chinese anger. However the issue of Tibet once again cropped up in 1959 and seriously strained India-China relations. To oppose china's forceful occupation of Tibet, huge demonstrations were broke out in china. The Tibetan government pronounced independence of Tibet. The Chinese army brutally suppressed the Tibetan revolt. To avoid arrest Dalai Lama fled from Tibet and took shelter in India. India also granted political asylum to Dalai Lama which enraged china. This Indian move was hugely resented by china

C. China Pakistan Nexus

The Sino-Pak nexus is basically emerged and evolved on the common anti-India interests. As noted by an analyst Pakistan perceives china as a security guarantee against India whereas for china Pakistan is low cost secondary deterrent. Pakistan

established diplomatic relations with china in 1951. Like India Pakistan was also from one of the few countries who recognized communist china and established diplomatic relations. Both china and Pakistan share mutual rivalry with India. China and Pakistan shared inimical view of India and their animosity with India brought into an alliance. Along with India factor, china's proximity with Pakistan has also caused by two factors. Firstly Pakistan's strategic location. Pakistan has proximity to the strait of Hormuz in Iran through which 20% oil transport conducts. Secondly china wants Pakistan's help in tackling the Uighur movement in Xin Xiang region of china. The Islamic militancy in Pakistan is supporting Uyghur.

It is pertinent to note that the china's political and military alliance with Pakistan has contributed in nuclear proliferation in south Asia. The military alliance between china and Pakistan threatened the security environment of India since the cold war days. India looks at Sino-Pak nexus as the biggest threat to India's national security. China perceives Pakistan as a strategic partner who can contain India and restrict Indian influence to south Asian subcontinent only. Despite of china's official adherence to the non-proliferation regime, china continues to help Pakistan's nuclear and missile programme. During cold war time china provided Pakistan with major military, technology and economic assistance. China also transferred sensitive nuclear and missile technology, spear parts to Pakistan. China supported and upheld the Pakistani side in its war with India in 1965 and 1971. china supported Pakistan's claim of Jammu and Kashmir region of India. Experts observe that China military and economic aid to Pakistan is part of china's strategic move of encirclement of India. The Sino-Pak relationship has benefitted Pakistan more than the china

Check Your progress

1. When India established diplomatic relations with China?
2. Discuss the Border Problem Between India and China

5.5 INDIA-CHINA RELATIONS DURING POST COLD WAR RELATIONS

From Estrangement to Engagement

In the post cold war era the Sino- Indian relation become more mature and practical. The process of engagement which began in the late 1980s further strengthens in the 1990s through a series of confidence building measures. This helped to reduce the cold war time misperceptions and distrusts as well as possibility of direct war. The India-China relations improved in the post cold war era as the all round cooperation in trade and other areas strengthened. Today the primary objective of both India and China is to develop their economy and to safeguard a favorable security environment. Both of them want to maintain peace along their borders, stability and access to energy resources and a stable Asian order.

The goals and objectives of Indian and Chinese foreign policy underwent change in the post cold war era. In the post cold war period India and china have redefined their foreign policy goals in tune with the logic of emerging world order and instead of ideology factor emphasized more on real-politik. There is a strong realization on both parts that economic development will not be possible without peace and only peace can serve their competitive ambitions of becoming 21st century global powers. China is focusing on military security, protection of its national sovereignty and territorial integrity, economic prosperity, social welfare, achieving status of super power and modernization. For its economic development china requires international environment of long term of stability and a stable surrounding environment. Peace in the neighborhood has top the china's south Asian foreign policy agenda especially towards India.

5.6 CHANGING CHINESE PERSPECTIVE TOWARDS INDIA

The Chinese perspective towards India underwent change in the post cold war era. Indian attempts to open its economy through its ambitious economic liberalization programme, its sincere attempts to economically engage with its East Asian neighbors, its emergence as a nuclear power, its progress in Information Technology, missile development fields, consolidation of Indo-US

engagement drastically change India's image. These events compelled china to change its traditional mindset to underestimate India and orient china to pay more attention to rising India. China realized that sooner or later India is bound to emerge as a major power in Asia and a major player in the world on the basis of its increasing economic growth and military capabilities. At the same time it also realizes the conventional policy of containing India will not yield any result. Therefore, instead of containing India, China is trying to engage India. The change in Chinese perception can be attributed to several new developments both at regional and global level. Prominent among them are as under

- Strengthening of Indo-US Relations in the post cold war era
- The emergence of India as a nuclear weapons state,
- The steady economic growth with an average 8% annual growth rate, India's increasing ability to influence regional and global events,
- Indian's growing engagements with the regional and global powers,
- India's quest to become a regional super power,
- India's membership to several influential bodies

These factors impacted on Chinese attitude towards India and make china to recognize Indian presence. The change in Chinese perspective has equally impacted on china's cold war time stands on a number of issues in south Asia including china's blind support to Pakistan against India, Chinese stand on Kashmir issue, Chinese attitude towards other small south Asian countries.

5.7 OVERLAPPING OF INTERESTS: INDISPENSABILITY OF COLLECTIVE EFFORTS

The interests of India and China are overlapping primarily in three areas.

A. Economics and Trade

In the rapidly changing international environment where geo-economics have replaced ideology both India and china have decided to deepen their economic ties. The economic cooperation is increasing year by year and some economic analysts are predicting the emergence of Chindia by the mid twenty first century. There is steady growth in trade and the trade between India and china by 2011 has crossed over \$50 billion and they have set the

target of \$100 billion by 2015. The world is looking at India and China as emerging economic powers and will replace the US and Japan by 2050 to become global economic powers. Economics and trade are the areas where mutual engagements and cooperation can benefit both nations. Despite strains in relationship due to political issues, the economic and trade relations between India and China are showing steady progress in last two decades. The trade has already crossed the figure of \$20 billion and will reach to \$50 billion by 2020. India's economic liberalization policy, policy to economically engage with its East Asian nations contribute immensely in economic cooperation with China. The India and China's economic and trade interests overlap in South and North East Asia. Both are in process of designing policies to engage states of these subcontinents into economic and trade agreements. India's Look East Policy is the best example to substantiate this point. India and China's membership to several regional and global joint economic and trade platforms like BRIC, WTO—boosted the cooperation.

B. Containing Terrorism

Both India and China are the victims of terrorist's violence although intensity of violence differs. Coincidentally the source of terrorism in both countries emanates from Pakistan. The roots of terrorist violence in India and China can be traced in Pakistan. Pakistan's historical links with the Jihadist elements and its policies of aiding and abetting cross border terrorism contributing in terrorist violence across the subcontinent. Despite of having close friendship with Pakistan, China endorses Pakistan role in its Xin Xiang territory. China is facing the challenge of anti-China agitation among the Muslim agitators of Xinjiang region of China. These Muslim agitations are getting external support from the Jihadist networks of Pakistan. In sum, the interests of India and China overlap in containing terrorism in South Asia and also in disciplining Pakistan. Collective counter terrorism efforts of India and China shall be crucial to counter the menace of terrorism. In 2002 India and China established a joint working group to counter terrorism. China is one of the fifth members of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization along with Russia, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Kirgizstan. The organization was founded in 2001 as a collective counter terrorism mechanism. India is trying to seek membership of SCO. If India becomes member, it will boost India China partnership on terrorism.

C. Nuclear Energy

Nuclear energy is an emerging area where the chances of overlapping of interests are grater. Both India and china are the energy starved countries and the nuclear energy has the potential to satisfy their increasing energy needs and reduce their dependence on Gulf. China can benefit more through nuclear energy trade with India. China is a member of Nuclear Suppliers group and can get huge benefit from supplying nuclear fuel to India.

Check your Progress

1. Identify primary areas where interests of India and china overlap
2. Discuss the factors responsible for changing Chinese perspective towards India.

5.8 WIDENING RIFT BETWEEN US AND CHINA: IMPLICATIONS FOR INDIA

The US-China relations are suffering from strain and stresses in the post cold war era due to following factors

- A. China is superseding US in almost all fields. Experts are predicting that the US is declining power and by mid 21st century it will relegate to third position after India and china. China's increasing military and economic strength has threatened the vital US security and trade interests in Asia. Ascending china with 1.3billion people, 40%savings rate and \$ 2 trillion currency reserve has indeed surprised the world. China has become world's largest manufacturer. China has strengthened its security system exponentially in last one and half decade. This military strength is core to china's foreign and strategic policy.
- B. China's territorial conflict with almost fifteen countries is one of the important reasons for rising US involvement in Asia. China has border problems with India, Russia, Japan and several south East Asian countries. Prominent among these are china's

conflict with Japan on Senkaku and with south East Asian nations on Spatley. China has declared south china as its core area of strategic interests along with Taiwan, Tibet and Xin Xiang. This Chinese posture has made south East Asian countries insecure. Recently china made several hawkish and aggressive pronouncements over border issues with the south and south East Asian countries which have created shockwaves. With these moves china has antagonized Japan, South Korea and India along with several other south East Asian countries. These countries are now contemplating a countervailing strategy to contain Chinese misadventures.

- C. These Chinese moves also threatened the US security and trade interests in Asia and reinforced its involvement in maintaining increasing imbalance of power in Asia. There are host of issues which has strained the relations between US and China. These includes Chinese stand on north Korean nuclear programmes, Nuclear nexus between china and Pakistan, Chinese attempt to replace American dollar as a reserve currency of world, china's totalitarian political system, instances of gross violation of human rights in china, china's opposition to several US moved resolution at United Nations Security Council among others.
- D. China is consistently increasing its spending on defense. The Chinese defense budget is on ascendance since last one decade. There is fivefold increase in the Chinese defense budget from 2000 to 2012. In its 12th Five Year Plan, china's defense expenditure has increased by 12%. Chinese attempts to increase its defense budget has made its neighbors more insecure.
- E. In the backdrop of these issues, few analysts predicts of possibility of rejuvenation of cold war like situation .In order to contain the rapid expansion of Chinese influence in Asia, the US has redesigned its strategic policy in Asia. The new policy emphasizes on strong US presence in Asia. As a part of this new policy, the US is trying to control china's energy resources transport lanes by attaining military superiority over central, south and south East Asia. The US planning to encircle china by negotiating defense agreements with its neighboring countries and turning them into US satellites. The US arms supply to Taiwan, Joint military exercise with South Korea and India, dispatching aircraft carriers to the yellow sea are some of the recent moves of US which has infuriated china and caused strains in US-China relationship.
- F. The US wishes and encourages political reforms in China. The US while criticizing the totalitarian regime in china and

appealing for democratic reforms in its political system. China is considering these US attempts as interference in its domestic affairs.

- G. The instances of human rights violation in china are the centre of US criticism. The US is using international platforms like UNHRC to criticize china and directing several international NGOs to target china for gross violation of human rights.
- H. The ambitious National Missile Defense System programme of US has infuriated china as it considered the programme an US attempt to create anti-china security system and to neutralize china' Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles. The programme aims to provide an umbrella protection cover to the US and its allies both in Europe and Asia from the possible missile attack of China and Russia. The 2004 Defense White Paper of China openly voiced its concerns against these US attempts. The paper states, "the US is realigning and reinforcing its military presence in this region by buttressing military alliances and accelerating deployment of missile defense systems" China is accusing US of violating the provisions of 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty which prohibits the member countries to develop anti-missile systems
- I. The china factor has provided opportunity for US and India to intensify cooperation. The US and India's interests overlap in countering china.

5.9 BOTTLENECKS IN INDIA-CHINA ENGAGEMENT

A. China's increasing preponderance in Asia

In the recent past, China has emerged as the biggest threat and security challenge to several Asian countries including India. China has made several hawkish and aggressive moves in the recent past which has caused panic and created insecurities among the East Asian countries. China is trying to convert the East Asia into its exclusive zone of influence. China has made south china seas as its core strategic area along with Taiwan, Tibet and Xinxiang. China is also trying to penetrate into Indian Ocean which has panic India. Indian defense analysts pointed out that China is encircling India by augmenting its presence in all India's neighboring countries and turning India's neighbors into its satellite. These developments reinforced why India should stop worrying about Pakistan and concentrate on China.

B. Projecting India as a Counterweight to China

There is a strong realization on the part of both US and India that their new national and geo-strategic interests are increasingly

overlapped in Asia especially in containing china. The strengthening of Indo-US engagement in last one and half decade is a well choreographed strategy to tame the dragon. As a part of this strategy, the US is supporting and encouraging India's rise as a regional power and projecting it as a potential counterweight to china. The improvements in Indo-US relations in the post cold war era has proved bottleneck in the engagement process of India and china. The US attempts to project India as a counterweight to china is a serious cause of concern for china.

C. China-Pak Nexus

The nuclear nexus between China and Pakistan is as serious cause of concern for India. China has been providing missiles, nuclear technology, spear parts to china of for years which has constituted one of the prominent reasons for the nuclear proliferation in south Asia. By doing so, china has violated provisions of NPT .

D. Widening economic and military gap between India and china

The economic and military gap between India and china is widening day by day and that has necessitated India to reconsider its foreign and security policy choices. China's economy is growing by ten to twelve percent annually and china's per capita GDP is around \$4000. Whereas India's economic growth rate is 8% and its per capita GDP is \$1000. If both India and china maintains same growth rate in coming two decades, China's economy will be eight time bigger than India. Economists are predicting that by 2040 china's GDP will grow up to \$123 trillion and it will constitute 40% of total output of the world.

E. Chinese Policy of Encirclement

China is trying to encircle India. Chinese presence in India's neighboring countries has increased exponentially and dramatically. Security analysts are arguing that china is turning India's neighbors into its satellites. The Chinese attempts to aid and abet Pakistan's nuclear programme, increasing Chinese influence on Myanmar through intelligence cooperation, Chinese deployment of missiles directed at India at Tibet exemplifies Chinese plans to encircle india. According to J.Mohan Malik, Strategic Analyst from India, "There is fundamental clash of interests between China and India which is rooted in history, strategic culture and geopolitics and manifested in China's determination to prevent India from emerging as a great power and play a role it once played as a great power and a great civilization from Central Asia to Southeast Asia." China has turned into India's external security preoccupation in last one decade. The overwhelming Chinese preponderance around India has constituted a reference point for India's military buildup. India's defense modernization has become china focused. India is

confronting widening gap with china both in economic and security fields and trying to compensate this imbalance through military buildup principally its nuclear forces.

Choices before India

The most important strategic question before the strategic planners of India is how to deal with hawkish china. The china factor largely dominates the strategic thinking of India. This has been clearly exemplified when a group of experts in India drafted a security strategy for India in 21st century recently. The strategy which is popularly known as “Non-alignment 2.0: A foreign and strategic policy for India in 21st century” released in February 2012. The strategy identified china as a formidable challenge and emphasized on indispensability of comprehensive mechanism to preserve India’s strategic autonomy vis-à-vis china. The strategy focused on two goals with respect to china. Firstly, to acquire defense capabilities enough to protect India from its adversaries especially China. Secondly to forge partnership with other powers notably US both at economic and strategic level. Renowned foreign and security policy analyst Prof.Kanti Bajpai maintains that considering rising economic and military gap between India and china, India has to reconsider its choices. He stated that India has four choices to compensate widening economic and military gap

1. To embark on massive military buildup especially qualitative and quantitative expansion of its nuclear weapons
2. To enter into alliance especially with the US, Russia and Japan
3. To settle major disputes with china
4. Not to offend china

India can counter the expansionist and hegemonic policies of china by developing a balance of power both in economic and military field with china. Prof. Bajpai argues that instead of embarking on any one of above-mentioned choices, a judicious combination of all will be the best strategy for India. In recent past India has deepened its economic and defense engagement with US. It is also strengthening economic and military ties with Russia. India is trying to rise above the local issues and asserting its stand on several global issues. India is responding positively to the US attempts to project India as a natural counterweight to china and trying to become US global partner on several issues. Several

analysts feels that although there is no direct military threat from china, india should remember that china is the most unpredictable adversary and hence should not compromise on its security posture

Taming china with missile power

In April 2012 the successful test firing of the 5000-km-range ballistic missile Agni V has changed the strategic profile of India in the world. The Agni test fire is largely perceived in terms of India's nuclear deterrence against China. India test fire Agni V missile to secure and safeguard its legitimate nation interests in an environment of insecurity and threat caused by China's growing preponderance in the region. The test constituted a vital component of India's nuclear deterrence programme and made it truly invulnerable and credible. Agni V with a range of more than 5,000km is capable of delivering a nuclear warhead to the Chinese capital Beijing. The test has gave India an element of parity with china .With the success of Agni test, China has apparently lost its privileges position in this arena and forced to accept India's increasing strength. It provided credibility to the India's nuclear deterrence programme on the one hand and succeed in communicating strong message of India's growing nuclear capability to its adversaries especially china.

Check Your Progress

1. What are the bottlenecks in India-China engagement?
2. Discuss the choices before India to deal with China.

5.10 CONCLUSION

The relationship between India and china have really transformed in the post cold war era. India and china may not become the friend, however they have learnt to regulate their relations and adjust their ambitions to accommodate each other's

concerns. As rightly observed by J.N.Dixit, “at most Indian and china could be friends whose relations would be based upon practicability and convergence of mutual interests tempered by appropriate reticence and objectivity of each other’s interests, security perceptions and economic requirements”. Many believes that There is no possibility of direct war between India and china in future as both of them are nuclear powers and balance of terror has been established between them. Even the conventional war is remote possibility because it would be very costly and the losses would exceed the gain from it.

5.11 LET US SUM UP

India and china are the two largest countries of Asia and have potential for growth and development. India became independent in 1947 whereas china became communist in 1949.

- During the cold war time India and china were apprehensive and hostile about each other’s interests and objectives
- the legacy of conflict and distrust in India-China relations caused by a number of issues prominently unresolved border dispute, Tibet issue and Sino-Pakistan nexus
- The relations between India and china were seriously strained in 1950s on the highly complicated issue of border problem which led to war in 1962
- Because of Tibet issue the India-china relations deteriorated in 1950s
- The Sino-Pak nexus is basically emerged and evolved on the common anti-India interests which strained India-China relations during cold and post cold war era
- In the post cold war era the Sino- Indian relation become more mature and practical. The process of engagement which began in the late 1980s further strengthens in the 1990s through a series of confidence building measures
- The change in Chinese perception can be attributed to several new developments both at regional and global level.
- The US-China relations are suffering from strain and stresses in the post cold war era which has implications for India
- The relationship between India and china have really transformed in the post cold war era. India and china may not become the friend, however they have learnt to regulate their relations and adjust their ambitions to accommodate each other’s concerns.

5.12 UNIT END QUESTIONS

1. Discuss the India-China relations during the cold war era
2. Explain the changes in India-china relations during the post cold war era
3. Do you agree India-China relations have moved from estrangement to engagement in the post cold era? .Discuss.
4. Discuss the factors responsible to alter Chinese perspective towards India in the post cold war era
5. Discuss the changes in US-China relations in the recent time and its implications for India

5.13 REFERENCES

1. Amitabh Mattoo, Imagining China, in Kanti Bajpai and Amitabh Mattoo edited The Peacock and the Dragon: India-China Relations in the 21st Century, HAR-ANAD PUBLICATIONS 2000,
2. J. Mohan Malik, "India-China relations in the 21st Century: The Continuing Rivalry", Brahma Chellaney edited, Securing India's Future in the New Millennium, Orient Longman, 1999,
3. Franklin and Harding ,The india-china relation:Riverly and engagement(New Delhi:Oxford University Press,2004)
4. N.S.Sisodia,Emerging India:Security and foreign policy perspectives,india and the Asia Pacific(New Delhi:IDSA,2005)
5. Dittmer L,South Asia's security dilemma:India,Pakistan and china(New York:M E Sharpe,2005)
6. Malviya J.G,Indian and Chinese foreign policies in perspective,Indian foreign Policy(LA,USA:Radiant Publisher,1998)



INDIA AND UNITED STATES

Unit Structure :

- 6.0 Objective
- 6.1 Introduction
- 6.2 Unit Structure
- 6.3 Post cold war US foreign and security policy towards South Asia
- 6.4 Dominating Issues on India-US foreign policy agenda
- 6.5 The post 9/11 US security policy towards South Asia : Implication for India
- 6.6 Mutuality of Benefit
- 6.7 Signs of Engagement
- 6.8 Concluding Observations
- 6.9 Let us sum up
- 6.10 Unit end question
- 6.11 References

6.0 OBJECTIVE

This unit attempts to analyze India-US relations during the Cold and Post Cold war era while discussing US foreign and security towards South Asia policy during this period. The main objective of this unit is to understand the evolution of India-US relations from estrangement to engagement, overlapping of interests between them and growing engagements. At the same time the unit focuses on few gray areas and bottlenecks in India-US engagements. After studying this unit the student shall be able to understand the entire gamut of India-US relations and how the relations have evolved from estrangement to engagement in the post cold war era

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The Indo- US partnership which has entered into 21st century has great impact on the security environment of Asia in general and South Asia in particular. This unit analyses how the relationship between India and US has progressed from estrangement (cold war era) to engagement (post cold era) and factors responsible to this transformation. Along with this primary objective, the unit also discusses the areas where both the countries have convergence of interest and how this factor brought them closer. The unit argues that although there are major differences in the worldview of India and the US, there is still possibility of security alliance on the basis of complementary interests.

6.2 UNIT STRUCTURE

This unit has been divided into six sections. The first section deals with gradual evolution of relationship from the cold war phase of estrangement to the post cold war phase of engagement. The second section narrates peculiar problems of south Asian subcontinent and how these problems draw US attention to the region and facilitated cooperation between India and the US. The third section covers the US security policy towards south Asia in the aftermath of 9/11 and US changed stand on Kashmir issue. The fourth section deals with the importance of US and India for each other and how the engagement is mutually benefitted. The fifth section highlights reflections of engagement, various steps and moves by India and the US to consolidate engagement. At the end the unit concludes with an optimistic note that the present engagement between India and the US can convert into strategic partnership and will alter the existing balance of power scenario in Asia in the 21st century. The sixth section is concluding observations.

SECTION - I

Evolution of Indo-US Relations

A) The Cold War Era: Phases of Strains and Stresses

In the 21st century the US has made its engagement in Asia as a top priority and India is being seen as a corner stone of the new

policy. With a series of significant events unfolded in Asia in the post cold war era, the US engagement in the region become indispensable. In Asia, South Asia in particular drew US attention for a number of new developments. In South Asia the nuclearisation of India and Pakistan, conversion of Kashmir into prospective nuclear flash point, the gradual and steady emergence of India along with the increasing Chinese attempts to penetrate into Indian Ocean were the prominent issues among other attracted the US attention to the subcontinent. Right from the Bill Clinton to Barak Obama administration, special emphasis was given on engagement with India as a core ally in the US security policy towards south Asia on the basis of shared interests in regional and international affairs. It is pertinent to note that in this period engagement, the divergent perceptions of India and US on the certain issues like help to Pakistan, Kashmir and terrorism did not come in way of cooperation in the field of security and trade. It demonstrates the mutual willpower to segregate contentious issue from shared interests.

Despite being largest democracies in the world and having common faith in universal democratic values, the Indo-US relations were constantly marked by frequent ups and downs during the cold war years (1). The relationship witnessed strains and stresses due to differences in foreign policy orientations and perspectives in respect of certain crucial regional and international issues mostly emanated from the cold politics. There was a clear lack of objective understanding of each other concerns and compulsions. India had doubts about the US intentions and preferred to maintain safe distance under the veil of its non-alignment strategy. The US who planned to engage India to represent US policies in the south Asian subcontinent after China embraced communism antagonized with this Indian stance. During the cold war period the US was not directly indulged into the sub continental politics and mainly acted as an offshore balancer in South Asia. For the US, North and South East Asia were the priority regions as its and its allies interests were directly threatened there by the USSR(2).

B) Post cold war era: A New Direction for a New Reality

However with the end of cold war the US perspective towards South Asia undergone changes. The post cold war US foreign policy drafted during the presidential tenure of Bill Clinton accorded priority to economic interests. Pragmatism became determining factor in conduction of US foreign policy than the rhetoric of ideology. Accordingly the long run US policy of defining relations in terms of super power conflict both at bilateral and multilateral level was replaced by new pragmatism based on

commercial interests. This pragmatism was oriented to protect the vital US trade and economic interests irrespective of political systems and secure extensive commercial opportunities at the newly emerging markets in Asian countries. In south Asia under the prism new pragmatism, the US began to look at India and Pakistan differently and unlike the cold war days, essentially from the regional perspective. Pursuant to new priorities, serious attempts were made in last two decades by the US to dispel the long shadow of cold war over the relationship with a series of agreements and pacts for healthy alliance. India also reciprocated positively considering complimentary of interests with the US.

The shift in US policy towards South Asia and its increased engagement with India has been caused by multiple factors. As discussed above, the US priorities had undergone substantial changes in the post cold war era. Along with protecting economic and commercial interests, containing nuclear proliferation, aggressive china and terrorism dominated the US foreign policy goals in Asia. These issues moved to the top of US foreign and security policy during Bill Clinton, George Bush(Jr) and Barak Obama tenure respectively. To address these issues, the US readjusted its relations with various Asian powers including India. India who was also in process of readjusting its relations in the emerging post cold war world order welcomed these change and responded positively to the US gesture of engagement. A new wave of pragmatism also ushered in Indian foreign policy at the same time which facilitated the consolidation of engagement process **(3)**. Further, the emerging geo-strategic developments in the south Asian vicinity compelled India to readjust its foreign and security policy priorities.

In this process of readjustment there was a strong realization on the part of both US and India that their new national and geo-strategic interests are increasingly overlapped in Asia. This convergence interests ushered in three crucial areas- countering terrorism, managing nuclear proliferations and finally containing china **(4)**. The coincidence of interests in these areas augmented the possibility and scope of joint efforts and closer strategic engagement.

In last one decade, apart from this convergence of interests, there are some extra ordinary developments which necessitated US to embrace India closely. The US appears to lose credibility and pre-eminent position in many parts of Asia due to its interventionist

and dictatorial policies. The US unilateral interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan received worldwide criticism. Moreover, the US has suffered huge setbacks in Iraq and Afghanistan. Statistics reveals that the Iraq war has cost US \$ 600 billion and the Afghanistan is becoming worst than Iraq (5). The US economy is growing through a serious phase of recession, large budget deficits and high unemployment rate among other problems. In the backdrop of this recession, it is complicated for US to shoulder global responsibilities of maintaining balance of power alone. Hence The US is in search of new partners to share the burden of collative security . At the time when the US is losing its position and facing recession, the world is witnessing miraculous ascendance of China and India. The rising economic power of India and China is altering existing balance of power game in Asia. Experts are predicting that by mid twenty first century the US will relegate to the third position after India and china. India's rising geopolitical importance, its burgeoning market opportunities and India's increasing ability to impact the major events in Asia necessitated US to embrace India closely. The US is looking at India not only as a trade partner but a potential ally to share responsibility with the US in maintaining balance power in Asia.

Check your progress

1. Discuss the issues which strained India-US relations in the post cold war era
2. Discuss the issues dominated US foreign policy towards south Asia in the post cold war era

SECTION - II

6.3 POST COLD WAR US FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY TOWARDS SOUTH ASIA

The Indo-US relations have strengthened in the backdrop of worsening condition in South Asia in the post cold war era. As designated by the former president of America, The South Asia has

emerged as the most dangerous and unstable region in the world in last couple of decades(6). The south Asian countries are suffering from territorial disputes, the ethnic and religious divergence, national separatism, religious extremism and cross-border terrorism and the nuclear confrontation. These issues altered the balance of power scenario in south Asia and impacted the interests of both US and India in the region. To address these issues the US has been consolidating its position in south Asia by forging new agreements with the south Asian countries. The US war on terrorism which commenced in Afghanistan and involved two south Asian giants India (indirectly) and Pakistan (directly) was the crucial step towards that direction. This war facilitated US to establish in south Asia militarily (7). Lets analyze few important issues in detail and ascertain how these issues draw India and US close .

6.4 DOMINATING ISSUES ON INDIA-US FOREIGN POLICY AGENDA

A) Terrorism

Centre of terrorism shifted from West Asia to South Asia: Implications for Indo-US relations

Today, the issue of terrorism poses a serious challenge to the sovereign states and threatens the regional and international peace. In the post cold war era the terrorism has assumed transnational character and the terrorist organizations got access to non-conventional weapons of mass destruction like nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. In the aftermath of 9/11 terrorist attacks the US perspective on terrorism has been changed. It moved to the top of American foreign policy. The US declared war against terrorism and forged an international coalition to combat terrorism. Since the center of terrorism shifted from West Asia to South Asia, it received unprecedented importance in American security policy. The US war against terrorism facilitated a foothold for the US in South Asia by promoting its military presence in the region. America turned it into an opportunity to spread American military presence in the region ostensibly to face the challenges thrown by terrorism. America consolidated its position in South Asia. In the aftermath of 9/11, the US military engagements had speeded up and new alignments and agreements were forged with South Asian countries to isolate Taliban government in Afghanistan and catch the mastermind behind the terrorist attack on America,

Osama Bin Laden who took shelter in Afghanistan. As the Taliban regime in Afghanistan refused to hand over Osama, the US launched war against Afghanistan. The US forged an international coalition for its Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan, which included two south Asian powers –India and Pakistan. India promptly offered its unconditional cooperation to US in its war against international terrorism. India offered military and logistic facilities to the US war-the Operation Enduring Freedom-in Afghanistan. Although the US was aware of Pakistan's nexus with Taliban and Al Qaida, it was involved in the coalition because of its strategic utility in US war against terrorism in Afghanistan.

The threat of terrorism led both India and America to realize clearly the coincidence of their national interests and need of joint efforts in this field. After 9/11 terrorism became core issue between Indo-US cooperation. Both the countries agreed to share experiences, exchange information related to terrorism. The convergence of interest in strengthening the counter terrorism regime has provided an ideal platform to enhance cooperation. In October 2001 India and America signed a new bilateral extradition treaty. Both India and America strongly support UN Security Council resolution of September 2001 global and regional cooperation to combat terrorism .In December 2001 a joint statement issued after the meeting of Defense Policy Group stated that-US and India share strategic interests in Asia and beyond and their defense and security cooperation can promote global peace, economic progress and security. The cooperation between India and the United States has been institutionalized by 2002.Both the countries decided to chart a new strategy to combat terrorism in 200

In the aftermath of 9/11,joint counter proliferation efforts have made an area of defense cooperation. The New Framework for Indo-US relationship signed on 28th June 2005 also called the need for counter terrorism cooperation and collaboration. The same commitment and partnership in combating terrorism was reiterated during Prime Minister Man Mohan Singh's visit to America.

In last couple of decades, as the centre of terrorism has been shifted from Middle East to South Asia, almost all the south Asian countries are wrecked by the terrorist violence. The religious extremism and the terrorist acts are on rise has spread its tentacles in almost all pockets of south Asia. Today most of the South Asian

countries are victim of terrorism supported by none other than their own neighbors (8). The US "War On Terrorism" which began in Afghanistan has equally contributed in spreading of the virus of terrorism in the subcontinent. Due to this war, several top leaders of Al Qaeda and Taliban reportedly took shelter in Pakistan and they are now abetting terrorist violence in Pakistan and other parts of the subcontinent. Like India, the United States has also become victim of a series of well organized and highly coordinated terrorist attacks. Several thousand US citizens were killed in these attacks both in and out of the country in last two decades. These terrorist attacks have changed the US agenda in south Asia. Containing terrorism in the subcontinent top the agenda in US's South Asia policy especially since 2001. India offered its full support to the US war on terrorism(9). The 9/11 terrorist attack on US proved as a blessing in disguise for Indo-US relations. This incident provided an opportunity and platform to both US and India to strengthen strategic partnership and initiate joint action (10).

Recently nuclear terrorism has emerged as a gravest threat to the peace and security of the subcontinent. There is a definite risk of nuclear attack by the technically sophisticated terrorists' organizations. This issue acquired global attention in the aftermath of 9/11 terrorist attack on US. The problem of nuclear terrorism has been aggravated due to the nuclear policies of some countries especially Pakistan which facilitates terrorists in acquiring nuclear weapons. Ever since Pakistan's nuclear tests in 1998, the ability of Pakistan to secure its nuclear arsenals is in doubt for various reasons. Pakistan's historical links with the terrorists and fundamentalists elements has made its nuclear weapons most vulnerable. The steadily proliferating Jihadist elements in Pakistan is the most immediate and prominent threat to its nuclear weapons. There is a strong evidence to suggest that there are well established connections between military and intelligence personnel of Pakistan and these Jihadist elements. Several research studies published from 2000 to 2010 revealed that Pakistan's nuclear weapons faces a greater threat from Islamic extremists. As of now Pakistan is believed to have around 200 nuclear weapons and in the midst of qualitative and quantitative expansion of its nukes. Nuclear experts are more worrisome as Pakistan is continuously producing fissile material, increasing its capacity to produce plutonium and deploying additional delivery vehicles. Pakistan is also in the process of building small tactical nuclear weapons for quick deployment. These attempts by Pakistan

have further aggravated the possibility of theft or transfer of nuclear weapons and technology as the safeguard measures are highly inadequate. Hence the formidable challenge before the US and India is to ensure that the nuclear material does not fall into the wrong hands. Expert also believes that the nuclear terrorism can lead to another kind of nuclear clash in south Asia. According to them the south Asian countries might use nuclear weapons in retaliation of terrorist acts. Both India and Pakistan might resort to nuclear retaliation to contain terrorism Therefore the US concern in south Asia is not just for prospective Indo-Pak nuclear clash but for the consequences of falling nuclear weapons into the hands of terrorist outfits (11).

B) Nuclearisation of south Asia

The nuclearisation of south Asia is one of the prominent issues which draw the US attention to the subcontinent and subsequently paved the way for ambitious Indo-US Nuclear Deal. the nuclear proliferation in the subcontinent in the late 1990s complicated the south Asian security dilemma. Today in south Asia there are two nuclear powers who share borders and a long history of animosity. The antagonistic relations between India and Pakistan further complicated with this nuclearisation. Ever since the nuclear tests of 1998, both India and Pakistan have indulged in developing more reliable nuclear delivery system and increasing their fissile material stock. As of now both India and Pakistan believed to have more than 200 nuclear weapons and in the midst of qualitative and quantitative expansion of its nukes. Nuclear experts are more worrisome as these countries are continuously producing fissile material, increasing their capacity to produce plutonium and deploying additional delivery vehicles. They are also in the process of building small tactical nuclear weapons for quick deployment (12).

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction has indeed endangered the stability of south Asia. In case of India and Pakistan, it is important to note that the famous Cold War mechanism of ensuring peace through nuclear balance of terror seems to have failed. Unlike nuclearisation of US and USSR during the cold war, the nuclearisation of India and Pakistan could not prevent the possibility of war. In the aftermath of the nuclear tests of India and Pakistan, several strategists argued that the balance of terror caused by the possession of nuclear weapons would reduce the possibility of war possibility of war between India and Pakistan.

However this assumption proved wrong. Immediately after the nuclear tests of India and Pakistan in 1998, both the countries were at the brink of another full scale war along the line of control in Kashmir. During the confrontation, Pakistan reportedly deployed nuclear weapons near the border and if full-fledged war had escalated, it could have been converted into nuclear war. The escalation of war was avoided due to the timely intervention of US (13).

In the backdrop of nuclearisation of the south Asia, containing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the region dominated the US security strategy towards south Asia .An US expert on South Asian affairs,Stephan Cohen rightly stated the American concern over the nuclearisation of south Asia and its ramifications for India-Pakistan relations, ***“by the time of 1990, many in Washington felt that south Asia was out of control. The conflict over Kashmir seems to be moving toward conventional war, which in turn could ignite a nuclear conflagration. Furthermore there was a strong disposition for the US,as the sole superpower to assume the leadership role in healing off this chain of events----Nonproliferation againbecpme the centerpiece of US regional policy”***(14)

Non-proliferation agenda seriously bubbled up to surface and become the sole determinant of US south Asia policy in the aftermath of Kargil war. The kargil war profoundly altered the US views on nuclearisation of south Asia. The confrontation constituted the background of the then US president Bill Clinton’s historic visit to India and Pakistan(15). Since the Kargil war the US is continuously putting pressure on both India and Pakistan to engage in composite dialogue to diffuse the tension. It is believed that any future conflict between India and Pakistan can erupt into a nuclear exchange. Hence the US is interested in preventing Indo-Pak war(16). The US is urging India and Pakistan a) to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) b) to stop production of fissile material and join the Fissile Material Control Treaty negotiations; and c) to institute tight export controls on goods and equipment related to their nuclear programmes . (17)

C) The Pakistan factor

Pakistan has become a great cause of concern especially for India and the US. In the post cold war era Pakistan has emerged as a great difficulty for US and there are clear indicators of alienating

of Pakistan by the US on several occasions (18). Due to its strategic significance in the containment of communism, Pakistan was the main recipient of US aid during the cold war years. However in the post cold war era the US aid towards Pakistan has been substantially curtailed. The ongoing aid to Pakistan is mostly directed to protect the nuclear arsenals of Pakistan from theft or transfer. Although Pakistan assumed significance in US South Asia policy after 9/11 as a frontline state in war against terrorism, most in US look at Pakistan as a trouble maker with uncertain future due to its worsening economic and political problems.

Pakistan's historical links with the terrorists and Jihadist elements on the one hand and the persistent climate of political instability on the other are the sources of concern for the US. In last two decades the Pakistan is known to have become epicenter of terrorism and the breeding ground of religious fundamentalists in south Asia. Pakistan is suffering from weak governance, poor infrastructure and thriving Islamist extremist movements and the terrorists have capitalized this environment. The US is mainly concerned about the safety of nuclear weapons in Pakistan and wish to ensure that it do not reach into the hands of terrorists. Experts in US believe that any theft of a nuclear weapon could lead to a nuclear 9/11 type attack on Mumbai or New York. The US intelligence agencies have also put the risk of nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism high in the list of global risks. Since 2001 the US has provided hundred million aids to Pakistan to safeguard its nuclear weapons. There were also reports in media that the US is planning to deploy special security force in Pakistan to safeguard its nuclear weapons. The US confidence in Pakistan's ability to protect its nuclear weapons shattered with two developments in recent past. Firstly, the A.Q. Khan episode which confirmed Pakistan's role in unauthorized nuclear deals with rogue states and secondly the multiple terrorist attacks on Pakistan's defense establishments which exposed inadequate security arrangements in Pakistan. It is widely suspected that the terrorists must have got access to nuclear weapons or technology through the Khan network. (19). The unearthing of A.Q.Khan's nuclear network revealed that the Pakistan has failed to protect its nuclear weapons and technology and they are highly vulnerable for theft. A CRS Study published in 2004 also observed that Pakistan might be the potential source of nuclear weapons for the terrorist. The reports pointed out that there is possibility of covert nuclear technology and weapons transfer from the Islamists in the Pakistan army to the

terrorist outfits **(20)**. In Pakistan the military has reportedly established connections with the Islamic fundamentalists. Many have expressed fear that in case of Islamic revolution in Pakistan the Islamist in Pakistan army might transfer weapons to the fundamentalists and the terrorists. Several research reports suggested that in Pakistan nuclear material is stored under inadequate security and there is no viable strategy for its protection **(21)**.

D) The Dragon challenge

In the 21st century China has emerged as a potential alternative source of power in international affairs. On the economic front, China with 1.3 billion population, 40% savings rate and two trillion currency reserve has emerged as a super power. Nobel laureate Robert Fogel in his article in Foreign Affairs(Jan/Feb 2010) predicted that by 2040 China's GDP will be around \$123 trillion and it will constitute 40% of world output. The US will be next to china with 14 % **(22)**. Moreover China has hugely benefitted from the ongoing economic recession in West.

In terms of security, China has made several hawkish and aggressive moves in the recent past which has caused panic and created insecurities among the East Asian countries. China is trying to convert the East Asia into its exclusive zone of influence. China has made south china seas as its core strategic area along with Taiwan, Tibet and Xinxiang. The South China Sea region is vital to the Chinese economic growth as major supply of oil and raw material passes thorough this belt. Moreover the South China Sea alone is estimated to have 61 billion of barrels of petroleum. China is also trying to penetrate into Indian Ocean which has panic India. Indian defense analysts pointed out that China is encircling India by augmenting its presence in all India's neighboring countries and turning India's neighbors into its satellite **(23)**. Robert Kaplan in his recently published book "Manson: The Indian Ocean and the future of American power" has observed that the increasing Chinese penetration into Indian Ocean has threatened the US interest in the region. He opined that "*the Chinese penetration has cast shadow of danger on the economic route of 21st century stretching from Persian Gulf to the Strait of Hormuz covering South China Sea towards South Korea and Japan. China is trying to control South China Sea's hydrocarbon rich water and crucial shipping lanes*"**(24)**.

Significant number of people in India and the US believes that China has emerged as the biggest threat and security challenge to both US and India in long term and they have to grope up a joint strategy to tackle this challenge. The ASEAN countries along with Japan, South Korea and India perceive US help to counter Chinese aggressiveness in South, East and North Asia. A new document released on 28th February 2012 titled, Non-alignment 2.0: A foreign and strategic policy for India in 21st century perceived china as a formidable threat to India and calls for the active US involvement in the Asia Pacific theatre(25)

The increasing Chinese penetration into Asia Pacific region and Indian Ocean has compelled US to draw a new geopolitical strategy to protect the vital oil routes from the china (26). In this new strategy India occupied a prominent position due to its strategic location in the Indian Ocean. The US and India have mutual interests in containing china (27). China's age old proximity with Pakistan is also a serious cause of concern for the both India and US. In 2006 China and Pakistan had an agreement for trade and joint military exercises. Pakistan is building two nuclear reactors with the help of china. The 15 billion US aid package to Pakistan is also reportedly an attempt to dissipate Chinese influence on Pakistan. To offset china's aggressive military posture, the US is trying to attain superiority over Central, south and south East Asia .The US is looking at India as a potential counterweight to balance the increasing military and economic might of china (28)

Check your Progress.

1. Discuss the salient features of US's South Asia policy in the post cold war era
2. Explain how nuclearisation of South Asia impacted US's South Asia policy in the post cold war era

SECTION - III

6.5 THE POST 9/11 US SECURITY POLICY TOWARDS SOUTH ASIA: IMPLICATIONS FOR INDIA

In the post 9/11 era the Indo-US relations have been developing more due to increasingly overlapping of national and geo-strategic interests of both the countries. There is convergence of interests in three major areas—firstly, **countering terrorism**, secondly, **managing nuclear proliferation** and finally, **containing china**. Both countries today are facing the challenge of terrorism, which poses serious security threat along with the potential to damage the very fabric of their stable democracies. The threat from terrorism to India's national security is real and live. The spread of Islamic fundamentalist movements in South Asia has been a matter of serious concern to India. The wide networking of jihadi forces across the subcontinent with their links to international terrorist organizations like Al Qaida has threaten India's internal and external security. Since last two decades India has been facing the scourge of Pakistan sponsored proxy war and cross border terrorism in the Kashmir valley. Now it has been proved that the kind terrorism that India is facing in Kashmir valley is not just cross border terrorism but international terrorism requires international means and international cooperation to combat it. Islamic terrorism in Kashmir has been supported not only by the Pakistan but also by the Taliban movement in the Afghanistan. Pakistan's Inter Service Intelligence has been active in providing financial support, arms and training to all militant groups acting against India.

This stage is also marked by increase in Indo-US defense cooperation to an unprecedented level for the first time since India's independence. This stage witnesses a closer strategic engagement and an unprecedented enhancement in the Indo-US defense cooperation covering not only dialogues on issues of common concern but also supplying defense equipments to India and military to military exercise. An India-US strategic partnership involving naval cooperation to protect vital sea-lanes of communication has transformed security environment in south Asia help adjust balance of power equations in Asia.

There seems renewed emphasis on India's strategic significance due to the US recognition of the Indian capabilities and potentials as an emerging power in Asia. The US Secretary of State Rice made it clear in her statement in 2005 that the America would back India's emergence as a regional superpower in Asia. This convergence of interests also soften US stand on differences over nuclear issue. The US lifted sanctions imposed on India following the Indian nuclear tests in 1998. America also made it clear that they will not put pressure on India to sign CTBT. The initial contentious issue of non-proliferation became an area of cooperation between two countries. The US appears convinced that the Indian track record in nuclear field is better than most other nuclear states.

Us Changed Stand On Kashmir Issue

It was an opportunity to India to change American perception on terrorism in Kashmir by linking it to international terrorism. India attempted to convince America the organic link between terrorist outfits in Pakistan and Kashmir and Taliban government in Afghanistan and Al Quida. Before 9/11, when India accused Pakistan of sponsoring terrorism in Kashmir and appealed for American pressure on Pakistan, America termed terrorism in Kashmir as freedom struggle. The US had maintained the quasi-isolationist form of policy towards the terrorist activities in Kashmir. The US endorsed Pakistani stand that the terrorists in J&K were freedom fighters and was reluctant to take action against Pakistan. However the US stand on Kashmir issue has also undergone change. Now the US appears convinced that the Kashmir issue is not an issue of freedom struggle or case of domestic terrorism. It also agreed with the Indian view that the negotiations on Kashmir issue can only begin if there is an end to cross border terrorism. Moreover the US has been supportive of recent Indian efforts for the peaceful resolution of Kashmir issue. India capitalized this opportunity to internationalize Pakistan sponsored terrorist activities in Kashmir. Indian efforts to link terrorism in Kashmir to the international terrorism yield result when America declared two Kashmir terrorist organizations-Lashkar-e-Tayyiba and Jaish-e-Mohammed as foreign terrorist organization. After 9/11 several major terrorist attacks have taken place in India including the attack on the Legislative Assembly of J&K attack on Indian parliament, attack on American center in Calcutta, and recently attack on Samzouta Express. These attacks have

changed American attitude towards Pakistan to certain degree. America not only condemned these attacks but also asked Pakistan to take action against those terrorist organizations responsible for attacks. America has also started putting pressure on Pakistan to stop cross border infiltration permanently

Check your Progress.

1. Discuss the changes in US's South Asia policy in the post 9/11 era
2. Explain the changes in US's perspective towards Kashmir issue in the post 9/11 era

SECTION - IV

6.6 MUTUALITY OF BENEFIT

Importance of India for US

- Indian is a democratic country and unlike with china and Pakistan, India does not have particular contentious issues with the US. The people to people contact between the US and India inspired by the common democratic values has strengthen over a period of time is the corner stone of this relationship. India is the fourteenth trade partner of the US with the trade over \$22 billion(29). The US policy makers are convinced about India's rising economic clout. The former Secretary of State Colin Powel has outlined the significance of India for the US in future. He stated that; ***We must deal wisely with the world's largest democracy. Soon to be the most populous country in the world, India has the potential to help keep the peace in the vast Indian Ocean area and its periphery. We need to work harder and more consistently to assist India in this endeavor, while not neglecting our friends in Pakistan. (30)***

- Economists are predicting that by mid twenty first century India's GDP will increase from present four trillion to thirty two trillion which will be larger than US with the ongoing growth rate of 8 percent. The US policy makers are also convinced that unlike China India's economic growth will not hamper US interests in Asia and the regional balance of power in Asia can be maintained by supporting India's growth. Hence Indian capabilities and potential as an emerging regional power is being recognized and supported by the US. The US started collaborating India in international affairs. The flow of US aid to India in various fields substantially increased in last one and half decade.
- India is being perceived as an opportunity by the US. The US is looking at India as a trade partner and admits that economic partnership with India is now indispensable. In the backdrop of India's economic rise, trade interests dominating the US policy towards India. The US has made export to India as a cornerstone of its policy. Such export will create job opportunities in US. Stephan Cohen took stock of burgeoning Indo-US trade, "***with the transformation of Indian economic policy in the 1990, corporate America has began to take India seriously. America's two way trade to India rose from \$5.3 billion in 1990 to 48.5 in 1995 and \$12 billion in 1999,with \$9.1 billion in import and \$3.7 in export(31).*** During the President Obama's visit to India, India has place order of imports of worth \$12billion. These orders will create 50,000 to 60,000 thousand new jobs in US. Indian companies are second largest investors in America after UAE and created 57 thousand new jobs in US(32). The US eye on India's expanding middle class market. India's defense budget is also on rise which the US wishes to capitalize. There is huge scope of cooperation with India in the areas such as climate change, non-proliferation, and energy and food security. At the strategic front, the US looks at India as a natural counterweight to china.

Importance of US For India

- India need the US help for its civilian nuclear programme by facilitating fuel supply from the nuclear suppliers and create an environment in which India can produce nuclear energy for developmental purposes.
- As India is in midst of its economic development, it will certainly benefit from US investments in India and India's development. India needs US investment, their technology, expertise, equipments. US cooperation with India in the field of economy, energy and education which will be crucial for India in achieving its development objectives

- Several security analysts in India believe that India can compensate military and economic imbalance with China and checkmate china by entering into close military alliance with the US. India needs US help in dissipating Chinese aggressiveness. India don't want china to emerge as a dominant power in Asia and want US presence in Asia to strike balance
- The threat form terrorism to India's internal security is real and live. The Pakistan sponsored proxy war has been going on against India for a long time and there has been significant increase in terrorist acts recently. India requires the US help in containing the menace of terrorism by disciplining Pakistan
- India needs US support to secure permanent berth at the UN Security Council. During the November 2010 visit of US president Barak Obama to India, he promised to seek a permanent UN Security Council sear for India.

Check your Progress.

1. Discuss the importance of India for US
2. Discuss the importance of US for India

SECTION - V

6.7 SIGNS OF ENGAGEMENT

- On Kashmir issue the US has changed its cold war stand and made it clear that the US is not interested in interfering in the Kashmir issue and it endorses the Shimla Agreement which emphasizes that the issue has to be resolved in the bilateral framework. During his historical visit to India in 2000, the then US president Bill Clinton promised that the US would lend support to India and Pakistan wherever possible to resolve this issue. He urged both the countries to create the atmosphere of peace and resolve the issue through composite dialogue.

- Since 9/11 the US is continuously putting pressure on Pakistan to stop aiding and abetting terrorism in the subcontinent and also to stop supporting the then Taliban government in Afghanistan. The US declared two terrorist organizations, Lashkar-e-Toiba (LeT) and Jaish-e-Mohammed (JeM) as Foreign Terrorist Organizations. These two organizations are threat to US interests and also responsible for a series of terrorist attacks in India.
- In terms of defense cooperation, the new Strategic Partnership Framework which was evolved during the tenure of Republican government of George Bush (Jr) and transformed the India-US relations facilitated close defense cooperation between two countries (33). There were series of agreements from 2001-2011 which ultimately strengthen the defense relations between two countries. In last two decades the militaries of US and India have conducted 10 joint exercises, and Indian naval vessels have been escorting 31 American naval assets from the Straits of Malacca to the Arabian Sea, thus freeing up American ships for other operations.
- A new frame work of cooperation popularly known as The Next Steps in Strategic & Technological Partnership (NSSTP) signed in 2005 envisaged a new role for India in US foreign and security policy. As a part of this framework On July 18, 2005, India and the US signed a landmark strategic agreement that had far reaching consequences. This agreement recognized India's status as a responsible nuclear nation. The US offered to cooperate with India on civilian nuclear energy issues (34).
- Combating terrorism is a common interest of India and the US. The Joint Working Group on Counter Terrorism was established in January 2000 as a first step towards increasing exchange and technology co-operation in the field of defense and security (35) India joined the international coalition against terrorism under the US leadership in 2001. India and the US also signed an agreement to help each other investigate offences related to terrorism, narcotics, trafficking, and organized crimes in October 2005
- India was included as a full partner in the ambitious multinational 'International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor' (ITER) energy project. The US and India have forged cooperation in the field of nuclear energy, space, missile defense and high technology
- Since 2005 the two countries have taken several initiatives of cooperation and consultation that helped to strengthen the relations. Prominent among them includes-civil-nuclear

cooperation deal, defense framework agreement of ten years, beginning of ministerial level strategic dialogue, cooperation in economic and trade, US support for Indian candidature for the permanent seat of UNSC. These achievements helped in taking relationship forward in the 21st century. The 2010 visit of US president Barak Obama to India constituted a pinnacle of goodwill in both countries.

- **Check your Progress.**

1. Discuss the signs of engagements in the India-US relations
2. Discuss the progress in India-US relations on the issue of combating terrorism in the post cold war era.

SECTION - VI

6.8 CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

- **Indispensability of Partnership:**

As the new power game being shaped in Asia in the 21st century, there is a strong realization on the part of both US and India that they can no longer afford neutrality and the partnership between these two countries is indispensable to protect mutual interests. The partnership is also required for Asian security, stability and prosperity.

- **Growing convergence of Interests**

The Indo-US engagement can turn into security alliance on the basis of complementarities of interests. The shared interests in the multiple areas including security, non-proliferation, terrorism and open governance has created an environment and increased the prospects for security alliance. Apart from this, the US and India share many common interests in South Asia right from maintaining regional balance of power, containing Chinese penetration into Indian ocean ,combating terrorism to discipline Pakistan. India and the US can cooperate in improving the region's security and stability; to counter terrorism; to promote democracy; to prevent nuclear proliferation, and contain China

- **Implications for Asia**

The Indo-US relations will alter the course of major events in Asia in future if this engagement turns into a formal alliance similar to US-Japan Security Alliance. Such alliance will act as a counterweight to the rising power of china and can stop the Chinese juggernaut in Indian Ocean.

- **Nuclear Safety**

The primary concern of US in south Asia is to prevent all out war between India and Pakistan and ensure that the nuclear weapons of both countries are safe and not vulnerable to theft especially by the terrorists. The US is putting pressure on Pakistan to stop cross border infiltration and on India to engage Pakistan in dialogue

- **Opportunity and Challenge**

India's engagement with the US is both an opportunity and challenge to India and vice versa .Considering the possibility of escalation of conflict with China over border issue and with Pakistan over Kashmir issue, India need to develop constructive relations with the US. Equally, the US should pay more attention to India considering its increasing influence in the region. It is necessary for US to support the development of India to ensure regional stability in Asia

- **Indispensability of bold initiatives**

India has big power aspirations. It is nurturing the dream of becoming regional super power. However Indian foreign policy does not seems to commensurate with its power ambitions. As several Indian and foreign analysts have observed, Indian foreign policy is an astonishingly risk averse foreign policy. India needs to draft a compressive national security strategy based on its power ambitions. India should strengthen its bilateral ties with the US based on shared political, security and economic interests.

- **Need to intensify cooperation**

In order to move the relationship forward both India and US requires continuous cooperation and consultation and few bold steps on regional and international issues. They need to intensify their dialogue on several issues. There are several untapped areas containing huge potential for cooperation.

Check your Progress.

1. Identify the areas of convergence of interests between India and US
2. Suggest the measures to strengthen the India-US relations.

6.9 LET US SUM UP

- The Indo-US relationship has evolved gradually in the last two decades from estrangement to engagement heading an alliance.
- The convergence interests especially in the crucial areas such as countering terrorism, managing nuclear proliferations and containing China augmented the possibility and scope of joint efforts and closer strategic engagement between the India and US.
- Various problems of the South Asian subcontinent such as territorial disputes, the ethnic and religious divergence, national separatism, religious extremism and cross-border terrorism and the nuclear confrontation draw US attention to the region and also facilitated cooperation between India and the US.
- There is an increasing awareness and acceptance of India's growing importance and future potential as a global player among the US policy makers
- India's emergence as a regional power in terms of security and on the economic front will not jeopardize US trade and security interests in Asia
- The Indo-US engagement can turn into security alliance on the basis of complementarities of interests
- It is in the interests of both US and India to work together, to support and understand each other to achieve shared goals and common causes of concern effectively. Both are the natural partners and they can do much more if they work jointly.
- Requirements of few bold and assertive steps to be initiated from both sides to further consolidate relations and dispel mutual suspicion

6.10 UNIT END QUESTIONS

1. Discuss the India-US relations in the cold war era
2. Critically evaluate the US's south Asia policy in the post cold war era
3. Discuss the changes in India-US relations in the post cold war era
4. Discuss how India-US engagement is mutually benefitted for both the states
5. Discuss the Pakistan and China factor in India-US relations

6.11 REFERENCES

1. Dennis Kux, **Estranged Democracies: India and the United States**, Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1993, p. 307
2. C.Rajamohan, Beyond the Clinton visit, **world focus**.vol.21,no.6-7,June-July2000,P3
3. Deolankar Shailendra, **Foreign Policy of India: Continuity and Change** (Pune: Pratima Prakshan,II Edi,2010)pp.65-70
4. The growing strategic convergence of interests between India and the US has been highlighted in the **Editorial of Telegraph**,6th April 2001
5. **The Times of India**, November 2010
6. Robert Hathaway, The US –India courtship: From Clinton to Bush in Sumit Ganguly. ed., **India as an emerging power**,(London: Frank Cass publishers,2003) p.9
7. J.K.Baral, J.N.Mohanti, “the US war against terrorism: Implications for south Asia,**strategic analysis**,vol.26.no4OCT/Dec.2002,pp-208-519
8. Sreedhar, terrorism in south Asia, **world focus**,vol.21,no.6-7,June-July 2000,pp-18-20
9. Washington Post,17th September 2001.The reference of Washington Post is cited in. Robert Hathaway, The US –India courtship: From Clinton to Bush in Sumit Ganguly. ed., **India as an emerging power**,(London: Frank Cass publishers,2003) p.6
10. John Thronhill, Moving closer to the US, **Financial Times**,London,23rd September, 2002
11. Paul Kerr,Mary Nikitin, **Pakistan's Nuclear Weapons:Proloferation and security issues**, congressional research service,30th November 2011, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/RL34248.pdf>

12. Farewell to Foreign Arms, Times of India, 1st August, 2010, p.22 also see Ashley J. Tellis, India's Emerging Nuclear Posture: Between Recessed Deterrence and Ready Arsenal, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2001, p. 61.
13. Stephan Cohen, India, Pakistan and Kashmir, in Sumit Ganguly. ed., India as an emerging power, (London: Frank Cass publishers, 2003) pp.38-48
14. Stephan Cohen, India: Emerging Power, (Washington D.C: Brookings Institution Press, 2001), p.300
15. Robert Hathaway, The US –India courtship: From Clinton to Bush in Sumit Ganguly. ed., India as an emerging power, (London: Frank Cass publishers, 2003) pp.6-12
16. Stephen Burgess, India's Emerging Security Strategy, missile defense and arms control, INSS Occasional Paper 54, June 2004, USAF Institute of National Security Studies, USAF Academy, Colorado
17. Strobe Talbott, "Dealing with the bomb in South Asia," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 78, No. 2, March 1999, p. 120.
18. C. Raja Mohan, "Indo-U.S. Dialogue on Pakistan?" The Hindu, April 10, 2003
19. Charles Lutes, new players on the scene: A.Q.Khan and nuclear black market, 28th July 2008, www.america.gov/st/peacesec-english/2008/july
20. Jonathan Medaline, Nuclear Terrorism: brief review of threat and responses, CRS Report to congress, 22 September 2004. www.fas.org/irp/crs/RL_32595.Pdf
21. David Albright, Kelvin O'Neill, Carry Hinderstain, securing Pakistan's nuclear arsenals: Principles of assistance, Institute for Science and international security, Issue Brief, www.isis-online.org/publications/terrorism
22. The reference of the article cited in Times of India, November 2010
23. Bharat Varma, Indian must counter china's imperial ambitions, Indian Defense Review, Vol.24.4, Oct-Dec 2009, <http://www.indiandefencereview.com/geopolitics/India-must-counter-Chinas-imperial-ambitions-.html>
24. The reference of the book was cited in Times of India, November 2010
25. Sanjaya Baru, Empires of the mind, Indian Express, 8th Feb. 2012, p.10, Sitaram Yechuri, Under the Influence, Hindustan Times, 6th March 2012, p.10

26. Abanti Bhattacharya, china's foreign policy challenges and evolving strategy, **strategic Analysis**,vol.30,no.1,Jan-Mar 2006,pp-184-85
27. Robert Hathaway, The US –India courtship: From Clinton to Bush in Sumit Ganguly. ed., **India as an emerging power**,(London: Frank Cass publishers,2003) pp.19-21
28. Robert Hathaway, The US –India courtship: From Clinton to Bush in Sumit Ganguly. ed., **India as an emerging power**,(London: Frank Cass publishers,2003) p10
29. **The Times of India**,November 2010
30. **Washington File**, *January 17, 2001*
31. Stephan Cohen, **India: Emerging Power**,(Washington D.C:Brookings Institution Press,2001)p.311
32. The Times of India,November 2010
33. Rajeshwari Rajgopalan, Indo –US relations in the Bush white house, **Strategic Analysis**,Vol.XXV.No.4July 2001,pp545-557
34. K.Subrahmanyam, Indo-US nuclear agreement: Partnership in a balance of power system, **Strategic Analysis**, Vol.29.No4,Oct/Dec 2005,pp-549-561
35. Joint Statement between the United States of America and the Republic of India, November 9, 2001, **www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011109-10.html**



INDIA-RUSSIA RELATIONS (POST 1991)

Unit Structure :

- 7.0 Objective
- 7.1 Introduction
- 7.2 Indo-Soviet Friendship
- 7.3 Post-Soviet Relationship in a Global Context
- 7.4 Strategic Partnership
- 7.5 Multilateralism: Opportunities and Challenges
- 7.6 Conclusion
- 7.7 Let us sum up
- 7.8 Unit end question
- 7.9 Reference

7.0 OBJECTIVE

In this chapter, we will study the cornerstones of India-Russia relations, which has its origins in the Soviet Union era. The time-tested relationship between these two large countries deserves special attention in India's foreign policy. We will discuss the imperatives and incentives for both the countries to maintain strong cooperation in the post-Cold War phase, which signifies continuity in India's foreign policy rather than any radical change.

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Special relationship between India and Russia is based on trust, mutual compatibility and national interests. It has deep domestic acceptability in both the countries. There exists hardly any constituency in either country that vies against this exemplary relationship. In 2008, during his visit to Russia, Prime Minister Dr. Man Mohan Singh said, "Our strategic relationship is based on political consensus in both countries. Despite the historic transformations underway in both countries, the essence of our partnership has not been diluted." Importantly, India-Russia relations reflect upon India's role in international political system.

The first-ever recorded contact between Indian and Russian people dates back to second half of fifteenth century, about a

quarter century before Vasco da Gama's famous arrival. A Russian merchant, Afanasy Nikitin from the city of Tver visited India and studiously described about its state system, society, economy, religion and nature in his travel notes "The 1466-1472 Voyage Over Three Seas." However, nothing notable happened for a long time after Nikitin's visit, mainly due to geographical distance between the two lands.

In the 20th century, Nikolai Roerich, a Russian writer, archeologist, traveler and painter came in close contacts with India. In fact, Roerich chose Naggar in Kullu district of Himachal Pradesh as his home in 1928 till his death in 1947. He was the brain behind the movement for protecting the cultural monuments as well as founder of the Himalayan Roerich Institute "Urusvat" in Naggar. On Indian part, Rabindranath Tagore succeeded in winning the hearts of many Russians and has been admired widely in Russia. He visited the Soviet land in 1930. Tagore brilliantly summarized his observations and opinions, in his letters in Bengali, about the great socialist experiments underway at that time, which were later published in a book titled 'Letters from Russia'. British rulers did not allow its translation into English due to Tagore's critical admiration of the upheavals in the Soviet Union at that time. On 20th September, 1930, Tagore wrote, "In Russia at last! Whichever way I look, I am filled with wonder. It is unlike any other country. It is radically different from top to the bottom; they are rousing everybody up without distinction."

7.2 INDO-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP

The great Soviet experiments attracted and impressed many Indian leaders and thinkers. Pandit Nehru visited USSR in 1937 and the achievements of planned economy had a lasting impact on him. With the establishment of Communist Party of India in 1920 and its rapid growth in 1930s, many communist leaders and thinkers paid visit to Soviet Union, openly or clandestinely to understand the nature of socialist revolution there. Thus, in 20th century, wide level of political contacts was formed between Indian groups and USSR. This has led to establishment of diplomatic relations between USSR and India in April 1947, i.e. four months before India was formally declared independent. Mrs. Vijaya Laxmi Pandit was appointed as India's first ambassador to the USSR.

On February 2, 1955, both countries signed first important agreement for the construction of Bhilai Steel Plant, which has become a celebrated symbol of economic cooperation between them. USSR provided significant technological assistance in establishment of many other public sector units, such as India's first autobotonic plant in Rishikesh, and metallurgical plants in Bhilai and

Bokaro. India also launched its first satellite with Soviet help. During Nehru's period, Indo-Soviet relations were based on economic, scientific and technological cooperation, along with cultural exchanges. Both countries also shared anti-colonial and anti-racial positions in their respective foreign policies. This ideological similarity resulted into both countries adopting almost identical positions on many international issues in the United Nations and elsewhere.

Indira Gandhi further firmed up bilateral relationship by signing the historic *Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation* with the Soviet regime. This milestone treaty was signed on August 9, 1971 for 20 years' period. With this treaty, India and USSR formally became the strategic partners in world politics. Its worth was proved within few months when India not only withstood the U.S. pressure tactics on Pakistan's behest, but also impinged a decisive military defeat upon Rawalpindi in December, 1971. India's intervention in support of Bangla Desh's liberation movement received a strategic support from the USSR that had nullified U.S. and Chinese attempts to deter New Delhi from taking military action. On the other hand, over the years, India had delicately calibrated its positions on Soviet military interventions in Hungary, Checkoslovakia and Afghanistan to avoid joining the western chorus of condemnation.

Check Your Progress

1. Discuss India's orientation towards Soviet Union.
2. Discuss Indo-Soviet 20 Years' Treaty.

7.3 POST-SOVIET RELATIONSHIP IN A GLOBAL CONTEXT

India and Russia were reliable partners during the cold war period. After the collapse of Soviet Union and advent of neo-liberalism in the policy circles in India, their relationship has witnessed upheavals. However, both countries demonstrated tremendous maturity in understanding each other's concerns and changed geo-political contexts. This perseverance has proved

fruitful; as off late, both countries have accelerated bilateral cooperation in defence, technological and economic fields, along with cooperating in multilateral forums.

In the post-cold war period, India has been articulating and promoting emergence of multi-polarity in international system; and at the same time, it is adjusting itself to the reality of unipolar world. India wants to balance Russia with US whenever it requires, however, idea of closer alignments with the latter dominates its strategic thinking. On the other hand, India has become attractive for US and other developed economies due to its liberalization policies, impressive economic growth, expansion of middle class resulting into creation of vast market potentials and new flexibilities in its foreign policy. Although Indian establishment always maintained that *relations with the United States will not have negative effects on its relations with any other power, particularly Russia*. However, U.S. is just not *any other power*. Historically, bilateral relationships of the U.S. have been carved out as exclusive since its strategic partners were hardly spared of Washington's concerns, interest and priorities. This situation had created limitations, particularly in the decade of 1990s, on approaches and imaginations of deepening relationship with its traditional partner, i.e. Russia.

This is supplemented by domestic upheavals in Russian polity and economy, along with changed security scenario in the Eurasian region. Russia's transition to market economy from the socialist system was a chaotic affair that had resulted in its economic decline and its inability to counterweight US strategic initiatives in international politics. As a result, Russia itself attempted to align closely with the United States, albeit for a short period under Boris Yeltsin. It has also broadened engagements with China and opened up with Pakistan. This has led to an impression upon New Delhi that Russia could no longer be stable and reliable partner in world affairs. This thinking was strengthened by lack of institutional decision-making structures in Russia during its transition phase.

India faced dilemma about future of bilateral relationship with Russia in the first half of 1990s, while the latter wanted to maintain balance in its relationship with New Delhi. It took a while for both the countries to realize strategic value of their friendship, and more so to comprehend that, relationships in new world can not be based on *either-or* premise. In 1992, the Foreign Policy Concept of Russian Federation hardly mentioned India. From 1992 to 1996, much water had flown in *Ganga* and *Volga*. In 1996, the then Russian foreign minister Primakov placed relationship with India at the centre of Moscow's external outlook. In 2000, the Russian national security doctrine made it clear that '*Russia's foreign*

economic interests do not lie with the West; instead Russia must seek markets in the third world countries." (RNSD, 2000) In October 2000, both countries signed *Declaration of Strategic Partnership* during Russian President Vladimir Putin's visit to India. This has partially filled up the void in bilateral relations created due to expiry of Indo-Soviet Peace Treaty in 1991. After this, relationship between two countries witnessed incremental growth. Uncertainty about the future of Indo-Russia friendship gave way to new vigour in developing bilateral relationship in the 21st century due to multiple factors. First, Russian polity has stabilized and economy witnessed resurgence under bold leadership of Vladimir Putin. It was an incentive for India to re-engage with its 'natural partner.' Second, Russia's relationship with western countries steadily soared after initial bonhomie; particularly when Moscow began to assert its sphere of influence among Eastern European and Central Asian countries. Third, period of new Sino-Russian friendship is accompanied by increased bilateral interaction between India and China; as well as cooperation among New Delhi, Moscow and Beijing on multilateral forums. Also, efforts to forge new relations between Russia and Pakistan were grounded to a halt due to complications involved in the power game in Afghanistan. This has helped in confidence building between India and Russia and provided mutual impetus to both to strengthen their relationship. Fourth, India aggressively adopted to 'superpower diplomacy' under the leadership of then Prime Minister AtalBihari Vajpayee to forge strategic relationship of 'nuclear India' with all the great powers; i.e. the P-5 nations. In this endeavor, Russia acquired serious attention among policy rooms in New Delhi. Fifth, new international realities enforced by global recession and declining western economies compels nations like India, Russia, China, Brazil and other potential regional powers like South Africa, Argentina, Indonesia etc to collectively demand greater say in international decision making. This has necessitated institutionalization of interactions among these nations; for example, formalization of BRICS summits, G-20 meetings etc.

India and Russia advocate multi-polarity in the emerging new world order. This idea is equally promoted by other regional and emerging global powers. Concept of multi-polarity argues for emergence of independent international actors as multiple poles in the form of political and/or economic powers to counterweight the hegemony of a single superpower. Following are the main features of multi-polar vision:

1. International system must be based on co-existence and participation of multiple powers in policy making.
2. Sovereign states should formulate their 'independent' foreign policy, without any outside pressure.

3. Conducive international environment for sovereign states to follow their own foreign policy.
4. International strategic decisions must be made at United Nations, which should be strengthened and empowered through its democratization and greater representation.
5. Concept of collective security should be encouraged, but it must be inclusive in nature.
6. Regionalism should be promoted to serve greater regional interests.
7. International disputes should be resolved through negotiated settlements rather than use of force.

India and Russia realize that transforming the international relations according to these principles is in their best interests. This overall global context is shaping the relationship between these two erstwhile friends.

Check Your Progress

1. Discuss the changed context of International Relations after the demise of USSR.
2. Discuss the issues of common understanding between India and Russia post-1991.

7.4 STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

Structural interdependence is the key feature of India-Russia relations, wherein both the countries are mutually dependent on each-other. Over all, there are more than 80 politico-legal documents signed between the two countries that provide concrete basis for bilateral cooperation in diverse fields. The Indo-Russian Strategic Agreement of 2001 establishes multi-directional bilateral relations with strategic and political sub-system frameworks. Both the countries enjoy strategic advantage from this agreement. Indian interests like Kashmir, energy security, relations with China, access to natural gas and oil resources in Central Asian countries are properly safeguarded in a strategic partnership with Russia.

India and Russia both are victims of terrorist acts and are embroiled in internal conflict situation in Kashmir and Chechenya regions respectively. As a result, they understand each–other's concerns as well as causes and sources of terrorism. They have committed to joint intelligence sharing mechanism to curb the menace of terrorism. Russian position on Kashmir and terrorism are fairly consistent over the period of time and has not affected by the regime changes in either countries. Significantly, Russian defence and strategic support is almost unconditional and is not linked to status of either countries' relations with any other nation, including China or U.S. Importantly, India continues to enjoy independence in decision-making, even on the issues of special concerns to Russia. For example, India's standings on Iran, climate change negotiations, Afghanistan and Syria are not identical to Russian positions. Yet, differences in perceptions on some issues have not come in the way of bilateral friendship.

Defence is a major component of Indo-Russian relations. Even today, Indian military's 70% of hardware imports are sourced from Russia. Procurement of military equipment from Russia, which began in 1960s, has reached the volume of 33 billion dollars in overall contacts. In fact, cold-war era relationship of supplier and client in the field of military equipment is gradually giving way to one of partnership between the two countries. Joint production mechanisms are put in place for wide range of sophisticated weapons, significant among them is the joint manufacturing of Brahmos missiles. In the *Defexpo India 2004*, Russia's exposition was one of the largest that featured 34 enterprises. Russia displayed over 370 samples of military equipment and 70 samples of dual use and civil products. Bilateral cooperation in the fields of military equipment, security apparatuses, space and satellite technology, and nuclear power has created interdependence between Indian defence establishment and Russian military industrial complexes.

Energy Sector

India is oil importing dependent nation as it imports 80 per cent of its petroleum products' need, of course, mostly in a crude form. Consequently, energy security acquired increasing importance for strategic cooperation between India and Russia. This situation is best summed up by the then Petroleum Minister of India, Dr. Mani Shankar Aiyar, in the year 2004, when he said, "In the half-century of Indian independence, Russia has guaranteed our territorial integrity, and in the second half it may be able to guarantee our energy security. What I am talking about is the strategic alliance with Russia in energy security, which is becoming for India at least, as important as national security." (Baruah, 2004) Indian policy is centered on access to Russian nuclear energy and hydrocarbon sources.

In December 2009, India and Russia signed a Civil Nuclear Pact, which guarantees India uninterrupted nuclear fuel supply. In contrast with the 123 agreement associated with controversial Indo-U.S. nuclear deal, the above mentioned Pact does not seek assurances from India on end-use and reprocessing. Thus, India need not to return the fuel and equipment under any circumstances. Apart from the commitment to supply additional civil nuclear plant at Koodankulam and a new plant in West Bengal, Russia has promised to construct 20 nuclear energy plants in India. Each plant is estimated to cost \$ 1.5 billion to Russian government.

In the petroleum and natural gas sector, India banks on Russia to ease out its pressures. In 2005, Russia has helped India out of crunch situation by offering oil at below market price, which had touched \$50 a barrel at that time. On the other hand, India's ONGC has made its biggest investment ever in the Russian mega plants, Sakhalin-I and Sakhalin-II. These investments go beyond the technological and human resource partnerships. India has got the trade rights in the Russian hydrocarbon reserves, wherein it can engage in oil swaps with Russian supplies in the market. The two countries also agreed on joint exploration and production of hydrocarbons in the Bay of Bengal off-shore areas.

Russians have rejected the U.S. investment claim for Sakhalin-III plant, and indeed, invited India to be part of it. This kind of decision is taken at the highest level of policy-making, which signifies return of Indian influence on Moscow. Apart from Sakhalins, India and Russia share the vision to explore Central Asian hydrocarbon fields sooner than later. India has strategic and energy interests in Central Asian Republics. India is serious in its attempt to diversify energy resources, which are heavily tilted towards West Asia at present. In order to achieve this objective, India has adopted a twin approach. It is strengthening its relations with Russia, which maintains influence over number of regimes in the region. Indian approach includes possibility of joint Indo-Russia projects. At the same time, it is independently developing friendly relations with former Soviet Republics in the region.

India has made successful strides in deepening relationships with Kazakhstan and Tajikistan, and is in the process of elevating its relations with Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan. Along with the energy interests in these countries, India has geo-strategic goals in Tajikistan due to its proximity to Afghanistan, Pakistan and West Asia. India has reportedly negotiated an air base in Tajikistan, which could be a great strategic asset for New Delhi. This achievement was not possible without keeping the Russians in good faith and humour. Russia not only has its interests to defend in the region, but also has historic politico-cultural ties with the people there. There are estimated 10 million ethnic Russians

residing in Central Asian states, along with the presence of 20,000 strong Russian military personnel camping in the region. Russia's linkages with transportation and pipeline routes in the region, as well as its share in communications and power grids are manifestation of these omnipresent ties. Thus, access to Central Asia is an important façade of Indo-Russian relations.

Check Your Progress

1. Discuss issues of terrorism and regional cooperation in India-Russia relations.
2. Discuss India's relations with Russia from Energy security perspective.

7.5 MULTILATERALISM: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

India and Russia are poised to develop their relationship beyond the bilateral framework. Both the countries constantly explore possibilities of cooperation in existing or new multilateral forums. In mid-1990s, the then Russian premier Primakov floated the idea of Russia-India-China (RIC) triangle as a strategic counterweight to western hegemony. The idea could not be realized due to inherent contradictions of such an arrangement. First, India can not forge strategic relationship with China, directly or indirectly, unless border dispute between two countries is settled amicably. Second, India is not interested in acting as a balancing power against western democracies, whom it does not view as threat to its strategic or any other important interests. Third, India has better trade relations with the west than with Russia or China, therefore, it will not jeopardize its trade interests in pursuit of RIC power triangle. However, India continue to participate in trilateral discussions to maintain good relations with both the countries. In the future, the idea of RIC can take more constructive turn, which will be beneficial to India, particularly on trade front.

Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), a forum of Russia, China and four Central Asian Republics, is emerged as a powerful international platform in Asia in last one decade.

Conceptualization of SCO is considered as a diplomatic masterstroke of China and Russia, wherein they have secured their strategic and energy interests in Central Asian region against the U.S. attempts for the same. Many Asian countries, particularly in South, West and Central Asia are keen to become SCO members. India has already acquired observer status and is one of the frontrunner for its membership. With India's increased interests and investments in Afghanistan, it becomes pertinent for New Delhi to acquire greater stakes in SCO. After the western military withdrawal from Afghanistan, SCO is set to play important role in determining the future of this troubled country. SCO has proclaimed time and again that it will deal with three evils of terrorism, extremism and separatism. These are areas of India's core concerns too, hence India can play a substantial role in this organization. Importantly, even though SCO is a security organization, it does not plan to be a military alliance, the proposition which could deter India from joining it. Instead, SCO focusses on economic, energy and regional security issues. Full membership at SCO will further improve India's relations with Russia, wherein both countries can play influential role in Afghanistan and other countries in the region.

Most significant multilateral forum of Indo-Russian engagement is BRICS, i.e. the regular summit meetings of five emerging and vibrant economies in the world, which are Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa. Despite differences on some global issues, such as climate change, this grouping of five emerging nations is the most powerful platform to influence global policies, particularly in the economic realm. BRICS is envisaged not merely as a 'group of five' to defend and promote their interests, but as a representative body of developing nations. BRICS is floating the concept of its own *Developmental Bank* as developing nations do not have larger say in existing Bretton-woods' institutes. Similarly, BRICS's Delhi Summit 2012 declared institutionalization of mechanism among group members to trade in their own currencies to decrease reliance on American Dollar. If these two concepts are materialized, BRICS can emerge as the most significant new organization of 21st century. This will comprehensively boost India-Russia bilateral relations.

Shortcomings in the Bilateral Relationship

Lack of substantial trade volumes between the two friendly countries is the biggest shortfall of Indo-Russian relations. In 2005-06, bilateral trade was only \$ 3 billion, which reached to \$ 7 billion in 2009. The Joint Indo-Russian Business Council aims to push the trade volume up to \$ 20 billion by the year 2015, which is a herculean task. Indian exports to Russia mainly comprise of RMG cotton, accessories, drugs and pharmaceuticals, tea, coffee, processed minerals. It imports iron and steel, fertilizers, non-ferrous metals, coal, news print, silver metal, rubber, machineries and

chemicals. Both countries are willing to diversify trade, along with promoting joint ventures and business partnerships. Recently, joint working groups on business have been set up to obtain this objective. However, role of private entrepreneurs of both countries is crucial in increasing the trade volume. On the other hand, political leadership in both countries needs to demonstrate concrete will to install easy visa processes and joint banking procedures. Indian investment in Russia is particularly low, which should be increased substantially for sustained bilateral ties. Problems of Russian bank guarantees and Visas are hindrance for improved trade. On the other hand, Russia still has about 1 billion dollars of Indian Rupees, unspent from debt repayment.

Check Your Progress

1. Discuss multilateral issues involved in bilateral relationship between India and Russia.
2. Discuss the constraints in bilateral relationship in post-1991 era.

7.6 CONCLUSION

India-Russia relationship has withstood the tests of different time and circumstances. It is one of the unique bilateral relationships in world history. Despite being at a geographical distance from each-other and differences in their respective strengths, the relationship is exclusively based on mutual interests and benefits. Regular summits of leaders of two countries, institutionalization of BRICS and India's growing interests in SCO enlarge scope of further cooperation between New Delhi and Moscow. For next few decades, Afghanistan, Central Asia and energy resources stand out as marked areas of strategic cooperation between two countries. With Moscow's entry into WTO regime, Indian businesses may find it opportune to trade with and invest in Russia. Both countries can immensely benefit from increase in educational, cultural and scientific exchanges. For this purpose, both the governments must initiate liberalized Visa regimes and boost up interactions between civil societies in respective countries. Russian support is crucial for India's aspirations of permanent seat at the United Nations Security Council. The mutual support and cooperation will help India acquire its rightful place in world polity and Russia to re-establish itself as the great power.

7.7 LET US SUM UP

Russia and its political predecessor USSR has been the most reliable of India's friends in world politics. It is now proved that the friendship between two of the major countries of the world was not merely guided by ideological considerations but has been founded on the basis of mutual need and capacity to cooperate with each other. In today's context, cooperation on the issues of terrorism, defence, energy security and regional cooperation form the core of Indo-Russia friendship. On the other hand, lack of mutual trade and declined cultural interest about each-others' society and culture are few areas which presents scope of further engagement and consolidation of unique friendship between the two countries.

7.8 UNIT END QUESTIONS

1. Discuss in detail the contours of India-Russia relations.
2. What were the circumstances and reasons of India drawing closure to the USSR in post-Independence period?
3. Discuss the continuity and change in bilateral relations between India and Russia.

7.9 REFERENCES

- Chenoy, Kamal Mitra and AnuradhaChenoy, "India's ForeignPolicy Shifts and the Calculus of Power", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42 (35), September 1-7, 2007
- Das, P.L., "Hurdles and Hopes in Indo-Russian Relations," *World Focus*, 347-348, Nov.-Dec. 2008
- Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, *Annual Report*, 2011-12, New Delhi
- Mittal, Manu, *Cultures and Societies in Transition: India, Russia and Other CIS Countries*, 2008, Shipra Publications, New Delhi
- Mohanty, A., *Indo-Russian Relations: From Yelstin to Putin(1991-2001)*,2001, Moscow: Ikar.
- Stobdan, P. (ed.), *India-Russia Strategic Partnership: Common Perspectives*, 2010, IDSA, New Delhi
- SCO, "Declaration on Fifth Anniversary of Shanghai Cooperation Organisation", Shanghai, June 15,2006 at <http://www.sectsco.org/html/01470.html>



THE EU- INDIA RELATIONS

Unit Structure :

- 8.0 Objective
- 8.1 Introduction
- 8.2 Looking into the History : Period of Development Partnership
- 8.3 Analysing the Present : From Development to Trade Partnership
- 8.4 EU-India Strategic Partnership
- 8.5 The Problem Areas, Challenges and Prospects
- 8.6 Conclusion
- 8.7 Let us sum up
- 8.8 Unit end question
- 8.9 References

8.0 OBJECTIVE

The main objective of this chapter is to bring out salient features of EU- India relations, tracing its history and analysing the contemporary issues. Chapter will help the readers to understand various dimensions of this bilateral relationship. Problem areas are also covered in this chapter for a proper and objective analysis of this relationship.

8.1 INTRODUCTION

The EU- India relations has a long history, a stable present and ambitious future. The relationship once defined within the contours of 'development partnership' is now spelled as 'strategic partnership'. The importance of the strategic partnership lies in the fact that both India and the EU share common vision for a democratic, multi-cultural and multi-polar world order. At a time when new economic and security architecture is evolving in Asia, EU's engagement in the continent is incomplete without partnering India. Similarly, India has to engage with liberal, democratic and

globalising Europe for its own benefits(Sachdeva, 2008). Considering commonality of vision, contemporary international scenario and future stakes, the India- EU relationship is of paramount importance for both sides. This is even accepted and approved by the both the sides and very well defined by Herman Van Rompuy, the President of the European Council during his visit to New Delhi in 2012. According to Herman Van Rompuy, “we share a common determination to move the EU-India relationship forward. We made significant progress of fields and set the tone for future. Our common objectives are to turn our growing cooperation into mutual opportunities and to turn our strategic partnership into a key element for the global architecture” (Rompuy, 2012).

Considering the progress made in the India-EU relationship there is general perception that miles had been covered and things are on the right track. There is nothing wrong for those who subscribe to the above viewpoint but all is still not well. In this chapter we will try to analyse India – EU relationship considering its strength, but also will try to analyse from a critical perspective to understand the prevailing lacunae, which are perilous hurdles and blocking the potential of the India-EU relationship. For this purposes the chapter is divided into three distinct parts covering the history of India – EU relations, discussing the contemporary progress and examining the present and future challenges for this relationship.

8.2 LOOKING INTO THE HISTORY: PERIOD OF DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP

EU- India relations date backs to 1962 when India established diplomatic relations with the European Economic Community (EEC). India was amongst the first country to enter into a diplomatic relations with the EEC. Despite this vintage association India- EU relationship remained docile during the cold war. One of the obvious reasons for this was the ideological differences about the worldview subscribed by New Delhi. The Non-Alignment orientation of Indian foreign policy during the height of cold war never allowed it to develop a strong alliance with the capitalist western countries and blocs. This equally applies to the India- EU relations, which remained passive for a very long time.

While pointing towards India it is also important to underline the culpability of the EU, which is equally responsible for neglecting South Asia as a region of priority for its external policy. The EU,

which is presently regarded as the most successful exercise in regionalisation to date and role model for the other projects around the world (Lawson, 2003) did not had a comprehensive policy for South Asia and this was also one of the reasons why India-EU relations remained ceremonial till end of the cold war. Arguing from the realist paradigm of international relations, South Asia was not considered as the region of interest by the European community for a very long time. South Asia was geographically inaccessible and had Soviet and Chinese influence making it unattractive for the EU to get involved in this region.

There is another reason cited by some scholars for the lack of warmth in the India- EU relations. This school of thought is of the view that before the formal authorization of Maastricht treaty¹, the EU did not had any vision of foreign policy. There was no guiding principles and basis available for building close external relations with different countries and parts of the world. It was some set paradigm based on which the EU played a nominal role in the world politics. Certain changes witnessed after the end of cold war and the EU looked ahead for some intervention of global scale in international relations. Reshaping of the EU's foreign policy begins in 1992 when Maastricht Treaty introduced Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) as one of the pillars for the EU (Tripathi, 2011). In the terms of external relations, the development of CFSP has been extremely valuable to the EU in helping to facilitate the emergence of overall policy and implementation framework in regard to its effort to engage third countries through four main areas - diplomatic, economic, development, and security policies. This process of CFSP at the EU level was in part, driven by the need to tackle the deficit between the EU's obvious and growing economic power and it's political and security focus in relation with third countries (Quigley, 2007; 194)

These are some of the broadest possible explanations put forth to explain the jaded relationship between India and the European Union before the beginning of 1990s. Although, the general cordiality and multitude was missing in the India-EU relationship but still there are numerous development programmes and schemes in India that was supported by the EU in the cold war. In this regard it will not be wrong to assume that the EU was the development partner of India during the cold war.

There are many success stories of the EU's cooperation programme in India. Operation flood is noteworthy, which helped India to become the world's leading milk producer. Operation flood was the world largest food and development programme running from 1970 to 1996 and co-financed by World Bank and Indian

government along with the EC. The education and health sectors also received much of the EC's aid, which accounts to nearly 600 million Euros. According to the figures since 1976, the EC had committed some 2 billion Euros to India in development assistance. Primarily, the EC supported Indian government's effort to improve quality of life for the poorest and most disadvantages member of the society. India is a country where majority of its population lives in rural areas and any development project must take this feature in consideration. Priority given by the EC to the rural development in India and 60 million ECU was financed by the EC in the form of non-reimbursable grants in 1985.

In 1973, India and the EC had signed commercial and economic cooperation agreements. Preferences given to the Indian products and steps are taken to promote the EU's trade with India. As a part of trade promotion, Indian Trade Centre (ITC) opened in Brussels with the financial help from the community. The primary export commodities of India to the EC supported through preferential treatments. This includes textile, jute, and sugar. For Indian textile, the EC had GATT Multifibre Arrangement (GMA) and this was simply to encourage Indian products. India also benefited from the import duty free quotas, which the EC granted annually for its handicraft and handloom products. Going beyond this the EC lifted tariff and quota restrictions on import of jute products from India, which helped jute industry at a large scale. The EC also signed cane sugar agreement with India in 1975. Under this agreement, the EC had undertaken to import annually up to a total of 1.3 million tons of sugar at the price, which are generally higher than the world market price.

In short, the history of India-EU relations is more of development partnership where India was generally benefited and developed some of its contemporary core structures by the aid, help and support of the European Union.

Check your Progress

1. What are the main reasons for coldness between the EU-India relationships during the cold war.
2. What supports the EU extended for the development activities of India.

8.3 ANALYSING THE PRESENT: FROM DEVELOPMENT TO TRADE PARTNERSHIP

The world underwent a change after the fall of Berlin Wall and these changes were accelerated with the demise of Soviet Union. India, which followed a socialist economic model giving preferences to public sector and opted for protectionism in international trade, overhauled its economic policy and integrated with the world by adopting privatisation, liberalisation and globalisation. This alteration in the economic system also influenced its foreign policy and more open posture was shown towards the west and effort were undertaken to establish new partnership around the world. While India still faces a number of significant challenges, this tectonic shift from slower to high growth rates is important not just for India but also for the developing world, for global institutions, and for great power relationship (Malone, 2011). The economic growth story of India is very debatable and there are strong objections by a group of scholars in proclaiming it a success. Still from the strategic and foreign policy point of view swollen Indian economic growth curved a better positioning of New Delhi in the comity of nations. This applies to the India- EU relations, which in the last two decades has witnessed several new milestones. In the three decades after establishing diplomatic ties with India, the EU was generally regarded as a development partner for India and helped to promote some genuinely good projects. There were no basic objections or reservations on the EU's development role and Brussels enjoyed general goodwill in India. This primarily development partnership got changed with time and opening of Indian economy altered the picture.

There is a surge in the trade relationship (see table 1) in last one decade with India and the EU presently engaged in one the longest trade negotiations for concluding a Free Trade Agreement (FTA). In the table (2009-2010) one can easily estimate the overall increase in trade between India and the EU.

Table 1: EU – India Trade Partnership in 2009-10 (in Billion Euro)

Trade in Goods (2010)	
EU goods export to India	34.7
EU goods import from India	33.2
Trade in Goods (2009)	
EU goods export to India	27.5
EU goods import from India	25.4
Trade in Services (2010)	
EU service export to India	9.8
EU services import from India	8.1
Trade in Services (2009)	
EU services export to India	8.6
EU services import from India	7.4
Foreign Direct Investment (2010)	
EU outward investment to India	3
Indian inward investment to EU	0.6
Foreign Direct Investment (2009)	
EU outward investment to India	3.2
Indian inward investment to EU	0.4

Source: European Commission Trade [Online: web] Accessed on 2 June 2012, URL: http://ec.europa.eu/trade/creating-opportunities/bilateral-relations/countries/india/index_en.htm

EU-India trade has grown impressively and more than doubled from Euro 28.6 billion in 2003 to over Euro 67.9 billion in 2010. EU investment to India has more than tripled since 2003 from Euro 759 million to Euro 3 billion in 2010 and trade in commercial service has tripled since 2003 Euro 5.2 billion in 2002 to Euro 17.9 billion in

2010 (European Commission, 2012). With this overall increase in trade the EU is presently the biggest trading partner of India and similarly, India is also the eight largest partner of the EU. According to available studies this figures will go up once India and the EU will finalise FTA. According to the available study on the future impact of the FTA, carried out by Yvan Decreux and Cristina Mitaritonna there are likelihood of two scenarios (Decreux & Mitaritonna, 2007). These two scenarios are as follows

Scenario I: Adds uniform 10 % cut of protection in services on both sides. Services liberalisation is implemented in two steps, a first half of the cut is implemented in 2007, and the second in 2010.

Scenario II: Introduces a 25 % cut of protection in services on both sides, with the same timing.

It per the estimate of the study by 2020 Indian export to the EU would increase by 13 % under scenario I and 14 % under scenario II. Likewise the EU trade with India will also witness an increase of 17 % under scenario I and 18 % under scenario II. To sum up India and EU both will get benefits from the FTA. While discussing about the impact of the FTA on the trade relations of India and the EU it is worth notable that civil society of both Europe and India has some vehement opposition. There are strong objections by the civil society to some of the provisions in FTA and it is not easy for New Delhi and Brussels to completely ignore the points of oppositions. It is also important to note that some of these objections very genuine and should be taken seriously before making any formal approval of FTA.

Check your Progress

1. The new economic policy after the end of cold war influenced the Indian foreign policy.
2. There is a quantitative jump in the EU-India trade relations. This will further grow after the conclusion of FTA.

8.4 EU- INDIA STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

To strengthen the India-EU relationship several initiatives were taken by both the sides. Amongst all the India-EU summit, which started in 2000, played a very significant role. The first India-EU summit was held in Lisbon and according to the assessment of the European Commission, 'the first EU-India summit signifies the single most important milestone in enhancing EU-India relations to date since the European Commission took the initiative in the mid 90ties to communicate to Council and Parliament its blue print for a substantially enhanced partnership in India'. After four regular summits it was agreed by both the sides to enter into a strategic partnership and finally in 2004 India and EU became strategic partner. After getting into a close strategic partnership India – EU set a formal guidelines for giving a direction to the strategic partnership. These guidelines are covered in what is known as EU-India Joint Action Plan (JAP) which was launched in the 2005 after EU-India Summit. According to JAP, EU and India in 2005 has zeroed on following priority areas.

1. Strengthening dialogue and consultation mechanism
2. Deepening political dialogue and cooperation
3. Bringing together people and cultures
4. Enhancing policy dialogue and cooperation
5. Developing trade and investment.

With the change in time EU-India partnership has entered into a new era and to match with the demand of time JAP was revised. Following new areas of importance was included in 2008.

1. Promoting peace and comprehensive security
2. Promoting sustainable development
3. Promoting research and technology
4. Promoting people to people and cultural exchange

In both the JAPs one thing is worth notable that lot of significance is given to people to people and cultural exchange. People to people contact between Indian and the EU yet not developed, as it is the case with the America and Canada. There is a general lack of awareness about the EU in India and with Europe people usually relate with Britain, France and Germany and that too because of obvious historical and cultural reasons. This is not a good sign for the EU- India ties as lack people to people contact is

most important aspect of foreign relations. People's perception matters immensely in the making of the foreign policy.

8.5 THE PROBLEM AREAS, CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS

The picture above appears very optimistic but there is some critical issues pertaining to the EU- India relations which need to be focused for the comprehensive understanding to this topic. It is interesting to note that both in Europe and India there are number of scholars who are yet to give relevance to the EU- India ties. According to European expert Christian Wagner, "India's new middle class and its foreign policy elites remain much more focused on the US and Asia rather than on Europe (Wagner, 2008)". Likewise Indian strategic analyst C Raja Mohan in one of the articles raised several questions on the EU's role in the world politics (Mohan, 2006). These analysts are not wrong while making comment on the EU-India tie and on close examination several lacunae cannot be identified.

Firstly, it is hard to locate one example where India and the EU had jointly played a substantial role in resolving any international crisis. Theoretically both New Delhi and Brussels have some common point of regarding the world politics but a common action is yet to be started. India and the EU can play a vital part in West Asia but the EU due to its over dependence on the US for the security issues never tired to look for any international collaboration which is not driven Washington. There are scholars who put it as, the Union wishes to promote a Kantian world because of the weakness of its foreign policy instruments and its incoherent policy apparatus, unable to confront decisively the real threats and challenges it faces. The 'dirty work' is left to its ally the US, which has the military clout and the strategic resolve to act in world affairs, allowing the EU to free-ride on the US and NATO's achievements (Tocci, 2008). Similarly, India also failed to take any independent initiative on West Asia and followed the US led action plans except for some differences it showed over the NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) attack on Libya. These are some of the glaring lack of vision on the foreign policy front and India and EU both have to rectify such gap to emerge as true strategic partners at the world level.

Afghanistan is another country where India and Europe can jointly make a difference and can prove better in many respects if we compare with the present involvement of the US. India, very recently also entered into a strategic partnership with Afghanistan and as a matter of fact New Delhi enjoys certain goodwill in this war wrecked country. There is historical and traditional ties of India with Afghanistan and make it as one of the preferred partners of Kabul. After 9/11 the focus of the world had shifted to Afghanistan precisely because it was then ruled by Taliban the most destructive elements of the contemporary world, which even not hesitated to provide safe shelter to 9/11 mastermind Osama Bin Laden. After the American led forces replaced the Taliban regime with the Karzai government international agencies and different nations extend full cooperation to rebuild Afghanistan in order to bring peace and prosperity in that country. India and EU both responded to the desperate call of the Afghan government for development assistance and as of now the EU is one of the largest donors of the development fund to Afghanistan. Similarly, India is the sixth largest bilateral donor of Afghanistan (largest regional donor). India and EU, which had equally suffered from the terrorism, has deep mutual interest in Afghanistan to make it a peaceful, democratic and stable country. India and the EU can work on some joint development project in Afghanistan and this can bring fruitful results.

Climate change is another issue in which, India and the EU can collaborate for better future of human beings. Unfortunately, the narrow boundaries of national interest are yet to be sidelined by the two sides to reach on a common ground to work jointly on the issue of climate change. In this issue is it expected that EU will take the lead and will also show some openness in accommodating the viewpoint of the developing countries. Unfortunately, the deadlock between the developed and developing countries is the biggest hurdle and it appears that climate change has acquired the shape of trade conflict. If India and EU can jointly work on the climate change agenda some acceptable solution can be reached.

Check your Progress

1. What are the main points of JAP 2005 and 2008?
2. What are the common issues where the EU and India can work together?

8.6 CONCLUSION

India- EU relations has travelled a long distance but has not achieved any milestone. The point of satisfaction is that the ball is rolling with the steady pace. There are potential areas, explored agendas and common grounds to be covered by India and EU. There is no lack of political willingness by both the sides to develop a strong strategic partnership but the development is slow. EU needs to regard India as one of the important player not only at the regional level but also at the world level. Joint programmes apart from academic sphere have to be developed and in this India also share the responsibility. It is generally witnessed that Indian foreign office is yet to get the EU orientation and still prefer to deal with member states rather than with the organization as one single body. A little effort from Brussels and New Delhi can change the picture and let hope that future will testify this assertion of the author.

8.7 LET US SUM UP

1. Theoretically EU-India relationship is on the right track but practically there is a need for further collaboration especially on the pertinent issues of international relations.
2. EU-India relationship had made progress in past and has good future.
3. The worldview of India and EU are similar
4. Some critically questions raised by civil society members on the FTA, should be taken seriously both by India and the EU.

8.8 UNIT END QUESTIONS

1. Why India EU relationship remained very formal till the end of the cold war?
2. What are the main points of the EU-India strategic Partnership?
3. Has India been benefitted by the development grants of the EU?
4. What led to the change in Indian foreign policy?
5. Which treaty greatly influenced the foreign policy of the EU and how?

8.9 REFERENCES

- Dexreux, Yvan and M. Cristina (2007), *Economic Impact of the Potential Free Trade Agreement (FTA) Between European Union and India*, [Online: web] Accessed on 31 May 2012, URL: http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2007/may/tradoc_134682.pdf
- European Commission (2012), *EU- India Trade*, [Online: web] accessed on 2 June 2012, URL: http://ec.europa.eu/trade/creating-opportunities/bilateral-relations/countries/india/index_en.htm
- Lawson, Stephanie (2003), *International Relations*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Malone, M, David (2011), *Does the Elephant Dance? Contemporary Indian Foreign Policy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mohan, Raja, C (2006), "India and Balance of Power" *Foreign Affairs*, 85 (4): 17-32
- Quigley, John (2007), "EU-Asia Relation and the Role of European Union CFSP Special Representatives", in Peter Anderson and Georg Wiessala (eds) *The European Union and Asia: Reflection and Reorientations*, Amsterdam: Rodopi Publishing, 2007.
- Rompuy, Van Herman (2012), "EU-India Summit" Speech Delivered on 10 February 2012 at the India International Centre, New Delhi, [Online: web] accessed on 2nd June 2012, URL: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/127927.pdf

- Sachdeva, Gulshan (2008), "India and the European Union: Broadening Strategic Partnership Beyond Economic Linkages" *International Studies*, 45 (4): 341-367.
- Tocci, Nathalie (2008), "Profiling Normative Foreign Policy: The European Union and Its Global Partners", in (ed), Nathalie Tocci, *Who Is A Normative Foreign Policy Actor? The European Union and Its Global Partners*, Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies
- Tripathi, Dhananjay (2011), *Development Role of the European Union in South Asia*, New Delhi: Vij Publication.
- Wagner, Christian (2008), "EU and India: A deepening Partnership", Chaillot Paper No. 109, Paris: Institute of Security Studies.



INDIA RELATIONSHIP WITH THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE SOUTH- EAST ASIA, THE SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA AND THE LATIN AMERICA

Unit Structure :

- 9.0 Objective
- 9.1 Introduction
- 9.2 India and Developing World
- 9.3 India - the South - East Asia Relationship
- 9.4 India - Africa Relationship
- 9.5 India-Latin America Relations
- 9.6 Let us sum up
- 9.7 Unit end question
- 9.8 Reference

9.0 OBJECTIVE

Objective of this unit is to trace continuity and changes in India's engagement with developing countries in general and with South- East Asia, Africa and Latin America in particular. The unit will apprise about evolution, pattern, and dynamics of India's relationship with developing countries .

9.1 INTRODUCTION

India and the developing countries from the south share a number of similar concerns and challenges, and remained to be in the same side for during most of the modern history. However India's relationship with the developing countries from the southern hemisphere has not been a smooth ride. In past and present, India has been trying its level best to show solidarity with the South-East Asian, African and Latin American countries.

9.2 INDIA AND THE DEVELOPING WORLD

Owing to its size, geographical location, resource base and politico-cultural heritage India's capabilities to play crucial role at global and regional levels have never been in doubt. But, transformation of India's capabilities into realities requires an active and effective foreign policy that needs to be understood in the present context. Foreign policy, broadly, refers to attempts by a nation-state to influence or/and manage events outside the state's borders by affecting behavior of other countries, transnational entities and non-state actors, and to make the external environment amiable for a country to undertake its activities without any serious trouble. In broader sense foreign policy of a nation-state is intended to make conducive world order and ensuring and maximizing national interest in the existing world order. The world order has two connotations. Firstly, it is related to arrangement among powers at global and regional levels. Secondly it is also inextricably linked with maintaining stability and amiable environment, which includes providing security, maintaining national development, and confronting new challenges like energy crisis, environmental degradation, socio-cultural conflicts, financial crises, economic meltdown, etc. In these two contexts, India's relationship with other developing countries remains one of the central points of discussion.

Independent India's Foreign Policy towards developing world can be characterized by ebbs and flows during last six decades or so. Initially, India tried to flock developing countries together under the umbrella of Non-Alignment Movement (NAM) and to provide a leadership to developing them. The movement was successful neither in fulfilling India's foreign policy objectives nor in attaining developmental objective of other developing (the Third World) countries in longer run as it lacked any socio-economic content. However, in the wake of end of cold war, technological revolutions and globalization induced dynamic changes; India's relationship with the developing countries has been gaining greater prominence in the present world order. Moreover, owing to the systemic changes, the world has become so much interlinked that no nation-state can afford to live in isolation. In this context, the South-South cooperation has now become more realistic than any other period. From India's perspective as well its relationship with other developing countries is not only capable of fulfilling its wider material requirements but can also support it in its endeavours to make global governance and world order more amicable for itself.

During last two decades India has been gaining economic strength and has become the third largest economy in the World,

following the USA and China in Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) terms. It has been also consciously attempting technological modernization of its military to strengthen the second arm of its 'hard power'. India's outward economic orientation during last two decades has allowed it to reestablish trade and investment linkages with the other developing countries at multilateral and bilateral levels. New Delhi is negotiating a slew of free- and preferential-trade agreements with individual countries as well as multilateral bodies in different developing regions including the South East Asia (SEA), Africa and Latin America. Hard powers make a country capable of influencing agenda setting at global and regional levels. Apart from its enhanced hard power status, in the context of India's relationship with the developing countries, India's greatest asset is its 'soft power'.

India's biggest "instrument" of soft power has been its diaspora. India's diaspora is certainly an asset, but far from the only one. Public diplomacy is a tool which is adopted by government of India to enhance its soft power at the global level in general and in developing countries in particular. The age of globalization and Information revolution heralded new dimensions of soft power for India. Culture is one of the most important sources of soft power for India in developing countries. India is the world's largest democracy. India's biggest asset in terms of soft power is its successfully-functioning democracy which has survived despite many challenges. Unlike most other developing countries, India has established democratic traditions.

Check your progress

1. What were India's Foreign Policy imperatives during the Cold War?
2. What are the implications of India's growing 'hard' and 'soft' power capabilities during the post-Cold War Period?

9.3 INDIA-THE SOUTH-EAST ASIA RELATIONSHIP

Even though geographically and culturally no other region is so closer to India than the South-East Asia (SEA), the relationship

of India with this region has been mixed-bag in the chronological terms. The region consists of as many as eleven countries including ten members of the ASEAN (Association for the South East Asian) which is one of the most vibrant and successful examples of regional cooperation. Historically, India's interaction with the SEA Countries had been multifaceted and friendly, as the relationship was based on mutual trust and 'soft power' appeal, and as neither India nor any of its mighty kingdoms of the past, including *Mauryas* and *Cholas*, shown any imperialist intent towards its eastern neighbours. However, the relationship caught in downturn spiral during the post-Independent India.

Broadly speaking, the India-SEA relationship can be divided into three distinct phases. During the first phase (1947-1962), India taxed providing leadership to the region. At the one hand, it tried involving the countries of this region with the help of its ambitious Non-Alignment Movement; at the other hand it also supported decolonization processes in Indonesia, India-China and Philippines. India's role was instrumental in the Indonesian decolonization process. It not only defied the Dutch blockade (1945-49) by supplying essential commodities to Indonesia and gave refuge to Sultan Syahrir, it also held a conference in Delhi to support Indonesia's decolonization process. Subsequently, India became one of the first countries to ink an agreement with independent Indonesia. Moreover, Indians headed International Commission of Supervision and Control (ICSC) of India-China decolonization formed by Geneva Accord.

Notwithstanding India's engagement with some of these countries during the first phase, the region did not fit into India's foreign policy calculus during the second phase (1962-1990) and vice-versa. The phase began with India's defeat in the hand of China, which shattered India's image as the third world leader. Moreover, during subsequent years, India's military and technological modernization programs, and 'blue water' navy ambitions were not perceived well by the SEA's. Apart from the incipient mistrust towards India, the slump in relationship can also be attributed to scores of domestic, regional and global factors. From Indian perspective, autarkic economic orientation, myopic decision making, the USA-China-Pakistan strategic triangle centric foreign policy priorities and neglect of this region by leadership, were some of the reasons that have had heavy toll over India's relationship with these countries during this phase. From the SEA's perspective, however, focus on economic prosperity, quest of engaging the western powers, internal movement against Indian diaspora are some of the depolarizing factors that did not support the region's engagement with India. Shadow of the Cold War also loomed large over India engagement with the region, as most of nation-states from the region were highly influenced by the USA.

Although countries like Vietnam was influenced by communist regimes. To some extent, pro-Islamic orientation of some of the significant countries in the region was also detrimental for India's relationship with these countries. During this phase India remained to be marginal player in the SEA region because of trust deficit, missed opportunities and mutual misperception.

The third phase (1990-) and the present phase of India's relationship with the region was byproduct of dynamic changes both at the systemic and domestic levels. Changing global and regional environment, in the wake of end of the Cold War and the march of globalization, paved the way for India and the South-East Asian countries to look beyond their traditional spheres of influence. In the changing world order the economic interests started to take front seat than those of ideological and cultural loyalties that had been driving force during the second phase. At the one hand India, following disappearance of all-weather friend Soviet Union and USA's reluctance to engage India in a big way, started searching for new friends and allies at global and regional levels, the SEA countries have also demonstrated their willingness to engage their western neighbours, at the other. During subsequent years, however, USA's improving relationship with India has also catalyzed India's engagement with the SEA. Of late, China's assertiveness in the region encouraged countries from the region to look out for new countries. India, unlike China, has not been involved in any bilateral security tension with any of these countries. Similarly, India being frustrated by bleak prospects of SAARC started looking beyond Indian sub-continent. The SEA, owing to its geographic proximity and socio-cultural resemblance, became natural choice for India to offset sub-continental structural limitations. As a corollary to India's renewed interest in the region, India embarked on its 'Look East Policy' during early 1990s. Although, India's 'Look East Policy' also includes the East Asia and the Oceania, the SEA remains central to the policy. As the region bridges two of the most vibrant and dynamic maritime regions, i.e. the Pacific and Indian Ocean, of the world and their littorals, the SEA remains vital for India's economic and strategic interests. Although economics is pivotal for determining the course of India-SEA Relationship; protecting vital Sea Lines of Communications (SLOCs) traversing through northern Indian Ocean and western Pacific ocean, and securing national interest against new generation of threats including that of Asymmetric & Low Intensity Conflicts are other important issues over which interests of India and SEA countries converge. Rising India's emphasis on pragmatic cooperation rather than ideological As part of its "Look East" policy inaugurated in 1991, India has progressively expanded its engagement with the 10-member Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) posturing and its cooperative maritime strategy make India a new strategic factor in the SEA.

India's growing relationship with the regional organization ASEAN is manifestation of its growing relationship in the region. During last twenty years or so India's involvement with the ASEAN has been exponential and steady. In 1992 India became Sectoral Dialogue Partner of ASEAN, and in 1995, India became Full Dialogue Partner of ASEAN. In 1996, India was given membership to ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). Subsequently, India endorsed the treaty on the SEA as Nuclear Weapon free zone (1998) and ASEAN's Treaty for Amity and Cooperation (2003). India, in 2002, became 'Summit Level Partner' of ASEAN. In 2005, India was invited for the East Asia Summit. The signing and operationalization of the Free Trade Agreement with ASEAN (2008-10) are supposed to give strategic depth to the relationship.

Apart from India's exponentially growing ties with the ASEAN, its bilateral relationship with some of the selected countries of the region has noticeable. The relationship between India and Singapore has been one of the closest. Singapore has provided India with a platform to develop and strengthen its presence in the region. The entry into ASEAN was provided by Singapore to India in the Singapore summit in 1992. Since then Indo-Singapore relationship has blossomed both in economic and strategic terms. Singapore is India's largest trading partner in the region and is the first country from the region to have a Comprehensive Economic Cooperation Agreement (CECA). Strategically India and Singapore have been involved in numerous multilateral and bilateral defence arrangements including benign and constabulary naval exercises and joint armies' exercises. Singapore was made use of India's missile testing facilities at Chandipur. Singapore is also the second largest FDI source for India. Singapore has also been instrumental in voicing India's inclusion in other multi-lateral forums such as the East Asian Summit.

Vietnam is yet another country that has emerged as an important economic and strategic partner for India in the region. During last five years itself, India's total trade with Vietnam has grown by more than 3.5 times. From paltry 1 billion US dollar in 2006-2007, the India's total trade with Vietnam has crossed 3.5 billion dollar in 2010-11. Vietnam has also leased India out an oil exploration block in the high voltage South China Sea. Apart from Economic and strategic interests, cultural legacies and China factor have been other factors that have been bringing these two countries together.

Although India's economic ties with the SEA have yet to acquire the depth of China, the expectations of India's superior economic performance and the prospect that it will emerge as one of the world's largest economies has created a sound basis for

India's relations with SEA countries. Even though, India is likely to act as an extra-regional power in the SEA, India is unlikely to initiate offensive military action against any extra-regional power. Recently, after aggressively responding to Vietnam's invitation to explore hydrocarbon resources in the East Sea (the South China Sea), India has slowed down its exploration venture. By and large, India's strategy in the regions involves engaging them politically, militarily, economically and culturally in order to ensure that no single great power dominates this region, especially one that is hostile to India. In the present period two of the most important extra-regional powers, China and the USA, are trying to woo India, so that they can counterbalance each other in the region. India has to be very careful and strategic in the region, so that its vital interests are not harmed.

Check your progress

1. Discuss the role the South-East Asian countries that catalyzed India's presence in the region.
2. What are the areas of cooperation between India and South-East Asia?

9.4 INDIA- AFRICA RELATIONSHIP

Although India is adding significant elements of political, economic and security cooperation to its relationship by engaging countries from Africa and Latin America, and, of late, new south-south partnership is being built with collaboration with some of significant countries from these continents, i.e South Africa and Brazil, under the India-Brazil-South Africa (IBSA) framework, its relationship with the most of the African and Latin American countries are in the nascent stage. It is also significant to note that South Africa and Brazil are also members of Brazil-Russia-India-China-South Africa (BRICS) initiative.

Africa- a continent consisting of 55 nation-states (more than any other continent), one billion population and more than ten times in size than that of India- has always been given least priority in India's foreign policy making. Even though, India and Africa

(specifically sub-Saharan Africa) have been sharing plethora of common features, India's engagement with Africa has always been below par. Similar colonial legacies, lower developmental level, heterogeneous society, diverse cultural heritage, low status of political development, conflict torn societies, marred by pandemic and epidemics, high vulnerability against natural disaster are some of the major common issues that make these two geographical entities' concerns common.

India's trade and cultural relationship with Africa can be traced back to ancient and mediaeval times. Emigration from India to Africa during colonial period was determining factor for India's growing ties with some of the British African colonies including South Africa, Kenya, Uganda, Mauritius, etc. The emigration that took place in various streams as indentured laborers, business community and forced migration became one of the guiding factors for India's relationship with these African countries during post-colonial period. Even during colonial period there are instances wherein People of Indian Origin (PIOs) played important role in mobilizing opinion against colonial masters. Mahatma Gandhi's experimentation with non-violence movement began in South Africa itself.

Most of time during the post-independence period India's policy towards Africa has been either influenced by extreme idealism or by extreme realism. Nehruvian policy towards Africa was having idealist overtone. Very similar to that of policy in the SEA, India was one of the vocal supporters of Africa's decolonization process. India supported various liberation movements across Africa and as a leader of the Non-Aligned nations supported African movements against colonialism, imperialism and racism. Even though, by early 1960s only a few countries from Africa got independence, then independent countries from Africa including Egypt, Ghana played important role in Nehruvian Non-Alignment movement. India's role was very crucial in Afro-Asian solidarity that exhibited as Bandung Conference in 1955. However, Nehru's policy towards Africa was so idealist that he did not recognize role of Indian diaspora as an instrument of India's foreign policy in Africa. India's disillusionment to become leader of the third world country in the wake of India's humiliating defeat in the hand of China and dearth of support from African countries on the issue motivated her to embrace the realist-another extreme- foreign policy. During Indira Gandhi period India's Foreign Policy towards Africa was highly realistic which, in longer run, harmed India's image in the continent. The realist policy did not serve India's foreign policy imperatives in Africa. Eviction of Indian community from Uganda by the dictator Idi Amin during 1970s was one of the lowest points in India's relationship with Africa. Moreover, by this time, India-Africa relationship was overshadowed

by the cold war realities. India's autarkic economic policy also did not help India in realizing its presence felt in the continent. Subsequently, Rajiv Gandhi tried to moderate the realist policy towards Africa. Establishment of Africa Development Fund in 1986 was one of the steps to regain lost glory in Africa.

Systemic, regional, national and domestic dynamic changes in India and Africa during the post-Cold War period have shaped an environment wherein India-Africa relationship has become much more relevant than any other periods. With each passing year, India-Africa ties are gaining greater strategic significance. During 1980s, most of the African countries witnessed one of the most traumatic times in their economic histories, as the Neo-liberal Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) had pushed them to debt trap and economic growth of these countries had nose-dived. Even though, during 1990s and first five years of the present century, India did not try hard to woo African countries, it was visible that Africa was going to emerge as one of future focus areas for India. India's tremendous economic growth during last fifteen years, burgeoning middle class, and depleting natural resources pressed India to search for new resource supply sources abroad. In this context, Africa has become an ideal supply source of mineral, land and energy resources. Africa has relatively higher resource-population ratio with lower technological capabilities to exploit these resources.

India is an energy hungry nation-state. India's domestic sources are not capable of fulfilling its growing energy needs. External dependency for hydrocarbon supply is more than seventy percent of its total consumption. Traditionally, the West Asia has been major source for India's hydrocarbon requirements. However, overdependence on a volatile region like the Persian Gulf for its hydrocarbon needs has negative ramifications for India's energy security. Hence, India has been trying to diversify its external energy supply bases. Africa has emerged as one of the viable option for India to feed her oil desires. Africa possesses around 8 per cent of the world's oil reserves and 11 per cent of the world oil production. In 2010, Africa accounted for 20.6 percent of India's total crude oil imports. The state owned Oil and National Gas Corporation (ONGC) Videsh Limited (OVL) has acquired shares in various oil exploration ventures in Libya and Nigeria. Nigeria alone accounts for 15 percent of India's oil imports. OVL has also been involved in various oil exploration joint ventures in Sudan's Greater Nile Project and in offshore drilling in Cote d'Ivoire. Besides, Indian private sector companies are venturing into Angola, Burkina Faso, Equatorial Guinea, Ghana, Guinea Bissau and Senegal.

Africa is not only vital for India's present energy needs, but it is also significant for its future energy security. Apart from striving to

expand its external hydrocarbon supply sources India is also determined to diversify its energy basket. Even though, at domestic level there is no unanimity over use of nuclear energy as a feasible alternative, Nuclear energy is expected to meet roughly a quarter of India's energy demand by 2050. The Indo-US nuclear deal has legitimately opened the option of nuclear trade with African nations. South Africa, Namibia and Niger alone account for around fifteen percent proven global uranium deposits. Coal is yet another energy resource that India is looking for. According to different estimates coal represents more than 50 percent of India's primary commercial energy sources. As India's domestic coal supply is waning, Africa can become an important coal supply source. For instance, South Africa is not only capable of supplying high quality coal. Besides, South Africa has also developed a state-of art technology that is used to convert coal to petroleum. Moreover, in order to reduce its dependency on hydrocarbon resources, India has been planning to blend biofuels and ethanol with petrol and diesel. Africa has huge virgin land that can be and is used to grow sugarcane and other plants used for biofuel production. Land resources of Africa can also be used to sustain India's food security. Figures suggest that in 2010, over 80 Indian companies invested over \$2.4 billion in either buying or leasing land in countries such as Ethiopia, Kenya and Madagascar.

Africa is also known for its metallic and non-metallic mineral resources that India requires for industrial and strategic purposes. For instance, Africa is major producer of Gold (over half of world's gold is produced in South Africa and Ghana), Bauxite (Guinea accounts for 15 percent of world's Bauxite), Manganese (Ghana and South Africa have over half of the world's manganese), Lead (South Africa and Morocco are one of the major producers of lead), Copper (Democratic Republic of Congo, Zambia), Chromium (Zimbabwe and South Africa house over 99 per cent of the world's Chromium), Cobalt (Democratic Republic of Congo and Zambia), Diamond, rutile, vanadium, titanium and platinum.

Guided by buoyant private sector players, India has been emerging as one of the important source for Foreign Direct Investment and as an important trading partner in Africa. Although, India has lagged behind China in investments on the African continent, but recently private companies from India, backed by New Delhi's diplomacy have shown a flurry of activities in different African countries. During last decade, India's strong trade and investment links with Nigeria, Tanzania, Kenya, and South Africa have been conspicuous. Indian companies have made a mark in the African markets such as Ranbaxy Laboratories Limited which provides affordable high quality drugs to many African countries. Similarly in 2008 a joint venture between the Indian pharmaceutical company CIPLA and the government of Uganda and the Ugandan

pharmaceutical manufacturer Quality Chemicals Industries Ltd growing economy (largely reliant on oil) Indian companies such as Bharati Airtel and TATA that are not state supported have invested heavily in the Nigerian markets.

Emergence of Indian Ocean as one of the geopolitical and geo-economic centers of gravity has intertwined India's security interest with Africa. Relative decline in the western economy and rise of China and India as major economic powerhouses have modified the global patterns of Sea Lane of Communications (SLOCs). Now Indian Ocean has emerged as the most important trading route. In this context India's cooperation with Africa is very important.

India has been adopting a multifaceted approach to engage Africa. Traditionally, India has been engaging Africa under frameworks of multilateral channels and regional organizational. For instance, India has always, with rare exception of derecognizing of Western Saharawi Republic in 2000, supported and accepted the Organization of African Unity's (OAU)-and later on its successor the African Union's (AU) - since its inception in 1963. India is also engaging with different sub-regional organizations including South African Development Community (SADC), ECOWAS (15 nation Economic Community of West African States), ECCAS (11 member Economic Community for Central African States), COMESA (Common Market for Eastern and Southern African Countries) and EAC (East African Community). The major development cooperation initiatives that India is collaborating with Africa on are the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) and the pan-African e-network. Development cooperation, through development of physical and human infrastructure, creates an immense capability to project soft power. The India has successfully been able to project a more positive image in Africa than China, in spite of China's strategic assertiveness in the continent. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, during **Second Africa-India Forum Summit 2011** held in Addis Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia, affirmed the critical importance of South-South cooperation in India-Africa Relationship. IBSA and BRICS have provided alternative multilateral channels to support India's initiatives in Africa. IOR-ARC is yet another multilateral initiative that includes all the littoral countries of the Indian Ocean.

Apart from engaging African countries through multilateral channels, India has also been strategically developing its bilateral ties with major African countries. South Africa, Nigeria, Kenya, Mauritius, Ethiopia, Tanzania, Senegal have emerged as major strategic partners for India in Africa.

India's shared colonial histories and common development issues have placed India in as a contemporary partner for African nations in their development. Additionally, India's focus on development cooperation and capacity building on the basis of Africa's requirements has gained considerable favour amongst the African political elites, business classes and emerging middle classes. But, except a few countries, India's bilateral ties are limited to Anglophone, resource rich nation and Indian Ocean littoral nation-states of Africa. India's diplomatic presence in Africa is below par. Moreover, China has emerged as a major player in Africa leaving India far behind. India needs to consciously work on developing a consistent and sustained policy towards Africa.

Check your progress

1. What are the areas of convergences between Africa and India?
2. How did leadership and institutional factors play important roles in India-Africa Relationship?

9.5 INDIA-LATIN AMERICA RELATIONS

India and Latin America-despite their cultural dissimilarity, unlike colonial legacies and geographical remoteness- have been confronting plethora of challenges and relishing numerous opportunities throng open by the post-cold war world order. These challenges and opportunities have induced India and Latin America to rethink and revive their underrated mutual ties. Unlike the two regions discussed earlier, India's relationship with Latin America countries (LAC) is not very old. Since the time of Latin America's discovery, its different parts were colonized by Spain, Portugal, France and Britain. Even though, Indian immigrants got settled in the Caribbean islands, most of the continental Latin America was far away from India's Foreign Policy radar and vice versa. In the recent times, however, India and LACs have recognized mutual importance. The mutual cooperation mainly began in the fields of Trade, investments and resource exploration. India's FTAs with Mercosur (2004) and Chile (2006) are manifestation of the changing trend. Venezuela has emerged as an important source for India's Hydrocarbon energy requirements.

In the recent times India and Brazil have emerged as natural partners on various issues and through various channels. India and Brazil aim at enlarging the middle class by creating jobs for the poor and by developing a technologically advanced economy. Similarly, both the countries are vying to increase their political clout in the international arena. The order has made south-south cooperation between these two countries more sustainable as the interaction is not only limited to political and economic spheres, rather it has paved the way for diversified network of lateral and vertical interactions. India and Brazil- reckoned as two of the fastest growing economies in the world- are having their own requirements, capabilities and limitations to support and sustain their economic growths, and to negate asymmetric and distorted developmental pattern. India and Brazil have recorded impressive rates of economic growth in recent years and aim to achieve economic growth rate of over 8 percent in the next two decades in order, to diffuse the fruit of development to those regions and demographic sections that were untouched in the earlier phases, to raise the standards of living, to consolidate a modern economy, and to participate as a significant partner in an increasingly integrated and global world.

On the bilateral fronts India and Brazil are cooperating and can cooperate on several issues. To mitigate growing concern of the global warming, renewable energy sources such as ethanol and biodiesel have been seen as a promising alternative to fossil fuel consumption. Brazil was the world's first nation to run a large-scale program for using ethanol as fuel. In Brazil, ethanol for fuel is derived from sugarcane and is used pure or blended with gasoline in a mixture called gasohol (24% ethanol, 76% gasoline). The biofuels industry is poised to make important contributions to meet India's energy needs by supplying clean, environmentally-friendly fuel. Biofuels are going to play an extremely important role in meeting India's energy needs. Brazil uses pure ethanol in about 20 per cent of their vehicles and a 22 to 26 per cent ethanol-petrol blend in the rest of their vehicles. The Government of India has developed an ambitious National Biodiesel Mission to meet 20 per cent of the country's diesel requirements. Nanotechnology today is regarded as a revolutionary technology that can help address key needs relating to energy, environment, health and agriculture in developing countries. Nanotechnology development in India is at a nascent stage with policy initiatives directed towards promoting research and development. It is largely a government led initiative and industry participation is still emerging. In Latin America, Brazil has been a leader in nanotechnology research and the first country to implement public programs to support its development.

India and Brazil have shown their willingness to cooperate on various technological issues that can help them to ameliorate

their socio-economic conditions. They have been discussing technological cooperation in the areas of Defense, Energy, Nanotechnology, Agriculture, Space, etc. India and Brazil, faced with severe resource limitations, are trying to develop modern economy. Because of lack of development and relatively lower level of research these countries are forced to import technology-rather technique- without having their own expertise in the field. Technological diffusion from developed to developing countries are generally led to technological dependency on the western countries.

India and Brazil has been partnering under South-South cooperation framework and widening its scope to bring other developing countries into fold. South African officials, in the recently held IBSA summit, were hoping to be well on the way to launching a joint space satellite as a symbol of IBSA achievement South Africa to make the satellite vehicle, Brazil to make the measuring instruments and India to launch it for Earth and weather observation. The recently held IBSA summit in Pretoria (2011) had decided to focus more on key areas and allocate these to the three countries: South Africa on trade and infrastructure; India on health and technology; and Brazil on agriculture and the environment.

India and Brazil are key participants of a number of multilateral organization and share common views on a number of issues. This includes G20, G4, BRICS and IBSA. Although these all multilateral forums having their own mandate, there is also requirement of maintaining specificity and avoiding overlapping mandate, is essential for success for all these multilateral forums.

In nutshell it can be concluded that India's relationship with the South East Asia, Africa and Latin America can be characterized by missed opportunities, misperceptions, misjudgments, mistrust and mismanagement. Of late, although India's relationship has taken a good shape with the SEA, and has started well in the cases of Africa and Latin America but in the case of latter two geographical units India has a lot of ground to cover. In all the cases, China's presence is widespread. Hence, India has to chalk a strategy, so that it can improve its relationship with the countries of all the above mentioned regions.

Check your progress

1. Discuss the prominence of Indo-Brazil Relationship in India's engagement with Latin America
2. How did multilateral arrangements play vital role in shaping India's world view towards Latin America?

9.6 LET US SUM UP

Despite the fact that India has time and again shown courage and willingness to provide leadership to the developing world, its relationship with South-East Asian, African and Latin American countries has remained to be low key during the Cold War period. The underrated relationship during the period can be attributed to plethora of systemic, domestic and leadership factors. However, systemic change at global level, policy alteration at domestic level, and transformed foreign policy orientation during last two decades have induced a paradigm shift in magnitude and intensity of India's engagement with developing countries. India has been bilaterally and multilaterally growing its relationship with the south in various fields including the issues of trade, resource sharing, global governance, climate change, etc. Moreover, India's interaction with the developing countries has been guided by the framework of south-south cooperation. Even though, India and South Asia accepts each other as strategic partners and their relationship is growing in leaps and bounds, India's engagement with Africa and Latin America has to go a long way.

9.7 UNIT END QUESTIONS

1. Highlight the systemic and domestic changes that laid down the foundation of India's world view towards the developing countries.
2. What are the converging and diverging issues between India and South-East Asia?
3. Discuss the roles of Vietnam and Singapore in developing a sustainable relationship between India and South-East Asia.

4. Identify the sectors of cooperation between India and selected countries from South-East Asia
5. Highlight continuity and change in India's engagement with Africa.
6. What are the multilateral and bilateral dimensions of Indo-Africa relationship
7. What are the areas of cooperation between India and Africa
8. Analyse spatial dimension of India's engagement with Latin America
9. How trans-regional multilateral forums like IBSA and BRICS have been instrumental in India's growing ties with Africa and Latin America?
10. Elucidate the China Factor in India's cooperation with the developing world.

9.8 REFERENCES

- Seethi, K.M. and Vijayan P. (2005), "Political Economy of India's Third World Policy" in Rajen Harshe and K. M Seethi (eds.), *Emerging with the World: Critical Reflections on India's Foreign Policy*, pp.47-72, New Delhi: Orient Longman.
- Thomas, A.M. (2005), "India and Southeast Asia: The Look East Policy in Perspective", in Rajen Harshe and K. M Seethi (eds.), *Emerging with the World: Critical Reflections on India's Foreign Policy*, pp.297-318, New Delhi: Orient Longman.
- Ghosal, Baldas (1996), "India and Southeast Asia: Prospects and Problems", in Baldas Ghosal (ed.), *India and Southeast Asia: Challenges and Opportunities*, pp.95-118, New Delhi: Konark.
- Hussain, Karki (1996), "China, India and Southeast Asia after the Cold War", in Baldas Ghosal (ed.), *India and Southeast Asia: Challenges and Opportunities*, pp.41-53, New Delhi: Konark
- Singh, K.R. (2005), "The Indian Ocean Rim Association for Regional Cooperation in the Indian Ocean", in Rajen Harshe and K. M Seethi (eds.), *Emerging with the World: Critical Refelections on India's Foreign Policy*, pp.342-355, New Delhi: Orient Longman.

- Harshe, Rajen (2005), "Recasting Indo-African Development Cooperation", in Rajen Harshe and K. M Seethi (eds.), *Emerging with the World: Critical Reflections on India's Foreign Policy*, pp.442-458, New Delhi: Orient Longman.
- Beri, Ruchita (2003), "India's Africa Policy in the Post-Cold War Era: An Assessment" *Strategic Analysis*, Vol. 27, No. 2, Apr-Jun 2003, pp.216-32.
- Alden, Chris and Marco Antonio Vieira (2005), "The New Diplomacy of the South: South Africa, Brazil, India and Trilateralism", *Third World Quarterly*, vol.26, No.7, pp.1077-1095.



INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Unit Structure :

- 10.0 Objective
- 10.1 Introduction
- 10.2 Evolution of United Nations
- 10.3 India and the UN
- 10.4 India's contribution to UN
- 10.5 India and Restructuing of United Nations
- 10.6 Peacekeeping Operations
- 10.7 India's Contribution to UN Peacekeeping Operations
- 10.8 Let us sum up
- 10.9 Unit end question
- 10.10 References

10.0 OBJECTIVE

This unit attempts to analyze India-UN relations during the Cold and Post Cold war era in the backdrop of evolution of UN and its changing role in last two decades. The main objective of this unit is to evaluate India's contribution to United Nations especially to UN Peace Keeping Forces. At the same time the unit discusses the ongoing Indian efforts to secure permanent berth to United Nations Security Council. After studying this unit the student shall be able to understand the India and the UN relations comprehensively and India's contribution to UN in last six decades

10.1 INTRODUCTION

The UN represents 193 countries in the international community. It is the only intergovernmental organization which truly represents world community. The UN is an organization committed to prevent international conflict and facilitates cooperation among states.

10.2 EVOLUTION OF UNITED NATIONS

The need for an international organization to resolve various issues, problems among the nation-states through peaceful means was first realized strongly in the aftermath of First World War. It was argued by many that the creation of an international organization would help in avoiding the war. With this spirit, the League of Nations was created. To create an organization which can control the national power was an unpalatable idea for the then ambitious nation states. However the League of Nations could not survive among nations who viewed international system as anarchic and conflict as an unavoidable instrument to achieve the national interest. The League failed to save the world from the fatal Second World War. The colossal destruction caused by the Second World War convinced the international community about the truth that the third world war will result into end of mankind on earth. Hence the international community realized that international cooperative efforts are imperative to save the world from the danger of third world war. This realization paved the way for the establishment of the UN.

The United Nations was established on 24th October 1945. To maintain international peace and security, to achieve economic and social development through international cooperation, to protect human rights were the main objectives behind the establishment of the organization. These objectives have been reflected explicitly in the UN constitution. The adoption of the UN Charter in 1945 was a defining moment since it heralded the creation of a new world order. The charters of the UN become the constitution of the international community. The UN is founded on the idealistic vision of creation of an universal IGO as a strategy to promote cooperation, common interests among sovereign states and manage conflicts in an international system lacked central authority. The Charter of the UN identified six agencies as the principal organs of the UN including- the security council, general assembly, the secretariat, international court of justice, trusteeship council, and the economic and social council. Apart from these more than 30 multilateral institutions, agencies, structures have been created under jurisdiction of the UN in last six decades.

The foundation of the UN is based on two pillars. Firstly, on international law and secondly on cherished human values, ideals. The UN is founded on the basis of some fundamental principles of

international law- sovereign equality among nations, non interference in the international affairs of a sovereign nation, resolving problems, issues among states not through conflict but through cooperation, right to self defense are some fundamental principles on which the foundation of the UN is base. These principles reflect through the various articles of the UN constitution. These principles have determined future course of action for the UN. Along with the principles of international law, the UN foundation is based on basic human values like peace, cooperation, fraternity, freedom and equality. The UN is committed for the promotion and the protection of these values. These are the directive principles of the UN. One of the basic objectives of the UN is to promote and protect human rights has emanated from these values. The former American foreign minister Cordell Hull observed that the UN has been established for the fulfillment of humanities highest aspirations. The UN took a revolutionary step in the direction of protecting human rights on 10th December 1948 by declaring and adopting Human Rights Manifesto. In last sixty years the UN has concluded more than agreements for the promotion and protection of human rights.

United Nations is known as an executive international council devoted to solve bilateral, regional and global level problems among nation states. It is an ideal example of multilateralism. While solving the problems among nations the UN attempts to coordinate policies and actions of the member states. The UN is an excellent platform for resolving problems among nations through mutual cooperation, collective discussion and peace. The UN is mechanism for conflict resolution in the international security affairs. The UN has provided a platform where the states can promote their views and bring their disputes. According to Shasi Tharoor, "the UN is a forum where sovereign states can work out strategies for tackling global problems and an instrument for putting those strategies into effect." The UN is a platform that provides opportunity to the members to place their problems, make arguments, to communicate their stand to international community and to consult with others. Along with national level problems there are several international problems also concerns the whole international community for example- to protecting human rights, environment pollution, proliferation of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction, international terrorism. The UN attempts to mobilize international public opinion on these problems and seek international cooperation to solve it.

To solve such global level problems not only coordination of relations but harmonizing actions of nations is also required. While underscoring the contribution of the UN in last six decades, Ines Cloud, an expert on UN has rightly observed “In any case, the United Nations is no longer ignored and neglected; whether it is regarded with utopian idealism or with cynical disdain, I t has achieved notable visibility.”

Check Your Progress

1. What are the main objectives behind the establishment of the UN
- 2 Discuss briefly the structure of the UN

10.3 INDIA AND THE UN

India has a long history of engagement with the United Nations. India has maintained healthy relations with the United Nations since its establishment. When the UN came into being, India was under British rule. Irrespective of India’s status, it got an opportunity to become the founder member of UN. India has been one of the 51 original members of the UN who signed the UN charter. The UN was born out of famous San Francisco Conference. India was invited to attend this conference. India was among the original members of the United Nations that signed the Declaration by United Nations at Washington on 1 January 1942 and also participated in the historic UN Conference of International Organization at San Francisco from 25 April to 26 June 1945. At the conference India signed on the UN Charter and become member of UN on 30th October 1945. From 1945 to 2012 the relationship between India and UN are characterized by mutual cooperation, respect and trust. India is committed to the objectives, principles and values of the UN in both spirit and letter. Right from providing financial assistance to actively participating into the UN proceedings as an esteemed member of various UN Committees,

India has contributed immensely in the development of this organization. On 29th September 1946, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru outlined Indian attitude towards UN. He maintained that, "Indian attitude towards the UN is that of whole hearted cooperation and unreserved adherence in both spirit and letter to the charter governing UN." He also made it clear that, "India will participate fully in UN's varied activities and endeavor to play that role in the council to which her geographical position, population and contribution towards peaceful progress entitle her". India's trust in the ability of UN in resolving disputes between states through peaceful means can be exemplified through an Indian move in 1948. In 1948 India herself took the Kashmir dispute with Pakistan to the United Nations.

The fundamental reason behind the prolonged cooperative relations between India and the UN lies in the core principles that govern both India and UN. India is committed to world peace and India considers UN as an instrument to secure world peace. The compatibility between Indian foreign policy and the UN Charter cemented the Indo-UN partnership. The ideals of peace, nonviolence, justice, right, freedom are the foundational principles on which edifice of UN is based also enshrined into Indian constitution. Other than this, there are several common principles that endorses by India and the UN. For example-resistance to colonialism, supporting right to self determination, peaceful coexistence, peace through peace, universalism, and emphasis on cooperation over conflict. Since independence India has concluded several bilateral and multilateral treaties which were based on the provisions of the UN charter and underscores respect to aims and objectives of UN.

The constitution of India reaffirms India's commitment to international peace and security. Indian constitution not only deals with India's domestic set up but also guides the Indian state on how to maintain relations with the international community. Article 51 A of Indian constitution comprises of guiding principles of Indian foreign policy's India's c which conveys India's commitment peace and security.. Accordingly, the state should strive to promote international peace and security, maintain just and honorable relations between nations, foster respect for international law and treaty obligations in the dealing of organized peoples with one another and encourage settlements of international disputes with arbitration. The UN also endorses the same principles. The charter

of the UN enshrines these directives. Since the emergence of independent India, to support and actively participate in the working of the UN has remained main objective of Indian foreign policy.

Striving for peace through peace is the cementing factor between India and the UN. The five principles of peaceful coexistence popularly known as Panchsheel Doctrine jointly initiated by India and China on 20th June 1954 find an echo in the UN Charter. In fact Panchsheel epitomizes the essential elements of the UN Charter. In 1959 a resolution on support to Panchsheel was moved in UN General Assembly which was supported by 82 UN member countries.

Check Your Progress

1. Discuss India's relations with the UN during 1950s and 1960s
2. What are the common principles endorsed by India and UN

10.4 INDIA'S CONTRIBUTION IN UN

- Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit was elected the first woman President of the UN General Assembly.
- During the initial years India represented the interests of the developing nations and supported the struggle against colonialism and apartheid. India strongly pleaded for right to self determination for colonized countries of Asia and Africa. Nehru outlined Indian approach towards right to self determination. While clarifying Indian stand on right to self determination Vijayalakshmi Pandit said, "the voice of enslaved people of Asia may not be officially heard at the conference and those who have usurped their birthright to freedom may cynically claim to speak for them; but there can be no real denied justice". Nehru also enunciated that, "we are particularly interested in emancipation of colonial and independent countries and people

and in the recognition in theory and practice of equal opportunities for all the people”

- India contributed towards global disarmament and the ending of the arms race, and towards the creation of a more equitable international economic order
- India also had a mediatory role in resolving several stalemates including the Korean crisis
- India played a prominent role in articulating the economic concerns of developing countries in such UN-sponsored conferences as the triennial UN Conference on Trade and Development and the 1992 Conference on the Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro
- In 1950s India played an important role in resolving the conflict over the issue of admission of new states
- India used the General Assembly Platform to oppose imperialism, colonialism and apartheid. India’s role was instrumental in invoking the international sanction against the racist regime in South Africa
- In 1970s India tried hard for the rights of developing countries and mobilized the General Assembly support for New International Economic Order
- It has been an active member of the Group of 77, and later the core group of the G-15 nations.
- India contributed in areas such as environment protection and the promotion and protection of human rights,
- India is one of the main contributors to the UN regular budget. Indian contribution to United Nations Democracy Fund was USD 16 million for 2009

10.5 INDIA AND RESTRUCTURING OF UNITED NATIONS

The demand for restructuring of UN gathered momentum in the post cold war era to manage emerging challenges especially the challenge of increasing US preponderance in international affairs. The reforms are essential to make UN strengthened and revitalized and more democratic. There have been demands to

- Reform the structure and processes of the UN
- Reforms in budgetary procedure and
- Reforms in day to day administration
- Reforms in jurisdiction of the UN
- Reforms in structure and functioning of Security Council

The structure and the functioning of the UN Security Council constitute the core of reform debate. Experts feel that the Security Council does not represent the political realities of contemporary world. The membership of UN has increased exponentially since last six decade- from 51 in 1945 to 193 in 2011. However the Security Council has remained largely static and thus jeopardized the representative character of Security Council. Moreover the activities and responsibilities of Security Council have enlarged over a period of time. There are five permanent and six nonpermanent members in Security Council. The non-permanent membership of Security Council was increased from six to ten in the 1960s. However the permanent membership remained five till today. Hence there is an increasing demand to expand both the permanent and nonpermanent membership of the Security Council in order to make the body truly representative and democratic and to enable it to perform its enlarged responsibilities efficiently. Furthermore, large number of UN membership is constituted by the developing countries today and due to continuation of old UN structure they are inadequately represented. The UNSC is dominated by the developed Western countries and the developing countries are left out in shaping the decision of the Security Council. Hence there is particular demand to give adequate representation to Asia, Africa and Latin America in proportion to their strength in UN. Although there is a unanimous demand for the reforms in UN, there seems to be scant consensus and clarity among states on the nature of reforms.

India has strongly supported the ongoing initiatives at the international level to reform and restructure the UN so that it can face emerging challenges to international peace and security effectively. India is insisting that the United Nations must undertake reforms to become truly representative while enhancing its credibility and effectiveness. India is more concern about the composition of United Nation's Security Council and pleaded for its expansion. India is in favor of expansion of Security Council to make it more representative and reflect the increased membership of UN. India maintains that with the expansion of Security Council the credibility of UN will enhance and it will enjoy greater support in the international community. India wants the number of both permanent and non-permanent members to be increased.

India itself is in race of securing permanent membership of UNSC. India has been elected seven times to the UN Security

Council as a non-permanent member and now India has been seeking a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council along with Brazil, Germany, Japan. Indian claim to UNSC as a permanent member is based on its

- Huge population,
- Largest democracy,
- Increasing economic power, purchasing power parity,
- Colossal Armed forces,
- India's consistent contribution to the UN since its inception especially in Peacekeeping Operations
- Financial support to UN

It should be noted that India was offered a permanent seat on the council in 1955. However the offer was declined by India's first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru. Nehru said the seat should be given to China instead

Check Your Progress

1. Discuss India's contribution to UN in last six decades
2. India's claim to UN Security Council is based on which factors?

10.6 PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

The term peace keeping was coined in the 1950s after the UN mission in Greece in 1947. The peace keeping has evolved out of the UN's need to monitor the ceasefire it brokered in the first decade after the Second World War. There is no specific provision laid out in the UN charter for the conduct of peace keeping operations. It is an implied power located in chapter VI and VII of the UN charter. The peacekeeping operations have been defined by the former Deputy Secretary General of the UN, Marac Golding. According to him "United Nations field operations in which international personnel, civilian and military, are deployed with the consent of the parties and under the UN command to help, control

and resolve actual or potential international conflicts or internal conflicts which international dimension". Invention of peacekeeping operations is an important development in the history of the UN. It is important because the very concept of the peace keeping operation goes against the constitution of the UN. The constitution of the UN is based on the two fundamental principle of sovereign equality among states and respect to the state sovereignty. Although the structure of the UN is like an International Regime, the UN Constitution does not permit any interference in the internal affairs of a member state. The former Secretary General of the UN, Boutros Ghali in one of his articles published in the Foreign Affairs made this abundantly clear, "Under Article 2, Paragraph 7 of the charter, the UN shall never intervene in the domestic affairs of a member state, either in the guise of preventive diplomacy or for humanitarian aims". The peace keeping operations violate the principle of national sovereignty. The peace keeping forces intervene even without the consent of the concern state. As observed by the security analyst Jasjit Singh, "the expansion of the peace keeping operations is directly contradictory to the very basis of the UN charter itself, creating the fundamental problem of legitimacy."

The cold war task of peacekeeping forces was to supervise a ceasefire. Initially the scope of the peace keeping operations was limited to keep belligerent adversaries at bay in an interstate dispute. The UN peace keeping force used to act as a non-aligned force to resolve the dispute. The peace keeping operations were legitimized by the belligerent parties. The use of minimum force and impartiality were the essential principles of the peace keeping operations. The initial peace keeping operations were conducted under the provisions of Chapter VI of the UN charter. Before deploying the peace keeping forces at a concern country it was made mandatory to arrive at a status of Forces agreement between the UN and the host country.

Although the demands of UN interventions in several troubled areas of the world during the cold war were made, it could not be possible for the UN to sanction the missions due to cold war time hidden agendas, conflicting interests of superpowers and lack of mutual trust among the permanent five of the Security Council. The proposals of the peace keeping missions were vetoed by one of the permanent members if its interests were not met. During the cold war several proposals regarding the peace keeping operations

to control intrastate conflicts were came for discussion in the Security Council. However they were vetoed by either US or USSR as a part of their cold war strategy. During this period only 13 proposals were accepted and peace keeping operations sanctioned. On the contrary in the post cold war era from 1990 to 2009, 47 peace keeping missions have been authorized. The peace keeping operations in most of the states could not yield success due interference by either America or USSR.

In the post cold war era the nature and functioning of the peace keeping operations have been changed. Now the peace keeping is different kind of operation in which UN has employed military force for conflict management. In today's peace keeping operations the role of UN peace keeping forces is to stop the ongoing fight in a state, maintain cease fire and create conditions favorable for peaceful settlement of conflict through negotiations.

Check Your Progress

1. Discuss the nature and role of UN Peace keeping Operations.
2. Discuss briefly the qualitative changes in the UN Peace keeping Operations in the post cold war era.

10.7 INDIA'S CONTRIBUTION TO UN PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

India's most significant contribution to the U.N. is in peace operations. India is the largest contributors in terms of numbers of missions, force commanders, and personnel. Currently India is the third highest contributor, with 9,332 Indian soldiers and police on U.N. duty overseas after Bangladesh and Pakistan. India's contribution in the peacekeeping operations is reflective of objectives enshrined in the UN Charter. Maintaining international peace and security is the core objective of UN and India is contributing towards realizing this goal.

Since its independence India has contributing actively in the UN peacekeeping missions in varying capacities. Due to this contribution India has generated huge goodwill around the globe. India is the largest troops contributor to the UN peace operations since 1950s. As of today India has participated in 43 UN peacekeeping missions and more than 1,50,000 troops have deployed by India. While serving on UN missions 135 Indian soldiers have sacrificed their life. Apart from this India has provided military advisors to various UN missions. According to Ramesh Thakur, an expert on UN there are three broad reasons why India is asked to contribute troops to U.N. operations:

1. The size and professionalism of its armed forces;
2. The lack of such forces from most developing countries until recently;
3. India's influence in world affairs.

India is assisting the UN in maintaining international peace and security through peacekeeping operations since the inception of peacekeeping operations. India's contribution to peacekeeping mission began with 1950-54's Korea's paramedical unit to 2007's Liberia mission. India has participated in UN Peacekeeping missions of Korea, India-China, Middle East, Congo, Cambodia, Mozambique, Somalia, Rwanda, Angola, Sierra Leone, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Sudan, Ivory Coast, and East Timor, Haiti so far. India is the third largest contributor of troops to United Nations peacekeeping missions after Bangladesh and Pakistan. In the recent past there are 8680 Indian personnel deployed overseas out of which 27 are women in 9 of the 14 peace-keeping operations.

Indian troops are more in demand because of their experience, good training and equipment and impeccable disciplinary record. Apart from troops contribution India has provided Force Commanders to several operations and shared its expertise and experience especially in guerilla warfare and demining activities with UN in the conduction of peacekeeping operations successfully. In 2011-12 three Indian Army Generals are holding crucial postings in UN peacekeeping forces. Lt General Randhir Kumar Mehta is the military advisor to the UN secretary general and two senior Army Generals are heading UN peacekeeping missions up to 2011. India is also providing training to personnel from other countries.

Check Your Progress

1. Discuss India’s contribution to UN Peace Keeping Operations
2. Why India is asked to contribute to UN Peace Keeping Operations

10.8 LET US SUM UP

- The UN represents 193 countries in the international community. It is the only intergovernmental organization which truly represents world community. The UN is an organization committed to prevent international conflict and facilitates cooperation among states.
- India has a long history of engagement with the United Nations. India has maintained healthy relations with the United Nations since its establishment
- The demand for restructuring of UN gathered momentum in the post cold war era to manage emerging challenges especially the challenge of increasing US preponderance in international affairs
- India itself is in race of securing permanent membership of UNSC. India has been elected seven times to the UN Security Council as a non-permanent member and now India has been seeking a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council along with Brazil, Germany, Japan
- The term peace keeping was coined in the 1950s after the UN mission in Greece in 1947. The peace keeping has evolved out of the UN’s need to monitor the ceasefire it brokered in the first decade after the Second World War
- India’s most significant contribution to the U.N. is in peace operations. India is the largest contributors in terms of numbers of missions, force commanders, and personnel

- India has participated in UN Peacekeeping missions of Korea, India-China, Middle East, Congo, Cambodia, Mozambique, Somalia, Rwanda, Angola, Sierra Leone, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Sudan, Ivory Cost, and East Timor, Haiti so far. India is the third largest contributor of troops to United Nations peacekeeping missions after Bangladesh and Pakistan
- Indian troops are more in demand because of their experience, good training and equipment and impeccable disciplinary record

10.9 UNIT END QUESTIONS

1. Discuss the basic objectives, fundamental principles and structure of the UN
2. Discuss India's association with the UN in last six decades
3. Evaluate India's contribution to UN peace keeping forces
4. Do you think India is eligible to become permanent member of UN Security Council? Give reasons.

10.10 REFERENCES

- Thomas Weiss, Forsythe, The United NATIONS AND Changing world Politics (Oxford: West View Press, 1997)
- Stanley Meisler, United Nations: The first fifty years (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1997)
- Linda Fasulo, An insider guide to UN, (London: Yale University Press, 2009)



INDIA'S NUCLEAR POLICY

Unit Structure :

- 11.0 Objective
- 11.1 Introduction
- 11.2 India and Nuclear Disarmament
- 11.3 Heritage of nuclear ambiguity
- 11.4 Nuclear India
- 11.5 Nuclear Debate in India
- 11.6 Compulsions of Nuclearisation
- 11.7 India's Nuclear Doctrine
- 11.8 Indian stand on NPT and CTBT
- 11.9 Development of nuclear deterrence of India
- 11.10 Nuclear of South Asia : Strategy implications
- 11.11 Let us sum up
- 11.12 Unit end question

11.0 OBJECTIVE

This unit attempts to analyze India's nuclear policy since independence. The unit focuses on the evolution of India's nuclear policy while discussing Indian stand on nuclear disarmament and arms race, NPT, CTBT among others. At the same time the unit explores the compulsions behind nuclearisation and the structure of India's nuclear doctrine. After studying this unit the student shall be able to understand the evolution of India's nuclear policy while understanding Indian stand on arms race and disarmament related issues.

11.1 INTRODUCTION

India gained freedom in the nuclear age. It was a time when the entire world witnessed the havoc caused by the atom bomb which America dropped on two Japanese cities. The nuclear arms race followed by the Second World War threatened the existence of

mankind on the earth. The mad race among several states to acquire nuclear weapons resulted into vertical and horizontal nuclear proliferation. By 1960s five states-America, USSR, England, France and china acquired the potential do develop the nuclear weapons. In a world replete with hundreds of nuclear weapons, India decided to adopt peaceful nuclear policy on the one hand and demanded complete nuclear disarmament on the other hand. After independence India embarked on comprehensive economic development programme and decided to harness nuclear energy for the socio-economic development of India. The then political leadership of India encouraged Indian scientists to develop indigenous nuclear technology for developmental work.

11.2 INDIA AND NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

India has maintained an impeccable record on non-proliferation. Since independence India has been committed to the goal of general and complete disarmament in spirit and letter. The first prime minister of India Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru made it abundantly clear immediately after the independence that India had no plan to develop nuclear weapons and the India's nuclear programme is meant for peace and development. India's opposition to nuclear weapons and all forms of competition was most visible in 1950s itself. India supported the UN Nuclear Energy Commission's proposal in the early 1950s for the control on the use of nuclear energy. While supporting the proposal, India appealed the world community for limiting the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only and the elimination of nuclear weapons. In 1954 India appealed to the international community to ban all nuclear tests. India was the first country to call to an end to all nuclear testing. India supported and become party to 1963's Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. In the late 1960s the General Assembly of the UN passed a unanimous resolution for disarmament and eradication of all nuclear weapons. The nuclear non-proliferation treaty of 1968 is based on the same resolution. However India refused to sign on this treaty due to its own set of reservations against the provisions of NPT. In 1974 India conducted its first nuclear test which is popularly known as peaceful nuclear explosion. Even after the nuclear test Indian did not embark on nuclear weaponisation programme and continued to work for nuclear disarmament. In 1978, India proposed negotiations for an international convention that would prohibit the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. In 1982 India called for a "nuclear freeze" - i.e. prohibition on the production of fissile material for weapons, on production of nuclear weapons, and related delivery systems. In 1988 the then Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi proposed an action plan for global and regional nuclear disarmament in the phased manner at UN General Assembly. The plan proposed regional disarmament along with

global. The plan titled as “Action Plan for Ushering in a Nuclear-weapon free and Non-Violent World Order”. The Action Plan was designed for the elimination of all nuclear weapons, in three stages by 2010. As per the provisions of the plan there should be a binding commitment by all nations to eliminating nuclear weapons in stages, by the year 2010 at the latest. Further, all nuclear weapon States must participate in the process of nuclear disarmament. All other countries must also be part of the process. The Plan called for establishing a Comprehensive Global Security System under the aegis of the United Nations. Some Experts believe that the action plan was an Indian attempt to control and contain Pakistan’s nuclear weapons programme. Although India conducted nuclear tests on 11 and 13 May 1998 and declared itself as a nuclear weapons state, it immediately announced a self imposed moratorium on further nuclear tests. India also declared that it will maintain minimum credible nuclear deterrence for its security.

Check your Progress

1. Which states acquired the potential to develop the nuclear weapons by the end of 1960s?
2. When India conducted its second nuclear tests

11.3 HERITAGE OF NUCLEAR AMBIGUITY

Several analysts observe that the Indian nuclear policy is characterized by ambiguity. The post independent political leadership of India was ambivalent about the requirement of nuclear weapons to protect India’s strategic interests in an anarchic world. This ambiguity emanated from paradoxical policies. For example--

- On the one hand India exhibited repugnance towards nuclear weaponry and called for global abolition of nuclear weapons on the other hand India sustained capability to produce fissile material
- India called for the creation of an institutional structure at the global level to contain the proliferation of nuclear weapons and at the same time rejected any external political or legal restraint on its right to develop nuclear weapon

- Although India kept its nuclear option open, it kept it in suspended animation. The plans for construction nuclear bomb was neither expressed nor foreclosed.
- Although India conducted nuclear test and demonstrated its ability to make nuclear bomb, India refrained from developing it. India took almost twenty four years after its first nuclear step to construct a nuclear bomb.

11.4 NUCLEAR INDIA

Evolution of India from a Nuclear Capable State to a Nuclear Weapon State

India's evolution from a Nuclear Capable State to a Nuclear Weapon State is pretty cautious and slow compare to its rival Pakistan. Since independence India was committed to use atom for peaceful purposes. India was inclined to use nuclear energy for developmental purpose. The first PM of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru acknowledged the importance of Nuclear energy for the socio-economic progress of India. The Indian scientists were convinced that the nuclear energy would accelerate the development. Since its independence India embarked on civilian nuclear research at a small level with the help of US and Canada. India acquired nuclear reactors, heavy water and enriched uranium from these countries. Several experts argue that although India was capable for developing nuclear weapons in the 1950s, India did not move to a weapons programme. India maintained this throughout the cold war period.

However in 1970s a variety of internal and external pressure forced India to change its nuclear posture. The Indian war china in 1962 and the Chinese nuclear explosion in 1964 compelled India to rethink over its nuclear policy. The then PM of India Mrs. Indira Gandhi made it clear that her government's nuclear policy would be formulated on the basis of threat perceptions to Indian security. Considering the volatile security environment in the south Asian subcontinent in the 1970, India decided to go for nuclear test. In 1974 India conducted the first nuclear test and demonstrated to the world that India is capable of building a nuclear bomb .It is pertinent to note that despite having capability to construct a nuclear bomb, India did not follow that path of weaponisation. India took twenty four years after its first nuclear test to declare itself as nuclear weapons states and construct nuclear bombs.

In the post cold war era, the steady increase in the Pakistan's nuclear capability, enhanced Chinese nuclear threat, and Pakistan china nuclear nexus forced India to change its traditional stand of keeping nuclear option open. In May 1998 India

detonated five underground nuclear tests and put an end the era of four decade long ambiguity and uncertainty in respect of Indian nuclear policy. India's decision of 1998 to conduct further nuclear tests and construct nuclear bomb was the beginning of new era in the nuclear field.

Check your Progress

- 1.Which year India conducted its first nuclear test?
- 2.When India declared itself as nuclear weapons state?

11.5 NUCLEAR DEBATE IN INDIA

India's nuclear policy evolved through a series of debate on the use of nuclear energy. Right from 1950s to 1990s there were schools of scientists, strategic analysts, politicians who either supported or discouraged the use of nuclear energy for evil purposes. During the cold war era, the nuclear debate in India revolved around the point whether India should go for weaponisation or not. The actors in the debate were the then scientist and the political leaders. Immediately after the independence, Dr.Homi Bhabha, first chairman of India's Atomic Energy Commission proposed that India should either seek security guarantee from the nuclear weapons states or develop its own nuclear weapons. Even the nuclear advisers of Nehru suggested him to go for nuclear if the goal of global disarmament were not realized. However,these perceptions of India's nuclear scientists were not shared by the then political leaders. India's post independent political leadership especially Nehru had a strong aversion to nuclear weapons. Hence he reportedly turned down the proposal of Dr.Bhabha and other nuclear scientist for India's nuclearisation. While articulating its stand on nuclear policy in 1957 Nehru observed, "I think I can say with some assurance on behalf of any future government of India that whatever might happen, whatever the circumstances, we shall never use this atomic energy for evil purposes"

The debate on same issue continued in the post cold war era also.In the post cold war era as maintained by Stephan Cohen

there were three groups or school of thoughts who debated India's nuclear policy .

- The first group was consisted of **neoliberals** who emphasized on economic reform and economic growth and argued that an assertive nuclear and foreign policy could hamper the Indian efforts for economic progress.
- The second group represented the **Nehruvian legacy** of strategic restraint and emphasized on freedom of action in nuclear area.
- The third group mostly comprised of the **rightist elements** advocated a strong defense and development of nuclear bomb for India(Stephan Cohen, Arming without Aiming, India's military modernization, Brookings Institution,2010)

The nuclear debate in India remained continued even after India's decision of nuclearisation. The issues in debate were the strategic implications of weaponisation on Indo-Pak relations and India's self-proclaimed stand on moratorium on nuclear tests. After the 1998 nuclear tests of India and Pakistan, several Indian and foreign strategic experts stated that Pakistan would use nuclear weapons as a bargaining tool to advance its goals in J&K. At the same time some emphasized the enhanced perils of further war between India and Pakistan(Stephen Kinzer, Kashmir gets scarier, the new York times.p.11) .After the November 2008 attack on India, there is growing demand by few nuclear experts that India should go for further nuclear tests in view of increasing threat from the Pakistan and china. There is also call for reconsidering India's no first use principle. These demands gather space with the report of US intelligence agencies confirming that Pakistan is having around 90 nuclear weapons and is continuously producing fissile material.

Check your Progress

1. Who was first chairman of India's Atomic Energy Commission ?
- 2 Name the three groups or school of thoughts who debated India's nuclear policy in the post cold war era.

11.6 COMPULSIONS OF NUCLEARISATION

1. Deteriorating Security Environment in South Asia

In the post cold war era the security environment in south Asia was deteriorated due to several developments. The increasing security threats both from china and Pakistan created strategic problems for India. Both states possessed nuclear weapons and put India in a precarious situation where India was forced to develop comparable capabilities. The Indian prime minister A.B.Vijpai's letter to the then American president Bill Clinton (which was subsequently leaked and appeared in the New York Times on 14th May 1998) clearly outlined and underscore the Chinese threat and how that percepton forced India to have nuclear bomb. The PM Vajpai cited the deteriorating security environment in south Asia and its implication on Indian security. He pointed out the Chinese nuclear aid to Pakistan and how an overt nuclear state like china is helping Pakistan to become a covert nuclear state. Vajpai also expresses concerns over the climate distrust in south Asia emanated from the unsettled border problems. The same threat percepton was echoed in the justification of the then National Security Advisor. The then national security advisor to PM of India Brajesh Mishra while articulating the compulsions of nuclearisation asserted that, "the government is deeply concerned as were the previous governments, about the nuclear environment in India's neighborhood. These tests provides reassurances to the people of India that their national security interests are paramount and will be promoted and protected"(Brajesh Mishra, Government concern over the nuclear environment in the neighborhood, the hindu, 16th May, 1998, p.1). At the same time the NDA government made it clear that, "the tests were not directed in any country and were meant to provide credible option to counter the geostrategic threats in region"(the hindu, 14 May 1998, nuclear tests not directed towards any country. p.1)

2) The China Threat

The roots of India's quest for acquiring the nuclear weapons lie in the nuclearisation of china, Chinese threat perception, and China-Pak nuclear nexus. India's nuclear policy had undergone a significant change with the first nuclear test by the china in 1964. After the defeat by china in 1962 followed by its nuclear tests the national security threat for India had naturally inflated which led to India's first nuclear test in 1974. The decision for second nuclear test in 1998 was also influenced by the china factor. The growing military power of china and its covert hostility with India mainly due to the unresolved border issue mounted pressure on India.

3) China-Pakistan Nuclear Nexus

Chinese nuclear assistance to Pakistan is an issue of serious concern for India and also instrumental in nuclear proliferation in south Asia. China is believed to have assisted Pakistan in building its nuclear programmes since 1970s. The Chinese assistance to Pakistan comprise- supply of highly enriched uranium, ring magnets necessary for processing the uranium among others. China has also reportedly trained Pakistani engineers and scientists. In the early 1990s China provided Pakistan with nuclear capable M11 missiles that have a range of 186 miles. China has also provided short range missile technology to Pakistan. The Pakistani nuclear bomb as observed in several intelligence reports is based on the blueprint supplied by China. Due to Chinese help, by the end of 1980s there were confirmed reports about the Pakistan's possession of nuclear weapons. In 1995 China sold more than five thousand ring magnets to Pakistan (Washington Post, 5th Feb, 1996). The Heritage foundation of Washington also prepared a report on Chinese nuclear assistance to Pakistan and its implications on India, titled "the strategic implications of China's nuclear aid to Pakistan". The report pointed out that "China's deep involvement in Pakistan's nuclear programme contributed to the new Indian government's decision to test nuclear weapons" (Fisher Richard and John Dori, "the strategic implications of China's nuclear aid to Pakistan" (Washington: Heritage Foundation, 1998. the report is available at <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Asiaandthepacific/EM532.cfm>) The report categorically held China responsible for nuclear proliferation in south Asia and plummeting the risk of nuclear war in south Asia.

4) **Discriminatory nuclear regime:** Discriminatory nuclear regime of NPT (Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty) and CTBT (Comprehensive (Nuclear) Test Ban Treaty) created by nuclear haves to maintain their monopoly in the nuclear area is also one of the reasons compelled India to go for nuclear. The nuclear regime created by the NPT and CTBT Treaties failed to offer a universal mechanism for the elimination of all nuclear weapons. These treaties were designed to legalize the nuclear arsenals of the nuclear haves and prevent other to go for nuclear.

Check your Progress

1. When China conducted its first nuclear test?
2. What is the full form of NPT and CTBT?

11.7 INDIA'S NUCLEAR DOCTRINE

India formulated a draft doctrine to guide its nuclear weapons immediately after the nuclear tests of 1998. India's nuclear doctrine has been designed to make India a responsible nuclear state and aim to provide minimum credible deterrence to India. India's nuclear doctrine is defensive in nature which makes it clear that India is committed to no first use of nuclear weapons principle and India will not use nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear weapons state. The doctrine further clears that the nuclear command and control system in India is under civilian control. The salient features of India's nuclear doctrine are as under

1. Civilian control over nuclear weapons: The nuclear command and control system in India is under the civilian rule
2. Emphasis on developing a Minimum Credible Deterrence. This principle provides flexibility in deciding the number of nuclear weapons India should possess
3. India will not engage in arms race
4. No-first-use: nuclear weapons will be used only for retaliation against a nuclear attack on Indian Territory. This principle is based on the theory of deterrence and helps to reduce possibility of war.
5. The nuclear retaliation will be colossal and designed to inflict massive damage.
6. India will not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon state.
7. India will observe strict control on export of nuclear and missile related materials and technology,
8. India will participate in the fissile material cut off treaty negotiations
9. India will put moratorium on nuclear tests. In 1998 itself the then PM of India Atal Bihari Vajpai declared that India did not required nuclear tests and undertook a voluntary moratorium on nuclear tests
10. India will remain committed to the goal of nuclear disarmament.
11. India will built effective, enduring diverse forces based upon a nuclear tread of air-craft, mobile land-based missiles and sea-based assets.

The nuclear doctrine significantly contributed in demonstrating

- India's continued commitment to the goal of nuclear disarmament

- Emergence of India as a responsible nuclear weapon state
- Indian commitment to engage in bilateral agreements as well in discussions for a global no-first-use agreement
- Commitment for not to indulge into export of nuclear weapons and technology

11.8 INDIAN STAND ON NPT AND CTBT

Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty

The NPT is the most widely accepted arms control agreement. The Treaty was opened for signature on 01 July 1968. The Treaty entered into force with the deposit of US ratification on 05 March 1970. The important provisions of the treaty are as under

- The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) necessitates 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.
- Non-nuclear-weapon States Parties undertake not to acquire or produce nuclear weapons or nuclear explosive devices.
- All nuclear materials in peaceful civil facilities under the jurisdiction of the state must be declared to the IAEA, the IAEA may consult with the state regarding special inspections within or outside declared facilities.

(Source: <http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/npt/>)

Pursuant to the provisions of the treaty on May 11, 1995 more than 170 countries attended the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference (NPTREC) in New York. Three important decisions were taken at the summit.

- First, the NPT was extended for an indefinite duration and without conditions.
- Second, Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament were worked out to guide the parties to the treaty in the next phase of its implementation.
- Third, an enhanced review process was established for future review conferences.
- Finally, a resolution endorsed the establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.
(Source: <http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/npt/>)

It is important to note that Israel, India, and Pakistan have never been signatories of the Treaty, and North Korea withdrew from the Treaty in 2003.

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

The CTBT treaty was thrown open for signature in 1996 by the UNGA. The CTBT has established a global norm against nuclear testing and significantly contributed to the world community's efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to promote nuclear disarmament. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is intended to prohibit all nuclear weapon test explosions. Article XIV of the Treaty requires ratification by 44 named states, before the Treaty can enter into force.

Out of these 44 states,

- Three states - **India, Pakistan, and North Korea** - have not signed the Treaty.
- **China, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, and the United States** - have signed but not ratified the Treaty.

India was actively engaged in the negotiation of CTBT. However the final provisions of the treaty did not address Indian concerns on the issues such as

- Non-proliferation,
- Global disarmament
- Issues concerning to India's security and strategic autonomy
- The treaty is flawed and discriminatory as it favors few nuclear powers

India did not sign on these treaties because

- These treaties were designed to legitimize, legalize the nuclear capabilities of the nuclear weapon states
- The treaty was biased and attempted to create nuclear hegemony of few states.
- The treaty divided the world into two groups-nuclear have and nuclear have not.
- While doing so, the treaty allowed nuclear have to maintain their nuclear weapons and created a structural mechanism to prevent nuclear have not from going nuclear.
- These treaties do not include any time bound programme for the elimination of nuclear weapons or for nuclear disarmament. The treaty was not compatible with the Indian goal of complete nuclear disarmament.

- Moreover India wanted to maintain its autonomy in nuclear area. It wanted to keep its nuclear option open and continue fissile material production in the backdrop of volatile security environment in south Asia
- The NPT has legitimized nuclear arsenals of the NPT states possessing nuclear weapons into perpetuity
- The NPT is thus a major obstacle to the goal of global nuclear disarmament.
- The provisions of the treaty are contrary to its national interests or infringe on its sovereignty.
- India has also made it clear that it will not join the NPT as a non-nuclear weapon state.

Check your Progress

1. When the CTBT treaty was thrown open for signature?
- 2.Name the countries who have not signed on NPT?

11.9 DEVELOPMENT OF NUCLEAR DETERRENCE OF INDIA

Today nuclear weapons are an integral part of India's national security .The nuclear weapons programme of India is officially based on the concept of minimum deterrence (*Talbott, Stobe, Dealing with the bomb in south Asia, Foreign Affairs, Jan/Feb 1999,Vol 78,No.2,P.119.Also see Ashley Telis, India's Emerging Nuclear Posture: Between Recessed deterrence and ready arsenal(Santa Monica,CA:Rand,2001)pp.392-398*). However experts note that the concept of minimum deterrence is dynamic and it is difficult to define how much is minimum. According to them this dynamism has contributed in legitimizing the expansion strategies of India. Consequently, there has been steady growth of missiles in India. India has developed several missiles from the 300km Brahmos to the longer range Agni series. India have mastered the war-head making technologies and are vigorously continuing to produce more fissile material

India's Ballistic Missiles Arsenals *

*Source:				
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/India_and_weapons_of_mass_destruction				
Name	Class	Range	Payload	Status
<u>Agni-I</u>	<u>SRBM</u>	700 km	1,000 kg	Operational
<u>Agni-II</u>	<u>MRBM</u>	2,000 km 3,000 km	- 500 kg 1,000 kg	- Operational
<u>Agni-III</u>	<u>IRBM</u>	5,000 km	2,490 kg	Operational
<u>Agni-IV</u>	<u>MRBM</u>	3,000 km 3,800 km	- 500 kg 1,500 kg	- Induction by 2014-15
<u>Agni-V</u>	<u>ICBM</u>	5,000 km 6,000 km	- 1500 kg+	Induction by 2014-15
<u>Agni-VI</u>	<u>ICBM</u>	5,200 km 10,000 km	- 700 kg 1,400 kg	- Under development
<u>Dhanush</u>	<u>SRBM</u>	350 km	500 kg	Developed but not used
<u>Nirbhay</u>	<u>Subsonic Cruise Missile</u>	1,000 km	?	Under development

<u>Brahmos I</u>	<u>Supersonic Cruise Missile</u>	290 km	300 kg	Operational
<u>Brahmos II</u>	<u>Hypersonic Cruise Missile</u>	290 km	300 kg	Under development
<u>P-70 Ametist</u>	<u>Anti-shipping Missile</u>	65 km	530 kg	Operational
<u>P-270 Moskit</u>	<u>Supersonic Cruise Missile</u>	120 km	320 kg	Operational
<u>Popeye</u>	<u>ASM</u>	78 km	340 kg	Operational
<u>Prithvi-I</u>	<u>SRBM</u>	150 km	1000 kg	Operational
<u>Prithvi-II</u>	<u>SRBM</u>	250 km	500 kg	Operational
<u>Prithvi-III</u>	<u>SRBM</u>	350 km	500 kg	Operational
<u>Sagarika (K-15)</u>	<u>SLBM</u>	700 km 2,200 km	- 150 kg 1000 kg	- Awaiting Arihant SSBN's
<u>K-4</u>	<u>SLBM</u>	3,500 km	150 kg 1000 kg	- Under trials
<u>Shaurya</u>	<u>TBM</u>	700 km 2,200 km	- 150 kg 1,000 kg	- Operational

According to a recent report of the international panel on the fissile materials cited in a news paper article, “India has a stock about 560kg of weapon grade plutonium generated in the spent fuel of its CIRUS and Dhruva reactors. This is good for about 110 warheads. India is also enriching some uranium bit. It is generally agreed that that this is mean for submarine fuel.(Raja Menon and R Rajaraman,keep on talking, times of india,22 july,2010,p.16). India has a larger military than Pakistan and it is the midst of a major defense modernization drive. It has prompted Pakistan to lean more heavily on its nuclear deterrent. India is developing cruise missiles capable of delivering nuclear warheads. At the same time India is working on a new SLBM based on the Agni ballistic missiles.

Check your Progress

- 1.What are the names of India’s Ballistic missile arsenals?
- 2.What is the approximate range of Agni V ballistic missile?

**11.10 NUCLEARISATION OF SOUTH ASIA:
STRATEGY IMPLICATIONS**

Unleashing an era of nuclear arms race

In recent time’s nuclear weapons have played major roles in the strategic considerations of both India and Pakistan. The frequency with which nuclear weapons have been brought into play to manage strategic interests by these countries unleashing dangerous and disturbing trend of arms race.Nuclear arms race constituted by the competitive acquisition of nuclear arms. The enormous destructive power of the nuclear weapons compels adversaries to continually strive to meet the bomb or missile gap exist between them. It can be exemplified by the cold war era nuclear arms between the US and USSR. As a result of arms race, nuclear forces of both US and USSR multiplied in the 1960s and 1970s in a competitive manner, matching each other’s weapons and delivery means, missiles. In May 1998 India and Pakistan held nuclear test by abandoning nuclear ambiguity for an overt nuclear status. Ever since these tests by India and Pakistan there is a race for competitive acquisition of weapons and delivery means. Today

both countries have reportedly enough fissionable material to produce several nuclear bombs. In case of nuclear arms race in south Asia, the national security concerns of India and Pakistan vis a-vis each other forced them to acquire sufficiently strong conventional as well as nuclear arms to safeguard their national security interests. The south Asian arms race which has been triggered in the aftermath of nuclear tests by India and Pakistan resulted into competitive acquisition of missiles and fissionable material for nuclear weapon' development by these countries. The deployment of nuclear weapons in India strengthened the position of nuclear advocates in Pakistan and vice versa. While understanding the reasons of this arms race, an analyst observed, India and Pakistan's decision to acquire nuclear weapons were the outcome of cost benefit analyses of presumed benefits of nuclearisation. According to Varun sahani, "the impact of nuclearisation of south Asia on India and Pakistan has been asymmetric as regards their respective capabilities to use force against each other is concerned. While it has given unlimited freedom to Pakistan to use force against India, it has placed serious constrained on India to do the same against it" (*sahani Varun, "the stability-instability paradox: A less than perfect explanation" in E.Sridhanran, ed., India-Pakistan nuclear relationship: theories of deterrence and international Relations (new Delhi :Routledge,2007)pp.208-238*)

Arms race always results into increase in defense budgets and cost dearly to the participating actors. It forces the participants in race to spend vast amount of money to compete in the arms race. The military expenditure of India and Pakistan has increased considerably in last one decade. Presently India is spending about 3% of GDP or \$30 billion annually on defence. India will reportedly spend \$80 billion on defense equipments in the next ten years (Farewell to Foreign Arms, **Times of India**, 1st August, 2010, p22). Interestingly, in case of India and Pakistan it is important to note that the nuclear deterrence capability has not kept cap on their spending on conventional arms. India and Pakistan's conventional weapons imports shows steady incline. Their defense budget rises year on year. Given the present hostility, both the countries are expected to remain voracious consumers of defense equipment for foreseeable future. The continuous expansion of nuclear arsenals by India and Pakistan has triggered the fear of nuclear arms race in the subcontinent and has added fuel to the already troubled relations between these two countries. As a result of this arms race, the basic and enduring risk in South Asia, as pointed out by security analysts, is that the nuclear war will erupt through miscalculation, through preemption, or through sudden escalation (*Stephen Burgess, India's Emerging Security Strategy, missile defense and arms control, INSS Occasional Paper 54, June 2004, USAF Institute of National Security Studies, USAF Academy,*

Colorado).Expert further believes that, nuclear weapons deployment by these countries has heightened the chances of an intentional or inadvertent nuclear exchange. It is important to recall at this juncture the warning given by the former CIA Director James Woolsey ways back in 1993.In his testimony before the US Senate he stated, “The arms race between India and Pakistan poses perhaps the most probable prospect for future of weapons of mass destruction including nuclear weapons”. Hence, there is pressing need for these countries to engage into composite dialogue to break ongoing stalemate. Only continuous dialogue can dissuade India and Pakistan from deploying further nuclear weapons.

Check your Progress

- 1. Define Nuclear Arms Race
- 2. When Pakistan conducted its first nuclear test?

11.10 LET US SUM UP

- After independence India embarked on comprehensive economic development programme and decided to harness nuclear energy for the socio-economic development of India.
- India has maintained an impeccable record on non-proliferation. Since independence India has been committed to the goal of general and complete disarmament in spirit and letter
- The post independent political leadership of India was ambivalent about the requirement of nuclear weapons to protect India’s strategic interests in an anarchic world.
- In the post cold war era, the steady increase in the Pakistan’s nuclear capability, enhanced Chinese nuclear threat, and Pakistan china nuclear nexus forced India to change its traditional stand of keeping nuclear option open
- The increasing security threats both from china and Pakistan created strategic problems for India. Both states possessed nuclear weapons and put India in a precarious situation where India was forced to develop comparable capabilities.

- India formulated a draft doctrine to guide its nuclear weapons immediately after the nuclear tests of 1998. India's nuclear doctrine has been designed to make India a responsible nuclear state and aim to provide minimum credible deterrence to India
- The continuous expansion of nuclear arsenals by India and Pakistan has triggered the fear of nuclear arms race in the subcontinent and has added fuel to the already troubled relations between these two countries

11.11 UNIT END QUESTIONS

Discuss the evolution of India's nuclear policy since independence

Discuss Indian stand on NPT and CTBT

Explain the salient features of India's new nuclear draft

What are the strategic implications of nuclearisation of south Asia?

Discuss briefly the compulsions behind India's decision to go for overt nuclearisation



INDIA IN THE EMERGING WORLD ORDER

Unit Structure :

- 12.0 Objective
- 12.1 Introduction
- 12.2 India in the emerging world order
- 12.3 Let us sum up
- 12.4 Unit end question
- 12.5 References

12.0 OBJECTIVE

The objective of the chapter is to understand the nature of the emerging world order and locate the position of India into it. It takes into consideration those factors that have influenced the emergence of the present world order and have shaped the dynamics of the politics of the nations. On the other hand it is also the objective to understand and locate the role of India into it and what are the possible challenges and issues of confrontation that it will have to face.

12.1 INTRODUCTION

Certain questions must be raised while trying to understand how we perceive India in the emerging world order. These questions pertain to how the world has changed. What are the major events that have shaped the world since the demise of the Soviet Union? How does India perceive the changes at the global levels and what is the nature of changes in India's outlook towards international relations? What is the shape of the emerging world order? Where is it headed to? How do we comprehend the nature of this order in the vigorously dynamic nature of global interactions? What are the issues contemporary to this world order? What role does India perceive in this emerging global order- from politics to economics and the cultural imperative? What are the challenges of the international which India as a nation might face? What should be the Indian response to such challenges? Will India matter to the world or what should matter for India? These are the questions that certainly come to my mind, though all of these are not dealt in this

paper, some are certainly touched upon and others generally roped in to make sense of what is there for us to understand.

12.2 INDIA IN THE EMERGING WORLD ORDER

In the past two decades the world has changed with a rapid pace. The concept of nation state the basic building block of the global system is itself changing. Approximately one third of the members of the united nations are threatened by ethnic disharmony, rebel movements and insurgencies. National borders are increasingly becoming porous, currency rates are quickly going out of control of the central banks, imports and immigrants are moving freely across world and terrorists, guns and drugs are threatening the sovereignty of the nations. There is an uncertainty of what is going to emerge from the rapid changes occurring at the international front. The collapse of the soviet union which coincided with the end of the forty year long cold war have prompted the thesis of the triumph of democracy and the liberal world. The end of history thesis thus becomes a marking point in the academic discourse. The way thus, was cleared for the introduction of global financial regimes preceded by the signing of the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade and its culmination into the World Trade Organization. Along with it the culmination of the thesis that the conflict of system governing the world politics and economy is over and there is now only one system that will govern our global relations. The slow but steady establishment of global regimes be it in the form of the United Nations, the WTO, the International Court of Justice, are pointers towards a world more integrated and governed by international regimes, where national governments will have to confirm and adjust their constitutions to the requirements of the international.

The order of the independent sovereign states is not a very old phenomenon. The treaty of Westphalia which ended the 30 years war in 1648 established the system of independent sovereign states less than 400 years back, which again was Eurocentric till half of the 20th century. This world order of the State System which comprised of the international system of sovereign nation states possessing the monopoly of force within their mutually recognized territories is changing. The order symbolized the separation of the domestic from the international spheres, in which the states do not have legitimate powers to interfere in the domestic affairs of the other states. States have to look after themselves. One of the main functions of the state is to ensure the security and well being of its citizens and to protect them from outside interference. The system is characterized by formal diplomatic ties between states as modes of communication and interaction between them and relations maintained by formulating treaties or breaking them. The

abstract principles, norms and practices that constitute the Westphalian system of states have become the central organizing features of modern political life and are reproduced in the daily routine practices of the states. The Westphalian system continues to influence the governance of the contemporary global affairs reinforcing the perceived dichotomy between the domestic and the international affairs. The domestic realm defined by the existence of the government- the central institution of political rule- and the international realm by its evident absence. The contemporary debate between the traditionalist and the globalist/ transformation list informs today's understanding of the world order. For the traditionalists- who mostly belong to the realist camp- the Westphalian system remains central to the constitution of modern political life and to understand the dynamics of how the world is governed today. For the globalist and the transformation lists, the Westphalian ideals seem to be at odds with the expanding scale upon which contemporary economic, cultural and political activity is currently organized.

Yet, the consequence to the breakdown of the balance of power system, the initial experimentation on world government in the form of league of nations which were coincidental to the two world wars fought led to the emergence of the break down of the classical colonial hegemonic structure of the west European centric world into an ideologically divided yet an imperialistic world order governed by new global players- the North America and the Soviet Russia. The world order was now divided into two mutually exclusive systems of governance, economics and politics. The state system though sovereign was highly organized to serve the interests of the hegemonic power, structured and concentrated in the US and the USSR.

The demise of the Soviet Russia has restructured the world order in a different ways and some times dramatically. The End of History thesis and the Clash of Civilization thesis came as one of the most prominent to understand the changing global situation and how we are going to perceive it. The first declaring the end of the ideological wars and hence the end of the debate of the governing system of the world and the second on the contrary emphasizing the cultural fault lines among which the threat to world peace remain large and lingering and hence the suggestion of restructuring of the world on the lines of civilizations. The first has initiated the argument of necessity and the inevitability of the market system governed by the global financial regimes which eventually has culminated in the World Trade Organization. Contrary to the world order argument lists there is a skepticism towards this argument forwarded by the conspiracy theorists who maintain that a secretive power elite with a globalist agenda is conspiring to eventually rule the world through an authoritarian

World government—which replaces sovereign nation-states and an all-encompassing propaganda that ideologizes its establishment as the culmination of history's progress. Significant occurrences in politics and finance are speculated to be orchestrated by an unduly influential cabal operating through many front organizations. Numerous historical and current events are seen as steps in an on-going plot to achieve world domination through secret political gatherings and decision-making processes.

Having understood the developments undertaken in the interactions between states which had implications to their systemic environment, a world order is a condition defined in terms of the structural arrangement of the system in which the human society interacts at organizational levels. The modern world till now has been the dominant domain of the order of the independent nation/states which is seriously challenged and undermined by the globalizing forces. Or on the contrary the globalization has been initiated to put into transition the old state order.

What therefore are the definitive features of the emerging World Order, post cold war? We can point out at certain possibilities, as the dust is yet not settled finally.

1. Transition despite ambiguity and turbulence: One will have to acknowledge the fact that despite the ambiguities as well as the turbulence in the international environment, there is certainly a shift/ transition taking place. The end of the cold war seems to have profited Germany and Japan in the short run but appears to favour the US in the long run. The balance of power system seems to have run out of time and context. Arms control, conventional weapons, nuclear disarmament, Islamic/ or to the extent religious and ethnic fundamentalism/conflicts, issues of environmentalism have taken centre stage. This transition is influenced by the ever dynamism of the international order and hence has become difficult to predict the outcome. The window to understand the changes occurring at the international level is very narrow and temporal. Any interaction within the temporality of the international has to be judged on its long term as well as immediate impact on the relations. Hence the transitional nature of global politics is one of the definitive features of the present world order.
2. Stratification of Power at multiple levels: The post cold war world order has been oscillating from the unipolar world at the immediate demise of the soviet union with US as the only super power left and no other state to match its capacity to intervene and impact global politics, to the multipolar world where regional power centres including Russia, Japan, India, China, Brazil, Korea, Australia, South Africa, Israel, Indonesia and Malaysia

have emerged as the key in the way it influences the region, its politics and economy. Thus the power stratification is multilayered and liquidly mobile. The end of the cold war has broken the shackles of the rigid bipolar world to rearrange itself and given a more maneuvering space to align more freely to pursue their national interests.

3. Global politics on issues of concern: Security, technology, porous borders, influential market, transnational pressure groups, monitoring agencies, financial and security regimes, legal regimes, multilateral politics and maneuvering are some of the examples which prominently figure out in understanding the changing nature of the issue in international politics.
4. Bargain over sovereign and territorial rights: As the global erodes the national the tensions will be what is bargained and how far. How far the national governments and the population going to accept what is internationally imposed. In matters of economy there certainly have emerged enough criticisms to the policies of the WTO whether it is the matter of subsidy or pricing. In matters of human rights and the territorial jurisdiction of the courts, conflicts are galore over the national jurisdiction versus the international regimes jurisdiction.

India's entry into the global state system has been quite late given the evolution of this system. Having been subjected to a colonial government, India's integration in the world order was by default a result of the foreign rule which prompted her emergence as a modern nation. Yet, the response at the initial years remained perceivably, though with high idealism, within the global context of colonialism, neutrality, and support to multilateralism. Later, the constraints of the global politics and particularly the cold war, confined India's role as a global player. India's self image was marred by various factors both external and internal which remained un-conducive for global recognition. It is argued that India's potentials to harness growth has been constrained by the heavily built up structure of controlled economy, which it had to ultimately shed up in 1990 after an acute financial crises.

The opening up of India's economy did bring in some confidence in the Indian domestic conditions which provided a philip to the government to take more bold steps at the international levels. The period post 1990s marks a major shift of the Indian foreign policy and eventually its self perception as well as global recognition. This period also marks a historically important event of the dissolution of the Soviet Union, which prompted the Indian establishment to make immediate shifts in its perception of the unfolding world politics and accordingly make adjustments to its foreign policy to fit its role into the changed circumstances.

The context of the emergence of the Globalized politics, financial and legal regimes, transnational organizations and movements, multinational trade and corporations, and global concerns such as terrorism or global warming, security, development and the fluid power hierarchy at the international level etc., are the new set of conditions in which the national governments have to operate, to which India is no exception. In a Globalized world, just as India engages the world, India is also being engaged by the world. The test thus remains how far India is able to engage the world on its terms and how far the world is integrated with India on a mutual beneficial relationship.

The framing of the post cold war diplomacy and foreign policy have introduced changes which comparing to the history of India's foreign policy might look radical as India has to adjust and alter its policy to also a radically changed political and economic environment of the world. States do not easily alter their foreign policy and their international orientation, they generally respond to revolutionary changes either at home or in the world. What therefore has changed in the foreign policy of India therefore has to be noted.

1. Change in the philosophical premises of India's engagement with the external world from a Nehruvian idealism simplified by the ruling establishment to a more realistic understanding of the world governed by power interests. With both the old political and economic order both at the international and the domestic front represented by the cold war and the one party rule and socialism, upon which India's foreign policy was anchored collapsed, it eventually had no option but to discard the old beliefs in favour of the new system that has been emerging.
2. The move from third world trade unionism to the realization of national interest governed by power configurations is another feature of India's policy adaptation in the changed circumstance. Non alignment had been considered as the single most feature of India's foreign policy and a bogey of trade unionism that focused upon the language of third worldism. The end of the cold war forced India to reconsider its commitment to the idea and its relations with the erstwhile national governments.
3. Flexing the manoeuvrability from the earlier entranced and antagonistic relations towards the west to rapprochement with it. Four long decades of entrenched relationship with the west exuberated with the conditions of cold war, anti-imperialist traditions and the nativist ideologies had flogged India's relation and limited its interactions particularly with the west to the extent of anti west overtones. The post cold war policy of India mainly remained focused to come out of the shell and dispel those sources of opposition to the west.

4. Restructuring relations with major powers was one of the immediate necessities which remained the focus of India's foreign policy through out the post cold war period. The understanding of the power configuration concentrated in the sole super power and to initiate relationship with the US remained the defining feature of the Indian foreign policy the last two decades. Apart from building relationship with the US, the realignment with Russia as a former ally and China the newly emerging global player remained important for India's reach out policy.
5. Rebuilding relations with neighbors from the South Asian subcontinent as well as the west Asia and Middle East and the south East Asia was another important step in the direction to integrate with the region. Not to say that much of the time and energy has been consumed with the strained relations with Pakistan and China and though India has some stable relation with the Muslim countries in the middle east, the US was over Taliban in Afghanistan and the consequent Indian posture vis a vis the war and its all out support to the US certainly has strains over its relations with other Muslim countries. Containing Pakistan as well as china and integration with the Muslim countries both of the Middle East and the south east nations will be challenges which India faces in terms of its foreign policy posture. The Indian subcontinent needs a thorough integration rather than a big brother image that India carries. This challenge also remains at the domestic front with the rise of Hindu nationalism and fundamentalism the colouring of the foreign policy.

India has moved from a period of transition and is charting its foreign policy and to some extent has also laid down its essentials though not expressly nor articulatively but can be noted in the policy and diplomatic decisions and moves it has taken in the past two decades. What remains imperative is to understand those broad contours. First from the transition from the collective national consensus on building a socialist society to a consensus on building a modern capitalist one, yet not dispelling a concern of and equitable distribution and the notions of justice both at home as well as at the multilateral forums. It is commented that the success of Indian foreign policy depend on the pace of India's globalization and its integration with the rest of the world; Second the importance of the economics to shape the international relations with the growing economies; From a begging bowl of foreign aid that symbolized its foreign policy to foreign direct investment as the new way to integrate and build relations, and the third from third worldism to the promotion of its own national interest; Fourth, rejection of the anti west mode of thinking which has coloured India's foreign policy throughout; and Fifth, the transition from the

idealistic or normative mode of thinking to a more pragmatic approach to international politics¹.

Having dealt with the form and structure of both the new world order and India's foreign policy in this emerging world order there remains a word of caution which should guide the foreign policy initiatives as well as its formulation. If we believe that the old order of the state system is giving way to a new order of world government, we believe to the extent that despite that nation/states are challenged in terms of their sovereignty and territorial jurisdiction, yet their importance in the coming days is not going to fade and they still remain the important players in the international system. Yet on the other hand the international regimes do have an important stay in the global politics in integrating the world into one system of governance, be it economics, human rights, nuclear issues etc. India will have to understand the nature of the world. Globalization is not the issue of the national government to deal with but it also integrates peoples of cultures, classes, ethnicities, religions, regions to name any. Foreign policy faces the challenge of how peoples aspirations are the part of the national policies and how the global issues percolate at the peoples level so that understand the effect of the policies and are empowered to take decisions on such issues. India remains at advantage with a robust democracy at work and institutional arrangements at place to adjust with the emerging world order. The challenge before it will be the will to democratize the policy making process.

Indian foreign policy will also have to take into consideration the stratification of the power structure at the international level and engage at all the levels of the strata. It will have to evolve mechanism to quickly respond to the dynamism of the world politics and its ability to adjust the postures without keeping much predispositions. This power stratification in the transitional nature of the world politics too keeps on shifting from nation/states to the international regimes as well as other actors of international politics including the multinational corporations, transnational social movements, various multilateral forums, or even terrorist groups. It therefore will have to move from the classical state oriented theoretical orientations to understand the nature of the dynamics of the international politics the ways to respond to it.

The global politics is circumscribed with issues of global nature as well as a shift in the perspectives of those issues which had been fundamental in the understanding of international politics. The global energy needs, environmental concerns, terrorism, global economic integrations and its fallouts, porous borders to name the few are issues which require a non-state centric perspective. Efforts to analyze the same from the classical theoretical perspectives might block our understanding and the problems might not even

figure out and hence will shape our policy formulations. It on the other hand also has the danger to run into misunderstanding which might aggravate situations than controlling them. For example, the issue of transnational terrorism from the classical state perspective has the possibility of misguiding the policy formulations which has the implications of harming the interstate relations. On the other hand the issues of security, development etc., requires a change of perspective of understanding from its earlier perceptions. The issues of security from the conventional notions give a very limited and a militaristic understanding of the concept which is not helpful to understand the present security challenges faced by the national societies. Therefore, a policy formulation at the governmental level will have to face the challenge in comprehending the issues in the changed environment and will have to evolve a dialectical relationship between the government and policy makers with the people which will correspond to the channels of information and feedbacks. India is no exclusion to these issues may be those of the energy requirements for which India had to confirm its stand to the international energy regulation regimes and nuclear regimes which ultimately led to the signing of the 123 nuclear treaty with the US, or that of terrorism which has constantly strained India's relation with Pakistan.

Lastly, the foreign policy of India will also be challenged by the overtones of nationalism which certainly will have an overriding effect or holding effect on the issues particularly of multilateral nature which will require the subjection of national sovereignty as well as territorial supremacy. The national understanding of the international will be the core issue of confrontation within the context of the emerging world order which tends to move more towards a Globalized government. States like India will have to adjust very quickly to this notion of change and make extra efforts to inform the nation of these rapid changes, more so because, compared with the west nation/state in India has emerged very late and the nation at a nascent stage might find it difficult to adjust to such circumstance that will require compromises with its sovereign status.

12.3 LET US SUM UP

To sum up, the transitory nature of the global order is moving towards the difficult though but the reality of world governance. This emerging order is going to throw certain challenge which are fundamental and of the intervening nature towards such transition these are- sovereignty, jurisdiction and national governments to the analysis of the nature of the international relations. This will require a radical change in our understanding of the global issues of peace, security and development in a re-contextualized world. India

certainly is as an emerging nation and its urge for power is growing tremendous in the recent couple of decade riding on the lorry of global financial regime change and the domestic growth of economy. It is re-contextualizing its role and the change of positioning from a neutral idealist foreign policy towards a realist and pragmatic policy. Yet, the challenges of the conflicting nature of the global with the statist structure of international relations on the one hand and the layers of internal and external regimes of governance and the adjustment with the transitional and responding to the dynamic global interactions to mutual benefits will remain key to India's role in the global politics.

12.4 UNIT END QUESTIONS

1. What are the factors responsible for the emergence of a new world order and how do they seem to affect the world politics?
2. What are the premises upon which the traditionalist and the transformationist base their argument of a world order?
3. What does the End of History and the Clash of Civilization Thesis postulate?
4. Apart from the definitive features of the emerging world order as mentioned in the chapter, what other can you suggest?
5. Describe the changes India's foreign policy is witnessing particularly in the post cold war period juxtaposing with the earlier position.
6. What are the challenges before the Indian foreign policy in the emerging new world order?

12.5 REFERENCES

- i. Kanwal, Gurmeet, The New World Order: An Appraisal-I, in Strategic Analysis, June 1999.
- ii. Fukuyama, Francis, The End Of History, The National Interest, 16(Summer 1989), 4.
- iii. Held, David (ed.), A Globalizing World: Culture, Economics, Politics, Routledge, London, 2000.
- iv. Huntington, Samuel, The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order, Penguin Publication, New Delhi, 2000.
- v. Mohan, C Raja, Crossing The Rubicon: The Shaping of India's New Foreign Policy, Viking Publication, New Delhi, 2003.



