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**1.1.0** **OBJECTIVE**

This introductory lesson provides basic understanding about evolution of India’s foreign policy in the post-independence period. After going through this topic, you should be able to: know the ideological influences of nationalist movement on foreign policy of India;

• understand the goals and objectives of the India’s foreign policy;

• comprehend the principles on which India’s foreign policy is based upon, during Cold

• War and post-Cold War period.

**1.1.1 INTRODUCTION**

A country's foreign policy consists of self-interest strategies chosen by the state to safeguard its national interests and to achieve goals within its international relations milieu. The approaches are strategically employed to interact with other countries.

The aforementioned interaction is evaluated and monitored in attempts to maximize benefits of multilateral international cooperation. Since the national interests are paramount, foreign policies are designed by the government through high-level decision making processes.

National interests’ accomplishment can occur as a result of peaceful cooperation with other nations, or through exploitation. Usually, formulation of the foreign policy is the job of the head of government and the foreign minister or equivalent.

In some countries the legislature also has considerable effects. Foreign policies of countries have varying rates of change and scopes of intent, which can be affected by factors that change the perceived national interests or even affect the stability of the country itself.

The foreign policy of one country can have a profound and lasting impact on many other countries and on the course of international relations as a whole. 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 principles adopted to achieve those goals.

**1.1.2 GENESIS OF INDIA’S FOREIGN POLICY**

Indian leadership formulated certain basic principles on which the framework of India’s foreign policy was constructed. These could be termed as means of India’s foreign policy to achieve the ends. India’s first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, was the chief architect of this framework, which was an aggregation of India’s principles and concrete realities in international arena. In real terms, Indian foreign policy came into being with the advent of independence in 1947.

Until then the nation, as a satellite of the British Empire, had no diplomatic identity and eschewed the postulates of foreign policy dictated by the erstwhile rulers. India’s role in the First World War and the subsequent course of its rudimentary diplomatic overtures were constrained by prevailing British influences.

The preponderance of political leaders and philosophers such as Mahatma Gandhi, Nehru and Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan in the ruling elite of India in the immediate post-independence era brought an element of altruism and idealism into its polity.

Nehru himself taken responsibility as a foreign minister and throughout his life remained the chief architect of India’s foreign policy. He tried to identify the country’s foreign policy with anti-colonialism and anti-racism. He also promoted India’s role as a peacemaker, which was an extension of Gandhian policies and deeply rooted in the indigenous religious traditions of Buddhism, Hinduism and Jainism.

Like foreign policies of other countries, India’s was based first on its government’s perceptions of national interests and security considerations. India’s foreign policy defined by Nehru as non-aligned was based on the Five Principles of Panch-Sheel — mutual respect for other nations’ territorial integrity and sovereignty, non aggression, non-interference in internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful coexistence.

In the 1950s, India attempted to play an important role in international politics even though it did not possess all the necessary attributes. It endeavoured to overcome its power weaknesses by politically mobilising African and Asian nations and by assuming for a time, the leadership of non-aligned nations.

Washington considered this policy not only an obstacle in the way of its containment of the Soviet Union but also an attempt to create an additional global force. It thus launched a policy of military containment and neutralisation of India through the military build-up of Pakistan in 1954.

These years of diplomatic vacillations and ambiguity were characterised by a general unwillingness in India to address foreign policy issues in perspective and with pragmatic foresight. The next decade began as the era of Panch-Sheel and non-alignment and India hoped that the border issues over the validity of the McMahon line, incursions into Aksai Chin and military action in Tibet by the Chinese would be resolved by discussions, as it did not have the appropriate military preparedness to counter China’s coercive diplomacy.

The 1962 military defeat revealed that the country’s role pretensions were inconsistent with its capabilities, which resulted in somewhat undermining India’s global influence. Nehru’s attempts to play a global leadership role failed, because of the widespread recognition after 1962 that India was not master in its own house.

Indian diplomacy and statesmanship could not prevent a war with China, nor could its ill-equipped and ill-prepared military machine sustain it. The Chinese invasion humiliated India, shook its position in the international sphere and gave it its first object lesson that utopian foreign policies are often ignored in the face of pragmatic geopolitical compulsions so that a military backup to diplomacy is a prerequisite.

In this period, the country gave concrete proof of its capability to become a regional superpower in the twenty-first century. During the East Pakistan (now Bangladesh) Crisis, India was staggered by the American warning that it should expect no assistance in the event of Chinese intervention.

To counter the US–China alliance against India, in a masterly balance of power move, Indira Gandhi entered into a Treaty of Friendship with the USSR. When war erupted and with the US and China diplomatically and militarily neutralised by the USSR, India was able to inflict a severe military defeat on America’s proxy — Pakistan in 1971.

Thus, India created a new strategic environment and emerged as the preeminent power in South Asia. Its nuclear test in 1974 was an indicator that it would endeavour to maintain its pre-eminence in the subcontinent as well as its independent status.

During the 1980s, India came into its own in terms of foreign policy. The success of the 1971 War, a stronger military and a more mature nation were part of the reason. In addition, increasing domestic troubles led to the need for greater engagement with the world, as the emergence of the media increased “international pressure”.

The country began to play a greater role in Asian fora, engaged several countries bilaterally and increased its UN peacekeeping engagements. However, internal troubles and political turmoil stopped it from achieving a truly global status in economic terms.

Furthermore, the decade started on an ominous note for India’s strategic concerns. However, the post-Cold War context completely changed the international dynamics and India needs to reorient its foreign policy as per the changed context. And it did it very well. T

The political and diplomatic class moved quite well to stabilize India’s foreign policy in the changed context. The changes were so extreme that Israel, the country whose recognition India opposed, emerged as one of the leading exporter of India’s defence equipment. The responses at economic, political and strategic levels have enabled India to emerge as a potential great power though it still faces enormous developmental challenges.

**1.1.3 IDEOLOGY OF INDIA’S FOREIGN POLICY**

The ideology and political traditions of a country influences its foreign policy substantially. More so for a country like India whose political traditions evolved during the nationalist movement against British colonialism. Apart from anti-imperialist orientation, which is a natural outcome of anti-colonial struggle, the Gandhian values of non-violence and peace,

The following section will discuss some of the issues related to ideological foundations of India’s foreign policy.

**1.1.3.1 IDEALIST VIEW OF POLITICS AND POWER**

The ancient Indian tradition of nonviolence in general, and the Asokan tradition in particular, found its manifestation in an idealist approach to politics, both national and international, in the mainstream of Indian nationalist movement led by Gandhi. Politics Gandhi defined not in its usual sense of the art of capturing and managing governmental power, but as the “transformation of social relationships” in terms of certain ultimate values. He was severely critical of power politics and advised his followers to stay away from “power politics and its contagion”.

The only desirable and enduring form of power, according to him, was the power of nonviolence, which would involve love and respect for the adversary, and which he believed to be much greater than that of the atom bomb. Jawaharlal Nehru and other policymakers of the post-independent India were profoundly influenced by the nonviolent national movement led by Gandhi, as well as by the modern Indian tradition of idealist political thinking in general.

Although, Nehru, as prime minister, could not afford to be a pure idealist, and often referred to the real factors in India’s national interest as important determinant of his foreign policy, he also strongly criticized the purely realist view of international relations based on military and economic power, and repeatedly emphasized the idealist political tradition of modern India in general and the Gandhian insistence on nonviolent and right means in particular, as an important element of Indian foreign policy.

**1.1.3.2 IDEALIST APPROACH TO INTERNATIONALISM**

Idealist approach to internationalism is one of the important ideological instruments that influenced the India’s foreign policy during the early post-independence period. Gandhi pleaded for the “voluntary interdependence of nations” of nations as against their “isolated independence”. Jawaharlal Nehru did not come entirely under the spell of this romanticized idealism, and certainly introduced a political element and a large measure of objectivity.

But neither he nor the Indian National Congress came close to what in contemporary jargon would be called “political realism”. In 1942, the All India Congress Committee passed a resolution in which it observed that “the future peace, security and ordered progress of the world demand a World Federation of free nations, and on no other basis can the problems of the modern world be solved”.

Such a federation, the resolution said, would ensure the freedom of the member-nations, prevent aggression and exploitation by one nation of another, protect national minorities, lead to the advancement of all backward areas and peoples, and the utilization of the world resources for the common benefit of all nations. Before Independence, Nehru persistently stressed this world-view of the Indian National Congress.

In January 1947 he told the Constituent Assembly: “The only possible real objective that we, in common with other nations, can have is the objective of cooperating in building up some kind of world structure, call it One World, call it what you may.” IN his various foreign policy pronouncements Nehru stated categorically that the ideal of One World constituted one of the important bases of Indian foreign policy in general and of India’s policy towards the United Nations in particular.

**1.1.3.3 ANTI-IMPERIALISM AND ANTI-RACIALISM**

Anti-imperialism as an aspect of Indian foreign policy developed out of India’s own experience of British imperialism. At the initial states, however, India’s anti-imperialism was primarily a protest against British rule in India, rather than an international ideal.

However, since First World War Congress started protesting against all forms of imperialism. In 1928 the Congress observed that “the struggle of the Indian people for freedom is a part of the general world struggle against imperialism and its manifestation”.

On account of the British racialist policy in India, which “permeated all the services and constituted the distinguishing characteristic of British rule in the East in the 19th century”, imperialism and racialism became identified in India’s historical experience.

One of the aspects of Soviet life which made a deep impressions on Nehru’s mind during his visit to Moscow at the end of 1927 was what he considered to be the complete absence of the racial prejudice in Soviet society.

By 1947 anti-imperialism and anti-racialism had become categorical imperatives of the Indian national mind, and Nehru only expressed a deep Indian sentiment when he declared in 1946, as the Prime Minister of the Interim Government of India, that anti-imperialism and anti-racialism were the “kernel of our foreign policy”.

**1.1.3.4 ASIANISM India’s**

Asianism was a corollary to anti-imperialism and anti-racialism. The growth of the nationalist spirit in India was associated with the realization that practically the whole of Asia was suffering from imperialistic oppression and racial discrimination in one form or another, and that the historical experience and the destiny of Asian countries were linked together.

The national movements in different Asian countries, particularly the poitical consolidation and industrial development of Japan, resulting in her victory over Russia in 1905, and the Chinese revolution of 1911 further inspired the leaders of Indian freedom movement and strengthened their sense of a common Asian destiny.

From the end of the First World War the Indian National Congress talked of the need for an “Asiatic Federation”. In 1928 the Congress resolved that “India should develop contacts with other countries and peoples who also suffer under imperialism and desire to combat it” and directed its Working Committee to convene “the first session of a Pan-Asiatic Federation in 1930 in India”.

In 1942 the Congress resolved that “the freedom of India must be a symbol of and prelude to the freedom of all other Asiatic nations under foreign domination”. Thus when Nehru convened the first Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi in March 1947 and observed in his inaugural address that “in order to have one world, we must also, in Asia, think of the countries of Asia cooperating together for that larger ideal”.

**1.1.3.5 REJECTION OF WESTERN DEMOCRACY AND COMMUNISM**

The ideals of nonviolence, democracy, anti-imperialism, anti-racialism, Pan-Asianism, cooperative internationalism, etc. gave the Indian people a certain autonomy in political thinking and a world outlook which fitted neither with that of the Western countries nor with that of the Communist bloc.

The anti-Western democratic feelings were the result of the perception that this system was responsible for the cruel imperialism in Asia and Africa. There was also the feeling that the capitalist economic system which was associated with this type of democracy was based on the exploitation of the common people at home and the people in the colonies. Similarly, there is realization in the Indian nationalist leadership that the Russian Revolution and the state system which had come into existence as a result of it were utterly repugnant to the basic ideals of the Indian nationalist movement, especially against those of nonviolence, democracy, and cooperative internationalism.

Hence, the leadership strived to establish a new set of political and economic institutions which would steer clear of the evils of both the systems and break new ideological ground for the future course of human progress. The resolutions of the Indian National Congress since the early thirties reflected this ideological autonomy of Indian nationalism.

The Karachi Resolution of 1931 laid the foundation of both political democracy and state initiative, control and planning for rapid economic development with equality and justice. This middle ground of ideological stance later on led to India championing the nonalignment movement with likeminded countries.

Non-alignment is basically aimed at keeping equidistance from western bloc led by America and Socialist bloc led by Soviet Union. It always voices of the newly independent countries, which later on popularly called as Third World countries. India is in the forefront of this Third World movement for a long time.

**1.1.3.6 CHANGING CONTEXT: IDEOLOGY TO PRAGMATISM**

It must be kept in the mind that the above mentioned ideologies and political traditions had grown up with the Indian freedom movement and the Indian National Congress in a colonial context. It is natural that any change in this context, both domestic and international, also changes the ideological perceptions.

Hence, though Nehru represents the nationalist traditions, however, his foreign policy reflected a mixture of idealism and realism, and a constant effort to synthesize the two. Similarly, the next Prime Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri displayed realism in both war and peace during his brief tenure.

Under Indira Gandhi, there was a perceptible decline of idealism in both domestic and foreign policy, although the idealistic rhetoric was sometimes used as an ideological camouflage. But there was a strong emphasis on the anti-imperialist and anti-racialist aspects of foreign policy. The Janata Party, which came to power in 1977, pledged allegiance to Gandhian principles in both domestic and foreign policy. However, there were important developments in 1960s that affected India’s foreign policy substantially and led to the relative decline of Asianism.

The idea of Asian solidarity had developed within the mainstream of the Indian national movement at a time when the partition of the subcontinent or the triumph of the Communism in China was not anticipated. Nehru always regarded friendship between India and China as the only possible foundation of a movement for Asian unity.

But the growing antagonism between India and China from 1959 onwards, culminating in the border war of 1962, undermined the foundations of Asianism as an element of India’s foreign policy. The many wars that India fought with Pakistan further complicated the situation.

**1.1.3.7 IDEOLOGY IN POST-COLD WAR PERIOD**

India’s foreign policy throughout the Cold War period, i.e. it’s attainment of independence in 1947 to demise of the Soviet Union in 1991, guided by the ideological neutrality between East and West and not aligning with any one group on political or strategic matters. On a world-wide scale, this policy is well known as "active neutrality."

It arises in part from the great need for peace in order to concentrate upon internal problems, and in part from a deep sense of security which characterized Indian thinking on world affairs until recently and which obviated the need to take sides. It has incidental advantages as well.

India, unattached to any group, retains greater freedom of action to play its leadership role in Asia; also, the government can avoid antagonizing any one faction too much a vital consideration at a time when strong opposition is arising inside and outside of the Congress.

However, the collapse of the Socialist bloc of Soviet Union and Eastern Europe forced many countries alter trajectories of their foreign policies. The demise of the Soviet Union deprived India of the support of a veto-wielding power in the U.N. Security Council, ended a highly favourable arms-transfer relationship that had enabled New Delhi to maintain a modern military, and removed a virtual guarantee against Chinese nuclear blackmail. The Soviet collapse also undermined India's autarkic approach to economic development, which, in turn, had serious consequences with respect to its foreign policy options. Not only was the Soviet model of long-range planning, and massive state regulation of industry discredited, but almost simultaneously, in 1991, India faced an unprecedented financial crisis.

The high cost of purchasing oil on the global spot market, the expenses incurred in repatriating thousands of workers from the Persian Gulf states before the onset of the first Gulf War, the loss of their remittances, and loan payments to multilateral banks drained India's exchequer.

Hence, the end of Cold War and demise of Soviet Union not only altered the foreign policy course but also led to the changes to domestic ideological positions and normative order. The economic reforms that were introduced in India, have significantly altered core national values, traditions, norms and ideological grounds on which social, political and economic systems were founded in the early years of independence.

Adjusting to the unipolar realities of early 1990s, India's leaders also began to dispense with their anti-American ranting on matters ranging from global disarmament to climate change to international trade negotiations, and New Delhi started to play a more constructive role in such global multilateral institutions as the World Trade Organization.

They also dropped their rhetoric on behalf of the Third World at the United Nations and in other multilateral fora. And in another dramatic shift, India, acting on a desire to ingratiate itself with Israel and the United States, played a constructive role in overturning the obnoxious U.N. resolution that equated Zionism with racism. Other important policy changes followed. Throughout the Cold War, in an attempt to court Arab public opinion and fearful of a domestic public backlash from its substantial Muslim minority, India had refused to maintain full diplomatic relations with Israel.

Prime Minister Rao reversed this decades-old policy in a single stroke and with only mild domestic opposition. By so doing, he hoped to gain an invaluable ally in the Middle East, to acquire high-tech weaponry. New Delhi also made a concerted effort to improve relations with China, with which it had fought a disastrous border war in 1962, by expanding cultural exchanges, trade, and foreign investment, and through a series of confidence-building measures along the disputed border. However, the new pragmatism that began to inform Indian foreign policy calculations with the Soviet collapse has not led to an uncritical acceptance of American global dominance.

The issues of contention between the US and India changed, but not completely disappeared. In most critical multilateral forums of 21st century, the WTO and Rounds on Climate Change, India and the US were always on other side of the table, differing with each other’s position. These and other issues of such nature will be discussed later on, in other lessons.

**1.1.4 GOALS OF INDIA’S FOREIGN POLICY**

The making of foreign policy is essentially an exercise in the choice of ends and means on the part of a nation-state in an international setting. It is necessary, first of all, to formulate a broad end or goal which will give a sense of purpose and direction to foreign policy. This goal need not, and in fact should not, be static in content; it must be a conceptually long-term goal to which immediate objectives, and the short-term policies pertaining to them, can be related.

In the event of possible conflict between different short-term goals, the broad and long-term goal will indicate the direction of choice. Though broad, this goal should not be a vague one; it should be clearly definable and divisible into some concrete and specific components, since otherwise it will not be possible to formulate any goal-oriented clear policies (short-term or long-term) and foreign policy may degenerate into a futile exercise, loose talk, and aimless shift of one thing to another.

Though sometimes the policy makers may not always be able to relate their short-term policies to long-term goal, due to various factors and contingencies, but this relationship is the essence of rationality in the making of foreign policy.

In this broader perspective, India’s foreign policy strived to attain some basic goals to secure territorial, political and human security of the country. Since foreign policy is always instrumental in uplifting the economic wellbeing of the people, naturally India’s foreign policy always oriented to achieve economic development of the country in the post independence period. The following section would highlight some of those goals which India considered vital to its national interest.

**1.1.4.1 SECURITY**

Securing the borders and lives of the people is the most important responsibility of any nation-state. Hence, security becomes the most primary goals of foreign policy of any country; so is India’s. However, security should not be interpreted in narrow sense. The military preparedness of security cannot guarantee long-term security. Long-term and durable security always results from economic development and state-building.

Similarly, militarily aggressive postures (hegemony) cannot be equated with the security. That is the reason there is no general agreement among scholars what constitutes security. A countries effort to attain security might become insecurity to others.

Hence, while defining security one has to undertake a balanced viewpoint. From international relations perspective, security implies external threat to territorial integrity; on this count India has bitter experiences as it fought many bitter wars with Pakistan, and one major war with China. The tension with Pakistan has not ended, the easing of tensions with China was of a recent date.

However, India managed to achieve a measure of tranquillity on its northern borders and India and China were engaged in building confidence and understanding each other.

This is now way implied any real dilution of China’s relationship with Pakistan, but the logic of normalization of relations with India determined that China pursue its commitments to Pakistan less obtrusively, more subtly and with greater sophistication. The various Confidence Building Measures taken by India and China at the northern borders allowed greater flexibility to India’s external policies.

Similarly, India also overcame its insecurities vis-a-vis sea based threats by building one of the professional navies in the world. These and other dimensions of security will be analysed in the next lessons.

**1.1.4.2 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Ever since India became independent, the political leadership always focused on economic development of the country. The Nehru’s focus on heavy industries, the five year plans, emphasis on higher education and research, the big dams, etc. are intended to modernize the country and attain a respectable status in the international fora.

And one of the important dimensions of the non-alignment was also to secure assistance from both West and Socialist bloc economic assistance to achieve development. There is broad consensus at present in India that the country’s single most important goal is to become the world’s third largest economy by 2025 and, concurrently, also emerge as one of the key global political and security actors in the evolving multipolar world.

Reflecting on it, recently India’s Foreign Minister Sushma Swaraj while addressing at Growth Net Conference stated that “We have stepped up commercial divisions in our missions around the globe. The vision of the government is to empower people and bring about economic development. The foreign policy priorities are aimed at creating the right external environment for the same”.

**1.1.4.3 SEARCHING FOR IDENTITY**

Apart from those above mentioned goals which are vital for any country’s national interest, India also always striving to attain its own identity, rather than swayed by one or the other kind of influences. The non-alignment policy of India is an example for quest for own identity. India never became member of any security pacts, never became part of military alliances and never associated blindly with one superpower during Cold War period.

Though many criticised India’s tilt towards Soviet Union, it is largely in a particular context and to protect national interest when its security was threatened. And contemporary foreign policy is also pursuing the same goal of protecting its own unique identity, with clarity on international issues.

For a country, which wants to attain economic prosperity must maintain its own positions on various issues rather than swayed by influences of other countries.

**1.1.4.4 RESPECTFUL POSITION AMONG COMMUNITY OF NATIONS**

A country like India, which is known for its civilisational history, rich traditions and political values, is always respected in international forums. In fact, India commanded much higher respected comparison to its power attributes. When India emerged as an independent country in 1947 it was a very weak economic player and much weaker military power.

But still, it was respected by many countries and statesmen, for various reasons, most importantly the enlightened national leadership and the values professed during independence struggle. This can be seen when India was chosen as country for arbitrary in the Korean War which brought Cold War to the world.

In the contemporary period, India wants to keep that rich historical tradition by actively participating in various international forums. It was an important nation that significantly contributed to peacekeeping efforts of United Nations. Similarly it is playing very critical role in World Trade negotiations as well as negotiations on Climate Change.

In fact, the situation has come to such an extent that now without India’s consent it is very difficult to achieve any progress in these negotiations. In short, India has moved from a stage of “Rule-Follower” to “Rule-Maker”. Hence, it is not unreasonable if India makes claims for permanent seat on United Nations Security Council. It’s just a matter of time to finally attain this goal.

**1.1.4.5 SECURING FRIENDLY NEIGHBOURHOOD**

Another important goal of India’s foreign policy from the beginning was having friendly relations with all the neighbouring countries. As stated earlier, Nehru organised Asian Relations Conference much before India attained independence. However, the partition, Wars with Pakistan and China, a brief tension with Sri Lanka somewhat undermined this goal of securing friendly relations with all the neighbouring countries.

However, recently India achieved considerable success in maintain cordial and friendly relations with all the neighbours. Though the tensions with neighbours were at its peak during Indira Gandhi’s tenure, however, during the Janata Government India has achieved considerable progress in this direction. However, the Gujral Doctrine is considered to have made a substantial change in the manner in which India's bilateral relations were conducted with its immediate neighbours, especially the smaller ones. The Gujral Doctrine is a set of five principles to guide the conduct of foreign relations with India's immediate neighbours as spelt out by I.K. Gujral, first as India's foreign minister and later as the prime minister.

Among other factors, these five principles arise from the belief that India's stature and strength cannot be divorced from the quality of its relations with its neighbours. It, thus, recognises the supreme importance of friendly, cordial relations with neighbours.

These principles are: first, with neighbours like Bangladesh, Bhutan, Maldives, Nepal and Sri Lanka, India does not ask for reciprocity, but gives and accommodates what it can in good faith and trust; second, no South Asian country should allow its territory to be used against the interest of another country of the region; third, no country should interfere in the internal affairs of another; fourth, all South Asian countries must respect each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty; and, finally, they should settle all their disputes through peaceful bilateral negotiations.

**1.1.5 OBJECTIVES OF INDIA’S FOREIGN POLICY**

Objectives are off-shoots of larger goals a country sets for itself. Once the broad and longterm goal has been decided upon, it is the task of makers of foreign policy to test the rationality of every short-term objective in the light of this goal.

Hence, the long term goal can only be the cumulative result of a series of short-term objectives; unless the latter are consistent with the long-term goal, and the means for their efficient realization and rationality chosen, the actual long-term results of foreign policy will diverge from the set of goal.

The means selected for the achievement of the various specific objectives need not and should not be a single unique means or a static one; different alternative means may be chosen.

But there must be the highest logical probability of their efficiency in achieving the given objective. 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 India’s foreign policy.

**1.1.5.1 PROTECTING INDIAN CITIZENS**

Protecting the interests of its citizens is one of the primary objectives of India’s foreign policy. 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.. 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.

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.

The Indian government also bring back those Indians who are working in other countries that are engulfed in War, Civil War or other disturbances. 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.

**1.1.5.2 SETTLE AND SECURE INTERNATIONAL BORDERS**

Cross-border trade and broader bilateral intercourse can only be achieved when geographic boundaries are beyond doubt. India has achieved considerable success in securing its borders compare to the initial days of independence. The increased professionalism among the security forces and technological progress substantially contributed to this. Similarly, Indian Navy has emerged off late as one of the strong navies in the world. Due to the efforts of the Navy’s Coast Guard, India could curtail some of the sea-based threats to its security.

However, due to situation arising from Pakistan, still India is facing cross-border incursions. Reflecting these threats, Indian President in January 2015 expressed serious concern over repeated ceasefire violations on Line of Control (LoC) and recent incursions off the coastal line.

He stated that “"While India is committed to peace and non-violence, we cannot afford the luxury of being complacent on our borders. Repeated violations of the ceasefire on the LoC and recent incidents of incursions off our coastal line are a matter of serious concern. We should be ready to take all steps necessary to ensure both internal and external security, and protect territorial integrity of our nation”.

**1.1.5.3 COMBATING NUCLEAR THREATS**

Ever since China exploded nuclear bomb, India is experiencing a sort of nuclear insecurity. Though it has overcome by Pokhran nuclear explosions, however, the Pakistan’s nuclear capability added additional dimension to its security. Recently, there were alleged reports that claiming links of Abdul Qadeer Khan, the father of Pakistan’s nuclear bomb, to the terrorist organisations.

This has led to considerable tension in the international community. Preventing the nuclear technology and weapons not falling into the wrong side has become an important dimension of nuclear security.

Similarly, the recent nuclear efforts by Iran also created considerable turmoil in the international relations. Indian, being neighbourhood country, which maintains cordial relations with Iran, it has to factor all the dimensions related to nuclear threats emanating from the surroundings.

**1.1.5.4 SECURING SEA LANES**

India is making significant efforts to improve its naval capabilities to help safeguard vital sea lanes. For instance, India is cooperating with naval forces of other countries including that of the US, in the Gulf of Aden and off the coast of Somalia, to counter piracy and ensure safety and security of commercial shipping.

**1.1.5.5 COMBATING GLOBAL THREATS THROUGH COMBINED ACTIONS**

India is undertaking appropriate domestic measures to strengthen security, but the global nature of the threat requires global efforts. Issues such as terrorism, prevention and response to natural disasters, piracy, protecting sea lanes of communication and drug trafficking are the challenges that cut across national boundaries and require cooperative responses.

Terrorism continues to pose a threat to international peace and stability. India having been a victim of terrorism for many decades, has worked with the international community to strengthen the international framework to deal with this threat.

In the UN for instance India has taken the initiative to pilot the Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism or the CCIT, with the objective of providing a comprehensive legal framework to combat terrorism. Given the global nature of the threat India is working with our international partners including the US to tackle the problem.

**1.1.5.6 MAINTAINING CORDIAL RELATIONS WITH MAJOR POWERS**

Unlike the Cold War period, India’s foreign policy nowadays is much more calibrated and attained sophistication to keep controversial issues under carpet and maintain very friendly and cordial relations with all the superpowers. Especially the turnaround India achieved in its relations with the United States is very worth noting.

India’s relationship with the United States is in fact built on shared values and converging interests. Both countries set up a comprehensive architecture of engagement based on broad political support in each of our countries, strong people to people linkages, and growing habits of cooperation.

On the other hand, China emerged as a key priority of India's foreign policy. It has emerged as the largest trading partner of India, and India’s engagement with China has become multi-faceted. Similarly, India also intensified its relations with European Union countries and South-East Asian countries. Though somewhat lost the earlier rigour, India and Russia are still cooperating with each other in bilateral and multilateral relations.

**1.1.5.7 SECURING FAVOURABLE CONDITIONS IN MULTILATERAL**

FORUMS India is playing significant contribution to the international relations by actively participating in multilateral forums. One of the key factor in this participation is to secure the countries national interests. Even though it was actively looking for the establishment of rule-based world trade system, however, India has seen as a hindrance for the progress of trade negotiations since it has taken a strong position against the proposals came from the Developed Western countries.

India vehemently opposed some of the clauses as they are going to undermine India’s social and economic interests. Similarly, India has also taken a substantial position in the negotiations of Climate Change which also attracted considerable criticism from the western countries.

However, India has achieved considerable success on the nuclear front, as it has been completed all the requirements for membership to the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) and Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR). It is going to become one of the members of these critical organisations very soon.

However, it is not that successful in becoming permanent member of the Security Council of United Nations though there is general consensus in its favours. The demands originating from other countries for the same is prolonging the matter.

**1.1.5.8 ENERGY SECURITY**

To attain the broader goal of development is not possible without meeting the energy security required for it. India is on the cusp of emerging as a fairly developed nation within the next decade and a half, and this means that the energy requirement for an energy starved nation is going to jump significantly. For India to ensure that it has a suitable mix of energy sources to meet the expected demand, the government has to initiate long-term strategic planning and investment, in consultation and co-ordination with the private sector.

Hence, India is strengthening the activities of ONGC’s overseas organisation to secure energy security while maintain cordial relations with all the oil exporting countries.

**1.1.5.9 DEEPENING RELATIONS WITH COUNTRIES THAT SUPPLY MILITARY HARDWARE**

As an emerging power, India has to strengthen its military power that includes sophisticated weapon systems, communication systems and surveillance systems. Considering this vital requirement, India not only established diplomatic relations with Israel but also concluded agreements for supply of military equipment. India, also concluded similar agreements with the US, Britain, France, Russia and other European countries.

**1.1.5.10 STRENGTHENING SAARC**

Since establishing friendly relations with neighbouring countries is one of the goals of India’s foreign policy, India is trying to institutionalise good neighbourly relations through a regional organisation, South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC). Under the umbrella of this organisation, India is trying to improve military, political and economic relations among the countries of South Asia.

**1.1.5.11 PLAYING A CRITICAL ROLE IN INDIA’S EXTENDED NEIGHBOURHOOD**

Looking beyond South Asian neighbourhood, India is also attempting to expand circles of engagement, starting with South-east Asia, the Indian Ocean region, West Asia, Central Asia, Africa, and the world’s major powers. 1.1.6 PRINCIPLES OF FOREIGN POLICY Principles of the foreign policy are the guidelines to the policy makers through which India carries out its foreign relations. In essence, these are the means through which national interest is sought to be protected and promoted. However, the principles on which foreign Directorate of Distance Education, University of Jammu, MA Political Science, Semester II, India’s Foreign Policy 20 policy operationalised is always context specific. As context changes, the principles also change. The principles on which foreign policy conducted during the early years of independence were somewhat altered in the post-reform period.

**1.1.6.1 PRINCIPLES IN EARLY PERIOD OF INDEPENDENCE**

The nationalist movement and the values of the nationalist leaders have given strong normative order to the principles of India’s foreign policy in the early period of independence. Some of these were explained below.

**1.1.6.2 PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING AND WORLD PEACE**

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.

**1.1.6.3 NON-ALIGNMENT**

Non-alignment has been the central pillar of India’s foreign policy, which served its objectives and goals in international arena. 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. 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.

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.

**1.1.6.4 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. 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 Panch-Sheel.

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:

• Mutual respect for each-other’s territorial integrity and sovereignty; • Mutual non-aggression;

• Mutual non-interference in each-other’s internal affairs;

• Equality and mutual benefit; and

• 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 coexist and prosper if they follow the first four principles of Panch-Sheel and believed in the fifth one.

**1.1.6.4 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 problems.

However, the reforms introduced to Indian economy in the early 1990s added new priorities to the foreign policy.

**1.1.6.5 PRINCIPLES IN THE POST-REFORM PERIOD**

Underlining India’s development-centric foreign policy, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh has enunciated the five core principles that animate the country’s engagement with an increasingly globalised world, which include prioritising the economic aspirations of the over 1.2 billion Indians.

India’s prime minister has unveiled a pragmatic vision of the country’s foreign policy that seeks to blend the economic imperative of unleashing prosperity without compromising on core values of democracy, pluralism and secularism.

Manmohan Singh enumerated these principles while speaking to over 120 heads of Indian missions who have gathered in the Indian capital for a four-day conclave in November 2013. Manmohan Singh outlined what he called the five principles that define India’s foreign policy and exhorted the Indian envoys to ensure that they are guided by these principles in discharging their diplomatic duty. First, recognition that India’s relations with the world – both major powers and Asian

• neighbours – are increasingly shaped by India’s developmental priorities. The single most important objective of Indian foreign policy has to be to create a global environment conducive to the well-being of a great country. Second, that greater integration with the world economy will benefit India and enable

• people to realize their creative potential. Third, India seeks stable, long term and mutually beneficial relations with all major

• powers. India are prepared to work with the international community to create a global economic and security environment beneficial to all nations.

Fourth, India recognizes that the Indian sub-continent’s shared destiny requires

• greater regional cooperation and connectivity. Towards this end, India focuses on strengthening regional institutional capability and capacity and invests in connectivity. Fifth, India’s foreign policy is not defined merely by its interests, but also by the

• values which are very dear to Indian people. While outlining these five principles, Manmohan Singh also emphasised some of the core principles on which Indian foreign policy was conducted ever since it achieved independence. He lauded the Indian model of foreign policy, which is underpinned by strategic autonomy, non-alignment and the resolution of issues through diplomacy, for pursuing economic liberation of the country within the framework of time-tested principles of liberalism and democracy.

**1.1.8 NUCLEAR POLICY**

**Progress and Policy of Peace**

Non-Alignment stands for peace through peaceful co-existence and cooperation among nations. It means a policy of peace, a policy of "talking in a quiet voice and not shouting" or "a policy of converting strong feelings into strength and not into bad temper".

Non-Alignment rejects war, and therefore military alliances and power politics. It supports peace, through peaceful means. It supports peaceful settlement of all disputes and peaceful adjustment as the best means for resolution of conflict among nations.

These are the fundamental characteristics of Indian Non-alignment. As a principle of Indian Foreign Policy it stands for freedom from commitment to any power bloc and it emphasises the independence of choice and action in external affairs.

It is not a negative principle of in action or neutralism or isolationalism. On the contrary it is a principle of action. It is dynamic, and regards independence of foreign policy as the fundamental and most vital element.

In 1961. Nehru, Nasser and Tito accepted the following five essentials or tests of Non-alignment:

(1) Independent Foreign Policy.

(2) Opposition to colonialism.

(3) Non-membership of any alliance or bloc.

(4) Absence of bilateral military alliance with any big power.

(5) Absence of foreign military base/bases on the territory of the state.

Non-alignment is a vital principle of Indian Foreign Policy. It has in the past helped India to achieve the goals of national interest and is destined to secure, India's as we'll as Third World's interests in the times to come The non-aliened countries believe fully in the continued relevance of this principle of peaceful-existence and independence in foreign relations.

**Central Issues of Nuclear Policy**

Since 1985 within India, between India and Pakistan, the India and USA and India and Japan, and in all forums associated with the nuclear issue the issue of NPT nuclear non-proliferation vs proliferation, regional level nuclear control regimes, issue of possibility of spread of 'nuclear weapons' of the former USSR, issue of horizontal and vertical expansions of nuclear weapons etc., have been keeping occupied the attention of statesmen and leaders.

**Domestic Nuclear Policy**

Right from its origin in 1947, India's nuclear policy has been guided by the desire to harness nuclear energy for country's developmental needs. Even after the PNE of 1974, India has refrained from the path of nuclear weaponisation.

The first Prime Minister of Independent India Mr. Nehru, the architect of modern India, was quick to realise the important and big role that nuclear energy could play in the socio-economic development of the country. His vision of India's domestic and foreign policies was guided, as Dr. K.K. Pathak observes, by three guiding principles.

(1) India must develop a scientific temper of mind, acquire and keep abreast with the latest development in all the fields of scientific thought to regain and maintain its intellectual vitality and keep pace with the spirit of the age.

(2) Technology based on scientific thought was of fundamental importance to the realisation of Indian economic goals and the country must not lose time or effort to equip herself with the already developed and developing technology.

(3) The scientific temper and the application of technology must be made consistent with responsible internationalism and reconciled with the highest ideals of the age. PM Nehru found additional strength from Dr. Homi Bhabha's view that,

"When nuclear energy has been successfully applied for power production in, say, a couple of decades from now, India will not have to look abroad for its experts but will find them ready in hand."

Dr. Bhabha also advocated the need to tame the atom for securing the developmental needs of the country, particularly in the spheres of power, industry and transport. In fact, all the prominent leaders and scientists of Independent India believed that since atomic energy could play an important role in the future economy and developmental needs of an underdeveloped and under-powered country, India should go ahead in for developing "atomic technology for peaceful purposes.

**Atomic Energy Commission**

As early as 1948, the Atomic Energy Act was passed by the Parliament, and by it the Central] Govt. was given the responsibility to control the development of atomic energy through the research and the use of any mineral which is or may be used for the production of atomic energy. This Act provided for the legal framework of India's nuclear policy.

On 10th August, 1948, an Atomic Energy Commission, under the Chairmanship of Dr. H.J. Bhabha, was constituted to protect the interests of the country in connection with atomic energy and to launch a full-fledged atomic energy programme in the country. On 3rd January, 1954, a decision to establish a separate search institution at Trombay, in addition to the already existing the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research was undertaken. On 3rd August, 1954, the Dept. of Atomic Energy was set up under the charge of the Prime Minister, with Dr. H.J. Bhabha as the Secretary.

**Atomic Energy Commission, 1958**

With a view to improve the working of AEC, the Government of India decided to reconstitute it and vest it with full executive and financial powers. Accordingly in 1958, AEC was reconstituted.

The Commission was entrusted with the power to formulate the policy of the Dept. of Atomic Energy, to prepare the budget and to implement the policy of the government in all matters concerning atomic energy.

**Atomic Energy Act, 1962**

In 1962, the Parliament passed the Atomic Energy Act and laid down the foundations of nuclear policy of India. This Act gave statutory mandate to the Central Government lo provide for the development, control and use of atomic energy for matters connected therewith.

**Nuclear Research Establishments, Atomic Reactors and Atomic Power Plant:**

Since 1948, India has been making rapid progress towards the establishment of Atomic Centres, Atomic Reactors and Atomic Power Plants In addition lo the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research (T1FR) which had been in since 1945, the Atomic Energy Establishment was established in 1957. In 1967, it was renamed as Bhabha Atomic Research Centre (BARC).

India has established several Atomic Power Plants: Tarapore Atomic Power Plant (TAPP), Rajasthan Atomic power Station at Rana Partap Sagar, Kalpakkam Atomic Power Station and Narora Atomic Power plant.

India has in operation developed a network of institutes, reactors and power plants which are helping India to conduct nuclear research and develop and use nuclear energy and technology for peaceful purposes.

**Nehru Era Nuclear Policy**

During Nehru era, India confined itself to the development of nuclear research for peaceful purposes India strongly opposed the use of nuclear energy for military purposes, i.e., lor the manufacture of nuclear It strongly criticised the nuclear weapon slates for indulging in a dangerous nuclear arms race. India strongly favoured the cause of Disarmament, particularly Nuclear Disarmament.

**Nuclear Disarmament :** It, however, accepted the need for developing and utilising nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Nehru fully realised the potentials of nuclear technology as a means for the socio-economic development of the underdeveloped countries.

"Atoms for Peace", Inangurating the Swimming Pool Reactor (APSARA) at Trombay, the first such reactor on Asian soil, on 20 January 1957, Nehru observed: "No man can prophecy the future. But 1 should like to say on behalf of my government and I trunk I can say 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. There is no condition attached to this assurance, because once a condition is attached, the value of such an assurance does not go very far."

**International Safeguards**

During the Nehru era, India advocated the need for creating international safeguards against the misuse of nuclear technology, i.e., against use of nuclear technology for manufacturing nuclear weapons. These safeguards were demanded for all countries whether in possession of nuclear technology weapons or not. Nehru ascertained the right of every nation to have access to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

India signed the Moscow Partial Test Ban Treaty because it was designed to save mankind from the hazards of increased atmospheric radiation that always results from uncontrolled and open nuclear explosions conducted by the nuclear states.

**Nuclear Umbrella-Shastri Era**

Despite the nuclear explosions carried out by China and The continued stalemate and conflict in relations with Pakistan, P.M. Shastri did not think in terms of making Indian atom bombs.

Recognising the dangers of a possible nuclear blackmail attempts on the part of a hostile nuclear power state, he did advocate the need to secure an international nuclear umbrella for non-nuclear states. He added, "I have no doubt that we cannot at the present moment think in terms of making atom bombs."

**Indira Gandhi Era-Constant Review**

Keeping India's' security in view, Mrs. Gandhi maintained, "The country's defence and security would be paramount consideration in the formulation of the Government's nuclear policy, which was under constant review." She decided to keep the options open.

**Against Acceptance of N.P.T. :** It was with this end in view that Mrs. Gandhi decided against the acceptance of Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), which was made in 1968 and which became operative in 1970.

**NPT - A Discriminatory Treaty:** NPT was regarded as a discriminatory treaty which sought to impose restrictions upon the non-nuclear states even when these were committed to pursue a peaceful nuclear policy, and which provided for no measure to cheek the growing nuclear arms race among the nuclear powers.

NPT provided neither for disarmament nor for nuclear disarmament and arms control, and nor even for checking the open violation of Mowcow Test Ban Treaty by France and China. India, under Mrs. Indira Gandhi, refused to sign NPT and decided to develop further the drive towards the development of peaceful nuclear technology.

Analysing India's attitude to NPT, K. Subramanyam, Former Director, Institute of Defence Studies, rightly observed, "The Indian objection was mainly against the unequal nature of the Treaty and misuse of international public opinion to subserve a policy of vertical proliferation by a few powers and obfuscation of the dangers of nuclear first use.

In India's view this was not a non-proliferation treaty but a measure designed to disarm the unarmed.

Under this policy India conducted it first PNE at Pokharan on 18th May 1974, and earned entry into nuclear club through self-efforts. It was clearly stated and forcefully maintained by Mrs. Gandhi that Pokharan test was a peaceful and fully controlled explosion conducted to develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes for development of mines, construction of dams, harbours, search for minerals, etc.

**Pokharan Explosion:** The Pokharan explosion demonstrated the high level of scientific expertise attained by Indian scientists. It definitely reflected the progress made by India towards the development of indigenous nuclear technology for use in industrial and economic development of the country.

**Second Indira Gandhi Era : Nuclear Policy**

After having experienced the American pressures over India's nuclear policy, particularly after experiencing a big difficulty in securing fuel for its Taraporc planl, India decided to step up nuclear research in nuclear fuel reprocessing technology, alternative technology fuel for Atomic Plants, Reactor technology, Fast Breeder reactor technology and other related areas of research.

**Rajiv Gandhi Govt. Policy: High Level Technology**

India invigorated the movement for securing nuclear disarmament and nuclear arms control. In the New Delhi Declaration, India and former USSR gave a call for securing a non-nuclear weapon non-violent world in the 21st century.

India's nuclear options were kept open. With fully indigenous Dhruv Atomic Plant going into the production of Plutonium 239, and with the second unit of Kalpaskam atomic planl going critical, India attained a high level of indigenous nuclear technology during this period.

**National Front Government and Janata Party Government**

The National Front Government (1980-90) also decided to keep India's Nuclear options open. While going to Kualaumpur for attending the G-15 meeting P.M. VP. Singh declared on May 31, 1990 in a press conference aboard his plane that India was keeping its nuclear options open in view of Pakistan's adventurous plan to engulf the sub-continent in nuclear warfare.

**P. V. Narsimha Rao Govt. Nuclear Policy**

In the post-cold war, post-USSR world in which increasing pressure has been coming from the USA and some other states upon India, the Government of PM Narsimha Rao continued to believe in the policy of developing nuclear technology. It continued to desist from making nuclear weapons.

**India and NPT (Non-Proliferation Treaty)- Present State of Nuclear Policy :**

During his visit-to Japan, in June 1992, PM Narasimha Rao made a categorical statement on India's stand on NPT and the issue of nuclear proliferation. While stating that, "Indian could not sign the NPT because of its being a discriminatory treaty- (Japan, even while sighing it in 1975 had described NPT as a discriminatory treaty).

India too believes it (NPT) is discriminatory. India is against any weapons of mass destruction in the world. But the fact remains that these weapons are today in the possession of some countries.

On the current NPT, PM Narsimha Rao declared, "It is not a time for signing, it is a lime for reviewing." In October 1992 India gave a call for an international convention on the non-use of nuclear weapons, a freeze on the production of such weapons and fissile material for atomic arms and steps to achieve a nuclear weapon free world by the end of the century.

Mr. Atal Bihari Vajayee, the Indian delegate at the Political and Security Committee of the UN General Assembly observed on October 19th, 1992, " The sentiments already expressed that nuclear war must not be fought needs to be formalised as a multilateral commitment."

Atal Behari Govt. also pursues the nuclear policy principles established by his predecessors. The present govt. pursues the same policy.

**South Asia - A Nuclear Free Zone**

India has refused to accept the UN resolution making Soulh Asia a nuclear weapon-free zone, because nuclear free South Asia is a meaningless concept as China is already a nuclear power and Pakistan has known nuclear weapon capability, even a nuclear weapon.

**Basic Approach Indian nuclear policy insists on :**

(1) Total opposition to the development of nuclear weapons, opposition to both horizontal and vertical expansion of nuclear weapons.

(2) Total support For Nuclear Disarmament.

(3) Support for Nuclear Arms Control involving an immediate end to the nuclear arms race as the first step towards Nuclear Disarmament.

(4) Commitment to refrain, as far as possible from making nuclear weapons.

(5) Development and use of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

(6) Refusal to accept discriminatory international inspections and safeguards in respect of national nuclear establishments and facilities.

(7) Refusal to sign NPT.

(8) Refusal lo accept the demand for making South Asia a nuclear weapons free zone.

(9) Support for securing a non-nuclear world in the years to come.

**Refraining**

Despite the fact that Pakistan's nuclear programme is a weapon oriented programme, India has decided to avoid, as far as and as long as possible, the transformation of its present peaceful nuclear policy into a weapon oriented nuclear policy.

In the words of Dr. lyengar, Chairman of AEC "India is the most developed among the developing countries in the field of nuclear energy." The technology being developed in India has been most appropriate for a developing nation. However, it has voluntarily committed to remain away from nuclear weapons.

It refuses to accept piecemeal and partial nuclear control devices like the making of South Asia a nuclear weapons free zone and other such nuclear control regimes. It supports a total ban on horizontal and vertical expansions and securing of a general and comprehensive nuclear.

At the first ever UN Security Council Summit, January 21, 1992, P.M. Narasimha Rao did not budge from India's foreign policy principle that, "a global, and not a regional or country specific approach should be adopted to rid the world of nuclear weapons."

**The major foreign policy problems confronting India at the**

(1) **To meet the challenges posed by the neighbouring States-** China, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh in respect of Border-disputes, inter-state terrorism, ethnic problem, sharing of river waters, to check the infiltration of insurgents & terrorists and still keep the relations normal.

(2) **Defence Problems-** Atomic threats by neighbour Stales of China &. Pakistan, ISI activities, Border conflicts with Pakistan & China, to maintain Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, Pakistan's atomic expansion plan and arsenals & missiles. A Great problem for Indian foreign policy makers lo contain the expansionist policies of Pakistan, China & terrorist group is a major challenge for Indian foreign policy.

(3) **International Terrorism** is another important problem for Indian foreign policy makers, especially the terrorist activities in Jammu & Kashmir.

(4) **To remain Non-aligned** even in this age of International power politics is a very hard task for Indian foreign policy makers,

(5) **To protect the economic well-being and safety** of a large number of non-resident Indians in various countries of Europe, America, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq, Dubai, Abu Dhabi and many countries of South America & Africa.

(6) **To get a permanent seat in the Security Council of United Nations**.

(7) To oppose the signing of C.T.B.T.

(8)To restructure the international reaction against Indian Atomic experimental explosions for peaceful purposes.

(9) Economic diplomacy for the development of country and to attract foreign direct & institutional investment in key-sectors of Indian economy.

(10) To promote Indian culture.

(11) To help in the process of globalisation and liberalisation policies and procedures.

(12) To maintain regional & international co-operation.

(13) To help keep international peace.

(14) To help the economic development process.

(15) To help keep the world & its policies & power system multilateral.

**1.1.7 LET US SUM UP**

The broader direction to the India’s foreign policy evolved much before India achieved its independence, during the period of anti-colonial nationalist movement. The ideology, goals, objectives and principles of India’s foreign policy strongly reflect the core values that emerged as guiding principles for the development of modern India. Hence, anti-imperialism anti-racialism, strong solidarity between Afro-Asian countries, non-alignment, peaceful coexistence, peaceful resolutions of international problems, strong adherence to United Nations Charter, friendly neighbourhood relations, etc. are part of these core values.

However, since foreign policy of any country strongly determined by its national interest, throughout the post-independence period, the political leadership of India always tried balance these core values with the pragmatic interests. Hence, Indian foreign policy strongly guided both idealistic and realistic assumptions.

However, the end of Cold War and the realities of post-Cold War world drastically altered the foreign policy course of the India. The economic reforms introduced in early 1990s shifted the focus of foreign policy in favour of economic considerations somewhat underplaying the political and normative values.

**1.2 DETERMINANTS OF INDIA’S FOREIGN POLICY: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL -**

External affairs will follow internal affairs. Indeed, there is no basis for external affairs if internal affairs go wrong. - Jawaharlal Nehru
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**1.2.0 OBJECTIVES**

This lesson provides basic understanding about the determinants of India’s foreign policy, both internal as well as external. After going through this topic, you should be able to: know the national and international structures and context in influencing India’s

• foreign policy; understand the domestic factors that are determining India’s foreign policy;

• comprehend the role of external environment in influencing India’s foreign policy.

**1.2.1 INTRODUCTION**

The linkage between domestic and international determinants of foreign policy has long been a widely debated topic in the field of international relations, and foreign policy analysis in particular. Some scholars argue that domestic politics and foreign policy are two independent arenas of issues.

Others believe that the two respective issues cannot be separated from one another. Foreign policy and domestic politics are interdependent and could spill over into each other. While both schools of scholars make some convincing arguments about their respective cases, it’s probably reasonable to expect that the degree of influence between domestic and international determinants of foreign policy is contingent on different foreign policy contexts.

In some cases, international factors play a more important role, whereas in other cases, domestic reasons are more important.

**1.2.2 DETERMINANTS OF INDIA’S FOREIGN POLICY**

Foreign Policy is never determined by any one factor but is the result of the interplay of a large number of factors that affect the formulation of policy in different ways in different circumstances. Some of these factors are relatively stable and have to be taken as given by the makers of foreign policy, and can, therefore, be regarded as more basic or unchangeable determinants of policy than others.

But the more variable institutional factors, and even the personal role of the decision-makers, are no less important in the process of decision-making than the basic determinants.

Even the basic determinants of foreign policy, however, vary in importance according to circumstances, and it is impossible to lay down any general rule regarding the relative importance of each of these factors, or a scale of priorities which the decision makers must permanently adhere to in making their policy decisions.

The basic factors that shapes or conditions India’s foreign policy can be classified into two factors namely internal and external. The internal factors, which are the basic of all, are the domestic politics, geography, economic system, culture, military strength and national character. According to J. Bandopadhaya, the role of political institutions – public opinion, party system, lobbyists, ministry of external affairs, diplomacy, and persona are the other factors that influence in the making of India’s foreign policy.

**1.2.3 DETERMINANTS OF INDIA’S FOREIGN POLICY: INTERNAL FACTORS**

The socio-economic, political structures and other internal dimensions a country strongly influence the foreign policy. Internal factors includes geopolitical identity (location, size, natural resources, neighbours), economic development (growth level, development of resources, per capita income levels, class structure, technological development, etc.), the political structure (nature of political system, character of ruling elite, party politics, activities of interest groups) – the factors that are playing active role in influencing the policies, both domestic as well as foreign policy.

**1.2.3.1 GEOGRAPHICAL IDENTITY**

Geopolitical identity of a country is shaped by geographical location and size of the country. The geographical positioning influences power relationships in international politics. It basically reveals the inter-relationship of politics, geography and demography. There are two main reasons why geography should be regarded as an important determinant of India’s foreign policy. In the first place, there are various aspects of geography which tend to influence foreign policy irrespective of the degree of industrialization and the level technology. Secondly, India and most of the neighbouring countries will take some time to attain the technological level of the leading industrial and military states.

Hence, it will not be possible for India in the foreseeable future to ignore the Himalayas and the Indian Ocean, from the viewpoint of either trade and transportation or defence. It is therefore obvious that geography is the foremost determinant of Indian foreign policy. The prediction that Lord Curzon made in 1903 has proved to be true. He observed that the geographical position of India would more and more push it into the forefront of International affairs.

Jawaharlal Nehru too was fully conscious of the geographical importance of India. On 17th March 1950, in a speech in the Indian Parliament, he observed, “We are in a strategic part of Asia, set in the centre of Indian Ocean, with intimate past and present connection with West Asia, South-East Asia and Far Eastern Asia.

Even if we could we would not want to ignore this fact." Himalayas and the Indian Ocean are determining factors of India's security. To begin with, the Himalayas were considered to be natural security guard for India. However, in the fifties and sixties it led to a new security orientation in Indian foreign policy.

To defend Himalayas came to determine India's security and defence needs and consequently her relations with other nations. Geography includes location, size, topography, state boundaries, population, climate, hydrography, soil, etc., and all of these elements are important in varying degrees for India’s national politics and foreign relations.

Some of these aspects will be discussed below. Location The history of international relations shows that location has always been an important determinant of foreign policy of a state. The strategic location of Britain helped her historically to rule over the seas in terms of both trade and naval power. The highest mountain range of the world in the north and one of the three major oceans of the world in the south have given the Indian subcontinent a certain geographical insularity.

The Himalayas cut off India from her northern neighbours militarily, politically, and commercially, although in the modern period this mountain range is no longer as impenetrable as it once used to be. The Indian Ocean similarly offers India a certain insularity in purely geographical terms.

But the strategic location of India at the centre of the great Asian arc stretching from Aden to Tokyo has made it inevitable from ancient times that she should pay a vital role in the history of Asia and the world in spite of her relative geographical insularity. India’s strategic location at the centre of the Asian arc and on the Indian Ocean logically made India the bastion of the British empire in the East.

The manpower, wealth and strategic advantage of India were used by Britain to establish and maintain her politico-military dominance over the rest of Asia and Africa. The same strategic location gives India a central position in Asian and world politics. All the major air and sea routes of the world pass through India.

India and Indian Ocean are an indispensable link in world trade and commerce. India is a major connecting link among the geographical areas called West Asia, East Asia or the Far East. From the geographical point of view, as Nehru often used to say, India is a kind of bridge between the East and the West, and inevitably involved in major global issues. India’s location on the Indian Ocean has also made her defence and foreign trade heavily dependent on control over this Ocean and its sea-lanes.

India's strategic location has placed it within easy reach of many sensitive areas including China, South-East Asia, West and East Africa. Hence, it is no surprise that Indian Navy emerged as one of the most powerful navies in the world. Size The fact that independent India emerged as seventh largest state in the world is not without considerable geopolitical significance.

A large territory generally means a relatively large stock of natural resources. On the other hand, the vastness of India’s territory has an important bearing on her external security. Unless there is a great difference in military power, it would not be easy for any other state to occupy the whole country.

The bigness of territory make India an important and independent factor in international relations in her own right. It would not be rational for India to behave in international relations like a small state with a small territory, population, and resource base. This is the reason for Nehru to state that: “I can understand some of the smaller countries of Europe or some of the smaller countries of Asia being forced by circumstance to bow down before some of the greater powers, because they cannot help it.... India is too big a country herself to be bound down to any country, however big it may be. India is going to be and is bound to be a big country that counts in the world affairs”.

**1.2.3.2 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Economic development plays important role in shaping the foreign policy discourse of any state. Successful empires were built on the edifice of strong economy. Even Kautalya in his famous treatise called Arthashastra emphasises strong economy as a prerequisite to achieve foreign policy goals.

Historically, it is proved that the economically powerful country is the one that established its hegemony, authority and control over rest of the world, be it Great Britain till 19th century and the United States in the 20th century. The relatively backward state of the Indian economy, due to colonial exploitation, acted as a serious constraint of Indian foreign policy during the early years of independence.

Even depending on other countries, particularly the big powers, for a mandatorily required food grains made India vulnerable for external influences. An economically weak country cannot build modern military power to thwart the external military threats. This is the reason why India has to face a defeat in its war with China.

However, India has achieved a significant turnaround in terms of economic development in recent period. The high economic growth of India placed it as 7th biggest economy in the world and in terms of PPP (purchasing power parity) it is already third biggest in the world. As the data released by Ministry of Finance, Government of India in July 2015, India’s GDP crossed US dollar two trillion.

This is a significant achievement if we consider the fact that it took almost 60 years (after independence) to cross one trillion, and it took just seven years to touch one trillion to two trillion. For all the predictions, by 2030 India is going to emerge as a third biggest economy in the world. This economic development of India has enhanced its standing among the community of nations. It has moved from rule-follower to rule-maker in most of the multilateral negotiations. This is also the reason for India to overcome the nuclear apartheid practiced by the status quo powers and even concluded successful nuclear agreements with many countries, including United States.

Many countries are already concluded strategic partnership agreements with India. India’s technological development, especially in information technology, has given further edge to India’s foreign policy as many Indians are working in foreign countries are helping India to attain soft power in the conduct of its international relations.

As a result, India’s Overseas activities have gained momentum due to fillip the Indian Diaspora has given to its foreign policy. It is no surprise that in recent foreign visits of Prime Minister Narendra Modi, special efforts were made to mobilise overseas Indians, and the Prime Minster addressed in these meetings.

Many Indian origin people also gained important responsibilities in the governments of other countries, particularly in the United States. And there are many Indians who are heading the leading multinational companies, including the Microsoft. All these have significantly contributed to enhance India’s stature in international relations and provided leverage in conducting foreign policy.

Hence, it is not surprising when the then Finance Minster Chidambaram stated it is the economic growth that has enhanced India’s standing in the international community. He said that: “India is respected not because it has acquired the capacity to launch rockets or satellites, or because of the size of its population, or because of its dominant presence in Asia. The world respects India because of its capacity to emerge as an economic powerhouse”.

**1.2.3.3 POLITICAL STRUCTURE**

Foreign policy is not immune from the impact of values, ideas, initiatives and upheavals internally a country experiences. As we have studied in the previous lesson, the ideology and core values of the nationalist movement substantially influenced foreign policy of India in the early days of independence. The principles that guided India’s foreign policy such as anti imperialism, anti-racialism, Afro-Asian solidarity, non-alignment, peaceful resolution of international disputes, etc. largely reflect the political influences on India’s foreign policy. The political structure of state substantially influences its foreign policy. The nature of political system (democracy, authoritarianism, etc.), the character of ruling elite, the party politics, the activities of interest groups (religious, economic, political, etc.) considerably determine the foreign policy.

Ruling Elite There is a public perception that foreign policy is elitist, which stems from the belief that issues pertaining to foreign powers are too remote to matter in the day-to-day lives of ordinary people. For much of India’s history, that may well have been the case. The policies of Jawaharlal Nehru, India’s first prime minister and one of the main proponents of the principle of non-alignment – a doctrine that defined Indian foreign policy during much of the Cold War – went unquestioned for decades.

India emerged as an independent nation with a broadly three-tiered ruling elite: the political class, the bureaucracy and the armed forces. Of these three, only political class has strong Indian outlook, since the remaining two were largely composed by British-trained officers.

However, the situation has changed as time passed. The new generation of the officers are trained in Indian ethos and are as committed to advancing the national interest of India as India’s political class. However, one problem associated with foreign policy is the excessive dominance of the ruling elite in policy making. Since foreign policy making demands some sort of expertise as it has to deal with technical matters, the small minority of technocrats are determining the foreign policy matters.

Hence the material interests and individual biases of the small class is distorting the policy-making and sometimes most of the issues have been decided on a very narrow prism. Democracy has been a major structural characteristic of the Indian political system, and is therefore a major source of strength for India’s foreign policy.

India can and should adopt a positive and proactive policy for the promotion of global democracy, including the democratization of UN system. India is the largest democracy in the world. Contrary to the Western predictions that India will collapse due to internal crisis and conflicts and it move towards a sort of authoritarianism, it has emerged as a successful democracy, not only in the Third World countries but globally. Comparing to its neighbourhood countries, India’s democratic success was phenomenal.

It is the political class, the legislative and executive part of the government, that ultimately determine the country’s foreign policy. However, the democratic nature of the country also sometimes creates some hurdles to rational decisions on the foreign policy matters. The contestation between various political parties to determine the policy matters often leads to either stalemate or irrational decision.

The populism and vote bank politics often leads to political mobilization of people on matters related to foreign policy. For instance, many times the political parties in Tamil Nadu are influencing the foreign policy decisions on Sri Lanka, and there are many occasions the Government of India succumbed to the pressure of these parties. Similarly, the Trinomial Congress in Bengal stalled the conclusion of agreements with Bangladesh on matters related to boundary and waters sharing.

After a great persuasion with the West Bengal government, the Government of India successfully concluded an agreement in the early months of 2015.

**1.2.3.4 INSTITUTIONS AND INTEREST GROUPS**

The Indian official institutions of foreign policymaking broadly encompass the Cabinet, the Prime Minister’s Office (PMO), the Ministry of External Affairs (MEA), the Indian Foreign Service (IFS), the Ministry of Defence (MoD), the Indian Parliament, and various manifestations of the defence and intelligence establishment (the armed forces, the Defense Research and Development Organization, the nuclear establishment, the Research and Analysis Wing, the Intelligence Bureau etc.).

While the defense of India’s territorial sovereignty is viewed as paramount by virtually all of these, the defense establishment has historically played a selective role in wider foreign policymaking (except at times of military crisis), instead understandably choosing to focus on immediate threats from within India’s neighborhood. The broader conduct of diplomacy that spans the gamut of inter-state relations (and more recently, a range of instruments underpinning India’s “soft” power) has traditionally been the domain of the PMO, MEA, and IFS who are accountable to Parliament through various channels. Apart from the Government institutions many non-government organisations and groups also significantly influence India’s foreign policy.

For instance, the NGOs acted proactively in guiding India’s policy in the negotiations of World Trade Organisations as well as on climate change. Similarly, the trade and business organisations like Chambers of Commerce and FICCI also contribute significantly to the India’s policy making, particularly on matters related to economic interests of India.

Likewise, the many human rights organisations and their active role in organising people influences the decision making process in foreign policy.

**1.2.3.5 ETHNIC FACTORS**

Three kinds of domestic factors relevant to ethnic identity influence India’s policies towards certain countries. Transnational Ethnic Groups Indian populations in border regions tend to share a common ethnic and sometimes religious bond with populations in adjacent countries.

This is true of Tamils and Sri Lanka, Indian Punjabis and Pakistani Punjabis, Indian Kashmiris and Pakistani Kashmiris, Indian populations bordering the Tarai region of Nepal, and even Malayalis (the people of Kerala) and the Gulf countries. By corollary, and extending the concept to religion, it is also true of the Hindu minorities in Bangladesh and Pakistan, and Muslims in India with respect to some neighbouring countries and communities.

The broad territorial division of ethnic groups within India and the strength of regional ethnic identities ensure that Indian policy towards the countries in question is always attentive to the preferences of domestic actors in these regions.

This has been evinced by the sustained and vociferous support of the Tamil people and the Tamil Nadu government to the separatist movement of Tamils in Sri Lanka till the early 1990s, Similarly, there is “widespread sympathy” in Indian border regions and “most politicians and bureaucrats do not hesitate to express moral support” for the Madhesi movement for autonomy in the Tarai region of Nepal. Secessionist Movements and Insurgencies Due to its vast size and heterogeneous society and polity, India has been the subject of various conflicts between sub-national regions and the central government. Scholars particularly attribute this to the failure of the Indian state to ensure “substantive democracy and equitable development” for large swathes of society.

This, they argue, has resulted in the discrediting of state-sponsored nationalism and, inter alia, the rise movements aimed at establishing separate sovereign status from the Union. The history of modern India is replete with such movements, many of which are still in progress.

Movements in border areas are particularly problematic because they become flashpoints with neighbouring countries, mainly due to three reasons. First, secessionist movements, especially armed movements, are likely to use the territories of adjacent countries to stage their attacks on the Indian state.

This has negative consequences for the security of India’s neighbours, and makes India diplomatically vulnerable to allegations of not doing enough to prevent its domestic conflicts from destabilizing the border regions of neighbouring countries. Second, and more importantly, the cross-border activities of secessionists create obstacles to neutralising these movements.

Third, secessionist movements allow neighbouring countries with an interest in destabilising India to interfere in its internal affairs in an adverse manner. These number among the considerations that have influenced India’s policy towards Pakistan in the case of the Khalistan movement, toward s Myanmar, Bhutan, China and Bangladesh in the case of multiple secessionist movements in the Northeast, and towards Nepal in the case of the Naxalite (Maoist) movement.

The existence of domestic groups of insurgents and separatists therefore significantly complicates India’s security environment in South Asia. Migration: New Ethnic Groups The cross-border movement of large populations, although a version of the transnational ethnic group conundrum, presents a conceptually distinct challenge because it involves the large-scale migration of individuals into Indian territory, transforming an international affair into one with significant domestic ramifications.

The mass migration of such populations either at one time or over time results in the creation of new ethnic groups in the border (and other) regions of India, with the potential of creating security problems, particularly in relations with respective originating countries. Two examples stand out in this regard – the limited migration of Buddhist Tibetans escaping Chinese persecution, and the much larger and steady inflow of Muslim immigrants (legal and illegal) from Bangladesh into West Bengal and the North-eastern region of India.

The creation and expansion of two new ethnic groups (Tibetan Buddhists and Bengali Muslims) to which post-independence Indian society was not accustomed has impacted the domestic reaction to these migrations, not least given suspicions attaching to the purported connections between some recent terrorist attacks in India and Bangladeshi elements, and consequently impinged on India’s relations with China and Bangladesh respectively.

In the case of China, India has walked a tightrope between official recognition of Tibet as an integral part of China and granting asylum to the Dalai Lama and his followers in Indian territory. This is largely because Tibetan migrants are relatively small in number and representatives of a globally recognized struggle (yet one that the Indian government cannot officially endorse).

Also, Buddhism is accepted as a native faith in India, albeit nowadays a very minor one numerically. By contrast, the domestic sociopolitical response to Bangladeshi Muslim immigrants has been much less forgiving, partly due to their faith and partly the purely economic motive driving the migrants onto Indian soil.

The reaction has been particularly violent in Assam, where riots against migrant Bengalis date back to the 1960s and 1970s. Despite some progress towards normalisation of bilateral relations with Bangladesh, complicated by a host of other issues, the migration question remains a thorn in the Indian side.

A manifestation of the domestic impulse was the Indian decision to construct a 4000km concrete fence along the Indo-Bangladesh border in 1984, a project that carries on till today and has created controversy between the two countries.

**1.2.3.6 RELIGIOUS IDENTITY**

The importance of religion as an integral component of the Indian worldview cannot be understated. Various commentators have highlighted the weight that Indian foreign policymakers attach to the religious opinions and sentiments of India’s sizeable Muslim population, which by many accounts is the second largest in the world. C. Raja Mohan describes India as an “Islamic nation” with a national culture deeply influenced by Islam.

Other members of the Indian intelligentsia have highlighted West Asia as a priority area for India not just for strategic reasons but also due to the spiritual and religious needs of India’s Muslim population. Indeed the fear of alienating this population is cited as a major reason for the lack of a noticeable Indo-Israeli relationship until the 1980s.

India also has the second largest Shia Muslim population in the world, which makes its ties with Iran, a Shia state, particularly relevant and sensitive. The fate of Indian Muslims is keenly followed by Iran and plays an important part in cementing a long-term relationship between the two countries.

The impulse to accommodate the sensitivities of India’s Muslim community on at least some foreign policy issues derives more recently in part from a growing recognition that not all terrorism involving Muslims in India is likely any more to be directed from Pakistan or Bangladesh.

The actual and potential interplay between some Indian Muslims and radical Muslim forces outside India has worried many in the security establishment for some time, but no consistent policy in this regard has arisen under any recent Union government.

No other country has figured more prominently in the interplay of religion and India’s security than Pakistan. (In this regard, religion is more fundamental to the political identity of India than some observers recognize). India’s secular polity was forged as a conscious refutation of the idea that religion should be the basis of nationality, an idea more commonly referred to as the “two-nation theory.”

While the progenitors of Pakistan considered partition to be primarily a religious phenomenon, India’s leaders viewed it as an instance of territorial self-determination. This basic divergence lies at the root of India’s policy towards Pakistan and India’s position on the Kashmir issue. While Pakistan views the status of Indian-controlled Kashmir as abhorrent to the idea of Muslim nationhood (i.e. a Muslim-majority state in a Hindu-majority nation), India views the Kashmir valley and surrounding territory as an integral part of its territorial identity.

Moreover, Kashmir stands as a crucial test of India’s secular character – a move towards independence for Kashmir or, worse still, its accession to Pakistan would undermine India’s religious plurality while adding credibility to the two-nation theory. This could have “far-reaching, reactionary and undemocratic effects” in India.

**1.2.4 DETERMINANTS OF FOREIGN POLICY: EXTERNAL FACTORS**

A dominant international political discourse plays decisive role in deciding the foreign policy of a country. The structure of global power relations and the developments in immediate neighbourhood significantly influence foreign policy decisions.

**1.2.4.1 BIG POWER POLITICS**

India’s external environment at the time of her independence was characterised by bipolarity and the Cold War. The main task of the Indian diplomacy was to safeguard the country’s newly one sovereignty and independence in the context of the military alliances and counter alliances of the big powers and their global strategic manoeuvres.

The policy of nonalignment was the only rational option for India’s foreign policy in this bipolar context of international relations. The Sino-Soviet conflict diluted the bipolarity of international relations to a certain extent. However, the development of a US-China-Pakistan axis in the context of Sino-Soviet conflict posed a major threat to India’s national interest.

The prolonged Soviet presence in Afghanistan from 1979 onwards further strengthened this three-power axis and impelled India to move closer to the Soviet Union, particularly with regard to the security dimension of her foreign policy. The Cold War thus continued to be the most important international determinant of India’s foreign policy till the beginning of 1990s. The disintegration of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War has brought about a radical transformation in the structure of international relations. The USA has emerged not only as the only superpower of the world, but also as the unchallenged hegemon of the international system, both inside the UN and outside. Naturally, therefore Indian foreign policy has to adjust itself to his new reality of the international environment.

The new direction and shape of Indian foreign policy must be such as to ensure that there is no total opposition or direct confrontation with the US. At the same time it is necessary to formulate a strategy of counter-hegemonic resistance against possible neo-imperialistic encroachment upon India’s sovereignty in the economic or political interests of the US and its allies.

Hence, the structural transformation of India’s international environment necessarily involved radical change in the shape and direction of Indian foreign policy.

**1.2.4.2 DEVELOPMENTS IN NEIGHBOURHOOD**

India is also located in a volatile neighbourhood, with ongoing wars, insurgencies and unrest taking place in Sri Lanka, Nepal, Pakistan, and Afghanistan, and a coup in Bangladesh. Any developments in the neighbouring countries would have a cascading effect on India’s national interest. The external factors play at two levels: regional and international.

The immediate impact would be from regional level where major changes in politics, security or economy of India’s neighbouring states would make significant imprint in India’s foreign policy making. For instance, China’s growing footprint in South Asian countries in the name development altered India’s neighbourhood policy to revive its traditional approach of reactive polity to proactive one.

**1.2.4.3 NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

In spite of the end of the Cold War, the nuclear stockpiles of the US and Russia have remained almost as large as ever. India’s immediate neighbour, China, has also developed considerable nuclear-weapon capabilities, including Inter Continental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs) capability. In these conditions India has no option other than violating the international nuclear regime created by the US dominated west. India not only refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) but also exploded its own nuclear bomb. Now in changed international environment, India is successful to get a sort of acceptability for its nuclear status. It was also successful in terms of concluding agreements with many countries for cooperation in nuclear technology. It is also about to get a seat in international nuclear regime established by big powers.

**1.2.4.4 MULTILATERAL FORUMS AND NEGOTIATIONS**

Ever since the end of the Cold War, the dominant powers in the international relations are attempting to create a regulatory framework to create a normative order among the countries. Mostly, these multilateral forums are aimed to promote the interests of the big powers and international finance and multinational corporations.

For example, the World Trade Organisation has emerged as a regulatory body to order the trade relations among the countries. There are many similar forums to regulate various that are utmost concerned to international community, including Climate Change. All these organisations are influencing the foreign policies of all the countries. While adjusting to these international regimes, India is actively contributing to the outcomes voicing the interests of the developing countries.

**1.2.4.5 REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS**

The proliferations of regional organisations, as a offshoot of globalisation process also significantly influencing India’s foreign policy. Traditionally India was associated with Nonaligned movement and organs established by the United Nations for trade and other development.

However, the success of India in attaining some sort of economic development led it to become member of various regional and international organisations. For instance, India is actively involved with the ASEAN an organisation established for increasing cooperation between South-East Asian countries. Similarly, India is also founding member of the many other forums such as BRICS (Brazil, Russia, Indian, China and South Africa) and IBSA (India, Brazil and South Africa). The membership in these organisations has brought a new dynamism to India’s foreign policy.

**1.2.4.6 MILITARY STRENGTH**

Indian foreign policy under Nehru was based more on diplomacy than on military power. But the border war with China in 1962, and four war with Pakistan have compelled India to augment her defence capability, although the imperatives of economic development are still as great as ever.

In particular, the relentlessly hostile relations with Pakistan, and the continuously uneasy somewhat strained relations with China have impelled India to invest a larger portion of her resources in defence than would otherwise have been necessary. China’s relatively large nuclear-weapon capability, Pakistan’s nuclear programme, and the apparently active and continuous Chinese aid to Pakistan in the field of nuclear weapons have impelled India to adopt a strategy of developing a minimum credible nuclear deterrence.

On the whole, India’s fairly large military capability makes her a major military power in Asia, and this enables her to play a significant role in both intra-Asian and international relations.

**1.2.5 LET US SUM UP**

The realm of the foreign is an ideological concept, a product of international dynamics and domestic attributes. There is no denying that international socialization has re-shaped foreign relations, and similarly, the permeation of national politics on the international stage cannot be discredited. Since both factors play a pivotal role in external policy formulation, the domestic and the foreign are easily distinguishable conceptions.

Whilst the two environments may be different, the relationship between foreign and domestic policy is thus determined on a common level of populism, with the decisions of state leaders reflecting notions of common consensus and agreement. Moreover, the relationship between domestic and foreign is also commonly linked by the influence of domestic culture, with heavy emphasis on social groups and social attitudes within states.