

Role of Political Parties in India
A Study of the Indian National Congress
& the Left Parties (1967-2005)

Thesis submitted for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Arts (Ph.D.) of the
North Bengal University

Submitted By
Sudaita Ghosh



Supervised By
Professor Manas Chakrabarty

Department of Political Science
North Bengal University

THE 32000

100000

33044

100000

2

PREFACE

The present Ph.D. thesis on the Role of Indian Political Parties: A Study of Indian National Congress & Left Parties since 1967 – 2005 tries to depict the role, ideology of the Congress party and the Left Parties in India. Attempt has been made to explore & explain Congress party's dominant role in Indian domestic politics, its performance in terms of its election manifesto, in the field of economy & its significant role in shaping India's international relations, policies with regard to SAARC, the United States & the UNO in a comparative, manner with the left parties of India.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Professor Manas Chakrabarty for his perennial support, guidance & encouragement throughout the writing of my thesis without whose constant guidance the thesis could not be completed.

Sudaita Ghosh

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Research Questions	9
3.	Methods of Enquiry	10
4.	Review of Literature	11
5.	Congress in Domestic & International Affairs	30
6.	Left Parties in Domestic & International Affairs	110
7.	Comparison between the Congress and Left	150
8.	Conclusion	170
	Bibliography	171

INTRODUCTION

The political system that exists at present in India is the handiwork of the Indian National Congress, the party that won independence for the country and gave its Constitution.

From 1947 until it broke-down in 1967, this 'system' was at the centre of Indian politics spanning 3 distinct stages in its post-independence development. The 1st phase (1947-1967) was the period of the Congress system; the 2nd phase (1967-1977) was characterised by the decline and disintegration of the Congress system and the consolidation of power by a small oligarchy; and the 3rd and current phase (from 1978 on) witnessed the development of the new system, which because of its domination by Indira Gandhi became known as Indira Congress or Congress (I).

A dramatic change we can find in the Congress Party in its 2nd phase (1967-1975). The 2nd phase extended from 1967 to the imposition of the internal emergency in 1975. In the 1967 assembly election INC lost power in 6 states.

Important changes were set in motion owing to the split in the Congress in 1969, leading to the formation of the Congress and Congress (O). The split produced conditions that altered the shape of party system. The Congress controlled by Indira Gandhi faced largely United Opposition Party in the general election of 1971. Despite the strong opposition, it was with a thumping majority. A significant aspect of election was the elimination of Congress (O). The major reason for victory was the delinking of the Lok Sabha election from the State Assembly elections. The parliamentary election campaign was tried to avoid some word from the state assembly elections. The parliamentary election campaign was delinked from state level politics and the state leaders could not exercise the same influence as they had done in the past. Rather the campaign concentrated national issues such as development policy, particularly the

removal of poverty and foreign policy. Mrs. Gandhi's injected a powerful element of ideology by revising the issues of social change and by calling upon the electorate to support her endeavour to initiate new government policy for the benefit of the poor.

During this phase, the central role of the Congress party persisted. The dominant party model had given way to the differentiated structure of party competition.

Mrs. Gandhi's conflict with state leadership of the Congress party as well as that of the opposition parties created a style of politics which laid great stress on centralisation in decision making. The new 'political process' based on a centralised decision-making structure in party and government created an overly personalised regime. Institutional decline accompanied by decline of state based leaders and the replacement of regional structure of support by the central-leadership adversely affected the federal scheme of Indian politics.

After 1969 split, the Congress followed a broad-based strategy consisting of redistribute policies, such as nationalisation of banks, abolition of Privy Purse and garibi hatao, all geared towards widening its support. However, this did not happen for the variety of reasons. One reason was the failure of the Congress to alleviate poverty. Another was the depending crisis of the economy in 1970s. The economy was marked by a serious rise in inflation, followed by acute food shortages and massive unemployment. This was followed by a series of opposition led agitations against the various state governments.

In the party system as it has been developing in India, a single party has without any doubt attained the position of domination. The election of 1967 did change the pattern and the dominance of Congress was re-established in 1971's mid term election.

The role of the Congress party since 1967 to till date we can examine through working of this party in domestic politics (economic policy, national developments also include in this domestic politics) and through the assessment of the result of the foreign policy.

The 1969 split helped Congress led by Mrs. Gandhi to sweep the 1971 Lok Sabha elections and 1972 assembly elections in most of the states.

The mid time of Congress system's 2nd phase known as the 'Emergency Phase'. The imposition of an authoritarian emergency regime in June 1975 was the most marked feature of this period. The 19th month emergency regime accelerated the process of institutional decline and the weakening of the party by suspending civil liberties, particularly freedom of the Press and representative government. Relation between the Congress and opposition worsened. Concentration of power in the party, the government and in the office of the Prime Minister was the critical feature of the new pattern of party system. No criticism of the government was allowed or tolerated. Any attack on the Prime Minister's authority was considered to be an attack on the party's as well as nation's unity. Cabinet was also not be able to take any important decision in regarding the nation's current problem such as, the declaration of the Emergency, the postponement of general elections in 1976 and the decision to hold them in 1977.

We can't ignore the question, which was raised by the people of India during the Emergency period, and also demand of the new generation of nation to that the answer whether the Emergency was needed or not. All left, democratic and patriotic forces of our country were agreed that the proclamation of National Emergency on June 26, 1975, saved India from serious and imminent danger.

It was the fact that the 20-Point Economic Programmes of the Prime Minister and the steps which are being taken in pursuance of the same will bring substantial reliefs to the common people, especially in rural areas. It will help to mobilize them actively against counter-revolution. The Emergency has also led to the creation of a healthier atmosphere in the country which can be utilised for effective implementation of the anti-feudal economic programmes and to go forward to other basic, including anti-monopoly structural reforms.

Emergency has obviously hurt us imperialism and the entire pro-imperialist western press which has let loose a dirty anti-India campaign.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA (CPI):

The Communist Party of India is usually dated from 26 December, 1926. It remained effectively an illegal organisation until 1942 when British accept its support for the Allied War effort. After 1947, there were a number of changes in the party tactics and the period was marked by the splits. The first split in 1964 coincided with the Schism in international communist and the new party (CPI (M)) again underwent a split in 1968. The Maoist Communist Party was formed on 22 April 1969, which was Lenin's 100th birthday. It styled itself of the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) and claimed Mao as its guide.

The CPI membership is concerned in four states. Bihar, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and West Bengal. The other states have significant supporters: Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Punjab.

Professor Rashiduddin Khan observes "The CPI (M) differ in their policy perspective on a few important aspects of Indian politics such as the nature of the Indian state, the role of the national bourgeoisie and big bourgeoisie, the evaluation of the democratic revolution, the strategy for achieving the goal of socialism and in the tactics to be followed towards other parties at this stage of political development for the progressive socio-economic transformation of India.

The basic difference between CPI and CPI (M) is the adaptation of different communist ideology. The CPI (M) was linked with China and the Marxists were viewed as pro-Peking while the CPI was considered as pro-Soviets. For the CPI India's independence was a historic event and India was now on the path of independent development. For the CPI (M) the transfer of power was only a 'settlement' between British imperialism and Congress and what had happened since were the efforts of the Indian bourgeoisie to establishment a compromise with feudalism and imperialism at the expense of the people. The CPI's slogan was the establishment of democracy of national democracy; the CPI (M)'s slogan was people's democracy.

If we study the ideology and programme of CPI and CPI (M) we can find that CPI is committed to unparliamentary road to socialism. In its manifesto the CPI reiterated its demands for wheeling out of criminals and corrupt men from body politic tilting the

centre-state relations in favour of the latter, ending indifference to the welfare of the working class, agricultural labour, SC and ST, generating more jobs, implementing radical land reforms, reducing foreign debt by restricting imports, reversing the trend of handing over public sector units to private industrialists and above all, arresting the steep rise in price.

The CPI favours co-operation with all democratic and progressive forces including 'the centre' and 'the left' of the Congress party.

CPI (M)'s ideology and programmes are different in few grounds because of CPI (M)'s pro-Chinese stance. This party favoured to tactic of United Front from below, of alliance with peasants and workers to defeat the Congress, which it regarded as a party of the bourgeoisie and landlord classes.

Today the CPI (M) is characterised as a radical-democratic party. Its emphasis is on the preservation of democratic institutions. It lays emphasis on the unity and integrity of India and favours the restructuring of centre-state relations.

On the basis of ideology and party programme Left parties find its support base from the peasant class and the agricultural working class. Difference on ideology between the Congress and Left parties also makes difference in support base of main demarcation is the people who are the main supporters of the INC on the other hand rural peoples hands are Left parties.

Left parties main role is prominently can be visualised by the study of Left dominated state, where lefts not only worked for strong state government but their target has always set on the chair of Delhi. We consider the Left as a national party here we find that left workers in Indian politics as an opposition. A turning point in the history of the CPI came when in 1957 they won an absolute majority in the Kerala assembly and formed the first communist government in India. They retained the position as the largest opposition group in the Lok Sabha after 4th general election in 1967. In 1971 it secured 4.7% of the popular vote as its rewards for the support it gave to the ruling

Congress. In 1977 it secured only 7 seats with 2.8% votes. The following data is given below:

Year	Wining Seats	Contesting Seats
1980	11	48
1984	6	66
1989	12	49
1991	14	42
1996	12	43
1998	9	58
2000	-	
2004	-	

At present CPI (M) is in power in the state of West Bengal. It has a solid base in Tripura and Kerala.

CPI (M) Election Table

Year	Wining Seats	Contesting Seats
1967	19	62
1971	25	85
1977	22	53
1980	36	63
1984	22	64
1989	33	64

1991	35	60
1996	32	75
1998	32	71
2000	-	-
2004	-	-

There is no controversy in the opinion that Congress ideology is believed in Gandhian ideology. M Gandhi had mainly emphasised on the villages of India. He liked Kant and Rousseau, accepted the slogan 'back to nature', and was the only person among the prior Indian who realised the importance of village to make stronger the Indian economy. And it is very unacceptable that INC had really concerned about the villages. They did not exclude village improvement from their programme and at the same time they even didn't include the agricultural class in their policy programme with the goal of improvement of Indian economy through agriculture.

Though the Left parties were seriously impressed by the Chinese revolution and Marxist ideology and drew a programme of economic policies on the basis of it but their main trust is organizational improvement. Generally, the communist believes that rapid industrialization will automatically lead to the necessary transformation of the social structure. But the poverty theoreticians did not ignore the great distortions that might occur in the course of development.

Emphasis on the development of agrarian economy is the common point for both the left parties. But their approve ness differs on issue of international policy. In the fundamental pro the CPI praised Nehru's policy on non-alignment and offered only a mind criticism. According to the CPI the weaknesses on the non-alignment must be traced to Anglo-American blackmail.

The CPI (M) on the contrary declared in its election manifesto that an independent foreign policy could be followed only in alliance with the camp of peace and socialism and all freedom loving anti-imperialism.

Both the parties agreed in their attitudes towards Pakistan. This was not surprising because Moscow and Peking both are interested in the establishment of close relations with Pakistan. It was demanded that the Indian Government should strive for a peaceful settlement of all the differences and disputes with the neighbouring countries.

After the split of the CPI one could assume that the communist would suffer heavy reverses in the election of 1967. The Socialist parties had such experience in the past. But the election of 1967 introduced quite a few new elements into the political situation which the communists were called upon to answer. If the post-election situation leads its great positive possibilities for the communist parties, its dangerous potentialities could not be overlooked. As the National Council of CPI put it:

As the discredited Congress Party disintegrates and goes downhill and as its moral political authority slums more and more, a political vacuum is being created in the life of the nation which forces are going to find this vacuum is the most challenging question of the post election situation.

It is interesting to observe that the Communist Party in India try their utmost to project a positive image of their own by championing the cause of democracy and individual freedom. But these demands for democratic rights are primarily to be used for legalising their agitations and political activities.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study seeks to answer the following research questions:-

1. What is the nature of role played by the Congress Party in domestic matters?
2. What is the nature of role played by the Congress Party in international affairs?
3. What is the nature of role played by the Left Parties in domestic matters?
4. What is the nature of role played by the Left Parties in international matters?
5. What is the basic difference in the policies of the Left and the Congress?

Rationale for the choice of Topic

India being the biggest democracy in the world, the role of the political parties has always been interesting and significant. The choice of the Congress Party has been made because the Congress is the party which is operating in India from prior to the Independence and has contributed a lot for the attainment OF India's freedom from the alien rule. Even after the attainment of independence, the Congress is the only party which dominated at the Centre and the States uninterruptedly from 1952 till 1967. It has given leadership in both domestic and international affairs. On the other hand, the Left parties also occupy an important place in the Indian political system. Their role has always been significant in both domestic and international affairs.

Naturally, the choice of the topic has been made in this light.

METHODS OF ENQUIRY

Data for the present study has been collected from both primary and secondary sources. The primary source data have been collected from party manifesto and government reports. The secondary source data have been collected from books and journals from different libraries.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

After fourth general election the Left Party claimed its position as next to the Congress as an effective opposition. Taufiq Ahmad Nizami in his book ⁽¹⁾ has made an attempt to analysis and critically examines the programme of the CPI and CPI (M) with regard to India's relation as reflected in the pre independence pronouncements of the united CPI and indicated in the post independence strategy of the two Communist Parties. The work seeks to examine the parties approach towards basic aspects of the Indian foreign policy and some of the international issues like Korea, Germany, Vietnam and Kashmir.

A Centenary History of the Indian National Congress² is divided among five chapters. The last one covers the period 1964 to 1985. The main theme is to describing INC a new over in old atmosphere. At the very creation of INC was democratic and secular. Under the influence of mass politics is also became socialist, pledged to promoting the interest of the vast millions of landless and property less. Fighting poverty, along with the abolition of untouchability became the socio-eco programmes of the Congress even a winning freedom through non-violence was its object. It describes in its chapter V that how Congress became being a stronger in the Indira region. It also presented the period of splitting the existence of Janta Government and again returns of Congress in 1980. In this year also, Gandhi was very much busy to control the terrorists and secessionists in the Sikh community. And middle of this decade Mrs. Gandhi's assassination by two-security force that had been infected with the virus communalism.

The Rajib Gandhi's outrance into politics and whose charisma had portrayed a new light among minds of Indian people. With the support of the people and the Congress, Rajib Gandhi turned to the tasks, which confronted him with rare determination and courage. The people of India responded to the call given by Rajib Gandhi with an enthusiasm rarely witnessed in the arena of national politics.

What does the future hold for India; obviously there is no simple answer to this question. The reconstruction of a nation inevitably involves careless labour and toil over decades before the results of such activity becomes manifest. Perhaps the days of

struggle and achievement, spelt out in this century. History will provide to the leaders and to the people the poise and self-comprehension for such an epic endeavour.

K.N. Kumar³ made a very lucid analysis upon three national parties namely, Indian National Congress, Communist Party and the old Bharatiya Jana Sangh. It purports to examine whether ideological assumptions colour organizational structure of the parties. The author brings out how various parties are based on a 'kept' cadre which has no relationship to the ideological image a party presents before the public parties have a way, a common way, and a universal way of organizing themselves. A party organization can be organized only as an organization.

The study also discovers that there is a reciprocal or mutually re-enforcing relationship between commitment to politics and commitment to ideology. Those who devoted more to politics were also those who appeared to be more committed to their party ideology. Its data also indicate a conclusion, which is different from Weiner's or Brass's organizational cohesiveness and is more intimately related to ideology than to leadership.

The generalization in this work are made not on the basis of conversation with a few available individuals but on the basis of data gathers through carefully structured questionnaires, administered commonly to the members of all the political parties under study at various levels from grass-roots above.

Ajay Kumar Ghosh⁴ brilliantly presents not merely a portrait of a most remarkable political figure on the Indian political scene, but also a thorough analysis of the political situation in the country spanning over several decades. More impartially however this study examines the evolution of the left and progressive forces in the country with special emphasis on determining the correlation between the Indian bourgeoisie and the Indian left in terms of Marxist-Leninist ideological perception.

M .V. Rao⁵ in the book namely A Short History of The Indian National Congress⁵, is described the origin of the party, its struggle for freedom, and after the freedom its

working under different leadership. Author has mainly put emphasised over the pre independent political movement and working of the party.

Surjit M.⁶ is an excellent writer. He proved this in his beautiful writing in relating to Indian political parties. He mainly deals with the manifestoes adopted by different political parties during the election periods. It draws detail study about the Manifesto's. And also presents a story behind which the manifestos had been introduced. Manifestos mainly described the party programmes and promises. This programme preparation is very important of elections which can help party to in or defeat.

"Parties and Party Politics in India"⁷ by Zoya Hassan skilfully present the role of political parties in India, its emergence, dominance of a party over the nation, decline, reasons, again revival and growth. Through study of this book can bring students to know how much differences are present in work procedure of INC and Left parties. That the main agitation came from Congress on the economic issues.

Ajoy K. Mehra, D.D. Khanna, Gerk W. Kneck⁸ has done a tremendous study on political parties and party system. In this book they described the evaluation of political parties and party system in world's largest and most complex and volatile democracy reached a crucial stage at this turn of the country. The three general elections held in quick succession at the end of 19's thaw up major trends.

The emergence of 'federalised' party structure and coalition politics is now a battlefield of Congress dominant coalition party and BJP dominant coalition. The political field is also a war place of their ideological believe.

Horst Hartman wonderfully interpretes⁹ about important political parties. Their working procedure, its political standouts, economic planning, ideology, style of leadership, programmes. It also tried to examine the reality of party programmes.

Partha chatterjee's book (¹⁰) on State Politics has scrutinized India's major political institutions and analyzed the process of domination and resistance that play a central role in Indian politics. Some readings present a view of the party system, the electoral

system, the judiciary, bureaucracy, the federal system and the planning process through Nehru and Indira Gandhi's period.

Documents of the History of the Communist Party of India,¹¹ this book very beautifully helped to understand the history of Communist Party. The path was not favourable for smoothly growing the Communist Party in India.

Mohan Ram in his Indian Communism: Split within a Split⁽¹²⁾ has made a study on the issue split within the Communist Party of India. Author has presented broad study on the fact that how Sino- Indian Broader War brought some ideological conflict within the party. Author also put emphasis on another important issue of Mao Tse -tung's teaching in Communist Party which also be challenged in Party's Andhra Pradesh's regional Conference.

"Congress & Indian Nationalism"¹³ through light on the very important thing that not only the communist party is interested in agrarian reforms.

But this book has shown in few of its chapter that they were interested in British period in attracting to its fold. Several of the existing peasant movements in the country to show the world that Congress was a commonality of interest and the integrative character of reciprocal rights and obligations within India's internal rural and social structure.

Dalip Sing with his topic of Protest Movement in India¹⁴ expressed the INC's role during the Protest Movement in India. He draws it exclusively that during the liberation struggle, the Congress Party as an umbrella organisation had politicised the masses to gain their support for ending the colonial rule which was held responsible for the poverty, misery, hunger and exploitation of the Indian people. After independence Congress came into power with a new elite class who started manipulating politics of India to their own advantage.

As the result of the Parliamentary Elections of 1971, 78, 80 have been particularly responsible for radicalising the Indian electorate, as they were tied with new promise of "Garibi Hatao" and other progressive measures.

Prabhat K. Datta¹⁵ prepared the study on land reform policy adopted by various political parties. The late 1970's the land reform both as policy and ideology started taking a backseat in the election strategies.

V.P. Gupta in his article¹⁶ stated important part of Indian politics that 10th Lok Sabha Election 1991 brought the Congress party as the largest single party without a majority. It also revealed the political trends of serious complication among the major political parties and the voter's verdict was clear that different parties can rule over the state and the central government. This important political change brought by the 1991 state election may construct to have led into the growth of federalisation of the Indian political system.

Amitabha Chandra¹⁷ prepared a article namely Naxalbari Movement and attempt to review the politics of the CPI (ML) or the Naxalite politics to use the common purlieu – the most radical and militant stream of left political parties in India in general and communist politics in particular since 1967. He liked the call the CPI (ML) as the birth of Indian Third Communist Party.

Arunava Ghosh in his prepared study on the topic "West Bengal Election 2004"¹⁸ has studied the Left's victory for the 6th consecutive term. West Bengal came as an exception in Indian electoral politics, where most of the government are not able to survive for a second term. It seems that the people of West Bengal have voted for stability and developed as against adventurisms and anarchy.

Caste in Indian politics.¹⁹ in this paper the author's purpose is to analyse the development of Congress Party in one part of Rajasthan in terms of its support base to identify the manner and conditions under which elite groups at different level and representing different social strata have been mobilised into the political process.

'Caste in Indian Politics'²⁰ in this book the Rajni Kothari assembled various types of studies in relating to caste and politics in Indian political system. Main highlighted point is how political parties used the caste system in a particular state, or locality to capture power.

R.K. Suresh Kumar wonderfully show²¹ that this elicitation communist identifier played a crucial role ideology in determining the electoral partners. The 2001 legislative assembly election in Kerala mark the recurrence of general features that characterise Kerala election for a long time.

A. Balakrishnan Nair mainly stressed ²² upon the politics of Kerala CPI is the dominant political party in Kerala. Though in many times Congress and other political parties also came in power but still CPI's power is not reduced. In the context of Indian politics and particularly Kerala, it is more appropriate to one the term interest group rather than pressure group.

K.P. Singh expressed ²³ in his view about Congress party in framing India. According to him Congress a party, which really understood and tried to fulfil the demand of time during the mid British period Indian context has liberal outlook of the country reflected not only in the composition of the commitment seemly but also in its working.

Jogendra K. Das ²⁴ an eminent writer and also present his writing excellently that Lok Sabha elections in Assam since 1952 to 1985. Here author not only present the elections result and dominant political parties but he just prepared an elaborate study on the population growth, caste etc. To him fundamentalism and communalism have played a very marginal role in Assam's politics.

Akhtar Majeed ²⁵ in his brilliant presentation stressed that right from independence the CPI was advocating the theory of one stage revolution through the general strike-insurrection method and the communist form had also advised the CPI to follow the Chinese way to achieve independence in the formation of the CPI (M) dedicated to the revolutionary goals and tactics. The Naxalite philosophy rejected the idea of parliamentary democracy and placed emphasis on class war.

Rabindra Sharma²⁶ is a renowned Left (CPI ML) activist. The author mainly emphasised on the relation between CPI and CPI (ML). These two parties have their own ideological differences but 11th Lok Sabha election shows non-revolution ideology regarding the national unity, jobs checks prices and quite the prevailing government. According to the author CPI-ML view also to makes a strong party with the support of students, violence, youth, women, Dalit, Harijan, intellectuals, minorities with the view that the 'twin assault of globalisation and Hindutva have turn the Indian republic apart'.

V.M. Sirsikar and L. Fernandes very finely deals²⁷ with political parties nature and role, historical background, socio-economic environment, party ideologies, party organisation and party performance. Authors tried to investigate a universal reality that the beginning of political parties in India may be tried to the foundations of Indian Nation Congress. During the hours of freedom struggle the unprecedented mass mobilization and political socialism gave birth to a new political culture which provided an 'umbrella' character to the Congress party. But this post-independence era witnessed a basic change in the situation that the non-Congress party and regional parties formed the main opposition.

Sitaram Skinchan²⁸ highlights in his writing the shift on the socio-cultural bases of leadership both in rural and urban areas, which have been urgently attributable to the process of urbanization.

J.K. Baral and K. Banerjee²⁹ both the authors have put emphasise on the issue of regional political parties and its relation with national political parties. Ever since the independence many regional political parties have emerged in India and gained significant influence in some location or regions but at the national level their impact has been minimal. The reason behind it might be traced that national political parties have lost their own political power in the region.

Rural-self government³⁰ is an important part of West Bengal politics. Ruling party and opposition both of them always the battle of capturing rural powers. Bengal's rural politics played a necessary role in state politics. This writing also presents a study on the history of Bengal's Panchayati Raj System. This study says that British introduced the



local-self government in the modern sense of term in Bengal. The aim of this paper is to give a brief descriptive and analytical account of this process of evolution.

Vijay Kumar, K.K. Pandey³¹ and R.C. Rai their writing is evident of the situation of Chotonagpur and Santhal Parganas of Bihar during the period of pre-establishment of Jharkhand state. It is true that before establishment of an autonomous of Jharkhand Mukti Morcha (JMM) central government had started to play a cleaver politics to stop the demand of creating a separate state. Its based example is that in the 1980's general elections the JMM had been alliance with the Congress (I) and won most of the seats it contested. Congress during the regime always tried to hold the Indian image of national integration through its political tactics.

Braj Kishor Jha tried to inquire through his presentation³² the nature of the Indian political party system and underlines its distinctive features – multiplicity of parties, dominance of a single party and the unique political style. It is in fact a multi-factional one-party system. India offers an example of a hegemonic rather than a 'turn over' political system. Although the dominance of one party trends to persist the possibility of the revival of coalitional politics is not ruled out. Meanwhile the parties have only betrayed the hopes and aspirations of the people. They seem to be floated at the surface having no grass roots. Behind the façade of parliamentary democracy, India is still very far from being controlled by the majority of the people.

B.R. Purohit skilfully finds the roots³³ and the politics of state centring on the Congress in Madhya Pradesh after 1967 have to be traced in the preceding years when the party was plagued by factionalism. The Congress government under the leadership of D.P. Misra won the 3rd and 4th general election but before the election his party had broken down and introduced itself under the name of Jan Congress. During this period party suffered by several internal problems and this fractioned politics has been affected the popularity of Congress in Madhya Pradesh. This has given lesser opportunities to the party to focus its whole-hearted attention to the problems of the state.

Dr. A.M. Rajasekhariah and Dr. R. Jangam through light³⁴ on Chikmagalur Parliamentary by election, which was an attractive for the study of Indian politics. Of course the part of

attraction was troubled to the fact that Indira Gandhi seemed to combat a lost ditch political battle to come back into the mainstream of Indian political process. Firstly it was important because it is bound to have a sharp impact on the political power equations, alliances and structures in the country. More especially it is bound to initiate a process by which the Janata, Congress I, the Congress and the two Communist parties will compel to rethink their strategies to reorganise their strategies.

The book *Independence to Indira and After*³⁵ has portrayed nicely the way of politicisation of India from the days of Nehru to the time of Indira Gandhi. This book can be considered as showcase of India's political problem such as personality clash of heavy weight leaders, ideological conflict and how people made clear the Parliamentary election of 1977.

Prakash Sarang in his work³⁶ deals with the position of Congress party in Orissa and here he also presents through his studies relationship between state Congress and central Congress that central Congress is more stronger than state. Author also threw light on the reason of formation of regional Congress. To him the Congress dominance at the all India level sphere remained all pervasive for a couple of decade after independence.

Thomas Pantham's study³⁷ of political organizations in the city of Baroda is a modest way of answering this lacuna by way of holding a mirror to 'the willing' and 'acting of political activities engaged in party building and democratic consensus building'. The study shows a bit of the flux in which Mr. Gandhi was re-consolidating Congress. The traffic seems to have been open to a broad spectrum of parties from the Swatantra to the Socialist, the ideologically holding Jana Sangha and the communist alone holding their fort the objection to Pantham's approach, however is methodological.

P. Sood attempts to examine³⁸ in an ideological perspective the intra-ruling elite struggle for power preceding the declaration of Emergency in June 1975. The perspective is linked with India's struggle for independence and is historically traced from Dadabhai Naoroji to Nehru. This historically narrated recollection of the political, economical and social ideas of the leaders tends to give the impression that the INC was a homogeneous

political party. The fact however missed that the Congress prior to independence was neither a homogeneous political party nor had it can agreed ideological perspective.

W.H. Morris Jones explained³⁹ India's political experiences are different from other post-Colonial Societies. So, M. Jones liked to collect it optimist political miracle.

Congress retained at any rate over the period Prof. M. Jones covered in his book, a regime of solid one party dominance. He however, does not overstress the surface continuity. Though Congress retained its monopoly, it did not remain the same Congress.

Manirul Hussain described⁴⁰ that Congress or a political party is organised on the federal and democratic principles. At the national level, it has all India Congress Committee and the Congress Working Committee at the apex of the organisational structure. Pradesh Congress Committee which works at the state level with the organisational network beginning from the villages to districts. In this paper an attempt has analysed the functions of Congress at the state level. In Assam with particular emphasis on the competition and struggle for power leadership.

S.S. Patagundi and K. Raghavendra Rao put emphasise in their paper⁴¹ that both qualitatively and quantitatively the concern demonstrated by political parties in India for the foreign policy issue. Author defined that making of foreign policy also be an important issue in election. In the 1980 Lok Sabha and Assembly elections, Smt. Gandhi for reasons better knew to her close to make the Janata Government's foreign policy one of the electoral issues. She alleged that the Janata government diluted non-alignment and lowered our status in the world.

Dilip Singh prepared his paper⁴² on the Punjab election. The paper described that 6th Lok Sabha election brought the victory of Akali Dal and non-Congress alliances in Punjab. It is due to 'dirty' politics played by Smt. Indira Gandhi and her party. An experience with internal emergency Akali Dal raised its voice against injustice and oppressive politics of the Congress regime.

L. Lingamurty examined the 6th Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly.⁴³ According to him this election significant for the dominant role of the class-cum-caste factor in the behaviour of the electorate. In a heterogeneous society it would be ridiculous to attribute electoral behaviour to single factor like regionalism or caste or money.

Y.C. Bhatnagar and Moin Shakir examine the 7th Lok Sabha election.⁴⁴ this election has shown that Congress (I) has secured two-third majority in the Parliament with a failure of Janata Party. Authors in essay inquire the reasons behind the failing of Janata Party.

S.C. Arora presents a history of Congress party membership.⁴⁵ The membership in the party are direct qualifications prescribed for active members were somewhat strict, they were not too strict to check any person's desires to being active member of the party. The membership provisions enshrined in different Congress Constitution adapted from time to time proved beyond any doubt that Congress was a vast party.

V.K. Padmanabhan in his essay presents a descriptive study.⁴⁶ in regards to the development of Communist Party in Tamil Nadu. Author touched the years before independence in development of this party and also after independence development. To him communist party rare discuss the ideological question soon after its formation in 1964. When it faced serious threat from cultural government. They tried to prepare their ideologies for 1967's general election.

S.N. Talwar excellently examine communist movement.⁴⁷ The aim of the study is to portray the endeavours of the international communist movement to bring about revolution in the colonial, semi-colonial countries in general and examine the excellent to which the communist party of India's partnership at the international communist movement hampered the party capability to serve the use of national liberalization and the communist movement in India.

Satyapal Dang⁴⁸ in relation between CPI-CPM discussed that the present time deserve the joint work of this two parties CPI and CPM. Joint action of these two parties could make a good future for Left in India.

Satyapal Dang discovered⁴⁹ the solution to get rid from corrupted BJP government to support the Congress by the Left. But the people were not support frequently the election so only way is to criticise and expose the wrong policies and activities including corruption, in case of the collapse of the BJP government.

Dusmanta K. Giri examined the people's decision in 1998 election,⁵⁰ that the messages of 1998 are loud and clean. People are asking through the ballot for leadership governance, its ability, social change and development.

Nikhil Chakravorty in his editorial⁵¹ presented that it is obviously unfair to predict who or which party is going to form the next government. But still he was seeking a pre-election result by a little study on the national issues.

Surendra Mehra threw lights⁵² on the coalition government after 1996 election. Because it smelled that no one national party would be able to secure the magic figure. BJP has their own problem. Congress also has their own problem that it is suffering by internal disagrees. And as a results of uncertainty pointed finger towards the coalition government.

Soma Marik raised the question⁵³ about the electoral promises and their unfulfilments. She mainly touched the women's in West Bengal under the Left Front regime. Lefts in Bengal demands that women are more secure than other states in India and they also several proposals for women rights. The Left Front's manifesto asserts that its 19-years regime has meant that the rights of various groups including women are protected. Her whole writing has a feminine touch.

Bairaj Mehta has raised finger⁵⁴ towards the coalition politics after election verdict. According to the author before election and after election main support base was and is secular and anti-secular forces. But the political environment in India has tendered over the years to be increasingly tenure. Inter-party and intra-party rivalries have become more and more acute and aggressive.

Balraj Mehta⁵⁴ has raised finger towards the coalition politics after election verdict .According to the author before election and after election main support base was and is secular and anti –secular forces. But the political environment in India has tendered over the years to be increasingly complicated .Inter party and intra –party rivalries have become more and more acute and aggressive.

References:

1. The Communist Party and India's Foreign Policy: Tafiq Ahmad Nizami Associated Pub. New Delhi, 1974
2. A Century History of the Indian National Congress (1885-1985), Vol. I. Released by Rajiv Gandhi.
3. K.N. Kumar Political Parties. Mittal Pub. New Delhi 1999.
4. P.Kutsobin Ajoy K. Ghosh a Communist Movement in India. Sterling Pub .Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi 1987.
5. M.V. Rao A Short Story of the Indian National Congress. S.Chand and Company. New Delhi 1972.
6. Surajit, M. (presented) Manifesto's of Indian Political Parties.
7. Zoya Hasan Politics and Party Politics in India, Oxford University Press, New Delhi 2003.
8. Ajoy K. Mehra, D.D.Kanna ,Gerk W.Kwek (ed). Political Parties and Party System. Sage Pub. , New Delhi 2003.
9. Horst Hartmann Political Parties in India. Meenakshi Pub. Merrut and New Delhi 1977.
10. Partha Chatterjee (Ed) State Politics in India: Oxford University Press, New Delhi 1977.
11. G. Adhikari (Ed) Documents of the History of the Communist Party of India, People's Pub. House, New Delhi 1982
12. Ram Mahan Indian Communism: Split within a Split .Vikas Pub. Delhi 1969.

13. Indian National Congress Politics and Institution Building, H. Singh.
The Indian Journal of Political Science, Vol. L,
January-March, 1989.
14. Dalip Singh Protest Movements in India,
The Indian Journal of Political Science, Vol. LII,
No. 4, Oct-Dec., 1991.
15. Prabhat K. Datta Land Reform or Agrarian Revolution,
The Indian Journal of Political Science, Vol. L,
No. 4, Oct-Dec., 1989.
16. V.P. Gupta Indian Polity Today, The Indian Journal Political
Science, Vol. LIII, No. 2, April-June, 1992.
17. Amitabha Chandra Naxalbari Movement,
The Indian Journal Political Science, Vol. LI,
No. 1, January-March, 1990.
18. Arunava Ghosh West Bengal Assembly Election 2001,
The Indian Journal Political Science, Vol. 62,
No. 2, June, 2001.
19. Rajni Kothari. (Ed) Caste in Indian Politics, Orient
Longman, New Delhi.1985
20. - Ibid.
21. R. K. Suresh Kumar Ideological Chinera People's Mandali and The
Left Decade: Kerala Assembly Election, 2001.
22. A. Balakrishnan the Dynamics of Kerala Politics,
The Indian Journal Political Science, Vol. LV,
No. 3, July-Sept., 1994.

- Indian Journal of Politics, Vol. IX, No.1, June, 1995.
33. B. R. Purohit the Congress Party in Madhya Pradesh Since 1967, Indian Journal of Politics, Vol. IX, No. 2, Dec., 1975.
34. Dr. A.M. Rajasekhariah, Chikmagalur Parliamentary By-Election, 1978, Dr. R. T. Jangam A Political Analysis, Indian Journal of Politics, Vol. 40, March 1979.
35. K.T.J.Mohan Independence to Indira and After. S.Chand and Company Ltd. New Delhi 1977
36. Prakash Sarang Internal Challenges to the Congress System: The Case of Utakal Congress, Indian Journal of Political Science, Vol. 40, Sept.1979.
37. Thomas Pantham Political Parties and Democratic Consensus: A Study of Party Organisations in an Indian City. Macmillan Company of India LTD. Meerut 1976
38. P. Sood Politics of Socio-Economic Changes in India. Marwah Pub. New Delhi 1979.
39. W. H. Morris Jones Politics mainly Indian. Orient Longman , Hyderabad 1978
40. Manirul Hussain High caste to non-caste dominance – The changing pattern of leadership of the Congress Party in Assam. The Indian Journal of Political Science, Vol. XLIV, July-Sept. 1988, No. 3.

41. S. S. Patagundi,
K. Raghavendra Rao
the Indian Political Parties: Their Foreign
Policy and Strategic Concerns,
The Indian Journal of Political Science, Vol.
XLII, April-June, 1981, No. 2.
42. Dilip Singh
6th Lok Sabha Election in Punjab,
The Indian Journal of Political Science, Vol.
XXXIX, April-June 1978, No. 2.
43. K, Lingamurthy
the 6th General Election to Andhra Pradesh
Legislative Assembly, the Indian Journal of
Political Science, Vol. XXXIX, No. 3, July-Sept.
1978.
44. Y. C. Bhatnagar
Moin Shakir
the 7th Lok Sabha Election,
the Indian Journal of Political Science, Vol. 4,
March.
45. S. C. Aurora
Problem of Party Membership: A Case Study of
the Indian National Congress, The Indian
Journal of Political Science, Vol. XLVIII, April-
June, 1987, No. 2.
46. V. K. Padmanabhan
Communist Parties in Tamil Nadu,
The Indian Journal of Political Science, Vol.
XLXIII, April-June, 1987, No. 2.
47. S. N. Talwar
Under the Banyan Tree: The Communist
Movement in India. Allied Publications, New
Delhi, 1985.

48. Satyopal Dang On CPI-CPM Relations, Mainstream, Dec. 15, 1998.
49. Satyopal Dang Need for Left Democratic Front, Not a Third Front, Mainstream, December 19, 1988.
50. Duomanta Kumar Giri Verdict 1998, Mainstream, March 28, 1998.
51. Nikhil Chakravorty (ed.) Trends and Projections, Mainstream, May 4, 1996.
52. Surendra Mohan Coalition Pointers, Mainstream, May 4, 1996.
53. Soma Marik Electoral Promises, Performance, Mainstream, May 4, 1996.
54. Balraj Mehta on Post-Election Party Pligaments, Mainstream, May 25, 1996.

ROLE OF THE CONGRESS PARTY IN DOMESTIC AFFAIRS:

The gains of the year are being widely published – twenty one in the economic sphere and ten others in their worlds : fall in price index; rise in industrial production; record food grains production; distribution of surplus land; house sides of the landless; abolition of bonded labour; moratorium on rural debts raising of agricultural minimum wages; increased outlay for irrigation and power; development of handloom industry, more supply of controlled cloth; legislation on urban land ceiling, more task yield from voluntary disclosure of incomes; action against smugglers; liberation of industrial licensing; scheme for workers' participation in industry; national permit scheme for inter state transport; lowering of income tax rates; supply of essentials for students; ensuring supply of textbooks and prefer students; apprenticeship schemes in new trades and industries; and violence has gives place to calm; regional disputes reduced; complete communal harmony; peace coming to Nagaland and Mizoram, peace in University Campus; Railway earning more through more traffic better attendance and work disposal in Government Offices; nationwide campaign against dowry; new and vigorous dimension to family planning; significant improvement in external relations.

This impressive record is credited mainly to the Government's efforts under the one-year old Emergency. However, this point demands scrutiny on four counts. First, can all these be ascribed to the benign dispensation under the Emergency? The downward trend in prices, for instance, started much earlier than the imposition of the Emergency. The Government's Economic Survey for 1975-76 says : "The Whole-Scale Price Index declined by 7.4% between the 3rd week of September 1974 when an all time peak was reached – and the last week of March 1975"; that means that the price stability had already been achieve before the resort to the Emergency compared to this 7.4% decline in the pre-Emergency period, the score is much lower in the period under the Emergency; the Economic Survey notes : "The latest available index for the week ending February 14, 1976 shows a further decline of 5.6% as compared with the last weak of March 1975". The tempo of price decline has thus been slower under the Emergency than before.

Secondly, the performance on many other programmes can hardly be regarded as striking. In the latest publicity material issued by the Government, the actual completion of houses in the allotted house-sites, number only 246 thousand in this furlong Republic and of these Kerala accounts for about 50 thousand. Can we say, we have achieved very much when we find that less than 50 thousand bonded labourers have been freed? The total number of loud under the new ceiling laws comes to less than 180 thousand. With widespread scourge of rural indebtedness, does it behave us to congratulate ourselves that in nineteen rural *bandhs* set up; 50 cores planned during 1976-77"? No wonder the money lender continues to be very powerful element in the rural life.

Thirdly, there are serious shortcomings, or what is technically termed negative features of the situation. While liberal concessions have been readily extended by the Government to Big Business, the working class could not be accused of having wangled a fair deal. With more than half a million workers laid off in the period of Emergency and another fifty thousand retrenched the industrial scene does not present the picture of a trend towards a just and acquit able state of affairs. The private sector saved 100 corers of extra liquidity outlay by the statutory cut in bonus; sweeping excise reductions have been given to private industrialists both in the Budget and in the recent official announcements; this year the affluent have been awarded reduction in both personal and corporate income taxes; terms for foreign collaboration have been liberalised; licensing procedures for industrial units have been made easy; while so-long hidden industrial capacity regularised. Big Business can not complain of fall in production through strikes and other forms of working-class action. At the other end retrenchment and lay offs have not come under any executive ban. In the rural sector, while the rich farmer is not to be touched, the enforcement of the minimum wage for the agricultural labourer remains a jar cry.

Fourthly, it would be rather extra-ordinary to ascribe the success achieved in some spheres during the last one year mainly to the Emergency. If peace has been restored in Nagaland and Mizoram that have been the result of labours spread over years and the process was not accelerated because of the Emergency. If the State Governments run by same Congress Party could come to amicable understanding over long standing regional disputes like the questions of sharing river waters, would it be very flattering to them to

be told that they could be persuaded to agree only under the aegis of the Emergency? If there is significant improvement in external relations, can that be linked to the Emergency? The striking demonstration of Indo-Soviet extent during the Prime Minister's latest visit to Moscow has certainly more enduring foundation than the prevalence of Emergency in this country.

And such matters as the abolition of the dowry and vigorous family planning can be effective only through mass campaign rather than through drastic executive measures, or recent experience at some places has clearly brought it home.

In a sense, this is true of the entire Twenty-Point Programme. As the recent review by the CPI Executive has shown, the implementation of the Programme has been tardy, and perceptible result could be seen only where mass participation in implementation could be ensured under political leadership. Taking the country as a whole, such political activity has been negligible so far as the Congress is concerned.

This in fact, is one of the dangerous weaknesses of the situation. Although the Congress President has deemed it fit to declare 1976 as the year of the organisation, the noteworthy feature of this year of the Emergency has been conspicuous decline in the functioning of the Congress as a political organisation involved in day to day activities. No serious Congressman claims that grass-roots organisation of the party during the Emergency has been strengthened in a manner that it can help to carry out the Programme undertaken.

Retrospectively, one may venture to point out there was no bar whatsoever to the realisation of the Twenty-Point Programme even before 1975 had the Congress chosen to function as a well knit political party in the five-year period since the 1969 split. Reliance on the personality of the Prime Minister instead of the building of effective leadership at all tiers – from the national to the local – has become the accepted norm of Congress existence if this was the feature of the period falling the 1971-72 electoral victories, it has become more so and not less – in this one year of the Emergency. It is but inevitable that in a situation in which mass political activity is absent, the executive

authority comes to the forefront. With the Emergency investing the executive with enormous powers, the scope for healthy democratic activity can not but recedes.

Side by side omissions sight of an impending imparts in the economy are not lacking. The recent decision to cut the coal production target during the Fifth Plan period from 135 to 125 million tonnes has far reaching implications. It is not an economic measure in so far as the Government will be saving Rest. 153 corers, but a measure dictated by the grim perspective of a slump in the consumption of coal mainly because of the expected fall in industrial activity. FICCI estimates, has in hand installed capacity lying idle to the extent of over thirty per cent. The magnificent performance of the public sector has to be matched against the lack of orders for its major units like the BHEL and the HEC. The growing unemployment despite economic growth is a symptom of a malaise which cannot be wished away by any executive extent.

There are no doubt heroic efforts at expert boosting but no economy can really grow unless and until the internal market is exploited. There is no attempt at mopping up internal resources are could be seen in the singular absence of any move to touch the rural rich, despite the fact that the largest amount of public bandy has been poured into fatter the affluent in the country side.

The precarious position of the economy can be seen in the no mistakable reliance on western loans, particularly from the World Bank Consortium. The much published foreign exchange reserve is in reality an illusion, since it is boned on drawing heavily on massive foreign loans; in other words, by mortaring the future decades of Indian economy. There is no sign that with all our mounting antipathy to Western media, we are in a position to take a firm stand warding off any Western intrusion on the economic front. It is a wholesome development that we have advanced from June 1966 of Rupee Devaluation to June 1976 of Moscow Declaration, but we are yet to claim that we can do without PL 480 loans and large scale IDA credit.

An economy propped up on such quick sand foundations has the danger of hazardous twists and turns and in the bargain, the goal of self reliance may be lost. With all the apparent buoyancy in the present phase of our foreign policy, there is no harm in

reminding ourselves of Jawaharlal Nehru's warning "The international party of a country depends ultimately on the domestic state of affairs in that country : the two have to be in line and they cannot be isolated from each other." The growth potential of the Indian Economy is tremendous by all reckonings. But it can never be realised with sagging internal market, with sagging internal market, with ever widening disparities, and without a flea deal for the millions of the have-nots who are condemned below the poverty line through the constitute the overwhelming majority of the nation.

To be compelled to a state of emergency is a matter for celebration neither for the Government nor for the people. Because, an emergency by its very nature, is a temporary expedient – a stimulant and not a tonic. It can not be a way of life; it has nowhere in history been the hallmark of stability political, social or economic.

Wisdom born out of calm introspection over basic issues and not excitement generated by continued tension – has to be watchword before the leadership of this great nation, as it faces the future beyond the one year of the Emergency."

During National Emergency our Prime Minister expressed her view about the democracy that election cannot only help to reform and bring a great people rule there is also ruled maximum peoples participation for good running of democracy. And she declared the Twenty-Point Programme to support good going democracy.

Twenty-Point Programme also put the declaration about the desirability and necessity of *people's participation for successful implementation of the programme*, about the necessity and desirability of having committees consisting not only of Congressmen but also of member of the like minded parties.

Actually this decision of 'combined working over Twenty-Point Programme had been taken in AICC meeting, to where the Prime Minister and Shri Jagjivan Ram highlighted those progressive measures cannot be successfully carried through if the implementation is left to the bureaucracy alone. They also appreciated the scheme to give plots to landless and unskilled labourers in the rural areas (though it was announced long before the proclamation of Emergency).

As earlier, it has been referred that the implementation of Schemes were dependent upon the bureaucracy. And it was proved that in few cases officers performed well but in maximum cases it was not up to the mark.

In about 3,000 villages, that was 25% of the total of the villages in the state, not a single person has been sanctioned any plot. In many villages plots have been given in very low lying areas, at very far off or otherwise unsuitable sites. Many having land and owning houses, already have been sanctioned plots, while many without land and without any houses have been left out. In many cases, the CPI demanded setting up of popular committees to implement The Land Ceiling (Amendment) Act which was passed in 1972. The State Government took much time to get it accepted regarding the necessity for such committees at the State Level as well as at the Sub-Divisional Level. The State Level Committees which were advisory in nature without any statutory power has 3 CPI representatives whom CPI has nominated. The Congress members of these Committees were a mixture of anti-feudal outlook and other types. But in functional level, unanimously adopted recommendations aimed at plugging the loopholes have not been implemented.

At the Sub-Divisional Level, no qualitative improvement in the functioning of the Committees has taken place after the Emergency and the Twenty-Point Programme as it has always depended on the persistence of the CPI members and also on the individual offices.

From the above discussion, it can be concluded that there was tremendous pressures in the Congress. Where party itself became few elements from the ruling party were not interested neither about the strong democracy through maximum people's participation or about the implementation of the Twenty-Point Programme. They were not in favour of people's Committees and also to any cooperation with the CPI. But it was true that few forces in Congress party had whole heartedly accepted the people's participation as well as CPI's cooperation, and critics said that this force (later) was in favour of the Twenty Point Programme just because of fear of masses.

These internal clashes and contradictions created unholy working conditions between Congress and all its aim to implement Twenty-Point Programme went in vain. The purpose of Twenty-Point Programme turned in failure.

It is interesting to notice that during the period of Emergency the private sector secured more concessions than earlier. In the name of energising of economy, the liberalisation of curbs on business houses had not been inconsiderable. While the trade union leadership had been demanding for long for the take over of textile, jute and sugar industries, the concessions and incentives extracted in this period by the magnates controlling these industries have been conspicuous.

The working class was ready to response the call of increased production but there were hardly a few who could help them from being the victimisation of lay off, retrenchment, lock-out and many other cases.

What was also disturbed democratic opinion is that responsible leadership in the Government have aimed views underplaying the menace of multinationals, a phenomenon which has alarmed practically the entire developing world, and has attracted serious attentions even in the UN.

In 1975 an all India Campaign was initiated to educate the people about the danger of Fascism overpowering democracy in this country and in this regard a conference was held in Patna. And with more than fifty country delegates attended the Conference unveiled that Mrs. Gandhi and her Government's Twenty-Point Programme was not something very welcomed by the Western World. And the Patna gathered sharply proved an important stand of India and her relation with other territory is that in times of crisis Government and the People of India only can find support mainly from the Socialist World and the anti-imperialist forces in distant corners of the World.

PATNA DECLARATION WAS THE FLOOR OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROMISED REFORMS:

"The importance of the Twenty-Point Programme and similar measures lies in the fact that their effective implementation would considerably weaken the urban and rural vested interests that form socio-economic base of fascist forces."

The fact which was all over accepted was that basic malady behind the implementation of the programme was the virtual stagnation in capital formation and this is largely lie to the fact that the affluent in the rural sector is practically less untouched in any drive for mapping up resources. In the context of the heavy outlay in allocations for the benefit of this very section in community the Government's inability or hesitation in seriously touching the rural vested interests is a matter of serious national concern.

The Twenty-Point Programme had enormous scope of reformed the implementations. But it was the Government who never took any serious steps against which could help the rural sector and also increased the resources. No one can ignore a basis feature of Indian Political Structure that rural people are controlled by the rich and party dominated by this rich people. So implementation of every programme or scheme is completely dependent upon this politicise rural reach people and the consequences is as simple as water.

It was important that the Patna Conference has highlighted the international aspect of the danger of fascist penetration. The American strategy of decentralisation and it was also disturbed the American lobby of in our country. Vigilance against the many facets of Fascism in our country the price of the democratic order and ultimately of liberty itself.)

The regional polls were so much in operation that the Congress in the 1960s had to work like Federal Organisation State/Regional units were at times behaving like the regional parties, putting all kinds of pressures to force the central ruling leadership to succumb to their demands. The non-implementation of the Official Language Act and Three Language Formula, the tardy implementation of land reforms in most states, non-compliance of the West Bengal and the Bihar Governments issue on the Damodar Valley

Corporation Project, the strong sentiments on the linguistic states issue were some such examples which showed the areas of serious conflict between the Centre and the Regional Units of the Congress Party in the 1950s/1960s. This was a very interesting case of an embryonic development of a model where a national party had to negotiate its terms with its 'regional allies', all of course, within the political space provided by the Congress Party, which needless to say, was severely restricted, constrained, and therefore, limited.

The 1967 election manifested the hidden tensions that the Congress system had already developed. While it is true that the loose organisation of the Congress had party accommodated the regional polls to a great extent, it should be conceded that there is a limited beyond which no party worth its salt can give space to the dissenting groups. It was in that sense that the forth General Elections were nothing but manifestations of some kind of a political revolt that symbolised the growing assertion of the 'regional allies' which is the Congress system. It was not the emergence of these regional straps, but the case with which they opted out of the Congress Party, that was more significant than any other development.

The regional political parties which were emerged after the Fourth General Election indicated a new trend in the Indian Political Systems. These regional parties actually a regional figure of parent Congress Party and these newly-formed parties took such Congress sounding names as the Kerala Congress, the Bangla Congress, the Janata Congress and the Utkal Congress. An attempt was thus made to trend the middle path by keeping the national image intact with the Congress. Suffix, but at the same time identifying with the regional support base by arising the state name as its prefix.

This type of changes within the party and new trend in political culture was relatively short lived, and soon thereafter the mid-term elections were forced on several statuses in 1969. The re-emergence of the dominant party system in 1971 and 1972 Lok Sabha and Bidhan Sabha. The regional polls were so strong that the attempts to suppress them by the mighty Congress Party, resulting in the imposition of Emergency. Paradoxically, the frequent imposition of President's rule under Article 356 of the Indian Constitution

symbolised not a powerful Centre but 'pathology' of federalism resulting from the powerlessness of the Centre.

The period of 1980 and 1996 a new characterised of Congress Party came in front that two type of two party systems emerged 'those in which regional parties formed the principle opposition to the Congress and those in which the principle opposition was from all India parties'. The regional political groups started flourishing with independent political forces. In many states there became the ruling parties, either on their own or in coalition with some regional outfits. In some other states, some of these regional parties were in a position to compel the Congress Party to coalesce with the regionally dominant party.

The 1996 election period following the eclipse of the Congress Party, in the regional formation came to share the political power not merely in the States but became indispensable at the Centre as well. In a way, the rapid withdrawal of the Congress Party from the political scene in the 1990s was continues with the rise of the regional parties which were literally stepping in to fill up the space created by the gradual but steady decline of the Congress throughout the 1980s. Ironically the 1980 and 1984 Lok Sabha elections which the Congress won with comfortable majorities had also marked the decline of the party. It has been maintained that the party continuously gave way to the regional forces and neither of these two elections restored the Congress dominance.

More strong regional existence was visualised in 1989 when they conceded to each other to make National Front. The desire of these was to fight with the Congress dominance. With the help of anti-Congress mobilizations this type of regional political parties were being started to powerful. And other important issue which minimise the Congress dominance was Bofors issue. Therefore all-India called against the corruption in high levels of governance. The major supporter of this call was thinking about the strong coalition and consequence was Janata Dal led National Front Government, namely, the Left Front and the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), Telegu Desam Party (TDP) in Andhra Pradesh, the Congress (S) in Kerala and the Dravidic Moneta Kashia (DMK) in Tamil Nadu. But except Janata Dal coalition with other coalition parties were failed to perform very well in terms of electoral gains.

The defeat of the BJP-led government within 13 days in office in 1996, really forced it to do some rethinking on the issue of coalitional partners. The Party with its national, all-India political ambitions, had till then carefully avoided regional alliances, and had in a way denounced regionalism. Its alliance with the Shiv Sena in Maharashtra was more in tune with its *Hindutwa* plank than an arrangement with a regional party. The BJP had even viewed regionalism as something unethical to nationalism, which had earlier made it denounce the idea of small states. It was only in the late 1980s that it compromised on the issue in the wake of the growing sentiments for separate states in Uttarakhand and included these demands in its party manifestoes for the subsequent elections.

The Congress Party had ignored the fact that with an own base it was possible to set up renewed the present position of the party and other parties mainly BJP did not take time to improved their political position and they immediately went for coalition, which brought expected result also. But alarm of Congress down fully was started.

At the same time in few states the Party had tried to improve their position and fought in election again with a view of coalition arrangement is unworkable and unstable.

The increasing rate of regional politics gave birth of regional political parties and these political parties started to change the entire scenario of political culture of India, which also helped to shift the politics into centralised politics to regionalise politics. The middle class population of India enhanced the chances of stronger regional political establishment, the survey data of 1990's election had gave proved that it is the general mass who are holding the power of democracy and dominant cause of changing politics in India.

The democratic form of government's election based on Universal Adult Franchise which has ensured some kind of an 'electoral socialism', where every one has got a chance to exercise one's vote. The sign of 'Black Politics' also prevails here as violence, both capturing and rigging, these have not over the years seriously or materially affected the outcome of the elections held on such a massive scale. Even the much maligned 'vote banks' are no longer 'frozen' vote banks which could permanently ensure any party's victory or defeat.

The various vote banks have changed strategies and supported different political formations in different elections, thereby determining decisively the fortunes of various political actors. Thus to take an example, if the Dalits and the Muslims constituted the vote banks of the Congress party before the 1977 elections when they voted an block for it, in the last few decades they have not stuck to any one political formation. In Uttar Pradesh the Muslims have generally favoured the Swamajwadi Party, but elsewhere they have voted for other parties, including the Congress. Once again attempts are being made by the Congress in Uttar Pradesh to woo back the Muslim vote and even with some success. Similarly the details in Uttar Pradesh have switched over to the BSP, but this also in no way in final, and the Congress or even the BJP may partly succeed in winning over at least some sections of the Dalits in Uttar Pradesh. Similarly if a section of the other Backward Castes (OBCs) supports the BJP in Uttar Pradesh, another powerful section (the Yadavs) aligns with Swamajwadi Party.

In regional formation took place in Indian Politics after the 1990's election were not identical of western politics, where they keen to performed well in a broaden-aspect. On the contrary, in India the membership of most political parties, more particularly of the smaller regional formations, is not formal and in fact represents not the individuals but whole communities.

The western theories of coalition do not work in Indian political system. It is generally expected by the observers of the Indian scene that stable coalitions would emerge at the central and the state levels, which may then alternate, exactly in a fascism in which the two party systems is expected to operate. The successful alternative coalition's governments in Kerala and the structured stable coalition government in West Bengal have given credence to such expectations. And in the Centre the strong Congress also experienced about the challenge of BJP led coalition government in the Centre.

The continuous churning of the political ocean may lead to construction, de-construction and re-construction of many such coalition groups depending on the reconciliation of their antagonistic and non-antagonistic differences in the social, economic and the political arenas. It had been observed over the years, there had been a declining trend of party identifications. This been clear in a survey conducted by the Centre for the

Study of Developing Societies, Delhi, after the general elections to the Lok Sabha in 1971 and 1996. Obviously, compared to the 1971 Lok Sabha poll, fewer people felt closer to any single political party at the time of the 1996 Lok Sabha poll.

The 1990's election year brought two features for Indian politics one was coalition based structure of party politics and the other were the rise of small regional parties and Congress declination was paved the way of regional growth in national level politics.

Regional parties are those party wy8cy are bared a regional ideology of that particular region, and thrives on invocation of regional pride, e.g., Parties like Ahom Gana Parishad (AGP) or the Telegu Desam Party (TDP) or Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK). Without the above mentioned regional based parties feature another type of regional parties also prevails in India. These parties which enjoy considerable support only in one state of the Indian Union. Such parties may not emphases their regionalist outlook. They have infact an all India perspective but only a regional reach. The Forward Block (FB) and the Revolutionary Socialist Party (RSP) in West Bengal or the Peasant's and Workers Party in Maharashtra may be cited as example. The 1990's have witness the rise of such parties in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh.

Yet another type of regional parties is Communist Parties and Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP). It is often pointed out that the Communist Party of India (Marxist), CPI (M) had been confined only to West Bengal, Kerala and the Communist Party of India (CPI) is, in any case, a small party now. But CPI (M) has a presence in Assam, Tripura, Andhra Pradesh (AP) and Tamil Nadu (TN), while CPI also has some base in AP, Bihar, Punjab and TN. In case of BSP, its base in Jammu and Kashmir (J & K) [48% in 1999], Madhya Pradesh (MP), Punjab and Rajasthan.

In 1990 was witnessed as the year of regional growth and its effect in national politics. But the existence of regional parties is nothing new. In 1977, the Akali Dal and DMK were partners in the Janata Party Government. In 1980, regional parties lost their newly found movement of glory when the Congress returned to power. The DMK managed to win 16 and the smaller Left Parties of West Bengal remained only 36 in the Seventh Lok

Sabha. The election of Eighth Lok Sabha was held in the backdrop of Indira Gandhi's assassination. But in 1984, regional parties increased their share in Lok Sabha.

Non-Congressism brought many regional parties together in the National Front (NF) formed in 1988. These included the TDP, DMK, AGP and Congress (S) apart from the newly formed Janata Dal. But in the elections in 1989, these regional parties did not meet with success. In the Ninth Lok Sabha 45 members belonged to regional parties. In 1991, the strength of regional parties in the Lok Sabha was at 56 but this time around TDP had a fair share (13 seats). The All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (AIADMK), Janata Dal (G), Indian Union Muslim League (IUML), Sikkim Sangram Parishad (SSP) and Kerala Congress supported the Congress Government of Narasimha Rao. However these parties were not part of the Government. In any case both in 1989 and 1991, regional parties were playing a crucial role at the national levels in making or un-making the central government. Thus the 1997 elections not only speeded up the demise of the Congress system but also inaugurated a new era of partnership between all India parties and regional parties, something which had never happened in the pre-1977 period.

Since 1996m the regional political parties became an influential part in the formation of the coalition government. The experiment of the United Front (UF) Government first underscored the centrality of regional parties to national politics. In 1996 Lok Sabha, 137 Members of Parliament (MPs) belonged to various regional parties. At that time, it appeared that most of the regional parties were gravitating against the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP). Thus 95 out of the 137 MPs belonging to regional parties were part of the UF Coalition. This gave rise to the impression that regional parties were occupying the 'third' space – outside of the Congress and the BJP.

Few regional believes put on the switched over to the BJP-led National Democratic Alliance (NDA) in 1998. The Lok Sabha in 1998 included 161 MPs belonging to regional parties; 92 of these were part of the NDA. In UF Government TDP was a leading party and in 1998 it played a vital role for the survival for the NDA Government. And on the other hand AIADMK had played a crucial role in defeating the NDA Government.

In Fourteenth Lok Sabha Election a change took place that after a long time gap Congress again able to hold the power of the nation but not alone with the inside support of the DMK, JP, and others and from outside the Communist Parties are ready to influence in the decision making process.

So it is clear enough to understand the power and strength of the regional political parties over the nation. Since 1996 the BJP and Congress together got a little over 50% of the share of the total votes.

Regional Parties dominance shows that they are not able to play perfect role in areas of India in the States of Rajasthan, Gujarat and M.P., where the regional parties do not have much presence. Gujarat State has a unique type of party system where bi-party system prevails the Congress and the BJP. Karnataka has a potential for regionalised politics since the two JD factions together earner a quarter of the votes. Finally, politics in Kerala is neatly divided between the two fronts, the Left Front and the United Democratic Front. In both these alliances smaller state-level parties are important partners but the Congress and the Communist Parties holds the dominated position. Few States like Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Sikkim regional parties had sharer of maximum number of seats. And in Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Orissa, Maharashtra, Haryana and Jammu and Kashmir also have major seat sharer regional parties. In 13 states, regional parties had 30 percent or more share of the votes in the 1999 elections. In Manipur and Sikkim, regional parties had polled 67 and 97 percent votes respectively. Other states where regional parties placed around 30 percent or more votes are J & K, Haryana, Punjab, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Haryana, Punjab, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Orissa, West Bengal, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. In Tamil Nadu various regional parties together polled 75 percent of votes. In Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh, regional parties polled 44 and 42 percent votes respectively. The vote share of regional parties in West Bengal, Punjab, Orissa and Haryana was between 33 and 35 percent in the 1999 elections while in other states regional parties polled between 29 and 31 percent votes.

Last few election reports made a picture that before captured a powerful position of political system during the 1990s regional parties dominated State Level politics in many

states. Apart from the States of the Northeast, politics in J & K, Punjab, Tamil Nadu and Orissa had witnessed the rise of regional parties at the state level. The National Conference has been Central to politics in J & K. In Punjab, the role of the Akali Dal was limited till 1966. Punjab politics revolve around Akali Politics. The Akali established them politically by winning 43 out of 104 seats in the Legislative Elections of 1969. DMK came to the power in 1967 with 138 seats. The AIADMK replaced the DMK in 1977. Thus Tamil politics had been regionalised. Orissa also has been started to join on with the states of strong regional parties exists between 1952 and 1975. The Ganatantra Parishad won 31, 51 and 36 seats in the 1952, 1957 and 1961 Assembly Elections respectively. Later the Janata Congress won 26 seats in 1967; Utkal Congress won 33 seats in 1971 and 35 in 1974. Local parties of Karnataka had captured 41 seats along with independents in the State Legislature in 1967 while local parties of Andhra Pradesh won 70 seats along with independents. The Forward Block and RSP together won 22, 13 and 33 seats in West Bengal Assembly in 1972, 1967 and 1969 respectively. The 1980's saw the size of the AGP in Assam and TDP in Andhra Pradesh. To sum up regional parties dominated State-Level politics in many states in the pre-1990 period.

The root of formation of political parties lies on its ideological basis's. Many such persons are personally and centred around one leader. Main favourable condition for growing the regional parties in regional sentiment and arguments in favour of regional sentiments. These surround invocation of regional pride and mark of regional identity. Regional arguments involve demands pertaining to regional culture, history and language. The demands for formation of a state or inclusion of certain territories into a state are patent weapons of mobilization. Another regional ideology is the demand for more autonomy to the State. Such demands are passed as opposition to the role of the Governor, to Article 356 etc. Finally the regionalist ideological position takes the form of demands for the state's development. Such regionalism deals less with issues of identify and more with issues of backwardness, investment and industrial progress. Regional parties variously use these arguments – identity, statehood, autonomy and development. The National Conference, Akali Dal, DMK, often combine identity and autonomy arguments. Parties like Biju Janata Dal (BJU) or TC emphasise the development arguments. The TDP emerged on the basis of the identity argument but Chandrababu Naidu has led the party

quietly to the development argument. Many parties originate in the demand for statehood. The Jharkhand Mukti Morcha, Chhattisgarh Mukti Morcha, Vishal Haryana Parishad are examples of parties demanding statehood. Most parties of the northeast continue to combine to identity issue with autonomy or statehood demands. By involving regionalist arguments, a regional policy can easily identify with the different section in the regional society. Its language of identity appeals to the intelligentsia and the masses alike. Besides identity discourse also benefits the materially dominant sections of the society.

However, it is not always necessary that a regional party would confine itself only to regionalist arguments. Many times regional parties cover non-regionalist ideological ground. While the Akalis tend to define regional identity in terms of religion, the Shiv Sena was the two ideologies of regionalism and religious communalism according to the exigencies of electoral politics. Regional parties also rely on caste for their ideological formulations. Thus, the DMK originally combined Dravidian identity with non-Brahmanism. By employing anti-Centre ideological resources, the DMK strengthened its claims pertaining to a separate Dravida identity vis-à-vis the Aryans. More recently the DMK in Tamil Nadu has also combined the regional rhetoric with an anti-caste social position on behalf of the Other Backward Castes (OBCs). Such ideological formulations, they tend to restore the meaning of 'regional identity'.

Since 1996 political system appeared as a triangular in one hand, Congress and BJP played a role of Centre politics on the other hand. Regional parties started to capture the vacuum left by Congress and BJP. And in this situation Congress was the obvious loser in most states notably in Andhra, Assam, Kerala, Punjab, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal. One thing also took place was fragmentation of non-Congress and non-BJP votes. This has happened in Bihar, Karnataka, and Uttar Pradesh where the so-called Janata Dal was divided into regional fragments.

A BRIEF INTERPRETATION OF FEW REGIONAL POLITICAL PARTIES IS GIVEN BELOW:

Akali Dal: Active and central to the Punjab political scene since the mid-1960s, the Akali Dal has formed a social base of rural peasantry in Punjab. Almost three-fourths of

its supports come from the rural population. The party draws support from diverse in terms of caste and community. However, more than half of its votes are from the Sikh community. A sizable proportion (43 percent) of OBCs supports the Akali Dal accounting 20 percent of its votes. The social base of the Akali Dal is marked by weak support from the Dalits. The Party draws equal support from men and women. Since the Akali Dal is a well-established regional party of Punjab, it has a slight edge among middle aged (36-45 years) voters but the Party is not exactly popular among young voters (up to 35 years of age). It may be conjectured that lacking part of the establishment, the party is not popular both among the young as well as the elderly voters. Another interesting feature of the Akali support base is that it has weak support both among illiterates and those with higher education. The bulk of its support comes from the primary and metric educated voters.

AIADMK and DMK: Politics in Tamil Nadu has been exclusively region-based since the mid-1960s. From 1989 the Dravida Parties have realised that they can make and unmake national governments. This has changed their perception entirely. Now the two Dravida Parties simultaneously adopt a nationalistic and all-India stance as well as revert to shrill regionalist rhetoric. The former is necessary to assert an all-India role while the latter is required to prove that they have not lost sight of their regional ideological position. In the case of DMK, observers have noticed that a drift towards pan-Indian nationalism. It appears from the survey data that both parties (DMK and AIADMK) have a weak base among the younger voters. But in most other respects the parties are dissimilar. The DMK has equal support among men and women while AIADMK is more popular among rural and less educated voters. Two-thirds of AIADMK voters are either educated upto the primary level or not literate at all. Interestingly, a large chunk of DMK support comes from upper castes and OBCs, while AIADMK is dependent on OBCs and the Scheduled Castes (SCs). Thus, the two parties appear to be leading two different social coalitions in Tamil Nadu.

Biju Janata Dal: Non-Congress politics in Orissa has often been based around localised forces. Although, the Swatantra Party played an important role in state politics between 1967 and 1972, the formulation of a government depended upon the Gan Congress (1967-71) and Utkal Congress and Jharkhand Party (1971-72). It has been argued that

the middle class-upper caste nature of the Oriya political elites has contributed to the consolidation of region-based politics in Orissa. The JD Unit of Orissa under Biju Patnaik always functioned independently, but the JD Unit in the State quickly disintegrated after the death of Biju Patnaik and gave way to the formation of a State-level party under the leadership of Navin Patnaik who promptly aligned with the BJP. This decision was taken on the basis of anti-Congressism which drove Navin Patnaik towards the BJP and other was an aspiration to play a role at the All India Level. With the demise of the United Front, a regional party could gain account to the national centre of power only by aligning with the BJP. Navin Patnaik has thus consolidated anti-Congress politics in the State with himself (his Party) as the main nucleus of anti-Congressism.

BJD passed itself as opposed to Congress misrule and corruption. Their anti-Congressism combined with the State's progress must have been appealing to the middle class voters. The Party has greater support among the middle age (35-45) voters compared to other age groups. But on the whole, the Party draws blanked support from voters of all age groups. The BJD has good support among urban voters (43 percent). Its supporters comprise large section of illiterates and well-educated voters. This combination is perhaps well explained by the caste composition of BJD voters. More than half of its voters come from upper castes and a quarter comes from the OBCs. In contrast BJD has a weak base among SCs (25 percent SCs support BJD) and a non-existent base among Orissa's tribal population.

RJD and Samata : Both the Rashtriya Janata Dal and the Samata Party are Bihar based parties. Both had a common origin in the Janata Dal. While RJD has been a strong exponent of the advancement of OBCs, the Samata Party relied heavily on an anti-Laloo campaign which talked of good governance and opposed corruption. The Samata Party was one of the earliest allies of BJP since 1996 onwards. It is well known that the party enjoys the support of Bihar's peasant OVC community, the Kurmis. Laloo Prasad's RJD came into being in 1998, but even before that, the Bihar Unit of the Janata Dal was practically autonomous. In 1999, RJD had an alliance with the Congress. But the Bihar State of the Congress was not very enthusiastic about this SCs of Bihar. However, he and the RJD have not been able to concretise the alliance. Laloo Prasad

forgot an invisible coalition of OBCs, Muslims and support of the OBCs. The leadership of Laloo Prasad has been identified with a disproportionate rise of the Yadav Community.

The Samata Party, on the other hand, seems to have benefited from its alliance with the BJP. Voters of the Samata Party constitute a combination of Rajputs and upper castes apart from the lower OBCs (one-third of Samata votes). Thus it is a combination of upper and lower castes. Interestingly 65 percent Rajputs and almost 40 percent upper caste voters vote for the Samata Party. In terms of political identification, this means that voters of upper castes do not perceive the Samata Party or an OBC party like Laloo's RJD. The Samata Party too is slightly more popular among male voters. If voters come mainly from the age group of 26 years to 45 years. In terms of education, the Samata Parties base is fairly spread across different groups. It draws somewhat more support from the voters having education up to the metric level; over 33 percent voters from this category vote for the Samata Party. All these features of the support base of Samata Party had remained stable over a period of time since the same findings were noted in 1995 also. In 2007's Legislative Election gave power again in the hand of the SP.

Samajwadi Party: Like RJD, the Samajwadi Party originated from the Janata Dal. Since its base could not expand beyond Uttar Pradesh, this party has been identified as a state-based party. The Samajwadi Party has made efforts to carve out a base for itself in Maharashtra relying upon the Hindi-speaking population of Mumbai and the Muslims in Mumbai. This party has played a significant role in the politics of Mumbai City in the 1990s. In Uttar Pradesh the Samajwadi Party is seen as a party of Yadavs and Muslims. Since the BSP captures a large section of Uttar Pradesh's Dalit votes, the expansion of Samajwadi Party has been halted. However, like the RJD the success of the Samajwadi Party lies in the face that in Uttar Pradesh's turbulent political waters, this party has more or less retained its base during the 1990s. Just as there has been a keen tussle between BSP and Samajwadi Party for Uttar Pradesh's dalit voters, the BJP and Samata Party are engaged in a battle for OBC voters in Uttar Pradesh. The BJP has been trying to forge an alliance of upper castes and lower OBCs in Uttar Pradesh. Mulayam Singh on the other hand seeks to unite the OBCs under his leadership. The party is more popular

among urban voters compared to rural voters. Its voters comprise Yadavs, OBCs and Muslims.

Shiv Sena and NCP: For long, politics in Maharashtra was dominated by the Congress Regional Parties like Peasants' and Workers' Party (PWP), Republican Party of India (RPI) and even Shiv Sena did not matter much. Ironically, Shiv Sena start into prominence after it underplayed its regionalism and projected itself as a Hindu Party. Yet, Shiv Sena identifies itself with 'Marathi' people in the Mumbai-Thane-Konkani region in the 1990's Shiv Sena emerged as a militant Hindu party of moderately educated youth from both the Maratha Caste and the OBC's. In 1995 when Shiv Sena came into power in the state long with BJP, it had the support of 17 percent voters from the Maratha-Khubi Caste cluster. In 1998 the party had almost 30 percent support among the OBCs. Although this period, the base of Shiv Sena consists of illiterates and less educated voters. Some slight changes were observed in the survey of 1999.

The Nationalist Congress Party (NCP) has a strong base in Maharashtra. The social composition of NCP's base is somewhat comparable to that of Shiv Sena. Although the NCP was formed with a view to dividing the Congress all over the country. Shared power succeeded in only dividing the Congress in Maharashtra Power was already a leader of the breakaway Congress Party in Maharashtra between 1980 and 1986. It appears that he has retained his following. In 1999, NCP received balanced support from voters of various age groups. The party was supported more by women, rural voters' age groups. In terms of caste, there was a keen competition between NCP and the Shiv Sena for Maratha, Kunbi and OBC votes. Almost one-third of the NCP voters were Marathas. The main difference between NCP and Shiv Sena was that the former got a sizable support from SCs and Muslims. More than 20 percent Dalits and 30 percent Muslims voted for NCP. Since 47 percent of NCP voters are from the Maratha-Kunbi community, the party can be identified as a party of the Maratha-Kunbis of Maharashtra. Like Lok Shakti in Karnataka, NCP seems to have played an important role in formulating of the Maratha-Kunbi bloc in Maharashtra.

Telegu Desam Party : It may not be on exaggeration to say that TDP marks the beginning of the present era of prominence of regional parties. The TDP has successfully

polarised Andhra politics between itself and the Congress. In the 1990s the party assumed a significant role at the all-India level. In order to retain that position, Chandrababu Naidu swiftly switched over to the National Democratic Alliance from the United Front. The DTP-right from its inception has proved to be a relying point for Andhra's peasant OBCs although it does not invoke the ideology of OBC uplift. As a result of N.T. Rama Rao's (NTR) charismatic appeal and populist policies, TDP earned popularity among the poor, rural-voters, especially among women it was also supported by SCs and OBCs. It has been further observed that the original social coalition forged by NTR incorporated middle peasants from backward castes, but by 1998, while from backward castes, but by 1998, while the party elect orally assured the Backward Castes, some poor and backward caste voters shifted to the BJP. The alienation of OBCs from the Congress since the early 1980s has been observed by students of Andhra politics and this has been accounted for by the pro-Harijan policies of the Congress. However, TDP's strong, regional, developmentalist argument and the following it received, can be understood only in the context of the rise of the peasant OBCs – the Karmmas. By 1980, this section had attained a crucial amount of economic power and control over the state economy.

Trinamul Congress: Since the Left Front has been the ruling front in West Bengal since the late 1970s, politics in the State revolves around Left and anti-Left forces. It has been further observed that the success of the Left Front is attributable to the typically Bengali identity acquired and nurtured by Left Parties. In this sense, politics in West Bengal had already become regionalised. Strident anti-Left agitation by one section of the State Congress further contributed to this regionalization. The Congress in West Bengal was divided between two factions, one trying to assist with the all-India perception of politics leading to the anti-BJP strategy (effectively meaning a soft approach to the Left Front) and another factor rooting its politics firmly in the trajectory of State-level politics which led to a tacit understanding with the BJP. The Trinamul Congress emerged from this scenario in 1997. Although the new party did not enter into an alliance with the BJP – it had only seat adjustment in 1998 – The Trinamul Congress finally allied with the BJP in 1999. The Trinamul Congress draws heavily on Bengali Nationalism but identifies itself with minorities and poorer section of the State. It has

been observed that in contrast to the *Bhadralok* politics of CPI (M), Trinamul's plebeian policies attract the voters on the social and economic fringe. Survey data shows that more men vote for Trinamul than women (which are contradictory to the *didi* image of Mamata Banerjee among women). Second, the large support to the corner from voters in the age group of 26 to 35 years. In fact, Trinamul dresses relatively less support from the middle aged and elderly voters. The educational profile of its supporters is fairly balanced, though it has a slightly higher level of support in the group with educations up to matriculation. In spite of reverses, which the Trinamul Congress handed out to the Left Front support in rural areas and in contrast to its plebeian image, 44 percent of its supporters come from upper castes. Although Trinamul has reasonably good support among SCs and OBCs, support among the Muslims is quite weak.

Independent India has been genesis in the year of 1947 and before 1947 and after 1947 people of India by political party understands the Indian National Congress. So people of India from the very beginning believe on this party and also keep faith over the party for improved and developed national and individual condition.

After getting power Indian National Congress exercised their all effort to improve the condition of the people of this country and clear the obstacle on the way of national development. To remove the obstacles from development the first step the party had been taken was the *poverty eradication programme* and the party has again and again declared this in party's election manifesto and applied their programmes in the Five Year Plans year by year. The goal was improve the conditions of India's poor. Regarding the Chairman of the Central Planning Commission, Pranab Mukherjee in his 'Beyond Survival Emerging Dimensions of Indian Economy'.

Central Planning came to India not as an outcome of development which was the experience of the advanced countries of the West. We adopted Central Planning as an instrument for developing more on the pattern of the Socialist countries. At the same time, regimentation of the Socialist type in a centrally planned economy, which was inconsistent with our democratic set up, was avoided. Our planning also did not envisage total control of resources with a view to direct these for pre-determined objectives. Many areas of freedom and choice were conceived in our planning. We

adopted the middle path – the concept of mixed economy with public and private sectors playing complementary roles and remaining active partner in the common task of development.

From its very inception Indian Planning had to confront the multiple problems of low productivity in agriculture, technological backwardness, lack of infrastructure, persistence of traditional social structure along with the problems of rural inequality, unemployment and poverty. For the Development of Agricultural Productivity, the First Five Year Plan allotted 31 percent of total plan expenditure for agriculture. At that time the Planning Commission presented four broad objectives for the development of agriculture:

- (1) *Increase in agricultural production.*
- (2) *Extension of employment opportunity.*
- (3) *Reduction of population pressure on land.*
- (4) *Elimination of rural inequality for greater social justice.*

For the fulfilment of these objectives a number of strategies have been introduced for development of agriculture and for the establishment of growth, equality and social justice. The strategy to develop infrastructure, technology and agricultural input has been introduced to increase agricultural production. Various programmes like Community Development, IRDP etc. were used along with introduction of modern technology, irrigation and rural electrification. Since the decade of 1970's a number of wage-employment (Food for Work, NREP, RLEGP, JRY etc.) and self-employment schemes (IRDP, DWCRA etc.) have been introduced for ensuring employment and income distribution. Similarly strategy to set up agro-based industries and self-employment schemes has been introduced to reduce population pressure on land. Finally, for the establishment of social justice and reduction of inequality, redistributive programmes and strategies of land reforms have been implemented.

The first strategy of land reform in order to release of forces of production was to distribute land to the tiller, evolved during the decade of 1950's. The initial purpose was abolition of intermediaries (Zamindari Abolition). It was felt that such steps would give land to actual cultivators. Nehru explained that the objective of abolition of intermediaries was two: It would decrease the power of land lords; secondly, it would enhance production because the land acquired from the intermediaries would be given to the cultivators who would develop the land after becoming owners. After intermediary abolition, the Government also took over privately owned forest land, grazing land and waste land.

The second phase of Land Reforms involves protection of tenancy rights of the tenant cultivators or share-croppers. Some states like West Bengal, Karnataka, Kerala, and Maharashtra have successfully implemented such schemes protecting tenancy rights. But such rights are not protected in many parts of India (Operation Barga in West Bengal).

But this strategy does not involve radical land reform programme due to pressures from land owners. The policy to implement collective agriculture on the basis of Chinese experiment could not be introduced in 1959. Attempt to impose the land ceiling to review the size of land-holding also was not successful. Due to pressures from rich farmer, the rights of tenant cultivators also could not be achieved in many parts of the country.

The strategy which has become more important concentrates on development of infrastructure and introduction of modern technology in order to increase agricultural production and to acquire self-sufficiency in food. Low agricultural growth (1.5% to 2.5%) during 1950's and 1960's created the demand for greater investment in agriculture. Under the circumstances the new agriculture strategy was introduced during the Third Plan with the introduction of IRDP. The new strategy involved:

- (a) *Use of HYV seeds, fertilizer and technology to increase production.*
- (b) *Improvement of irrigation to minimise dependence on monsoon.*

(c) *To improve infrastructure (electricity, roads etc.).*

(d) *Storage and marketing facilities and to provide rural credit.*

This new strategy eventuated the 'Green Revolution' as a result of new technology. Wheat production in Punjab, Haryana and Western Uttar Pradesh increased massively. Production of rice, cereals, and sugar also increased. This strategy of increasing agricultural production by use of modern technology and by increasing the area under cultivation is reflected in the Seventh and Eighth Plan also.

But the Green Revolution is essentially a restricted affair because it has been limited to certain pockets like Punjab, Haryana and Western Uttar Pradesh. Only 20% districts in India uses modern agricultural practices.

Another important strategy involves fulfilment of basic needs and re-distribution. It has been realised that Green Revolution and agricultural growth have failed to solve the problem of rural poor. Only a handful of rich farmers benefited from Green Revolution. Studies by scholars like Dandekar, Nil Kanth Rath, Pranab Bhadra revealed that poverty in rural areas was not decreasing. Therefore the Janata Government and subsequently the Sixth Plan emphasised target group oriented programmes for the benefit of small and marginal farmers, rural artisans, tenant-cultivators and landless labourers. First such programme was introduced under Fourth Plan (SFDA, SMFDA, and Food for Work) and since the Sixth Plan IRDP has become an important element to ensure social justice. The objective of this strategy in income distribution and to lift the poor above poverty line.

Liberalisation has not curtailed allotment for such programmes. In fact the 1993 budget recorded 36% increase in the allotment for rural development. Eighth Plan also increased allotment for agricultural, irrigational and rural development. Even in the Ninth Plan the strategy of removal of inequality has been reflected in the plan objective of creating Seven Minimum Basis Services for all.

Rural employment also is considered as an outstanding strategy for development. It is necessary to reduce population pressure on land and to minimise disproportionate land-

man ratio. This strategy is the child of the first 'opposition' Government and has been reflected in various Plans since the Sixth Plan. The thrust of the strategy is to create jobs and new income by providing productive employment and work for the poor. For this purpose self-employment programmes (IRDP) and wage employment programmes (NRF JRY) have been introduced. The strategy also involves training for self employment under schemes like TRUSEM, and also arrangement for rural credit, through organisations like NABARD and creation of agro-based industries.

The issue of social justice on equality constituted a major objective of Indian Planning various policies. Hence, the question in India has been successful in reducing rural inequality. It has been argued that the main stay of agricultural strategy is increased in productivity and area under cultivation by employing modern technology, fertilizer, HYV seeds etc. Generally, this type of agriculture is capital intensive and requires a large amount of investment. Therefore, small and marginal farmers who can not invest large amount do not benefit much. It is the big and rich farmers who benefit more from this technology oriented production growth.

With the help of Green Revolution not only big farmers has increased their income subsequently in Punjab. Moreover, the percentage of landless labourers in India has declined from 30% in 1961 to 35% in 1981. Moreover the number of large land holding (More than 10 Hectares) in India also declined while the numbers of medium and small holding are increasing. Thus the small farmers are not forced to sale their land to big farmers. Therefore the agricultural strategy is not helping only the big farmers. The small farmers and poor are also benefiting.

On the other hand Kalpana Bardhan and Pranab Bardhan (in an article on *Poverty Growth and Rural Labour Markets* in EPW March, 1989) have argued that Green Revolution in India has been failed to solve the problem of rural in equality and landlessness. The number of landless people in Punjab was as high as 59% in 1980-81. A large section of them belong to agricultural labour force.

Since Sixth Five Year Plan (1980-85) Government of India headed by the Congress Party introduced Poverty Eradication Programmes. For rural development and removal of rural poverty in 1980. Integrated Rural Development Programme as IRDP approach signifies:

- (a) *Integration of sectoral programme (irrigation, transport, agricultural development).*
- (b) *Special integration (two or three districts).*
- (c) *Integration of departmental policy.*
- (d) *Integration of socio-economic progress.*

The IRDP is basically an anti-poverty programme of the estimated 350 million people below the poverty line in India. Some 300 millions are in the rural areas, comprising small and marginal farmers, landless labourers, rural artisans and other workers.

The IRDP actually attempts to improve the assets base of the poor and to ensure income generation by improving asset base. The IRDP originally was implemented through District Rural Development Agencies (DRDA) but later it was brought under the Zilla Parishad and District Planning Committee. The IRDP offered loans subsidised to the BPL families for assets creation and self employment. Under IRDP assistance was given to various programmes like agriculture, irrigation, animal husbandry etc. The target group of IRDP was mainly the poor. But special reservations were made for SC and ST people, women and physically handicapped.

An important complementary programme of the IRDP is TRYSEM (Training of Rural Youth for Self Employment). The purpose of TRYSEM is to provide for training for skill development. Self employment programme to be successful should have a training system – as DWCR.

The linkage between and IRDP has far been weak. The Fourth round of IRDP Concurrent Evaluation revealed that only 3.88% of IRDP beneficiaries received training

under TRYSEM. The findings of the Evolution of TRYSEM (June-August 1993) also indicate that of the total number of beneficiaries who got training under TRYSEM roughly 53.57% trained youth did not apply for assistance under IRDP and of the remaining youth only about 50% were given assistance under IRDP.

TRYSEM started as a centrally sponsored scheme on 15th August 1979. TRYSEM provides self employment in the broad field of agriculture and allied sectors, industries, services and business activities for the rural youth from families below the poverty line. This objective was subsequently enlarged in the year 1983 to include taking up of wage employment also to the trained youth. TRYSEM also played an important in facilitating diversification of activities taken up under IRDP. Diversification away from the primary sector to secondary and tertiary sectors requires acquisition or up gradation of skills relevant to industries and business enterprises. TRYSEM seeks to impart new skills and upgrade existing skills of beneficiaries who are by and large attuned only to stagnant levels of agricultural or artisan skills.

Million Wells Scheme (MWS):

Million Wells Scheme (MWS) was launched as a subschema of National Rural Employment (NREP) and Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGI) during 1988-89. It continued as sub-schemes of Jawahar Rozgar Yojana from April 1989 to 31.12. 93. from 1.1. 2000 MWS is an independent Scheme.

The objective of the Scheme is to provide open irrigation wells free of cost to poor, small and marginal farmers who are below the poverty line and freed bonded labourers.

Training of Rural Youths for Self Employment:

Started as a centrally sponsored scheme on 15th August, 1979, Training of Rural Youth for Self Employment (TRYSEM) aims at providing basic technical and entrepreneurial skills to the rural youth from families below the poverty line to enable them to take up self employment in the broad fields of agriculture and allied sectors, industries, services and business activities. This objective was subsequently enlarged in the year 1983 to

include taking up of wage employment also to the trained youth. TRYSEM plays an important role in facilitating diversification of activities taken up under IRDP.

Supply of Improved Toolkits to Rural Artisans:

The Scheme was launched as a sub-scheme of IRDP in July 1992. With the objective to enabling the rural artisans below Poverty Line to enhance the quality of their products, increase their production and income and ensure a better quality of life with the use of improved tools. This will also help reduce their migration to urban areas.

Ganga Kalyan Yojana (GKY):

Ganga Kalyan Yojana (GKY) was launched as a sub scheme of Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) under Eighth Plan affected from 1.2. 1997 and is being continued as an independent Scheme with effect from 1.4. 1997.

The objective of the scheme is to provide irrigation through exploitation of ground water (bore wells and tube wells) to individuals and group of beneficiaries of small and marginal farmers belonging to the below Poverty Line.

The beneficiaries under the Scheme are small and marginal farmers living below the poverty line, other than those who have already been assisted under any minor irrigation programmes of State or Central Government.

Housing is one of the most serious changes facing India's socio-political economy today. While food security has been largely achieved and clothing today is not a serious problem for the poor, shelter remains beyond the reach of millions in India, even after 60 years of the country's Independence.

Young Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of Congress Party got power in 1984 and to cope with the problem of housing the Government of India was implementing Indira Awas Yojana (IAY) since the year 1985-86 with the objective of providing dwelling units free of cost to the members of Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and freed bonded

labourers living below the Poverty Line in rural areas. From the year 1993-94 its scope has been extended to families of servicemen of the armed and paramilitary forces killed in action. 3% of the houses are reserved for the Below Poverty Line dialysed persons living in rural areas.

District Rural Development Agencies/Zillah Parishad on the basis of allocations made and targets fixed shall decide the member of houses to be constructed Panchayat-wise under. IAT during a particular financial year. The same is intimated to the Gram Panchayat. Thereafter the Gram Sabha elected the beneficiaries from the list of eligible households according to IAY guidelines and as per priorities fixed, restricting this number to the target affected. No approval of the Panchayat Samity is required. The Panchayat Samity is however sent a list of selected beneficiaries for their information.

Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP):

Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) is one of the area development Programmes launched by the Government in 1973-74 to tackle the special problems faced by those fragile areas which are constantly affected by severe drought conditions. Based on the recommendations of the Hanumantha Rao Committee, Comprehensive Guidelines for Watershed Development commonly applicable to the DPAP, DDP, IWDP, EAS (50% allocation in DPAP and DDP areas) were issued in October, 1994 which come into effect from 1995-96.

The basic objective of the programme is to minimise the adverse effects of draught on production of crops and livestock and productivity of land, water and human resources ultimately leading to the draught proofing of the affected areas. The programme also aims to promote overall economic development and improving the socio-economic conditions of the resource poor and disadvantage sections inhabiting the programme areas.

The common guidelines for Watershed Development provide for a uniform strategy in the implementation of all area development programmes viz., DPAI, DDP, IWDP and EAS.

The States where DPAP is under implementation along with number of districts and blocks may be seen in the table below:

Sl. No.	Name of the State	Districts	Blocks
1.	Andhra Pradesh	11	94
2.	Bihar	16	21
3.	Gujarat	10	52
4.	Himachal Pradesh	3	9
5.	Jammu & Kashmir	2	22
6.	Karnataka	11	81
7.	Madhya Pradesh	25	134
8.	Maharashtra	22	148
9.	Orissa	8	47
10.	Rajasthan	10	32
11.	Tamil Nadu	15	80
12.	Uttar Pradesh	18	91
13.	West Bengal	4	36
Total		115	947

Desert Development Programme (DDP):

Over the years, the increase in human and livestock population in desert areas has placed the natural resources of the region under great stress. The major problems are continuous deposition of vegetative cover, increase in soil erosion and fall in ground

water level. All these factors account for diminishing productivity of land and loss of natural resources. The problems would have been worse but for the introduction of some specific highly focussed area development programme in these areas. On the recommendations of the National Commission on Agriculture in its Interim Report (1974) and Final Report (1976), the Desert Development Programme (DDP) was started in the year 1977-78. The programme was started in both the hot desert areas of Rajasthan, Gujarat and Haryana and the cold desert areas of Jammu & Kashmir and Himachal Pradesh. The objective of the programme has been to mitigate adverse effects of desertification and adverse climatic condition on crops, human and livestock population, combating desertification and restoring ecological balance of the area.

Since 1967 when Congress adopted the power of the nation and ruled without any interruption before emerging the Janata Government. But when again Congress gain the power started came with the same stretch and same god goal of development and in during their time of power the party always emphasised an socio-economic development of the nation and to achieve that goal of government took lots of policies. And enhance the way of development; as a result India now considered a powerful country in the world. But till few problems are here which need to be solved as early as possible.

The more fundamental issue concerns the role of regimes are most likely to pursue a successful redistributive strategy aimed at alleviating the worst of India's poverty ?

A focus on the State's role in Indian poverty problems is made still more meaningful by the fact that the country's leadership has utilized the state machinery to affect the living conditions of the rural poor. Land reforms, for example, have been continuously on India's political agenda. India's regime authorities also took a series of steps in the 1970s to involve the poor peasants in the 'Green Revolution', to improve employment and wage conditions for the landless agricultural labourers. An investigation of regime efforts in these three policy areas – land reforms, attempts to include the smaller farmers in the process of economic growth and wage and employment schemes for the landless – provide empirical materials for analyzing the distributive role of the Indian State.

The federal nature of the Indian polity allows for a disaggregated and comparative analysis within India. Below the federal government, the State (or provincial) governments in India play a significant role in the formulation and the execution of agrarian policies. Variations in the nature of politics, rule of the state level can lead to differential effectiveness in the pursuit of anti-poverty programmes.

After the Ninth Lok Sabha election in 1989 the Congress Parliamentary Board not to stake its claim to form a government in Centre and as a result on December 1, 1989 National Front Government was created, V.P. Singh was selected as Prime Minister of the country. The country witnessed the first minority-cum coalition government at the Centre, all most non-Congress groups – big and small, Rightist and Leftists have jointed hands to back the National Front Government led by V.P. Singh.

In the mid -1990 the BJP and Vishwa Hindu Parishad their decision to go ahead with the construction of the Ram Temple and gave a call to people all over the India to converge on Ayodhya to render Kar Seva. The BJP leader L. K. Advani was arrested for his spectacular Rath Yatra. On October 23, 1990 BJP President A.B. Bajpayee met the President and presented a letter withdrawing to the V.P. Singh government. The withdrawal of BJP support deprived the National Front Government of a majority of the Lok Sabha.

After V.P. Singh's coalition government national politics again went to the direction of forming of another coalition government led by Chandra Shekhar and Congress offered unconditional support to this Government. But Rajiv Gandhi's dissatisfaction with Chandra Shekhar's Gulf Policy, the Punjab initiatives and the deepening economy crisis caused a dramatic end of Sri Chandra Sekhar's coalition government.

In 1990 The United Front Coalition government was formed and H. D. Deve Gowda took the chair of Prime Minister. This government was also created with the help of the Congress Party.

The emerging problem of national economy was still suffering during the United Front government. To cope with growing economic problem India has decided to go with the

policy of liberalization. India is opening up its capital markets at a time when conventional wisdom on capital account liberalization is being seriously questioned.

India had a closed capital account before 1991; barring trade, all external transaction between private residents and non-residents were prohibited. The restrictions on capital movements reflected the high share of government in Indian economy as well as its low degree of openness. With all private capital account transactions prohibited, the capital account consisted mainly of official transaction, leaving the only borrower abroad.

The policy of liberalization and privatization took place in the year of 1991, but the economic condition of the country during the period of 1980-1990 strictly demanding some thing new which can bring an immediate change in field of economy. Non – Congress had criticized these policy vary effectively. On the other side economists define that during the period of 1980-1990, on account of the large trade deficit the reserve of India became quite difficult which compelled India to borrow from IMF. In fact debt service ratio of India rose sharply from 9.3 % in 1980 to 28.8% in 1990. The situation grew still worse after the Gulf War. The situation reached a crisis position in June 1991 when the country had reserves which were barely enough to the meet imports for two weeks. At this juncture the government was left with no other option but borrow from IMF. Economic interpretation about the situation is no wrong in spite of that domestic mismanagement of the economy as well as wrong economic policies of the past can not be ignored.

To remove the economic problem, governments gad gone for economic reform but in transitional process India has faced several socio economic problems. Some of these problems can be listed as: the cut in government expenditure is likely to lead to unemployment, monetary is like by to lead to further unemployment, and industrial restructuring is likely to lead to reduction in labour force and cause unemployment. It is also desirable that the government changes its policy towards sick units .As one writer observed it would be a social crime to give artificial respiration to unviable sick units sustaining heavy losses on a perpetual basis, the increase in prices due to devaluation, reduction or abolition of subsidies, and rationalization of prices is likely to give rise to inflationary forces .This would pose a serious challenge for government to keep the

price under control. A gradual and sequenced process of liberalization, punctuated by need –based restriction, will allow it to build its financial intuitions. The most appropriate strategy for India would be to follow such a course, giving primacy at all times to its own national economic objectives.

India is experiencing a federal type of government in name, because the working structure has claimed different picture which can be called as Qasi – federal. The main difference between federal and quasi –federal is that though power has been dividing between centre and state, quasi federal enjoys stronger centre.

Powerful centre of India some time creates problem in the matter of Centre –State relation...Before 1967 there was no problem in these issue, forth general election had brought non-Congress government in of the states in India but centre was still ruled by Congress .The way of central leadership treats the states while giving grants is often a source of reaction from the States. The Left Parties ruling states always expressed their view against the discrimination done by the centre .In the maximum time One party ruled centre took place by the Congress party only, so question of discrimination always raised agained the same party.

The recent growth of regional political parties claimed that another reason behind is discrimination of Central government. And it is the Congress Party which is criminalized in maximum time by the non –congresses .

Role of the Congress party in International affairs:

India's relations with Sri Lanka were quite cordial to begin with and the two countries greatly co-operated in the economic field. On most of the international problems also they share identical views. But one factor which has proved a constant irritant in their relations is the problem of the people of Indian origin in Sri Lanka. This problem has existed since 1949 when Sri Lanka gained independence. Soon after independence Sri Lanka disowned the people of Indian origin settled in the country in this rendered a large number of them stateless. The problem was resolved with Indian Government permitting these citizens to come to India who wanted to come here on their own will. However, a sizeable number of Indian settled in Sri Lanka decided to stay on in Sri Lanka. Thereafter the two governments have held protracted negotiations to find a solution of this problem but without much success. A final understanding on this issue was reached between the two countries on 15th January 1986. As per this understanding India agreed to proceed with the process of conferring citizenship on 85,000 Tamils of Indian origin who applied for Indian citizenship prior to October 30, 1981, while Sri Lankan Government would grant citizenship to the remaining stateless Tamils of Indian origin. India shall complete the process of conferring citizenship on pending applications within six to eight months of Sri Lanka enacting laws to confer citizenship on residual number of stateless Tamils of Indian origin.

Towards the close of 1984 and by beginning of 1985 relations between India and Sri Lanka were strained due to internal ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka. The things assumed serious shape after the Government tried to settle armed Sinhalese in Tamil majority areas, which was resented by the Tamils and their guerrilla organisation Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) resorted to blowing up of banks, mining and army vehicles, cutting of rail and telecommunication lines and attacked army vehicles etc. The army also retaliated and burnt down many town and villages. Many innocent Tamils were killed and large number of Tamilians crossed over to India. The presence of large number of Tamil refugees in India greatly agitated the people of Tamil Nadu and their was a local demand for intervention by India. However, the Indian Government firmly ruled out such an action and pressed the Government of Sri Lanka to find a political

solution to the problem. The Indian leadership firmly ruled out intervention in Sri Lanka. It openly expressed its opposition to the partition of Sri Lanka and refused to extend support to the terrorists, even though Sri Lanka has been accusing India of allowing Tamil terrorists to use bases in India to launch raids into Sri Lanka. All along India has been pressing on Sri Lanka to find a political rather than military solution to the problem of ethnic conflict. India even went out of way to persuade Bhutan to host a meeting of the representatives of Government and Tamil leaders to bring about some sort of political settlement. However, Indian efforts did not prove fruitful and it lost its faith both with the Sri Lanka Government as well as the Tamil leadership.

Relation between India and Sri Lanka took a serious turn following rampage by Sri Lankan troops in the Vandamarachchi area in May-June, 1987 which resulted in the death of over 600 Tamilians and injury to hundreds of them. It was feared that this offensive of the security forces in Sri Lanka would lead to a fresh influx of Tamil refugees of India. In the midst of these developments India took the unprecedented step of sending an Indian Air Force missions to provide relief to the suffering people of Jaffna peninsula. India took this step following Lanka's refusal to permit the unarmed and unescorted fishing boats to carry relief supplies to Jaffna on 3 June, 1987. Subsequently, as a result of further negotiations the Sri Lankan Government agreed to accept relief supplies from India.

Thereafter, the relations between the two countries showed an improvement and an accord were signed between President J.R. Jayewardene and Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi on 29 July 1987. In terms of this accord they agreed that (i) Tamil majority northern and eastern provinces would be merged to ensure distinct Tamil Nationality without disturbing the integrity of Sri Lanka; (ii) a referendum would be held before 31 December 1988 to enable the people of eastern provinces to decide whether they would like to maintain links with the northern province or constitute a separate administrative unit with its own provincial government and Council; (iii) to hold election to Provincial Councils of north and east before 31 December 1987; (iv) emerging in eastern and northern provinces shall be lifted by 15 August 1987; (v) all hostilities in island would cease within 48 hours and all arms surrendered by militant groups; (vi) general amnesty would be granted to political and other prisoners detained under the prevention of

Terrorism Act and other emergency laws; (vii) President of Sri Lanka would have discretion to invite an Indian peace keeping contingent to guarantee and enforce cessation of hostilities in Jaffna and Indian argued to provide such military assistance; (viii) India shall ensure that its territory is not used for activities prejudicial to the unity and integrity of Sri Lanka; and (ix) Sri Lanka would not make available Trincomalee or any other port of military use to other countries. The pact was regarded as a significant step for ending conflict relations between the two countries. The pact was regarded as a significant step for ending conflicting relations between the two countries, and paved the way for greater co-operation between the two. In pursuance of this agreement India rendered every possible help to Sri Lanka in the containment of terrorism in the island country and even provided peacekeeping forces for this purpose.

The Indo- Sri Lankan relation took a new turn after election of Premadasa as President of Sri Lanka. Premadasa was opposed to the Indo- Sri Lankan accord right from the beginning and insisted on the replacement of the accord by a friendship treaty on the lines of treaty between India and USSR. He called for withdrawal of Indian Peace Keeping Force from Sri Lanka by 29 July, 1989. India, however took the stand that Sri Lanka could not impose unilateral deadlines and that as a guarantor of the 1987 agreement, India had to ensure that all its terms were fulfilled. But Sri Lanka stuck to its stand out even did not take part in the meeting of Foreign Ministers of SAARC Countries at Islamabad in July 1989. Efforts were made to avoid confrontation between two countries and talks were arranged at New Delhi, but the talks did not yield any result and ended without any agreement on 4 August 1989. After much squabbling an agreement was reached over formula for the withdrawal of Indian troops from the trouble north-east of the island. In terms of this agreement India agreed to make all efforts to accelerate the withdrawal of its forces with the aim of completing the process by 31 December 1989. However, subsequently the Indian representation of the guarantees for the safety of the Tamil Community, the agreement of 18 September, 1989 provided for establishment of a security coordination group comprising Sri Lankan Minister of State for Defence, Chief Minister of the North-Eastern Province and General Officer Commanding of the Indian Peace Keeping Force. The group was to be responsible for ensuring the security of all communities in the North-East during IPKF

withdrawal. A Peace Committee comprising representatives of various political and ethnic groups in North-East was set up which held its first meeting on 14th October, 1989.

In the meanwhile Sri Lanka presented a draft of peace, friendship and co operations in to the Indian Government. This treaty was expected to supplement rather than replace the 1987 Indo- Sri Lanka agreement on 19 September 1989 to IPKF unilaterally suspended its military operation The Liberation of Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), a major Tamil insurgent group, also agreed to respect ceasefire but asserted that it would make use of its right of self-defence if attacked. However, violence continued to persist between the Sinhala Insurgent Janatha Vimulabi Peramuna (JVP) and supports of governments. This obliged the Sri Lanka government to convene an all party conference. At this meeting five major political parties called for establishment of a provincial government based on Parliament Principles instead of the existing Presidential government. However, the meeting was adjourned by President Premadasa on the plea of holding informal consultation with parties.

Though India continued with the phased programme of withdrawal of peace forces from Sri Lanka, the Sri Lankan leaders were not happy with the peace of withdrawal. The emergencies of National Front Government in India in November 1989 raised hopes of better relations between the two countries. The new government initiated measures to improve relations with Sri Lankan. In January 1991 the two countries reached an understanding that the vexed ethnic problem of Sri Lanka can be resolved only through political settlement. They also reached an understanding regarding the return of some 200,000 Sri Lankan refugees in Tamil Nadu. On the part of the India assured Sri Lanka that it would not be a party to any political disintegration of the island republic; that the Indian territory would not be allowed to be used or a base for terrorist activities against Sri Lanka and the Indian forces would not be allowed to be used as a base for terrorist activities against Sri Lanka and the Indian forces would not be sent to Sri Lanka. In short, India adopted a policy of total non-interference with regard to Sri Lanka. It started leading the ethnic issue as an internal affair of Sri Lanka, even though it often expressed concern over the presence of refugees in Tamil Nadu. This policy of non-interference by India led to improvement of relations between the two countries.

However, following the collapse of Colombo Summit of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) in November 1991 the relations between the two countries got strained. Ranasinghe Premadasa, the President of Sri Lanka, but the entire blame for the collapse of the Summit of India and proceeded to hold informal talks with the leaders of Pakistan, Bangladesh and Maldives and openly displayed his hostility towards India.

However, after a short set back the relations between the two countries showed an improvement. In September-October 1992 President Premadasa of Sri Lanka paid a visit to India and closer relations with India formed. On this occasion India expressed support to the proposal for effective devolution of power within the framework of an early solution of the ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka. Indian President impressed the need to strengthen cooperation in the economic field. The trade between the two countries considerably increased during the next few years and the hostility, which characterised the relations between the two countries largely, disappeared.

The visit of President Chandrika Kumaratunga to India also helped in re-establishing the friendly and mutually beneficial tie between the two countries. During her visit to India she proposed a free trade and investment agreement to boost the economic cooperation between two countries. India also adopted more realistic approach to the ethnic problem of Sri Lanka. The leaders of the two countries realised that they must collaborate in fighting terrorism and improve their relations through regular contacts and consultations.

In June 1996 Sri Lanka's Foreign Minister paid a goodwill visit to India with a view to further strengthen relations between two countries. On this occasion the Indian Prime Minister (Dave Gowda) gave him an assurance that India would not extend any support to LTTE. In fact India decided to continue the ban of LTTE for a further period of two years (This organisation was banned following assassination Rajiv Gandhi in May 1991).

In January 1997, I.K. Gujral Indian's Minister for External Affairs paid a visit to Sri Lanka with a view to improve bilateral relations. On this occasion he announced certain trade and other concessions without expecting reciprocity, as a part of this good neighbourly

policy. He also announced India's decision to set up a Cultural Centre in Colombo to promote closer contact between the two countries. India's assurance of sustained support to Sri Lanka for its struggle against the Tamil insurgency and separatism led by the LTTE and the extension of economic and trade co operations between the two countries, further contributed to the improvement of relations.

In December 1998, the leaders of the two countries tried to finalise a free trade agreement which was to come into force in March 1999. This agreement aimed at ridding the region of the necessary restrictions. It proposed out of tariffs on a large number of items within set timeframe. While India was to reduce tariff to zero in three years, Sri Lanka was given eight years to implement zero tariff with regard to re-export of goods with local value addition of 35 percent would equality for tariff exemptions. It was hoped that the agreement would improve Sri Lanka's balance of trade position with India, which had shown huge deficit during the years 1997-98. The proposed free trade agreement evoked mixed reaction in both the countries. There were strong protests from different organisations and plantation unions against exemption of tea, rubber, coconut, etc. Ultimately India decided not to include items like tea and rubber in the negative live. However, India offered some sort of quotas for tea export and even offered to Sri Lanka an opportunity to export garments to India. In return, India wanted to export its car duty free into Sri Lanka, which would have operated against Sri Lankan into rests. In sort, as a result of these modifications the Free Trade Agreement between India and Sri Lanka suffered a setback.

In February, 2000 India and Sri Lanka held discussions and an agreement was reached whereby India agreed to phase out tariffs on a large number of items within three years, while Sri Lanka would remove tariffs in eight years. India also agreed to give 50 percent duty concession on nearly 2800 items. On the other hand Sri Lanka was to extend 50 percent duty rebate on 889 items. The Free Trade Agreement (FTA) came into effect on 1 March 2000. This agreement has been described as a land mark in bilateral relations between the two countries.

In April 2000, after the LTTE captured strategically important Elephant Pass and trapped over 35,000 Sri Lankan soldiers, the Government of Sri Lanka requested India for help

to stop LTTE onslaught. India ruled out any military intervention or arms supply. However, it agreed to extend humanitarian support. India also indicated its willingness to play diplomatic role in bringing about negotiated settlement of the problem.

In February 2001 Sri Lanka's President (Chandrika Kumaratunga) paid a visit to India and appraised the Indian leaders of the peace talks held with the rebel Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), as well as the efforts made by her government to introduce constitutional reforms to meet the demand of Tamil people for greater devolution. On its part, India reiterated its support for the unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Sri Lanka. It insisted on a negotiated political settlement of the conflict.

After the change of government in Sri Lanka, Prime Minister Ranit Wickremesinghe paid a visit to India in December 2001. The Indian Government assured him full support in his efforts to restore peace in Sri Lanka. India offered to help mitigate food crisis in Sri Lanka and agreed to provide 25,000 tonnes of wheat per month for next twelve months. India also agreed to carry out a feasibility study for the construction of 'Hanuman Bridge' over the Palk Strait.

India has also shown keen interest in the peace process initiated by the Norwegian Government in Sri Lanka. It remained constantly in touch with the representatives of the Norwegian Government, the US Government as well as Sri Lankan authorities, and offered full political support to all efforts to resolve the Sri Lankan problem. India's interest in Sri Lanka is bound to leave its impact on the stability, security and territorial unity of the country. J.N. Dixit, Indian former Foreign Secretary has also suggested that "India should assist whichever Sri Lankan Government comes into power to go down this path of accommodation and compromise with the Tamils. The assistance has to be diplomatic and political. There should be no direct participation, mediation or involvement by India in Sri Lankan political processes".

India and Bangladesh

Certain points of conflict also exist in relations between India and Bangladesh. Though India played a decisive role in the emergence of Independent Bangladesh and was one

of the first countries to accord it diplomatic recognition, certain tensions have appeared in their relations. In the main India's relations with Bangladesh have been strained on account of three factors: clashes over borders; dispute over Farakka barrage and dispute over Moore Island. The two countries have shown remarkable spirit of accommodation in the settlement of the borders. The Farakka barrage issue, however, generated much tension. Despite an agreement concluded in 1975 regarding the Farakka barrage the Bangladesh Government tried to internationalise the dispute by raising it at the United Nations. However, ultimately it agreed to settle the issue by mutual discussions and conclude an agreement in 1977. Under this agreement a Joint River Commission was set up to find out a long term solution of the dispute. Though the Commission has held a number of meeting no mutually satisfactory solution has been possible so far. The issue of Farakka barrage and the sharing of water of Ganga still continue to strain the relations even though it has not assumed the shape of an open conflict. Another issue which actually brought the two countries on the verge of conflict was the question of Moor Island in the Bay of Bengal. Both the countries claim sovereignty over this island. In May 1981 following despatch of certain gun boats by Bangladesh which threatened the Indian ship Sandhyak, which was engaged in a joint survey in the area, there was a possibility of an open conflict but the situation was saved and the leaders of the two countries agreed to settle the issue amicably.

Relation between India and Bangladesh showed an improvement in 1982 and the two agreed to set up a Joint Economic Commission. India agreed to provide Bangladesh credit worth Rs. 600,000,000 for launching of joint industrial projects in Bangladesh and facilitate purchase of Indian capital goods and equipments. In August 1983 the Export-Import Bank of India agreed to provide a further credit of Rs. 40,000,000. In the meanwhile in 1982, the Indo- Bangladesh Joint River Commission agreed to set up a committee exports to carry out pre-feasibility studies of each country's proposals for increasing the dry season flow of Ganges. However, the two countries could not arrive at any agreement till April 1984 when India announced that the sharing agreement on Ganges water would continue until the end of 1984.

The relations between the two countries were strained when India in its effort to halt the illegal migration of Bangladesh into Assam, undertook construction of barbed wire

fence on the border Bangladesh protested against this on the ground that it violates the 1975 agreement which prohibited construction of defensive fortification within 150 feet of border. After some border incidents the Government of India agreed to suspend construction of the fence and to discuss the matter further with the Bangladesh Government.

The relations between the two countries showed improvement in 1985 when Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi paid a visit Bangladesh to witness devastating floods and assured full support. On its part, Bangladesh also showed willingness to take part all the tribal refugees entering Tripura from Chittagong hill tracks. In May 1986 the two countries agreed to extend the existing trade pact for a further period of three years viz. up to October 1989.

Earlier in November 1985 the two countries reached an accord on sharing of Ganga Water under the Agreement the Ganga water would be shared for a period of three years beginning from the dry season of 1986 on the basis laid down in the memorandum of understanding signed in 1982. Despite this understanding Bangladesh continued to insist on building up of reservoir dams and inclusion of Kathmandu, while India is not keen on involving Nepal in the study of the problem.

The relation between two countries further deteriorated in June 1988 when President Ershad declared Bangladesh an Islamic Republic. In October-November 1990 in the wake of Ayodhya agitation in India violent mob attacks were organised on temples in Dhaka, Chittagong and other places which resulted in large number of non-Muslim population moving into Tripura. Further, despite the assurance of Bangladesh to check the influx of Chakmas from across the border into Tripura and Mizoram, there has been continuous influx of Chakmas into India. The problems of sharing of river waters of Ganga, Teesta and Brahmaputra and delimitation of the maritime boundary between the two countries are other factors contributing to tension in the Indo- Bangladesh relations. New Moore Island has been another cause of irritation in the relations between the two countries. Above all, the two countries have been trading charges and counter charges about providing sanctuary to rebels across the borders. While Bangladesh has accused India of harbouring and arming the Tribal Shanti Bahini guerrillas who have been

demanding political, economic and cultural autonomy for the Chittagong hill tracts region, India has charged Bangladesh of providing sanctuary to TNV guerrillas of Tripura. These entire irritant have contributed to tension between the two countries.

In May 1992 the Bangladesh Prime Minis (Begum Kalida Zia) paid a visit to India to remove misunderstanding and create favourable climate for establishing cordial relations. Several agreements were concluded. According to one agreement on Tin Bigha Corridor, India agreed to allow use of strip of land for 6 hours a day for people in Dabgram enclave to cross over to mainland Bangladesh to buy good, reach hospitals and send children to higher education. The two countries agreed to review long term and comprehensive arrangement for sharing of waters of Ganga, Teesta and other major river of the region. The two countries also expressed their determination to stop illegal movements of people across the border and take effective measures for maintenance of peace along the border. The agreement regarding leasing of the Tin Bigha Corridor was implemented in June 1992. In November the two countries held talks regarding sharing of river waters, but much progress could not be made. However a Joint Committee of Experts was entrusted the task of evolving an equitable long term and comprehensive agreement for sharing the flows of the Ganga, the Teesta and other major rivers in the best interests of the people of both the countries. This process of improvement of relations was greatly upset in December 1992 following demolition of disputed structure in Ayodhya and its instant reaction in Bangladesh. One of the immediate impacts of these developments was postponement of the SAARC Summit scheduled to be held at Dacca on 12 December 1992. The Summit was again postponed in January 1993 due to disturbed law and order situation in Bangladesh. The Summit was, however, finally held in April 1993.

Therefore, the relations between India and Bangladesh continued to be strained on account of their different perception on issues like sharing of Ganga waters, illegal immigration, Chakma refugees, treatment of minorities, demarcation of maritime boundaries and adoption of Islam as State religion by Bangladesh which had led to policy of intolerance towards minorities. In June 1995 the leaders of India and Bangladesh held talks to resolve the issue regarding the sharing of Ganga waters, but these talks proved a failure. The one outcome of these talks was that the two countries

agreed to reactive the Joint Rivers Commission (which had not for the past five years) to work out details regarding the sharing of the waters of common rivers, including Ganga on a permanent basis. The relations between the two countries further improved towards closes of 1995 when the Bangladesh High Commission to India indicated his country's readiness to take back Chakma refugees settled in Tripura.

With the assumption of power by the United Front Government in India in June 1996 and the initiation of policy of unilateralism under which India granted certain trade and other concessions to neighbouring countries. India's relations with Bangladesh showed considerable improvement. A further step in this direction was taken on 12 December, 1996 when the Prime Ministers of India and Bangladesh signed a 30-year water sharing treaty in New Delhi to resolve their long standing dispute over the matter. The treaty to be valid for 30 years contains provision for review every five years or earlier. It further provides that if the water level at Farakka drops sharply the two sides will share the available quantum on a 50: 50 basis. The treaty also provides for a 10 day alternated advantage formula which ensures that neither country suffers from acute situation. To oversee the implementation of the Treaty an Indo-Bangladesh Joint Committee was set up.

India also showed greater accommodation to Bangladesh with a view to reduce the trade gap between the two countries and decided to reduce tariffs on 13 items from Bangladesh coming into the Indian market. Further, the two countries agreed not to allow any activities on their territory against the interests of the other. India has been facing serious problems of insurgency and militancy in the north-eastern states from organisations like United Liberation Front of Assam (ULFA), National Social Council of Nagaland, etc. The Bangladesh Prime Minister Begum Hasina assured India that Bangladesh would not allow any anti-India activity from her soil by any third country.

A welcome development took place in March 1997 when Bangladesh Government reached an agreement with Chakma leaders regarding repatriations of 80,000 tribal Chakma refugees in India. The repatriations of the Chakmas from India started soon after and the last batch of Chakmas returned to Bangladesh in February 1998. The resolution of the Chakma problem, which had given rise to several problems and social

tensions, was a welcome development. In the meanwhile in January 1998 India-Bangladesh and Pakistan held a Trilateral Business Summit. At the end of Summit they issued a 15-point joint declaration stressing closer economic cooperation for consolidating and strengthening the ongoing effort for achieving sustainable development of the region. The Declaration expressed commitment to liberalisation of trade in the region, and reaffirmed the goal of achieving a free trade area in South Asia by 2001. The leaders of the three countries also agreed to provide special trade concessions for the less developed countries of the region on non-reciprocal basis for the development of equitable trade relations.

In June 1999, Prime Minister Vajpayee, in order to promote good neighbourly relations with the countries of sub-continent, introduced a Calcutta-Dacca Bus Service. A hope was expressed that the bus service would bring the people of the two countries closer and contributes to their social and economic prosperity. On 20th June, 1999, the two countries signed another agreement under which India agreed to provide credit of Rs. 200 corers during the next three years to enable Bangladesh to buy transport equipment and capital goods from India for its infrastructural development. India also agreed to extend duty-free concessions on selected Bangladesh items without insisting on any reciprocal arrangement. It is true that the range of commodities and goods which Bangladesh can offer to India is very limited, but this step would certainly give a boost to regional co-operation among the SAARC countries.

During the BJP regime the party tried to keep the promised to make good relation and maintain cooperation with neighbouring countries.

After BJP in the year of 2004 UPA Government got the majority in Lok Sabha with the help of other political parties. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh also followed the traditional way of relations. But the relation became strained when insurgent groups of north-eastern India and few terrorist groups take shelter to Bangladesh and use the Bangladeshi hilly regions on their training camp. India present all this report to Bangladesh Government and when they simply denied the true sustained of this report. And also said that they should do nothing in this regard.

But Bangladesh now on the power of military rule which make hindrances to return of democracy in the country and tries to abolish the party system from the country, the military government at the beginning of their power maintained good relation with the country like India but their way of ruling and denial of the presence of terrorist groups in the country strained the relation between the two countries. Some claimed had been made and some tension was generated in the Indo- Bangladesh relations in November 2002 when India's Deputy Prime Minister (L.K. Advani) expressed concern over the growing activities of the Inter-Service Intelligence (ISI) of Pakistan and the Al-Qaeda in Bangladesh. He further alleged that the insurgent groups in the north-east of India were getting refugee in Bangladesh. India's External Affairs Minister (Yashwant Sinha) also told the Lok Sabha that the Pakistan mission in Dhaka had become the nerve-centre of the ISI activities. It was encouraging terrorism, illegal drug trafficking and is also involved in the counterfeit currency racket in India.

The two also signed agreements for textile imports and exports. In 1995 the two countries reached an agreement for cooperation in the field of defence with a view to promote commercial relations. A special body known as US-India Commercial Alliance was created with a view to expand commercial and business relations between the two countries.

Performance of the party in peace keeping

The first phase of non-alignment started in 1947 and lasted till the Korean War in 1950. During this phase Nehru formulated the basis principles of Indian Foreign Policy and tried to give shape to the policy of non-alignment. On the various issues like recognition of West Germany and Korean War India took a stand which was close to the Western view. However, India also raised voice against forces of Western Imperialism in Asia and accorded recognition to Communist China much against the wishes of United States and other Western Countries. In short, despite tilt towards West, India tried to follow an independent foreign policy.

The second phase of the development of non-alignment lasted from 1950 to 1957. During this period the principles of non-alignment were elaborated and clearly

formulated. India became less apprehensive about Soviet Union after the death of Stalin on account of change in Soviet policy towards non-communist states like India who had refused to join the Western military alliance. The tension generated between India and USA on account of latter's decision to provide arms aid to Pakistan under SEATO, refusal to support India on the Goa issue, and India's agreement with China over Tibet also improved the chances of closer relations with Soviet Union. The leaders of India and Soviet Union exchanged visits in 1955 which resulted in closer trade and cultural relations between the two. Soviet Union also extended economic and technical aid to India. During this period the pro-West leaning in Indian foreign policy could and effort was made to develop closer relations with both the communists and non-communist countries. This phase also witnessed the adoption of *Panchsheel*, five principles of peaceful co-existence.

The third phase of non-alignment lasted 1957 to the death of Jawaharlal Nehru 1964. During this phase once again India drew closer to America and other Western powers. Several factors contributed to this. In the elections of 1957 the Communists emerged as a strong force which was not linked by Congress. Further a border dispute arose with China which convinced India about the expansionist intentions of China. On the other hand the country was faced serious food shortage, which obliged her to look for western help. In the wake of Chinese attack on India in 1962, there was strong demand for abandonment of policy of non-alignment and there was a definite swing in favour of the West, because only USA and Britain were readily agreed to provide arms to India to meet the Chinese threat. Despite growing pressure Nehru refused to abandon policy of non-alignment because that would drag India into Cold War and harm nation interests of India in the long run.

During this phase Nehru along with Egypt and Yugoslavia took initiative to popularise policy of non-alignment and tried to convert it into a movement. In 1961 the first Summit Conference of non-aligned countries was held at Belgrade and non-aligned movement was formally launched at the international level.

The fourth phase of non-alignment lasted from 1964 to 1977. After the death of Nehru in May 1964, Lal Bahadur Shastri became the Prime Minister. Soon after assumption of

office he announced that his government would continue to follow policy of non-alignment. Actually this policy paid great dividend during the Indo-Pak war of 1965, because despite the fact that Pakistan a member of the Western Military Alliances, U.S. did not openly come in support of Pakistan. On the other hand America imposed a ban on military aid and sale of arms to both India and Pakistan. Again India was able to get support of USSR in the UN Security Council on account of being non-aligned. Mrs. Indira Gandhi, who succeeded Shastri in January 1965, also announced her decision to continue with policy of non-alignment. This paid dividend because India was able to secure food aid from USA and economic and military help from Soviet Union. The set back suffered by Mrs. Indira Gandhi in the elections of 1967 compelled her to draw closer to the Communists and she proceeded with the enactment of several socialist measures viz., nationalisation of banks and abolition of privy purses of Indian princes. Along with these postures, the bitter criticism of US policy in Vietnam brought India closer to Soviet Union. These close relations with Soviet Union ultimately culminated in the signing of Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation with USSR in 1971. This treaty while securing Soviet support for India under certain circumstances did not in any way curtail her right to follow loyalty of non-alignment. In fact there after also India continued to work for the strengthening of non-aligned movement. The détente between two super powers in 1970's also did not affect Indian non-alignment. However during this period national interest was accorded higher priority in the contents of non-alignment.

The fifth phase of non-alignment lasted for only three years from 1977 to 1980. During this period the first non-Congress government was formed in India by growing apprehension that this would lead to cooling of relations with Soviet Union and development of closer relations with United States. However in actual practice the Janata Government did not make any drastic change in the policy of non-alignment. It soon got disillusioned with America due to delay in the supply of enriched uranium for use in the Tarapur Atomic Power Plant and pressure on India to sign the non-proliferation Treaty. It also appreciated the advantage of friendship with Soviet Union and established an Indo-Soviet Joint Commission for economic Co-operation. In fact

during its rule Janata Party tried to develop even handed relations with USA, Soviet Union and China.

The final phase of non-alignment which started in 1980 and is still continuing, witnessed the re-establishment of traditional non-alignment policy. After return to power in January 1980, Mrs. Indira Gandhi made a bid to revive close relations with Soviet Union, but did not meet with full success. Differences cropped up between the two on account of presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan. During this period India's relations also got strained with USA due to supply of highly sophisticated military hardware to Pakistan. Despite these differences Mrs. Indira Gandhi's period was able to develop co-operative relations with the two super powers.

The policy of non-alignment further matured in the 1980's and India played an important role in the popularisation of non-aligned movement. After her assassination in 1984 Rajiv Gandhi also followed policy of non-alignment vigorously. India as Chairman of NAM for three years played an active and leading role in popularising the movement. After the fall of Rajiv Gandhi in 1989, the National Front Government of V.P. Singh continued with policy followed by the predecessors.

In 1990's in view of the drastic changes in the international arena viz., end of Cold War, Gulf Crisis, collapse of Soviet Union, emergence of unipolarism, etc. doubts were expressed about the relevance of non-alignment in the changed context. Narsimha Rao Government which came to power in 1991 reaffirmed its faith in non-alignment. In the 1992 NAM Summit at Jakarta India played leading role in highlighting various issues like disarmament, terrorism etc.

The United Front Government which assumed power under Dave Gowda in June 1996 and the new United Front Government which succeeded it in 1997 also persisted with policy of non-alignment. BJP led Coalition Government of Atal Bihari Vajpayee also continued to adhere to policy of non-alignment and now Congress lead Coalition Government UPA also continues India's faith on non-alignment.

After collapsed of Dave Gowda's government, next government set up by Indar Kumar Gujral. And this new government also was taken to develop the non-alignment movement. "Aspects of India's Foreign Policy" a speech by I.K. Gujral in the Bandarnaike Centre for International Studies in Colombo, Sri Lanka on January 20, 1997 he expressed : "We were amongst those who pioneered the concept of Non-Alignment, a movement which today embraces over 110 countries in its fold. Through the UN and the NAM, India has consistently sought to build a better world by strength the structures of International Cooperation. We have spoken in every International Body during debate of any consequence to express our view point and our voice of moderation and reason invariably been heard and respected. In this context, I am particularly proud that, in this 50th year of its independence, India will host the Ministerial Conference of the NAM.

Today, more than ever, there is need for the developing countries of the world to have a much greater voice within Councils of the UN. The Non-Alignment Movement too needs be remigration. Together, we seek a renewed co-commitment to multilateralism, a new international partnership economic development and cooperation against terrorism. We also seek a more peaceful and secure world for all through genuine and comprehensive disarmament including the total elimination of nuclear weapons."

All parties in India support the policy of Non- Alignment. Indian National Congress and Left parties expressed a similar view that India should maintain this policy for internal development.

After independence, India from every possible platform carried out a crusade against nuclear weapons and tried to wear the away from the path of nuclear armaments. Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of India and in-Charge of the Department of Atomic Energy stated on more than one occasions that India had nothing to do with the purpose only. India has been a consistent opponent of the nuclear weapons ever since independence.

At the various international forums also India advocated the elimination and prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. As early as 1948, India's representative told U.N. General Assembly that India stands for the exploitation of the nuclear energy only for

peaceful purpose. India was willing to concede necessary powers to the International Atomic Development Authority to ensure peaceful uses of the nuclear energy. However, India firmly opposed the idea of giving to that authority any power which restricted the national sovereignty of a nation.

India stood for complete eliminating of the nuclear weapons and asserted that the contention of USA and USSR "that the atomic weapons would be used only to resist aggression" was not valid. Thus Krishna Menon told the plenary meeting of the General Assembly that to talk of use of atomic weapons for limited purposes was fantastic. He said: "We shall never support in any circumstances, even if it happens to be pushed to a doctrine which says that the atomic weapons may be used as an instrument of war."

After the Sino-Indian conflict, in view of the possibility of China acquiring an atom bomb there was a strong demand from certain quarters, that India should undertake production of nuclear weapons as a part of country's long term defence effort against China. This demand grew lock dear often after the Chinese exploded a bomb in 1964. The then Prime Minister (Lal Bahadur Shastri) while sharing the concern of the people and Members of Parliament reiterated the decision of his government not to produce the atom bomb for moral as well as practical considerations. He said that making of nuclear weapons would neither be in the interest of the country, nor would it benefit the mankind in any way. On practical grounds also he ruled out the bomb because it was bound to adversely affect the national economy of the country.

In the wake of Indo-Pak War in 1965 and the menacing postures adopted by China, a memorandum containing signatures of about 100 Members of Parliament belonging to all parties was presented to the Prime Minister demanding an immediate decision to develop nuclear weapons. However, the leadership ruled out any change in the policy and continued to express faith in the principles of utilising the nuclear energy for peaceful purpose only.

After the explosion of third bomb by China in May 1966 – the demand for production of bomb by India grew still louder. In the election manifesto of 1969 a number of political parties included the manufacture of nuclear weapons and missiles as their programme.

They insisted on the need of harnessing of the atom bomb both for peaceful development as well as for the manufacture of nuclear weapons.

In August, 1967, the two Super Powers proposed a non-proliferation Treaty at the Geneva Conference. India expressed its opposition to the treaty on the ground that the treaty would deprive the non-nuclear countries of the benefits of the development of peaceful nuclear technology. Swarn Sing, the then Defence Minister told the UN General Assembly on 6 October 1966 – “While the Government of India continue to be in favour of the proliferation of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes, an essential means by which the developing countries can get benefit from the best advances of science and technology in this field.” Similarly the Indian Representative told the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee that “India is willing to agree to international regulation under a non-discriminatory and universal system of safeguards to ensure that no country manufacture or stock pieces nuclear weapons” while undertaking research and development of peaceful nuclear explosives. The opposition of India to the non-Proliferation Treaty was in the main on account of the fact that it neither assured equality to all nations, big or small, nuclear weapons states or non-nuclear weapons states, non conceded equal rights to all countries to take the atom. On the other hand it sought to keep the existing international power structure intact completely disregarding the aspiration of the developing countries.

All the parties of India supported the peaceful use of Nuclear Energy and really to accept the establish nuclear research centres, experimental nuclear reactors, experimental nuclear reactors, nuclear reactor and nuclear power plants. During Mrs. Indira Gandhi's era India carried out its first underground nuclear experiment for peaceful purposes in the Pokhran range of Rajasthan desert on 18 May 1974. The Jan Sangh leaders while endorsing the government stand of developing nuclear energy for peaceful purposes insisted that time had come when India's defence arrangement must also be given a nuclear dimension. L.K. Advani, in his Presidential address to Jan Sangh said on 3 March 1975. “The influence which China has come to wield in global matters owns not small measures to its nuclear ability. Let us not dilly dally on this question any longer and unmindful of the annoyance, and displeasure of Super Powers let us decided to give India's defence a nuclear discussion.” However, the government did not favour

abandonment of its traditional policy and continued to insist on use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes only.

India's policy regarding peaceful use of nuclear underwent a change under Morarji Desai's government which took the stand that India would not conduct another peaceful nuclear explosion. But after returning in power Mrs. Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the government reiterated that India was fully committed to pursue a peaceful nuclear policy and would not hesitate to conduct peaceful nuclear explosion for the promotion of indigenous nuclear research and technology.

India has taken lack interest in nuclear disarmament and has been actively working with leaders of Sweden, Greece, Mexico, Argentina and Tanzania to promote nuclear disarmament. The leaders of these six countries have been meeting at regular intervals and urging the nuclear power to work for nuclear disarmament. They held such meeting at New Delhi, Ixtapa (Mexico) and Stockholm.

In the special session of the UN on Disarmament in June 1988 Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi proposed a three-stage time bound action plan to eliminate all nuclear weapons by 2010. He proposed that in the first state the INF Treaty should be followed by 50% out in Soviet and US strategic arsenals. All production of nuclear weapons and weapon grade fissionable material should cease immediately. To set the stage for negotiations on a comprehensive test ban treaty, moratorium on testing of nuclear weapons should be immediately imposed. He also proposed banning other weapons of mass destruction and suggested steps for precluding the development of new weapons systems based on emerging technologies. He emphasised that negotiations must commence in the first stage itself for a new treaty to replace the NPT which was due to expire in 1995. The new treaty should give legal effect to the binding commitment of nuclear weapon states to eliminate all nuclear arms by the year 2010.

In January 1993 India along with more than 60 nations, including five permanent members of the Security Council signed the Paris Convention which prohibits the use of and elimination of chemical weapons within fifteen years. The Convention also contains strong provisions for international inspections of suspected violation. It is noteworthy

that India decided to sign the Convention obligations of the member states regarding possessions and elimination of weapons in a time phased manner under a stringent verification regime. On the other hand refused to sign the NPT because it did not eliminate weapons discrimination in favour of nuclear powers and did not provide for an effective verification. Explaining India's stand on NPT, Prime Minister Narashimha Rao in June 1992 "India could not sign the NPT because its being a discriminatory treaty ... 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. There are some countries which do possess the capacity to produce weapons but have not chosen to do so. Nuclear war would however, affect all the countries – the haves (nuclear haves) and have notes. The only solutions to this complicated situation were that the nuclear weapon states should agree to dismantle the weapons within a stipulated period. The so called threshold states should give an undertaking that they will not cross the threshold and there could be a ban on the testing of such weapons and the production of fissile material. And at the end of the stipulated period it must be ensured that there were no nuclear weapons anywhere in the world.

In October 1993, India gave a call for international Convention of non use of Nuclear weapons and freeze on the production of such weapons fissile material for atomic arms. It pleaded that the problem of elimination of nuclear weapons can be resolved in the same manner in which the Conventions on Chemical Weapons had sought to eliminate the Chemical Weapons without discrimination.

In May 1995, when a global conference on extension of Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) was held in New York and the general consensus was in favour of permanent extensions of NPT, India refused to support the extension of NPT on account of its discriminatory nature, because the treaty permitted only five countries – the United States, the United Kingdom, Russia, China and France to legally possess nuclear weapon capability. (In other words, the extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty was virtually a declaration by the nuclear weapons states that they have exclusive right to hold nuclear weapons in perpetuity. Further, the nuclear weapon states were not willing to accept the goal of finally moving towards 'nuclear weapon free world'.

Again in 1996, when the question of approval of Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) arose, India voted against it on the ground that it would sign the treaty only after the nuclear five agreed on a time table for total removal of nuclear weapons. The treaty according to India was defective in so far as it does not have a fixed deadline for the elimination of all nuclear weapons. India's chief negotiator Arundhati Ghosh, declared in General Assembly that 'India would never sign this unequal treaty not now, not later until the major nuclear powers formulated a time table for elimination of their nuclear arsenal'. The India's External Affairs Minister (I.K. Gujral) however made it clear that the decision not to sign the CTBT does not mean that we are going in for new weapons, particularly nuclear weapons. It may be observed that the decision of the Government of India to oppose the CTBT was based on open and intense national debate and reflected the national consensus.

Though Indian political parties are keen to developed nuclear weapons since 1967. Even before the fourth General Election every political party enthralled the development of nuclear arms in their election manifesto. In August 1967, the two superpowers proposed a non-proliferation treaty at the General Conference. India expressed its opposition to the treaty on the ground that the treaty would deprive the non-nuclear countries of the benefits of development of peaceful nuclear technology. The opposition of India to the Non-Proliferation Treaty was in the main account of the fact that it neither assured equality to all nations, big or small, nuclear weapons states or non-nuclear weapons states, nor conceded equal rights to all countries to tame the atom. On the other hand it sought to keep the existing international power structure intact, completely disregarding the aspirations of the developing countries. And India was concentrated for peaceful use of nuclear power.

Again in 1995, Indira returned to join Her hands with the view of extension Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Another obstacle had been created by the West Pole to stop nuclear progress for the developing countries known as Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

The United Nations General Assembly on 10 September, 1996 approved the resolution on Nuclear Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) moved by Australia and co-

sponsored by 126 countries. India, Bhutan and Libya voted against the treaty while Lebanon, Syria, Mauritius, Tanzania and Cuba abstained.

India voted against the agreement saying it would not sign the treaty in order to block it from becoming law. India has said the treaty is flawed because it does not include provisions for disarmament. India has also expressed its concern that major powers could refine their arsenals despite the treaty by using highly advanced tests that did not involve nuclear explosive. Neighbouring Pakistan also refused to sign the agreement as long as India opposed it. The backgrounds of development of nuclear power in India were:

- a) A call for cessation of nuclear tests was made by Jawaharlal Nehru in 1954.
- b) India signed partial Test Ban Treaty in 1963 which banned nuclear weapon tests in atmosphere, outer space and under water.
- c) India's only peaceful nuclear test was the underground explosion in Pokhran (Rajasthan) in May 1974. Since then India has kept its nuclear option open.
- d) Talks on a ban on nuclear testing started at the Conferences on Disarmament (COD) in Geneva in January 1994 India and US are among the original co-sponsors.
- e) After the permanent and indefinite extension of the NPT in May 1995, India liked the signing of CTBT with a time-bound plan for global disarmament. This was done because the NPT failed to tackle disarmament, which is one of its fundamental aims. The other two aims are non-proliferation and peaceful use of nuclear energy.
- f) In addition to the five nuclear powers US, UK, France, Russia and China – India, Pakistan and Israel are "Threshold Countries" capable of developing nuclear weapons.

- g) CTBT seeks to achieve a total ban on nuclear testing. 61 countries are participating in the talks to decide the political and legal basis for the treaty.

From Jawaharlal Nehru to present days UPA government's Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, all the Prime Ministers accepted the importance of needs of nuclear power but certainly only for peaceful purposes. After attained the independence India faced problems and in maximum times she has been got trouble in regarding the security problem. So she needs something which not creates trouble for others but must helpful for her. After the first General Election India was not so concerned about increased in the matter of arsenal but changes on the outer world created a condition of security treat and as a result we find 1974 Pokhran incident. Just to show that India can do if she wants. But super powers were not agreed about power enhancement. First NPT then CTBT they were the just result of affluent unhappiness of few third world power structure. India and many few countries were not ready to support that kind of bindings. And to make it sure that India only uses nuclear power for peaceful purposes. She had evinced keen interest in disarmament India as a non-aligned country also played an important role in promoting disarmament and critical approach towards both the super powers. After the Chinese aggression of 1962, India started attaching equal importance to nuclear weapons and conventional disarmament. On 16 September 2000 India established a permanent decision to the Conference on Disarmament. Despite being a nuclear state, India combined to plead for a nuclear weapons free world. At the Nuclear Weapons Convention, India continued to press for a Convention that will prohibit forever the development, production, stockpiling, use or threat of use of nuclear weapons and provide for elimination of all existing weapons under international verification. India has repeatedly asserted its policy of non first use of nuclear weapons and pleaded with the internal community to take decisive steps to de-legitimize nuclear weapons.

"The U.S. and India are poised for a partnership that will be crucial in shaping the international order in the 21st Century"

- David C. Malford
(American Ambassador posted in India)

"The United States is serious about its vision for the U.S. – India relationship and we are working hard with our Indian counterparts to make it happen".

- Condoleezza Rice

(Secretary of State)

The United States and India are elevating their relations on all fronts. Trade is increasing. More people are travelling between our countries than ever before for work, study and vacations. Our two countries than ever before for work, study and vacations. Our two governments and private sectors are discussing bold new initiatives in availing space and energy cooperation, including new areas in nuclear energy. The U.S. and India are forging a bilateral defence agenda that was unthinkable four years ago.

After attainment of independence, India tried to develop friendship relations with United States of America. The Indian leaders acknowledge with gratitude the positive role played by the American President in exercising pressure on the British Government to expedite the grant of independence of India. Further the democratic ideals of America also greatly also greatly facilitated the Indian leaders, specially Nehru, and they tried to develop intimate relations with Us. Despite this the relations between the two could not develop along friendly line. No doubt the two countries succeeded in establishing useful trade and economic links, but their political relations continued to witness frequent ups and downs. The main factor which hampered the development of intimate mature relations between the two countries was difference in their foreign policy perception. India decided to keep out of the prevailing cold war and refused to join either of the two power blocks because it would have restricted her freedom of action. Instead India decided to pursue policy of non-alignment bared on the principle of seeking friendly relations with all and judging each issue on its merits. This was not liked by the United States, which considered this as an unfriendly act towards her.

U.S. Secretary of State (John Foster Dulles) declared, "Those who are not with us are against us". The refusal of India to join the military alliances sponsored by USA and different stand taken by it on various international issues, viz., grant of independence to

Indonesia and recognition of the Communist region of China was also quite annoying to the American leaders.

On the other hand, India did not like her partial approach of United States on the Kashmir issue. In January 1948 when India took the Kashmir of the dispute, it expected that America shall support the legal accession of Kashmir to India. Contrary to Indian expectation United States supported Pakistan on the issue.

In 1956 Nehru undertook a visit to USA with a view to improve relations with her. But the visit failed to produce the desired result, except that India was able to secure some food aid from United States. Some improvement in their relations took place as a result of their common stand on Suez Crisis in 1956. But the reluctance of India to criticize Soviet intervention in Hungary, and opposition to the American involvement in Lebanon (Middle East) further led to cooling of relations between the two. The prospects of improvement of relations between India and USA improved following visit of U.S. President Eisenhower to India in 1959.

However, despite differences in the political fields, the economic relations between the two countries showed considerable improvement. In 1960 India entered into PL 480 Agreement with United States under which the later agreed to supply food grains to India against rupee payment. USA also helped in the training of the Indian agricultural experts and helped in the establishment of agriculture research institutes in India. In addition USA also provided aid for the completion of various multipurpose projects and health projects.

During the tenure of Lal Bahadur Shastri or Prime Minister, Indo-US relations continued to make steady progress because President Johnson continued the liberal policy of Kennedy. In 1963 the two countries signed an agreement for the supply of enrichment of uranium fuel for Tarapore Atomic Power Station. In 1965, the Indo-US relations setback following Indian criticism of US bombing of North Vietnam. The relations became so bitter that President Johnson refused to receive Prime Minister Shastri in USA in May 1965. This led to rise of acute US feeling in India. In the United Nations also United States instead of supporting of India's stand on Kashmir suggested that a

political solution of the problem should be found. In view of the strained relations between the two countries United States stopped all aid to India, except food aid under PL: 420. The dominant role played by Soviet Union in bringing the Indo-Pak War to a close by arranging Conference at Tashkent also contributed to the straining relations between the two countries.

INDO-US RELATIONS FROM 1966-77:

After assumption of power in 1966 Mrs. Indira Gandhi made a serious bid to improve relations with USA. She paid a visit to USA in a bid to improve relations with USA. However, she could achieve only limited success and only succeeded in getting cuts in aid to India restored and that too after India agreed to devalue Indian rupee. Thereafter India's relations with US continued to cool on account of India's growing friendship with Soviet Union. India's relations with US took a turn for the worst after assumption of power by Nixon (1960-1974). Nixon tried to reduce US commitment in Asia and adopted a foreign policy which aimed at preserving the dominant position of America in international politics by checking expanding role of Soviet Union. He also tried to bring about rapprochement with China.

The Indo-British relations reached on all time low in 1971 following India's signing of Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation with the Soviet Union and her involvement in Bangladesh war of 1971. During the Indo-Pak war of 1971, United States took a clearly pro-Pakistan stand and charged India of interfering in the internal affairs of Pakistan. US administration even used Gun Boat Diplomacy to pressurise India and dispatched the US 7th Fleet to the Bay of Bengal. US also stopped economic assistance and supply of defence equipments to India. In the subsequent months also India's relations with USA continued to be bitter. Decision of India to upgrade her diplomatic with North Vietnam also contributed to their bitterness.

Some improvement in the relations between India and USA took place in 1973 when USA decided to write off nearly 2/3rd of the accumulated PL 480 funds. But soon difference over Vietnam, Diego Garcia and resumption of US military supplies to Pakistan gave a set back to relations between two countries. In 1974 US bitterly criticised India's

peaceful Nuclear Explosion which was not liked by India. In the midst of deteriorating relations Dr. Henry Kissinger, U.S. Secretary of State paid a visit to India in October 1974 with a view to effect an improvement in relations with India. On 28 October, 1974 the two countries signed an agreement for the establishment of Joint Indo-US Commission on Economic, Commercial, Scientific, Technological, Educational and Cultural cooperation. The prospects of improvement of relations between India and United States further improved due to end of Vietnam War, emerging détente between USA and Soviet Union and resumption US economic aid to India. But the criticism of imposition of emerging by Mrs. Mrs. Indira Gandhi in September 1975 was greatly resented by the Indian government and it drew closer to Soviet Union. All this resulted in coldness in the Indo-US relations.

Indo-US Relations during Janata Government:

After the formation of Government by the Janata Party in 1977, the prospects of improvement of relations with USA considerably improved. Indian Prime Minister (Morarji Desai) and Foreign Minister (Atal Bihari Vajpayee) affirmed their resolve to follow a genuine policy of non-alignment. This gave rise to the hope that the relations between two countries would become friendly and cooperative. In January 1978 President Carter paid a visit to India to impart new warmth to the Indo-US relations but he did not succeed. On the differences developed between the Indo-US on the issue refusing the signing the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty on the ground of being discriminatory and harmful. In 1978 India Prime Minister paid a visit to America to promote better cooperation between the two countries. Thus during the Janata Government, despite best effort by the Indian Government, India's relations with USA could make only limited progress.

Indo-US Relations in 1980's:

In 1980 there was change of leadership in India as well as USA. In India Mrs. Mrs. Indira Gandhi staged a come back, while in USA Regan assumed office as President. No doubt the two leaders made a bid to evolve friendly and cooperative relations, but these relations lacked warmth and depth. In fact the relations between the two countries

got strained to different stands on various issues. India refused to rally on the side of United States in the anti-Soviet Crusades over Afghanistan and advocated withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan at appropriate time. The decision of the US Government to provide arms aid and sell sophisticated weapons to Pakistan despite strong protests from India also contributed to tension. In addition to the above a number of other factors also contributed to the straining in relations between two countries. These included denial of critically needed nuclear fuel for the Tarapore Atomic Power Station on the plea that India had not signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and refused to accept full scope safeguards (USA did not insist on similar conditions with regard to China); growing military presence of USA in the Indian Ocean and the Indian demand for dismantling of the U.S. base in Diego Garcia and its unity and stability by encouraging agitations in Assam, Punjab etc. Despite the above irritants, the leaders of the two countries showed keenness to improve relations. The regular exchange of visits by high level officials of the two countries was a clear proof of their intentions to improve relations.

With the assumption of power by Rajiv Gandhi, the youngest Prime Minister in 1985 there was great optimism about improved relations between two largest democracies. In 1985 Rajiv Gandhi undertook a visit to USA to repair the badly strained relations of the two countries. The United States also responded favourably and agreed to the transfer of high technology (including the sale of high speed computers) and offered advanced military technology and weapons. As a follow up action of the several agreements reached between Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and President Regan on 5 November, 1987 the two countries signed an agreement on cooperation in high technology. Despite these developments the relations between the two countries continued to be far from friendly account of induction of sophisticated arms into Pakistan even after the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan and the emerging rapprochement between India and Pakistan. The growing presence of the United States in the Indian Ocean was also viewed with disfavour by India. Even on the issue of Afghanistan sharp differences existed between the two countries. While India fully supported Najibullah Government and established diplomatic contacts with that government, USA was determined to replace that government by a friendly government

in Afghanistan. India did not approve of the aid being provided by United States to the Mujahideens and regarded it as an interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. Thus despite numerous bids by the leaders of the two countries relations between India and USA could not remain that cordial. In fact as a result of US decision to invoke Super 301 Law against India and branding of Indian as an unfair trade partner further tension was generated in their relations. However, the Indian Government decided to adopt a low profile on this issue to avoid confrontation with USA.

Indo-US Relations in 1990's:

With the assumption of power by the National Front Government in India in 1989, fresh efforts were initiated to improve relation with USA. The Government also responded quite favourably and suspended action against India under Super 301. A change in US attitude was further evident from the fact that for the first time it warned Pakistan against extending support to the militants and terrorists operating in Kashmir from its soil and impressed on her that such support constituted a violation of the UN Charter. United States also for the first time revised its stand on Kashmir and said, "The U.S. Government no longer urges a plebiscite on Kashmir contained in the UN resolutions of 1948 and 1949, neither do we oppose or rule it out, should the parties agree in view of the Shimla Accord". India also adopted quite co-operative attitude towards USA during the Gulf War of 1990-91 and providing refuelling facilities to the American military transport aircrafts bound for the war zone in the Gulf, even at the cost of international as well as international criticism.

The end of the Cold War and disintegration of the Soviet Union further obliged India to develop closer relations with United States in view of the dominant role – it was expected to play in the international arena. India agreed to increase military cooperation with USA by according consent in principle to the Kissinger proposals. This was a significant development in view of the fact that India agreed to enter into a military agreement and work for bringing about stability through expanded cooperation in all fields. However, differences still persisted between the two countries on several issues US continued to exert pressure on India to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) despite her persistent resistance to signing the treaty on the plea of security threats

from both Pakistan and China. USA also continued to criticise India for alleged violation of Human Rights. On the other hand India expressed unhappiness over growing US control over the United Nations and demanded democratisation of the international organisation. Specially, the Security Council. Differences also persisted between the two countries on issues of New International Economic Order (NIEO), Uruguay Round, Nuclear Disarmament and other issues. But despite these differences the two countries were convinced of the need of strengthening their bilateral relations. In fact in May 1992 the two countries held joint naval exercises in the Indian Ocean, which marked the beginning of a new era of increased defence cooperation between two countries.

The policy of economic liberalisation and market economy adopted by India also facilitated development of closer relations with United States. The policy of liberalization of imports, decontrol, decimalisation, political convertibility of rupee etc. announced by India in the budget of 1992 was welcomed by the Americans administration and business. They saw in it a big opportunity for the export of American goods and flow of US expertise to India. In fact, India was obliged to welcome western aid, technology, import and capital because after the disintegration of Soviet Union India's trade suffered a great setback. Further, India also lost an important source of supply of arms on this account. The two countries were also drawn closer to each other on account of common interests like promotion of democratic rule, preservation of regional and world peace, opposition to Islamic fundamentalism and furthering of mutual trade and investment. Above all America felt that in the changed context the geo-strategic significance of Pakistan had greatly decreased and it no longer needed Pakistan to funnel military supplies into Afghanistan. It therefore decided to improve relations with India on account of vast size, population and strategic location. In June 1994 US decided not to take any action against India under US Trade Special 301, and preferred to enter into negotiations with India on lightening up its provisions relating to international property rights. In December 1994 the two countries signed accords for promotion of cooperation in the energy sector. The two also signed agreements for textile imports and exports. In 1995 the two countries reached an agreement for cooperation in the field of defence with a view to promote commercial relations. A special body known as US-India

Commercial Alliance was created with a view to expand commercial and business relations between the two countries.

In 1995 (during the period of Narasimha Rao) the two countries made a serious bid to improve and expand their relations. For this purpose the high level officials of two countries exchanged several visits. But this purpose suffered a serious set back following US decision to modify the Pressler Amendment in September 1995 which paved the way for arms transfer worth \$370 million to Pakistan and return of money for sale of 28 F-16 aircrafts from sale to a third country. In addition to the above there are several other irritants present in Indo-US relations. While US is a status quo power which seeks to preserve the present hierarchical international system based on inequality of wealth, status and power, India on the other hand stands for changing this system with a view to improve the access of developing countries to global wealth, status and power. The two countries also had differences over Tarapore reactor and the cryogenic engine sale. Tension was also generated between the two due to differences with regard to intellectual property rights and threat of USA to impose the Super 301 clause on India. Further, India has favoured a time bound programme of reduction of nuclear arsenals of the nuclear states not accepted to USA. India's opposition to the non-proliferation treaty as well as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty was another cause of irritation between the two countries. Despite this economic relations between the two countries have grown more intimate due to policy of economic liberation followed by India during the last few years. Further, the two countries have also reached agreement regarding cooperation in the military and naval exercises. Efforts of China to expand its influence in the region have also obliged USA to think of closer relations with India because India alone could be a balancing factor in the Asian politics.

After 1997 Congress was no longer able to capture power of nation. And nation started to experience with the government of Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) with the head of Prime Minister A.B. Vajpayee. But there was not any shortage of effort to make cordial relations with USA. Vajpayee's expanding hands for Pakistan with Bus diplomacy returned back by Kargil War, but India was failed to make it sure that all the people who illegally captured the mountain picks of Kashmir were the Pakistan's trained soldier not the persons unknown to Parvez Musaraf. The date of 11th September 2001 a day of

terror, attacks twin tower of USA and brought dead of more than thousand innocent pushed US closer to India and 13 December 2001 Parliament attacks also made a promised that both the countries will fight against terrorism together.

Next step of Indo-US relation start in new way in 2004 by the establishment of UPA government. At the new beginning of relation described by US Secretary of State – Condoleezza Rice:

"From the beginning of President Bush's administration, I have been privileged to pursue his vision for a growing strategic partnership between our great democracies.

On my recent visit to India and while meeting with Foreign Minister Singh in Washington in April, I outlined concrete steps with India's leaders to make this vision a reality. At a time when President Bush has made the spread of freedom his highest foreign policy priority, few tasks are more important than building the closest possible relationship between the United States and India, the World's two largest multicultural democracies. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's upcoming visit to the United States is an important opportunity to move this agenda forward.

The Next Steps in Strategic Partnership (NSSP) initiative launched in January 2004 allowed us to open a dialogue and build trust on a number of sensitive areas; including high-technology, trade, civil, nuclear cooperation, space and missile defence. In March 2005 the US and India agreed to build on this success and significantly broaden our agreement.

We have launched a number of forward-looking initiatives that address both our nations' interests. One is an Energy Dialogue that seeks to expand cooperation in areas such as clean energy and civil nuclear energy. Another is a revitalized Economic Dialogue that includes for the first time, a forum of Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) from leading corporations to advise our governments on how to accelerate our economic cooperation.

India is an increasingly important partner for the United States and we welcome its emergence as a global power in the 21st Century. I look forward to working with India's leaders as we reach for new heights in our cooperation."

To make an intimate relation with USA, Indian Prime Minister. Dr. Manmohan Singh and US President Bush met in New York on September 21, 2004 and in Moscow May 9, 2005. They met again in Washington on July 18, 2005. This visit will mark the next stage to expand and deepen the U.S.-India relationship and build on the recent high-level exchanges and initiatives between the two governments. The two leaders will touch upon all aspects of U.S.-India cooperation, including economic, energy and strategic elements. In this year the United States and India are elevating their relation on all fronts. Trade is increasing. These two country's governments and private sectors were discussing bold new initiatives in aviation, space and energy cooperation, including new areas in nuclear energy. The US and India were forging a bilateral agenda that was unthinkable four years ago. President Bush's vision of a strategic partnership between the United States and India in the 21st Century is becoming a reality.

The United States welcomes India's emergence as a global power and recognizes that both our countries must act to ensure that our values and interests support their bilateral relations and help us shape a free, safe and prosperous world in the new century.

At the field of energy, India and the United States have dynamic economies with growing energy needs. President Bush said recently that the United States as a net importer of energy, especially of hydro carbons, must work with countries like India to reduce our common dependence on fossil fuels if we are to have robust growth in the 21st Century.

Two countries had launched an Energy Dialogue on May 31, 2005 to do just this led by U.S. Secretary of Energy Samuel Bodman and Deputy Chairman of India's Planning Commission Montech Singh Aluwalia, the dialogue will build upon the broad range of existing energy cooperation and develop new avenues of collaboration. It will address all energy issues that are common to our economies: Civil nuclear cooperation and nuclear

safety, environment-friendly renewable energy and energy efficient technologies, coal power and clean coal, and oil and gas.

India and United States were deepening strategic partnership moving beyond the next steps in Strategic Partnership (NSSP) to a Strategic Dialogue, Global and regional security problems, high-technology trades, space and a deeper engagement on India's legitimate defence needs, including co-production of defence equipment are now on the agenda.

The progress is striking high technology and dual-use trade items that have both military and civilian applications and that require a license for export has increased significantly. Data available in 2005 show that licensing changes introduced in 2004 had a significant impact on bilateral trade – especially in terms of the number of items that no longer require licenses.

The positive impact of the United State causing of licensing requirements on bilateral trade with the Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO) and its subordinates is already having an effect. Ten million of dollars in additional transactions could be spurred by additional lifting of licensing requirements. A Space Working Group is forging links between the Space Programmes of our two nations and India has offered to fly a U.S. instrument on India's Chandeyaan Moon Mission.

Increased cooperation on non-proliferation is another important area. The United States in facilitating increased dual-use and defence technology exports to India and India is implementing its new weapons of Mass Destruction Export Control Law, thus commenting the trust necessary for an enduring partnership.

Existing things also happening in the area of economic and trade. Two governments are going the extra mile to bring commercial cooperation to the level it should be between two great powers. Through our Economic Dialogue, we are intensifying our interaction in finance, trade, commerce, energy and environment.

The Open Skies Treaty, signed in New Delhi, moved third agenda forward more than any other ever this year. By facilitating air traffic between the two countries, travel will be cheaper than earlier and faster. A number of U.S. and Indian carriers have already announced plans to launch new flights. Both the countries made forum to identify the way to take their economic cooperation to new heights as quickly as possible.

People to people contract continue to grow at a record rate. The demand for visa to United State has been so high this year from businessmen, employees, students and tourists – that the United States significantly increased staffing and expanded its visa officer in India. The U.S. Mission in India now is the United States now is the United States. Second largest consular operation in the world, behind our neighbour Mexico. More Indian students are studying in the United States than in any other foreign country, and more temporary workers are in the United States from India than from any other country.

Indo-U.S. cooperation continues to grow in numerous other areas as well. In regarding the economic issues between this the two countries Kamal Nath (Minister of Commerce & Industry) said “Today India actively seeks foreign direct investment from the U.S. but India is also eager to invest in the U.S. The two way investment ... must be underscored by technology transfer and technology exchange.”

On May 17, 2005, the India-U.S. Global Issues Forum re-affirmed the two countries commitment to harness the transformed bilateral relationship to address global challenges such as prediction of environment, sustainable development, protection of the vulnerable, combating transactional organized crime, promotion of democratic values and human rights.

In short, relations between the two nations have never been better. Prime Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh said, “The best was yet to come” and the two countries have reaffirmed their commitment to work together. It is satisfying to see that it is coming so quickly.

Indo-Pak Relations:

India and Pakistan are the neighbours of each other and World know thereby their spicy politics and cricket. But relation between the countries is so good; still they are suffering to main peaceful and prosperous relations. In the first instance India's relations with Pakistan have been greatly strained since the very beginning. The main causes of the strained relations between the two have been dispute over border, distribution of river waters. Distribution of properties, Kashmir etc. Though India was able to resolve the other issues by mutual negotiations, the Kashmir issue continues to be a permanent irritant. Pakistan's decision to join the Military Alliances sponsored by the Western countries and thereby to builder its military strength also contributed to the straining of relations. Through Pakistan port provided these arms on the plea of meeting the possible Communist threat to the region, it actually made use of these arms against India in 1965 and 1971. Again the attempt on the part of Pakistan to pose as the spokesman of all Muslims on the Indian Sub-Continent has also contributed to tension between the two countries because India treats it as interference in its internal affairs. The growing friendship between China and Pakistan, after the Sino-Indian conflict of 1962, and surrender of a large slice of Indian Territory under its occupation by Pakistan to China has also contributed to tension.

Likewise, India's role during the revolt of East Pakistan, which culminated in the creation of the independent state of Bangladesh also greatly, strained the relations between the two countries. It may be noted that India was obliged to intervene in East Bengal on account of the enormous influx of refugees from there which posed a serious threat to the economy of India and the failure of Pakistan government to arrange withdrawal of these refugees. Another major factor which has created conflicting relation between the two countries is the political instability in Pakistan. The Pakistan leaders have often tried to divert the attention of people of Pakistan from the domestic problem by raising the bogey of treat from India.

In July, 1972, after the conclusion of the Shimla Agreement a new orientation was sought to be provided to the relationship and the two countries agreed to settle their differences through bilateral negotiation in peaceful manner. Mrs. Gandhi was able to

established faith between the two countries in the principle of peaceful coexistence and non-interference in the internal affairs of each other; respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of each other. The two countries also agreed to cooperate in economic, cultural and scientific field. Thereafter, the process of normalisation of relations between the two countries set in and it was hoped that an era of co-operation would begin. However, the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and the decision of the U.S. administration to supply sophisticated arms along with military equipments to Pakistan created new tensions in India- Pakistan relations.

In March 1989, the two countries agreed to set up a Joint Commission to increase co-operation in the field of trade, industry, education, health, culture, tourism, information and scientific fields. The two countries reiterated their determination to develop peaceful relations on the basis of mutual cooperation. However, the relations between India and Pakistan were strained due to acquisition of Harpoon missiles by Pakistan. On the other hand, the support extended by India to the movement for restoration of democracy in Pakistan greatly irritated Pakistan. The other factors which contributed to the straining of Indo-Pak relations were supply of military training and equipment by Pakistan to Sikh extremists and Pakistan's failure to return the Sikh hijackers to India in contrast with the actions of the Dubai Government and unnecessary delay in initiating trial of the Sikh hijackers.

Despite all this incidents, Mrs. Gandhi tried at last to maintain their relations and co-operation. After Indira Gandhi's assassination, Rajiv Gandhi assumed office as Prime Minister expressed his determination to improve relations with Pakistan. He met Gen. Zia six times – twice in Delhi, once in Moscow, once in New York (on the occasion of 40th Anniversary Celebrations of U.N.O.), once again Moscow (on the occasion of Oman Sultan's 5th anniversary celebration of accession to throne) and once in Dhaka (at the SAARC Summit). Each of these meeting held at New Delhi on 17 December, 1985 was significant in so far as the two countries agreed not to attack each others nuclear facilities. In January 1986 the two countries reached an agreement to increase their trade; expand air services by increasing their frequencies and deploying bigger aircraft; strengthen telex links on Amritsar-Lahore route, introduce of direct dialling etc.

The relations between India and Pakistan, which should have some improvement during 1985 and beginning of 1986 suffered a set back towards the close of the year due to suspicions about each other's motives. The trade talks foundered, as did the negotiations on the Siachen Glacier. The deteriorating relations were evident from the fact that Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi postponed his proposed visit to Pakistan indefinitely. The friction between the two further increased with rise in the terrorist activities in Punjab and the accusations made by the Indian Government about Pakistan's hand. In subsequent months the unusually large military manoeuvres by both sides on their common border, brought their relations to virtually a breaking point. However, the crisis was averted as a result of high level talks and the two countries agreed to a partial withdrawal of troops massed on either side of the border. They also agreed to exercise maximum restraint and to avoid all provocative action along the border.

With the emergence of Benazir as Prime Minister of Pakistan and restoration of democracy in Pakistan in 1988, it was widely expected that the relations between the two countries would show an improvement. In fact Benazir Bhutto in one of her first Press Conferences indicated that various issues between the two countries would be resolved in accordance with the Shimla Agreement of 1991. In accordance with the new spirit of Rajiv Gandhi signed three agreements or accords with Pakistan during his visit to Islamabad in December 1988. As a result of these accords the two countries agreed not to attack each other's nuclear installations; they agreed to exchange location data of nuclear facilities including nuclear power and research reactors etc. They pledged to supply to each other on 1 January every year information about the latitude and longitude of its nuclear installations. The two countries also agreed to refrain from undertaking, encouraging or participating in, any action aimed at causing the destruction or damage to any nuclear installation or facility of the other country. The second accord sought to promote and develop relations in the realm of art, culture, archaeology, education, mass-media, sports etc. The third accord provided for avoidance of double taxation on income derived from international air transport. In view of the cooperative stand of Pakistan, India did not object to Pakistan's re-entry into commonwealth. In May 1989 India and Pakistan reached an agreement on non-patrolling to contain terrorism,

drug trafficking, smuggling and illicit border crossing. The Border Security Forces of the two countries for the first time decided to undertake force of the two countries for the first time decided to undertake simultaneous coordinated patrolling at mutually decided hours to curb unauthorised trans-border movement.

In July 1989 further steps were taken to improve relation between India and Pakistan during the course of Rajiv Gandhi's official visit to Islamabad. They tried to resolve the problem of Siachen Glacier and agreed on redeployment of forces in Siachen to reduce the changes of conflict and avoidance of use of force. They also agreed to increase cooperation in economic, medical and cultural fields and to relax travel facilities for the people in each other country. Pakistan agreed to give boost to private sector trade with India by expanding the list of items to be imported from 249 to 700. These agreements reflected a new mood to improve bilateral ties.

In May 1990, the V.P. Singh's government proposed a package of confidence building measures which was discussed by the Foreign Secretaries of the two countries in July 1990. These included military and non-military measures like exchange of information about military positions and army delegations; an agreement of non-violation of air space by military aircrafts and ceasing of hostile propaganda aimed at inciting subversion and succession. In January 1991 the two countries exchanged the Instruments of Ratification Treaty signed in December 1988 regarding non-attack on each other's nuclear installations. In April 1991 the Foreign Secretaries of two countries met at New Delhi and reached an agreement on advance notification of military exercises and on preventing violations of air space.

In subsequent months the two countries also reached an agreement on chemical weapons and agreed to hasten the process of exchange giving data on the location of nuclear facilities. Along with these positive steps Pakistan also continued effort to internationalise the Kashmir issue in violation of the Shimla Accord and even called for a bandh in the country on the Kashmir issue. The negative approach of Pakistan greatly hampered the process on normalisation of relations between the two countries. However, Pakistan also continued efforts to settle some of the outstanding differences through negotiations. The two countries reached a general consensus on the basic

principles to resolve the questions of demarcation of land boundary in Sir Creek area as well as delimitation of the maritime boundary. In May 1992 the relations between two countries again got strained following brutal assault on Indian Embassy Councillor, who was subsequently expelled from Pakistan. This resulted in cancellation of Sixth round of Secretary-level talks. India also retaliated by expelling two Pakistani diplomats on the plea that they were indulging in activities which were prejudicial to the security of India. A crisis situation again arose in October 1992 when the Azad Kashmir Force threatened to cross the border, but situation was solved by timely action by Pakistan government which arrested several prominent leaders involved in the organization of the march. In November 1992 during the Sixth round of Indo-Pak talks on Siachen, the two countries reached an agreement in certain fields to end confrontation. They also reached a general accord on de-militarisation of the Glacier area. The bitter criticism levelled by Pakistan Prime Minister before the U.N. Human Rights Commission against Indian government's handling of Ajodhya issue further strained relations between the two. India challenges the right of Pakistan to raise issue of Jammu and Kashmir under agenda item on self-determination and asserted that rigid to self governing determination of applied only to states which were won self-governing and was not applicable to integral parts of a sovereign independent state. Thus Pakistan persisted with policy of confrontations and negotiations at the same time.

With the return of Benazir to power in Pakistan in October 1993, it was hoped that the relations between the two countries would improve. However, these hopes were belied and during the next few months hostility between the two countries continued to grow. This hostility culminated in closure of the Indian Consulate in Karachi in December 1994. Pakistan turned down all offers of India to resume talks and instead on third party mediation. Pakistan charged India of violating human rights in Kashmir and raised the issue at the U.N. Human Rights Commission at Geneva. However, this ended in a fiasco.

In June 1996 after the United Front Government assumed power in India under Dave Gowda, Pakistan's Prime Minister (Mrs. Benazir Bhutto) offered to resume talks with India, which had remained suspended since January 1994. The Indian government immediately reciprocated and favoured immediate resumption of talks. However, these talks could not be held and soon after Pakistan reversed its earlier stand.

With the assumption of power by Nawaz Sharif in Pakistan in February 1997, the prospects of improvement in bilateral relations between India and Pakistan improved. The Pakistan Prime Minister suggested foreign secretaries' level talks to be followed by a meeting between the heads of governments of the two countries. This was warmly received by India. Accordingly a meeting of the Foreign Secretaries of two countries was held in March 1997. During the course of talks India laid emphasis on the need of normalisation of economic relations before political normalisation. Pakistan's stand on the other hand cantered around Kashmir. As a result nothing concrete emerged out of talks.

The only positive outcome of the talks was that the two parties agreed to continue the dialogue in Islamabad at a later date. The resumption of talks by the two countries was a welcome development. Another notable development in this regard was announcement of certain unilateral concessions by India, viz., easing of visa restriction for Pakistani nations; waiver of visa fee for senior Pakistani citizens, increase in the number of religious shrines in India which can be visited by Pakistani pilgrims etc. Pakistan on its part announced the release of 38 Indian children who had been under detention in Pakistan since 1994. The two countries also agreed to expand cultural groups comprising artists, poets and writers. Students and Journalists of the two countries were also to be encouraged to visit the two countries.

In June 1997 the Foreign Secretaries of India and Pakistan held talks in Islamabad. As a result of these talks the two countries succeeded in finalising the list of pending issues between the two countries and the mechanism to deal with them. The identified issues included ... peace and security, including Confidence Building Measures (CBM); Jammu and Kashmir; Siachen; Wullar Barrage Project/Tulbul Project; Sir Creek; Terrorism and drug trafficking; Economic and Commercial cooperation and Promotion of friendly exchanges in various fields. It was agreed that the first two issues would be dealt at Foreign Secretary level. During the next two months tension was generated in the Indo-Pak relations due to unprovoked firing in Kargil Sector by Pakistani troops and expulsions of diplomats by both the countries. Despite this the Secretary level talks were held in New Delhi in September 1997, but no further progress could take place, except that the two sides agreed to meet again on the convenient date. A positive outcome of

the talks was a decision to expedite the release of the civilians belonging to either side. However, within few days Pakistan resorted to unprovoked firing along the Line of Control in Kargil Sector by Pakistani troops and expulsions of diplomats by both the countries. Despite this the Secretary level talks were held in September 1997, but no further progress could take place, except that the two sides agreed to meet again on a convenient date. A positive outcome of the talks was a decision to expedite the release of the civilians belonging to either side. However, within few days Pakistan resorted to unprovoked firing along the Line of Control in Kargil, Kupwara and Uri Sectors in Kashmir which gave a set back to Indo-Pak relations.

In the year of 2005 after defeating the BJP, Congress makes the government but it is a coalition government namely UPA. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh also continues the traditional way of relation to maintain the cooperation between India and Pakistan. Now due to increase of World terrorism America declared 'Cursed' against the terrorism and it is well known to the world that this mission can not be possible without the help of Pakistan. And India is suffered from war genesis the Pakistan organised terrorism. So, America's missions to some extent help India to make closer relations. But still Pakistan denied the presence of Bombay bomb-blast's main accused Daud Ibrahim. Kashmir is yet a cause of strained relation between these two countries.

It is evident from the preceding account that despite occasional efforts by the leaders of the two countries to resolve their differences, much success has not been achieved and the relations between the two countries have generally remained strained. The main irritants in the relations between the two countries are support extended by Pakistan to the terrorists in Punjab and Kashmir, nuclear programme of Pakistan and the influx of latest generation sophisticated arms into Pakistan, which has obliged India to divert its resources from developmental needs to acquisition of making equipment. The Kashmir issue and the Siachen Glacier are other permanent irritants in the relations between the two countries. Pakistan's growing linkage with fundamentalist elements, trans-border smuggling of weapons and drugs, determination of maritime boundary, discriminatory trade barriers against India and the treatment meted out to the minorities in Pakistan are the other irritants in Indo-Pak relations.

Role of the Left Parties in Domestic Affairs:

The Communist Party of India (CPM) got power in West Bengal in 1977. This time, unlike the previous United Front Ministries, the CPM had a clear majority. Alone it won 177 of the 293 Assembly Seats; along with its partners in the Left Front, the CPM controlled a solid majority of 230 seats. In India only West Bengal and Kerala, Tripura witnessed the power of Communist Party. Since 1977 to 2005 West Bengal takes different steps to eradicate the poverty and try to bring rural development. The type of leadership, ideology, and organization the regime brings to bear on the operation of political power enables to perform two essential tasks: first penetration of the countryside without being captured by the landless classes; and incorporating of the lower classes to buttress State power as a tool of social reform.

The CPM is a 'Leninist' party within a democratic polity has thus facilitated a degree of balance. Some dissipation of power among the various wings of the leadership. Unlike initial period CPM regime's ideology changed from revolutionary to reform orientation. The doctrines of "class confrontation" as a means of establishing the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' is no longer control to the party line. It emphasises the preservation of democratic institutions on the one hand and on the other hand emphasises the use of state power for facilitating 'development with redistribution'.

Promod Dasgupta argued that the only way to gain the support of all the peasantry, 'rich and poor', was to pay attention not only to the "land question", but also to the issues of "irrigation, seeds, and fair prices for the produce. The thrust of the agrarian programme was increasingly to shift its focus away from "class confrontation" to issues of "development with redistribution." Under Communist Government both in West Bengal and in Kerala State development were hindrances due to external class problem and central government pressures. To maintain economic growth has led the CPM to take a reconciliatory stance. In the recent past the economy of West Bengal has been characterized by moderate to low growth in agriculture and by a tendency for industrial capital move out of the area. Had the CPM decided to withdraw its supports from agrarian productive activities (such support does benefit the largest landowners

disproportionately), agricultural growth would have suffered; had the leadership adopted a more radical stance encouraging labour unions, and other form of activities, there would have been a continued tendency to keep capital away from Bengal. A democratically elected, left of centre regime within the framework of an economy with private ownership is constrained by the very nature of the arrangement measures perceived as radical will discourage privately controlled economic activity. In order to avoid this outcome, the CPM regime has from the outset sought to appease those in a position to facilitate economic growth – landowners and urban capitalists alike.

Within West Bengal, the CPM has deep roots in some areas but lacks them in others. For examples the Burdwan District and large tracts of Twenty-Four Parganas have long been CPM strongholds, while Midnapore, except for small pockets, has relatively little CPM strength. Such variation is only in small part explained by social-structural conditions. Burdwan has a higher concentration of disaffected tribal population than most other districts and it is further down the road of commercial penetration. This however, is not sufficient to explain the political differences. Midnapore itself has a large tribal population and other areas such as Murshidabad have made rapid strides towards commercialization without parallel political changes.

It is important that caste does not play an important role in West Bengal politics. The causes of these are rooted deep in Bengal's history and do not concern us here. As a consequence, however, all political parties, including the CPM seldom use caste appeals as a mobilizing tool in this part of India. This is not to suggest that local loyalties are somehow no important political considerations. On the contrary, the CPM is sensitive to the fact that eastern districts have concentrations of Bihar and Jharkhandis, that Darjeeling is dominated by Gurkhas, that interior areas have tribal concentrations, and that districts such as Burdwan are dominated by land holding agricultural castes. These variation become important considerations are selecting local candidates for elections; candidates not only have to be politically 'Correct' but should also attract support on the basis of "primordial Loyalties". None of this is West Bengal, however adds up to the "backward Caste" movement of Bihar type, or the concern with the "dominant Caste" in Karnataka.

Role of the Left parties in International affairs:

After the genesis of Communist Party of India in many occasions the party had been guided by the international Communist movement. Support liberation, is an important ideology for the party. CPI is the great supporter of anti-colonialists, anti-imperialist movement and accepted India's role in struggle for peace and against Colonialism. 1953's Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement had attracted the attention of CPI towards making of Indian Foreign Relation.

It is true that the difficulties between Communist and the Congress is the ideological differences but few historical decisions brought two parties closer and also made a change to the Indian Government. Indo-China, Chou-Nehru Joint communiqué, the enunciation of the five principles of *Panchsheel* and India's refusal to join the South-East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) in spite of the British participating in it, India Government's friendship with the Socialist Parties played role in the change of CPI's mind and the CPI began to lend increased support to Nehru Government's foreign policy.

Over the issue of non-alignment CPI supported India's policy, but in the 50's CPI refused to accept this policy with the complained that the policy of non-alignment showed India's weakness towards the West.

Speaking in the Rajya Sabha on 8th December 1959, Bhupesh Gupta, a spokesman of the party said:

India's policy of non-alignment and friendship among nations is correct and everyday its correctness is being proved ... This policy has raised the stature of our country and given it a place of honour in the Committee of Nations. It has immensely strengthened our national independence and given us vast opportunities to build the nation. Whatever the differences over domestic issues, the entire people stand today solidly by the policy.¹

¹ India, Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. 27, 8 December, 1959, Col. 1765.

In a Press Conference, Ajay Ghosh, General Secretary of the Party said "Our basic assessment is that Government of India's foreign policy is a foreign policy of peace, non-alignment and anti-colonialism. As such we extended and even now extend our support to this foreign policy."²

After the Border conflict with China in 1962 the policy of non-alignment faced lots of criticism by the political parties except the Left. The Central Executive Committee of the CPI expressed the view that 'the policy of non-alignment, far from abstracting or weakening national defence is, on the contrary, vital for Indian defence. It is the pursuit of their policy which enables India to mobilize the greatest strength and support in its cause; non-alignment provides the conditions for obtaining the maximum military and economic assistance from all sides without political strings.'³

The Party Programme adopted at its Seventh Congress in Bombay (December, 1964) stated that 'the policy of non-alignment is a positive and progressive policy for all non-socialist, newly-liberal countries and its main strength is derived from the existence and support of the socialist camp in the new epoch, when socialism is becoming the decisive trend in the world history and when imperialism is finding it increasingly difficult to subvert independence attained by its former colonies'.⁴

The Communist support of non-alignment policy and faith in peace served a so strong role that it left India free from joining the 'Imperialist camp led by the USA'.

The CPI had stakes in the Cold War and therefore, was actively interested in all its issues. The Party blamed the United States for starting the Cold War and interfering in the internal affairs of countries. According to the party: 'It is they (USA and Britain) who started the 'Cold War' and decided upon a trade-boycott of the countries of Socialism and People's democracy. It is their armed forces that have been stationed in far-off countries .

² New Age (W), 24 December, 1961.

³ New Age, 9 December, 1962.

⁴ CPI Proceedings of the Seventh Congress of the CPI, 1964, Delhi.

In the case of Korea, it was Stalin who promptly accepted the very first proposal of Nehru to peacefully the Korean War and it was the USA that summarily rejected it. Again it was the USSR and China that persisted proposed armistice, and it was the USA that repeatedly rejected it'.⁵

The Party claimed that it did not favour the Government getting involved in the Cold War. 'The Government, the Party held, 'should judge every issue not on the basis that a particular stand has been taken on it by Soviet Union or the USA but on the basis whether that stand is in consonance with the principles of democracy and freedom for all peoples and nations'.⁶

Indo-Pak Relations:

The CPI has advocated cordial and friendly relations between India and Pakistan. The Party's approach was not sentimental as in the case of Jana Sangh. The Party's view on Pakistan were influenced by various factors (1) it had accepted the Muslim League as a major political party; (2) it was not emotionally involved in the problem of India-Pakistan relations; (3) it wanted to foil the 'imperialistic game' in Pakistan; and (4) believed that hostility between India-Pakistan would clear the ground for fresh imperialistic manoeuvres in the sub-continent. The greater the co-operation between India and Pakistan, the smaller would be the chances for manoeuvring by 'imperialists'.

The CPI blamed Anglo-American for keeping up the tension in the sub-continent. The partition of the sub-continent, the Party held, was imposed by imperialists – the 1951 programme of the Party stated: 'the strife between Pakistan and India enables the reactionary ruling circles to divide the people and provide the American and British imperialists with opportunities for intervention as in Kashmir. All these can be overcome by a firm alliance for friendship and mutual assistance between India and the State of Pakistan.'⁷

⁵ New Age, 18 July, 1954

⁶ New Age, 18 July, 1954

⁷ CPI, Programme of the CPI, 1951 Bombay.

The political resolution adopted at Palghat in 1956, should inter alia that the CPI would work 'for improvement of relations with Pakistan, for settlement of outstanding issues through peaceful methods and friendly negotiations for a no-war pact for establishing economic relations between India and Pakistan dislocated by partition, for removing all barriers that stand in the way of mutually beneficial relations between our two peoples and for promoting cultural and other activities to strengthen the bonds of brotherly relations between them.'⁸

The CPI looked upon the entire question of border and other dispute as a 'power in the game of imperialist power politics.' On the proposed transfer of Berubari to Pakistan, the party opposed the decision of the Government and requested the Prime Minister to reverse his decision. But it did not react vehemently unlike the Jana Sangh.

In January 1960, the CPI welcomed the agreement between India and Pakistan on the western sector of the India-Pakistan border and hailed it as an act of 'good neighbourly spirit.' The party also approved the signing of the Indus-Waters Treaty between India and Pakistan in September, 1960 and hoped that it would 'contribute towards similar amicable salutation of other controversies and problems that come in the way of complete normalization of relations between India and Pakistan.'⁹

The CPI held the view that the view that the Kashmir problem was created by the British and American imperialists, who had inspired and armed the aggressors in Kashmir. The party observed 30 August, 1953, as the 'Kashmir Day', in protest against the 'imperialist intrigues' in Kashmir.

The idea of the plebiscite in Kashmir was opposed by the CPI. 'The demand for a Plebiscite' commented the party organ 'harms not only the people of Kashmir but also of Pakistan and India. To keep in on the agenda of the U.N. is to give on opening to the imperialist powers.'¹⁰

⁸ New Age, 6 May, 1956.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid. 8 April, 1956.

The political resolution adopted at Paighat (1956) started that 'both India and Pakistan should settle the Kashmir issue by accepting the cease fire line on the basis for the demarcation of boundaries and restore economic and trade relations.'¹¹

While supporting the Government's stand on Kashmir, the party demanded the withdrawal of the Kashmir issue from the Security Council.

Hiren Mukherjee said:

The country certainly supports the Prime Minister's policy on this point especially in regard to Kashmir ... We suggest that perhaps it is better that we withdraw the Kashmir issue from the Security Council. But any how we are all with the Prime Minister or far as that policy is concerned ... why cannot suggest the idea of a kind of Indo-Pakistan understanding on economic matters ?¹²

He also suggested the idea of a customs union between India and Pakistan. The resolution adopted by the National Council in February 1961 clarified the Party's stand on Kashmir. It stated:

The whole of Jammu and Kashmir including the part occupied by Pakistan is a part of the Indian Union. Only India is entitled to deal with any other country in regard to any question than concerns the delimitation of the border of my part of Jammu and Kashmir including the part under Pakistan's occupation. Pakistan has no legal status at all to enter into any negotiations with any other country on the question of the settlement of such borders of any part of the territory occupied by Pakistan. There should be no negotiations with Pakistan by any country which implies recognition of the occupied part of Jammu and Kashmir as part of Pakistan territory.¹³

The CPI supported the Government's Kashmir policy. On this matter its approach more or less coincided with the Soviet stand. In the United Nations, it was the Soviet Union

¹¹ Ibid. 6 May, 1956.

¹² India Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. 3, No. 7.

¹³ New Age, 26 February, 1961

That supported the Government of India's position with regard to Kashmir.

The CPI supported the Government's Kashmir policy. On this matter its approach more or less coincided with the Soviet stand. In the United Nations, it was the Soviet Union that supported the Government of India's position with regard to Kashmir.

Pakistan's aggression in the Rann of Kutch came to handy for the CPI to have a tirade against the 'Anglo-American Imperialists'. The statement issued by the Central Secretariat of the CPI pointed out the 'growing anti-Indian collusion between the Pakistan and Chinese authorities and the refusal of the Chinese leadership to settle the Indo-China border dispute peacefully. The aggressions in Kutch are a continuation of Pakistani aggression which began on no interrupted since immediately after independency in 1947. The statement is called upon the Government to make it clear to the U.S. and British Governments that – 'our country is not for sale and that all the military, political and economic pressures or blackmail being used by the imperialists persons, shall not divert us from our sacred duty to defend India's territorial integrity and national policies.'¹⁴

The Party lent support to the Kutch agreement. It considered the withdrawal of Pakistani army from Kanjarkot, Biarbet, Chandbet, Sardar and other points as a 'positive gain for India'. At the same time it pointed out certain 'dangerous and dishonourable term in the ceasefire agreements', as for example Pakistan's right to patrol the Ding Surai area and the idea of making the Indian sovereignty over the Rann of Kutch a subject matter of arbitration. It warned the 'Government to give up its reliance on Anglo-US aid for India's defence and to accept all available arms and equipment and technical know-how from the USSR and other Socialist countries.'¹⁵

In August 1965, the National Council of the Party vehemently condemned 'the treacherous infiltration by thousands of Pakistani trained armed personnel across the cease fire line in Kashmir' It urged the Government to take firm steps to halt Pakistani

¹⁴ Ibid. 16 May, 1965.

¹⁵ Ibid. 18 July, 1965

Aggression through all possible means and to fight the imperialist conspiracy in Kashmir and elsewhere.¹⁶

The party welcomed the Tashkent Agreement. The National Council of the Party hailed the Tashkent Declaration as 'an event of great historic significance' not only for the people of the two countries but for all peace-loving mankind. It expressed the hope that the Tashkent spirit would be carried forward in all future efforts, for lasting solutions of all problems between India and Pakistan.¹⁷

In short, the CPI stood for friendly relations with Pakistan. In consideration of certain aspects of Indo-Pak relations as part of the Cold War, it strongly condemned the 'imperialists' for keeping up the tension between India and Pakistan stressed the need for closer relations between India, Soviet Union and other Socialist countries. The CPI's view on Indo-Pak relations differed very much from those of the Jana Sangh, but much less from those of Praja Socialist Party. On the general question of friendly relations with Pakistan, it was in agreement with the Swatantra Party. But on Kashmir, the CPI's view were different from those of the Swatantra.

Indo-China Relations:

A policy of restraint and moderation characterised the CPI's attitude towards Sino-Indian relations. From the very beginning the CPI had to reconcile its ideological affinity to the Communist regime in China with the need to project a nationalist image of itself in the country's politics. This presented a serious problem to the Party, which tried to solve it by pursuing a very cautious policy. Often political expediency was given precedence over ideological affiliations. The Communist revolution in China was hailed by the CPI as a 'landmark' in the history of Socialism. It welcomed the efforts of the Government of India to co-operate with the People's Republic of China (PRC).

Among the factors which might have influenced the CPI's attitude on Sino-Indian relations in the early years of independence, the following may be mentioned : (1) The

¹⁶ Ibid. 29 August, 1965

¹⁷ Ibid, 16 January, 1968

coming into power of the Communists in the mainland of China, which added strength to the Communist movement in Asia; (2) early recognition of PRC by India; (3) treaty of friendship and co-operation between the Soviet Union and China signed in February 1950; and (4) the signing of the *Pahchashel* Agreement between India and China in April 1954.

The CPI welcomed the 'liberation' of Tibet by China as well as the signing of the treaty between India and China over Tibet. Ajoy Ghosh hailed "initiation of the Five tenets of the principle of peaceful co-existence" enunciated by the Chou-Nehru Declaration as a 'significant landmark in the annals of Asia'.¹⁸

Consequent on his flight from Tibet, the Dalai Lama was given political asylum in India. According to the CPI this naturally irritated the Government of China. The Secretariat of the Party in a statement issued on 31 March, 1959, held the reactionaries responsible for the difficult situation in Tibet and alleged that they were working in "collusion with Chiang Kai-Shek and the American imperialists. It praised the Chinese Government for the scrupulous regard it has been shown towards Tibet's autonomy."¹⁹

The Party's stand on Tibet was clearly pre-Chinese and was reflected in its criticisms of the Government's action. According to the CPI, the Government of India could not sit in judgement over the functioning of autonomy in Tibet, as the Tibetan affairs came under the domestic jurisdiction of China. It criticized Nehru for characterizing the Tibetan rebellion as a 'national uprising'. Justifying the conduct of the Chinese Government for being sharply critical of India, he said 'At no time in the past did the Indian Government, as distinct from private individuals political party and press, adopt such as attitude towards an internal matter of the PRC as they have done now. One would have expected' he added that 'Sri Nehru would withdraw his characterization of the rebellion in Tibet as a national uprising'²⁰ The Party seemed to have ignored one vital aspect, namely the implication of Tibetan autonomy or otherwise for the security of India.

¹⁸ Election Manifesto of CPI, 1962 (New Delhi, 1961).

¹⁹ . New Age, 5 April, 1959.

A resolution passed by the Central Executive Committee of the CPI further endorsed the Chinese position. "The rebellion", remarked the resolution, "had nothing to do with the interests of the Tibetan people. It was designed to serve only the interests of a handful of reactionary forces at home and imperialism abroad". To describe such a rebellion as a "national uprising" said the resolution "is incorrect and highly misleading. Tibet as an integral part of China. Developments in Tibet are therefore an internal affair of the Chinese People Republic."²⁰

The CPI, thus, clearly endorsed China's action in Tibet, in sharp contrast to the other opposition parties. The party upheld the claims of the PRC. Those who opposed the stand of the CPI were branded as "reactionaries" and condemned as "opponents" of India's foreign policy. This was diversionary tactic deliberately designed to vindicate the Tibetan policy of the PRC.

On the question of the border conflict with China also, the CPI's attitude in the early stages, was different from that of the other opposition parties. The party completely ruled out the possibility of a threat from China: such a threat was only "mystical", because "Socialist China can never commit aggression against China", was stated by the Central Executive Committee in September 1959.²¹ this view was reiterated at the Meerut Session of the National Council (November, 1959). The Nation Council urged that the Government of India and China should start negotiations without either making the acceptance of its own stand by the other as a pre-condition for starting the negotiations.

While the other opposition parties did not welcome joint talks between Nehru and Chou, the CPI welcomed it as a "step in the direction of peaceful solution of Indo-China border

Questions" and hailed the joint communiqué as an "important document". The stand of the CPI on the Sino-Indian border disputes was later on explained by the Ajoy Ghosh. In a press interview, in November 1961, he said:

²⁰ Ibid. 17 May 1959

²¹ Ibid. 26 November, 1961.

The COI stands for the territorial integrity of the country. In its opinion the frontier of India in the Eastern Sector lies along what it known as McMohan Line, that in the Western Sector, it is the traditional frontier between the two countries that should be recognized ... The CPI has always argued that the dispute between our country and China should be settled through peaceful negotiations ... The COI thinks that the dispute between our country and China has the gravest consequences for the course of Asian Solidarity. The maintenance of world peace and the struggle against colonialism."²²

The Party always stressed the need for peaceful negotiations between India and China. The National Council supported the policy of Nehru "of making all efforts to bring about a peaceful, negotiated settlement of the border question, even while taking necessary measures for the defence of the border of the country". It expressed the hope that Government of China would respond to the efforts made by the Indian Government and lead to a workable agreement.²³ it might be noted that the CPI's stand coincided with that of the Soviet Union, who also stood for a negotiated solution for the problem.

The Chinese invasion of October 1962 was a turning point in Sino-Indian relations. It believed the hopes of the CPI. The national mood became one of the determinations to drive out the aggression at any cost and protect the territorial integrity of the country. Meeting under these circumstances, on 1st November 1962, the National Council of the Party adopted a resolution which reflected the mood of the nation. It acknowledge that the crossing of the McMahan Line by China "indisputably constitutes aggression and violation of our territory". The Party extended its full support to the position taken by Prime Minister Nehru in regard to the conditions for the opening of negotiations for the Settlement of the border disputes. It pledged itself to "participate fully in all activities for the promotion of national unity, defence and the strengthening of the national moral of The people."²⁴ The statements made by the Party however, were somewhat mild and guarded.

²² . Ibid. 26 November, 1961.

²³ Ibid. 26 August. 1964.

²⁴ "National Emergency arising out of Chinese aggression", Resolution adopted by the National Council of the CPI in New Delhi, New Age, 4 November, 1962.

The CPI supported and met welcomed the Colombo Proposals as an "initiative taken by friendly nations for an honourable settlement : speaking in the Lok Sabha, A.K. Gopalan said "We find that the Colombo Conference proposals with clarifications constitute a reasonable basis for starting negotiations, consistent with our honour and our vital interests."²⁵ The National Council welcomed the acceptance of the Colombo proposals by the Government of India, the stands of the Government of India in this respect is wholly consistent with the dignity of the nation and with its fundamental interests. The Council urged the Chinese Government to "reciprocate India's acceptance of the Colombo Proposals by a similar act on its part – without any further delay."²⁶

Later, the Party openly blamed the Chinese Government for not accepting the Colombo proposals. The Central Executive Committee declared that:

The responsibility for the continuance of the present undesirable situation and for the failure to start negotiations lies wholly on the Chinese Government which has turned down the just and honourable initiative and proposals of friendly and impartial non-aligned countries ... The adamant Chinese attitude coupled with their threatening notes and disruption mover, encourages the demand for ever greater military aid from the West. It is dangerous development which weakens India internally as well as internationally."²⁷

It extended its full support to the Government of India's offer of arbitration to settle the dispute, if negotiations failed. The stand of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was

Not different in this matters. Pravda's editorial on 19th September 1963 stated:

... the actions of the PRO in the Sino-Indian conflict contradict the common, co-ordinated course of the Marxist-Leninist Parties of peaceful co-existence and on supporting the national liberation movement ... The proposals of the ColomboConference

²⁵ India Lok Sabha Debate, Series 3, Vol. 22, 1963.

²⁶ New Age, 24 February 1983.

²⁷ Ibid, 21 April 1963

were nothing but a friendly recommendation of States which are sincerely striving to help find on mutually acceptable solution for the frontier dispute.²⁸

After the split in the Party in April, 1964 The (Right) Communists started vehemently criticizing the Chinese Government for launching "aggression" against India and "betraying" the cause of Socialism.

The Right CPI took the position that:

1. The attack south of the McMahon Line was unwarranted; it was a breach of an undertaking given to our Party and also of an understanding given to the Indian Government by the Chinese side that they would not cross the line.
2. After quarrel about boundaries and some regions is wrong, for they are not at all essential for the development of Socialism in China, nor worthwhile fighting for, at the cost of friendship with India.
3. A Socialist State should not exhibit the same blind nationalist fervour about boundaries as is natural to a state controlled by the national bourgeoisie and or from long a conflict over it.
4. Even assuming that the Socialist State had been attacked first at the Chinese alleged, after having lost nothing at all in the bargain, it should not have advanced beyond the point of attack or the McMahon Line or the Line in Ladakh.
5. Such behaviour on the part of the Socialist State strengthens the reactionaries in the bourgeoisie State, weakens internationalism and facilitates the manoeuvre of imperialism ... we think that though the Chinese violation of Indian territory is not aggression in the capitalist imperialist scene, yet it is aggression in the popular sense of the term.²⁹

²⁸ On Sino-Indian Border Conflict' (Pravda's editorial), New Age, 27 September 1963

²⁹ On Sino-Indian Border Conflict' (Pravda's editorial), New Age, 27 September 1963

The CPI's this attitude towards Sino-Indian relations showed a change, unlike that of the other opposition parties. The change in the attitude of the party might be attributed to: (1) the party's allegiance to international communism, (2) the sudden and unprecedented upsurge of nationalism in India during and after 1959 in face of increasing pressure on northern borders and (3) the ideological rift between Moscow and Peking which came on the surface in 1963. The split in the Party, transformed the Right Wing from the position of a fraternal party to that of a severe critic. The Right CPI openly accused Communist China of "unleashing aggression" on India and betraying the cause of international communism – a line taken up by Moscow. The Party however, stood for a negotiated settlement of the problem; it did not favour a military solution of the disputes as suggested by some other parties.

Sino-Indian boarder dispute brought a dramatic change within the Communist Party of India, a split took place in the Party and this division had brought two Communist Parties: CPI following the Moscow line, CPI (M) being pro Peking. Internal dissention in the CPI rank and file over the issue merely projected the difference in approach to the Communist ideology of the Soviet Union and China. The latter, according to it, was in the wrong and so were her supporters in Indian.

The Chinese aggression confronted the party with an unprecedented situation. Political tension and anti-Communist fervour in the country had reached the highest peak. The CPI refused to accept the Chinese thesis that the Indian-China boarder conflict was result of Nehru's expansionist policy and also US aid to India was the barometer of the Nehru Government's foreign policy 'particularly its policy towards China.

The CPI (M) always keeps in touch with the developments in China and follows similar policies and tactics .The Chinese brand of communism which the CPI (M) represents in different ways, considers Mao Tse-tung's thought and eliminates thoroughly the old ideology and culture, the old custom and habit. Armed with the lesson of the Chinese revolutionary path CPI pledged to follow the Chinese path of India. The CPI (M) had been creating an atmosphere of hatred and violence in the country resulting in reactions verging on large scale violence. Critics said that the way of agitation of CPI (M) in against the stand of Neheruvean view about China had absolutely an anti national way

of thinking. Nehru gave instances of Indian Communist Party members caring on pro-China propaganda in the northern boarder areas. He pointed out that CPI workers create propaganda on the Sino-India boarder issue on the lines that China would never attack India and China would help India in the event of an attack on her by Pakistan and India should give concessions to the Chinese in Ladakh by acknowledging their suzerainty over the disputed area through which the Chinese had constructed a road, while on the eastern boarder China should withdraw her claim to the territory situated across the McMahon Line in India. CPI's blind support to China that a socialist country like China cannot commit any sin like aggression was helped them to developed propagandas on Sino-India boarder issue.

The Left Parties aggress with the principles of India's foreign policy but differs in its achievements and shortcomings. Both the CPI and CPI (M) look at the Indian foreign policy differently, which rift in the international Communist movement. The CPI (M) has been stating that although the Government's foreign policy continues to be within the broad frame work of non-alignment and opposition to world war the, its increasing reliance on Western monopoly, aid, objectively facilitate the USA designs of neo-colonialism and aggression and lead to India's isolation from the powerful currents of peace, democracy, freedom and socialism and also the big bourgeoisie leading the State and pursuing anti-people policies. In contrast to this the CPI programme states that the foreign policy pursued by government of India is in the main policy of peace, non-alignment and anti-colonialism. But it is interesting to found that both the parties in regarding the issue of Congress Parties created foreign policies were vehemently criticized though they had their own internal relation were inconsistent. There were no controversies whether the non-alignment as a foreign policy is perfect for India or not, the point of opposition from Left was that Congress is failed to perform the ideology of non-alignment.

THE KOREAN CRISIS:

During the Word War USA and former USSR put there effort to finished the Hitler 's dictatorship .After the World War both the powers had emerged as a Super Power in world politics and the process had started from Korean battlefield in 1950 as a bitterest

enemy. This crisis was a test for the big powers as well as newly independent countries which had declared them non-aligned and was pursuing an independent foreign policy. And India also made her as strong non-align country in world politics.

The then Congress government policy towards Korea was based on four principles: (a) that the North Korea was the aggressor; (b) that war must be localized ;(c) that ways and means must be found to end the war at the earliest movement; and (d) that the future of Korea must be decided by the Korean themselves.

India decided to give vote for South Korea. This policy was based on the promotion of World peace and the development of friendly relations with all countries. But India's stand for non-align was largely criticized by the member countries General Assembly. India's opposition for US –sponsored resolution in UN branding China an aggressor was also not taken good foreign policy by USA, which made a difficult relationship for both the countries but the Congress government's contention was that China's entry into Korean War was defensive and not aggressive.

The Korean crisis had given the full opportunity to the Communist Party of India to make a serious assessment on Indian foreign policy. India's stand of non-align on the event US intervention on north Korea was largely criticized by the Left parties in India. For them the decision of US in North Korea was happened on absence of the USSR and Red China, this is proved enough that Congress is working as an agent of imperialist power. The CPI was not prepared to listen any peace proposals of the USA and wanted everything to be settled to the satisfaction of Communist China. They asked India to see that those objectives which the Communist party inspired Koreans and the people of China wanted were realized. These objectives included the peaceful settlement of the whole Korean question, the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the country and the peaceful settlement of every outstanding problem.

CPI's condemned Congress as an imperialist agent and asked the government to take the necessary action on issue of withdrawal of all foreign troops including China was not a rational demand because India as a new independent state declared Herself non – align nation, therefore She can not be interfere any internal activity of foreign nation

unless and until it jeopardize Her own security. And another reason was that both China and US were more powerful than India so it was good to maintain a cordial relation with both the countries for save national development.

With regard to the Korean War, the Party adopted a strictly anti-imperialist posture. The Party harmed the government for not acting in the manner in which it should have acted. It criticised the Government's 'blatant support to Imperialism' in the case of Korea. It characterized the elections held in South Korea as a "force", which the U.N. rubber stamped. It was also critical of the unbridgeable gulf between words and deeds of the Indian delegate."³⁰

The Party supported the stand of the Government, especially on the Indian vote against the U.S. Resolutions of 7 October 1950, authorizing the U.N. forces to cross the 38th Parallel. It criticized the Government for sending medical help to American troops in Korea.³¹

The party called upon the Government to give its firm support to the proposal and fight against the delaying and sabotaging tactics and pressure of the Americans. The political resolution adopted by the Third Party Congress welcomed the signing of the Armistice in Korea as a "mighty victory for the heroic Korean people and their allies, the Chinese people's volunteers, for the forces of world peace, a great success for the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic aggressive imperialistic, led by American and their plans for world domination."³² The Party Congress also expressed its appreciation of the role played by India in helping the settlement of the war in Korea.

The CPI opposed the Governments stand on Korea, when it endorsed the steps taken by the Soviet Union and China. By and large the Party supported the peace moves of Prime Minister Nehru with regard to Korea.

The Hungarian Crisis:

³⁰ Cross roads (Bombay), 3 June 1949.

³¹ Programme of the CPI. Adopted by the All India Party Conference, October 1951 (Bombay).

³² Ajoy Ghosh "Hungary the Lessons", New Age, 4 November 1956.

Whereas the CPI was very vocal in its response to the Suez Crisis, it was quite in the cane of the Hungarian crisis. The events in Hungary placed the Indian Communists in an embarrassing position and they put out several arguments to justify Soviet action in Hungary and blamed the "reactionary forces" and the "imperialists" for the rebellion.

Ajoy Ghosh, the General Secretary of the Party deplored the happenings in Hungary and remark, that they were "a stern warning to the governments in the socialist status, a grim reminder of the danger to which some of them have exposed the socialist system by many of their policies, acts and methods which in several respects constitute a violation of the principles of socialist legality, socialist ethics and socialist concern for the needs of the people"³³

Communists rejected the contention of the Praja Socialist Party that the Soviet action in Hungary was of the same time as the Anglo French action in Egypt. Ajoy Ghosh gave his own version of the Hungarian crisis and tried to defend Soviet interference. In his view "It was imperialist-guided intervention against the Hungarian people." The help of the USSR gave was essential in order to save the gains of the revolution and to protect the Hungarian people against the onslaught of fascism. The attempt to establish an imperialist base Hungary and the aggression against Egypt were closely interrelated. The issues at stake were momentous. On their outcome depended the fate of socialism, the fate of world peace, the fate of national freedom of all countries and especially of the countries of Asia and Africa".

Unlike the PSP, the Party endorsed the stand taken by the Indian delegation in the United Nations. While all other parties condemned Soviet interference in Hungary, the CPI have tried to justify it somehow or the other. The virtues of socialism were extruding to defend Soviet action in Hungary. The CPI held the view that what had developed as a movement to secure full equality of Hungary within the Socialist camp, had grown into an attempt to transform Hungary into a "base for imperialism." Had Soviet Union not intervened in Hungary, the entire socialist movement would have been

³³ CPI Political Resolution, 3rd Congress of the CPI, Madurai, December 1953 – January 1954

in jeopardy – this could probably be the rationale of the party's stand on Hungary. This was an explanation which satisfied only the Communists.

The Czechoslovakian Crisis:

The developments in Czechoslovakia in August 1968, once again put the CPI in a tight spot. The non-Communist opposition in Indian Parliament wanted to adopt a resolution condemning the Soviet action. But the two CPI leaders, Dange and Bhupesh Gupta, were opposed to the adoption of any such resolution. In their view, the country should not play into the hands of reactionary parties. They warned that any resolution would have serious international repercussions and would run counter to India's interests. For all they know, the Soviet action might to maintain the socialist character of Czechoslovakia.³⁴ of trying Participating in the discussion in the Lok Sabha on the steps taken by Czechoslovakian to reform and liberalize the system there, but in the same breath accused "imperialist forces"

To snatch Czechoslovakia from socialism. In Rajya Sabha, the Party's position was scantily defended by Bhupesh Gupta – He declared that the CPI wanted the armies which had entered Czechoslovakia to withdraw or soon as possible. However, he felt that the Soviet action necessary to put down the "counter-revolutionary movements launched by certain "reactionary elements in Czechoslovakia and the other injected through West Germany."³⁵

The Party had a divided mind on the issue, as could be seen from the deliberations of its Central Executive Committee (CEC) and the National Council and the National Council. It was reported that ten CEC members supported the Soviet action and ten opposed it. Finally, it was decided to put forward four points for discussion before the National Council. There were no public condemnation of the Soviet action, free and frank criticism of the Soviet military intervention in Czechoslovakia before the rand and file; that the inner party debate should be immediately started and considered in a

³⁴ National Herald, 24 August 1968

³⁵ Ibid, 5 September 1968.

democratic manner so as to unify the party on the basis of collective discussions and that a sober document, critical but not condemnatory of the Soviet Union, be prepared and forwarded to the Communist party of the Soviet Union and other sister-parties.³⁶

In the National Council also opinion was sharply divided. Bhupesh Gupta made a rather long report in which he gave very possible defence of the Czeck Party and the sharpest possible criticism of the Soviet Party but ended by saying that on 20th August, something extraordinary seemed to have happened to compel the Soviet Union to take immediate military action. The Soviet Union action was defended by S.A. Dange, Rajeswar Rao and Sardesai, it was criticised by Adhikari, Mohit Sen and Prem Sagar Gupta.

At the end of its meeting the National Council issued a communiqué saying that the "discussion brought out the need of a further examination of a number of questions of principle, involved in the recent developments. In order to organize proper inner-party discussion with a view to verify the understanding of the Party, the National Council appointed two sub-committees to prepare draft documents for the purpose of such discussion." "That there should have been need for two sub-committees and for two drafts,

Reveals the extent of differences within the Party. The statement adopted National Council appears equivocal. There is much sympathy for the Czechoslovak people and much support for the decisions of the January and May Plenary Sessions of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. The rest of the statement is a diversionary attack on counter-revolutionary and anti-socialist elements within Czechoslovakia and in India."³⁷

As in the case of Hungary once again the CPI tried to defend the Soviet action. But then the facts of the situation were so adverse that they could not adopt a unanimous resolution. The Party was sharply divided on this issue – a development which did not take place in the case of Hungary. But whether this divergence of views within the party will be further accentuated remains to be seen.

³⁶ . Ibid. 10 September 1968

³⁷ CPI, Programme of the CPI 1951.

The Commonwealth Link:

The CPI opposed India's association with the Commonwealth from the very beginning. The 1948 Declaration regarding India's association with the Commonwealth was condemned as a "great betrayal"³⁸

The Political Resolution adopted at the Madurai Party Congress (1953) said:

A fully free India outside the Commonwealth and outside all imperialist influence will be a great factor for world peace and freedom of all Asian and Colonial peoples. Hence, the necessity to intensify the fight against British imperialism for quitting the Commonwealth and for the confiscation of British capital; hence the necessity of opposition to every manifestation of subservience to British imperialism in economic, political and military conference under its aegis³⁹

The Communist rejected the Government's claim that Commonwealth connection had promoted the cause of peace. In Press Conference on October 1, 1954, Mr. Sundarayya said:

It is India's association with Britain and through Britain with America that gives the heart to those countries to talk at launching war. If Nehru had dissociated himself with the Commonwealth and joined the peace-loving countries, the situation would have been quite different. Then the U.S. could not have interfered with Asia in this fashion.⁴⁰

The (1956) Suez Crisis came in handy for the CPI to urge that India should quit the Commonwealth, not because it threatened India's independence but because India's membership of the Commonwealth gave the British "The prestige which enable it to deceive the World Public Opinion".⁴¹

³⁸ Crosswords 6 May 1949.

³⁹ CPI Political Resolution adopted at the 3rd Congress, December 1953

⁴⁰ New Age 10 October 1954

⁴¹ India Lok Sabha Debate Vol. 9 1956

Speaking of the resolution regarding India's membership of the Commonwealth, Bhupesh Gupta said in Indian Parliament that India would lose nothing by leaving the Commonwealth. He felt that the British aggression against Egypt and the resulting blockade of the Suez Canal "had created a crisis in Indian economy and our economy is facing considerable strains and it was jeopardised our Second Five Year Plan. Why should our friends ask us to continue in this association which has injured our prestige, which has injured our economy, which offends our conscience and offends our prestige in the world?"⁴²

The Party started a demonstration in front of the Parliament House on 14 November 1956 Demanding Indian withdrawal from the Commonwealth. Early in 1957, Communist leaders pleaded for the severance of Commonwealth relations as a "retaliatory measure for Britain's deliberate hostile acts" in relation to the Kashmir issue in the UN Security Council.⁴³

The CPI's uncompromising attitude towards the apartheid policy of South Africa, a member of the Commonwealth till May 1961, was a factor to be reckoned within consider-

The Hindu 24 February 1957

Ring the Party's strong opposition to the Commonwealth link. In May 1960, the National Council of the CPI appealed to Nehru to see that the Commonwealth Conference took steps to ensure an end to a partial policy, failing which Prime Minister Nehru and other Afro-Asian Prime Ministers should walk out of the commonwealth conference and make it clear that India and other Afro Asian Countries will not remain members of the same Commonwealth of which South Africa was a member.⁴⁴

In short, the Communists opposed India's association with the Commonwealth for various reasons and continuously raised the slogan of "Quite Commonwealth". To the

⁴² India Rajya Sabha Debate Vol. XV, Dec. 1956.

⁴³ India Rajya Sabha Debate Vol. XV, Dec. 1956.

⁴⁴ India Rajya Sabha Debate Vol. XV, Dec. 1956.

Communists the Commonwealth connexion constituted a 'Liability' which often led Indian to compromise anti-colonial policy. The main argument, both inside and outside the Parliament, was that Commonwealth connexion was inconsistent with India's economic and political freedom and it linked India with the Western Block.

Anti-Colonialism:

The CPI attached the greatest importance to India's role in the World-wide struggle for peace and against colonialism. Time and again it urged the government to take up a firm stand against colonialism.

The Party expressed its strongest condemnation of the US aggression in Lebanon and that of Britain in Jordan. It said that by demanding the withdrawal of the US and British forces from the Lebanon and Jordan respectively the Government of India had correctly expressed the demands and sentiments of the Indian people.⁴⁵

Constitution with its strategy of anti-colonialism, the CPI favoured the liberation of Goa. A Central Committee on the Party in a resolution disapproved the policy of the Government of India in preventing under "pressure of the British Government", India volunteers from entering Portuguese territory, for giving fraternal support to the local population struggling for freedom. It pledged full support to all political parties inside and

Outside the Portuguese possessions who were fighting for their liberation. It called upon the government to intervene directly in Goa in aid of the local population.⁴⁶

The Party welcomed the statements of Nehru concerning the Portuguese imperialists that India would not wait indefinitely to win her full independence, which remained incomplete as long as Goa was not free. The Party stated that this warning to be effective must be followed by determined action. It promised its whole-hearted support

⁴⁵ . Ibid. 24 August 1958

⁴⁶ Resolution of the CEC of the CPI" New Age, 18 September 1954

to "any action by the Government of India which helps to make to the Portuguese imperialists quit Goa without delay."⁴⁷

The Political Resolution adopted by the Sixth Congress of the Party state that the Government of India had failed to take a consistent stand on issues of anti-colonialism. "The Government of India", the resolution added, "takes too long a time to take a correct position and even then the position is not always sufficiently firm."⁴⁸

The Election Manifesto of the CPI (1962) emphasized the importance of the struggle against colonialism. The manifesto criticized the government for 'trying to soft-pedal the fight against imperialism'. It also demanded the immediate 'liberation of Goa and thereby the completion of the process of national independence'. It fully justified armed action by the Government 'to free several lakhs of our long suffering brothers and sisters from savagery and violence of the Portuguese imperialists. Later on the party welcomed the liberation of Goa. The party viewed the liberation at part of a world-wide struggle against imperialism.

Racial Discrimination:

The CPI adopted a firm attitude against racial discrimination pursued by the Government of South Africa. In order to express the Party's sympathy with the people of South Africans, it observed 10-17 April 1960 "as solidarity with Africans in South Africa week.

The National Council of the Party condemned the "barbaric policy of apartheid" pursued by the Government of South Africa, in defence of the US Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights. It stressed the need for solidarity between Indians and Africans can be deemed it a vital factor for the common struggle against apartheid. It called for an economic and diplomatic boycott of South Africa by all Asian and African countries. The Council gave a call to observe 26 June 1960 as the "South Africa Day" for a united worldwide protest against the crimes of the South African people's movement for

⁴⁷ New Age, 8 January 1961.

⁴⁸ CPI, Political Resolution adopted by the Sixth Congress, Vayaya Week, April 1960.

independence.⁵¹ at the later stage, the National Council also urged Nehru to take steps to get South Africa removed from the Commonwealth. On 27 June 1963, the National Council of the Party sent its warm fraternal greetings to the people of the South Africa "battling against the most bestial forms of racialism." The Council urged the Government of India to take the active part in the moves being made "to secure the expulsion of the racist, barbaric and oppressive South African Government from all the U.N. bodies.

The CPI was very sensitive to issues arising out of colonialism and racial discrimination. The Party criticized the Government for showing "weaknesses and vacillations" and self-peddalling the struggle against colonialism and racial discrimination. But it lent its support to the Government whenever it thought the latter was following a "firm and consistent" policy against colonialism.

Military Pacts:

Several pacts were formed in exercise of the inherent right of collective self-defence outlined in Articles 51 to 53 of the U.N. Charter.

The CPI reacted immediately to the US-Pak Pact signed in May 1954. A resolution passed by the Central Committee on 7 December 1953 said:

This pact is in continuation of the policy of American war-mongers to surround the Soviet Union, China and the People's democracies in Europe with war bases launching a Third war ... having been thwarted in their drive of seizing Kashmir through their military and diplomatic machinations, the American war-mongers are now maligning the state of Pakistan as their jumping ground. By surrounding India also with war bases, they seek to bring pressure on India to unconditionally join their camp.⁴⁹

The Party welcomed the Government's resistance to the pact. The resolution adopted by the 3rd Congress of the Party, stressed the need for "the development of a powerful

⁴⁹ New Age 13 December 1953

campaign against US blackmail and for Indo-Pak friendship, Asian solidarity and world peace."⁵⁰ On this problem the CPI's views coincided with those of the Government.

The CPI wholeheartedly supported Prime Minister Nehru's denunciation of the South-East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO). It considered this treaty a threat not only to peace but to freedom as well and could only be met by building Asian Unity against the US and all "Colonial" powers.

The Party opposed SEATO on two grounds. Firstly it considered SEATO as a conspiracy of the western powers effectively to "encircle" the Soviet Union and China and secondly, as "a menace to peace in Asia". Both these arguments were based on their conviction that peace in Asia could not be separated from peaceful relations with the Communist Countries.⁵¹

Hiren Mukherjee, leader of the Party characterized Nehru's dissociation from the SEATO moreover, as a "positive contribution to peace" In his view, Pakistan-American military pact, SEATO and the Baghdad Pact were "links in a vile chain of conspiratorial acts against the peace and freedom of Asia."

The policy of the CPI was one of full support to the Government in the latter's rejection of SEATO, but they did not at first associate the Government's intention to follow a policy of non-involvement in the Cold War. While it opposed NATO and SEATO, the Party nevertheless approved the Warsaw Pact. According to the Party the Warsaw Pact"

Is open to all countries to join while NATO is confined to certain countries only, thus making it clear that they are contemplating aggressions." Besides, it was argued that the Warsaw Pact had come into existence as a result of the threat created by NATO.

Nuclear Weapons:

⁵⁰ Ibid. 3 January 1954.

⁵¹ Ibid. 23 May 1954.

The CPI has expressed the view that the making of atomic weapons would not only place crippling burdens on India's national economy but would also weaken India's role in the preservation and consolidation of World Peace.

Supporting the nuclear policy of the Government, the CPI stressed the need for India taking the initiative in the matter of rousing world public opinion and in action in concert with other peace-loving states to prevent the further purification of atomic weapons, to bring about nuclear-free zones in Asia, Africa and Europe and to move rapidly towards the destruction of all nuclear stockpiles and the complete banning of nuclear weapons. An active policy for the prohibition of nuclear weapons and complete and general disarmament alone, the party held could effectively defend India against nuclear threats from whichever quarter they may emanate.

The party fully supported the Government's policy of not manufacturing nuclear weapons and not accepting the imperialist nuclear "umbrella" or shield in any form. A memorandum presented by the Party to Prime Minister Shastri on 9 February 1965, said "We are glad that this policy has been reiterated by you and other government spokesmen recently ... we would suggest that a categorical statement be made once again reasserting India's policy of using nuclear energy solely for peaceful purposes, of never manufacturing nuclear weapons and rejecting all proposals for the 'umbrella' or shield."

Consistent with its idea of world-peace and disarmament the party has supported non-proliferation of atomic weapons. In this regard, the Party's attitude coincided with that of the Government of India.

'India' a country which is known as most strongest nation regarding its population, territory and now for its growing economic and military power among the South Asian Countries. From the genesis of this country (1947) it liked to maintain a cordial relation with all its neighbouring countries and also with other parts of the country. Actually Gandhian ideology always has played an important role in all aspect of this country. From 1971's war to 2006-2007's Mao-problem of World's only Hindu nation Nepal, India had extended her friendly hand towards the neighbouring countries. In spite of India's

limited resources, the country is always ready to help the foreign nations – and it proved on during the Tsunami disaster and in Earthquake. From the origin of the United Nation, India also put her name with the organization and still she is requesting for permanent membership in UNO.

One of the important features of India's foreign policy in the post-independence period has been the issue of status, rights and welfare of the people of Indian origin settled abroad. This issue was taken up during the pre-independence period in a big way by the Indian leadership. They protested with the British Government against the policy of discrimination being followed towards the Indian in several dominations of British Empire. The Government of India also took up this issue with the Imperial Government and sought its intervention to check this evil practice. It is different matter that the Imperial Government could not achieve anything substantial in this regard. However, it cannot be denied that anti-racialism and anti-apartheid which became dominant features of Indian foreign policy in the post-independence period had their beginning in the pre-independence period.

India's economic and trade relations in the pre-independent character. In the 20's and 30's of the 20th century India established trade with several countries, even through she continued to maintain close links with Britain. In 1931, India signed Indo-British Trade Agreement at Ottawa whereby preference in tariff rates was granted to the Indian and British goods. In the post-independence period also preferential treatment continued to be extended to the goods of Britain and other Commonwealth countries. In other words the basis for India's economic and trade relations were laid down during the pre-independence period itself.

India started taking active part in various international conferences during the pre-independence period itself. As a result of this participation India became a signatory to the Treaty of Versailles and other peace treaties which brought the First World War to an end. India was not only admitted as an original member of the League of Nations as well as the International Labour Organization and Permanent Court of Justice. India even sent delegates to the Assembly of the League in 1928. India not only acquired membership of various international conferences and conventions. India played an

important role in the drafting of several conventions viz., Opium Convention on Traffic in Women and Children, Slavery Convention etc. India also took active part in the activities of the International Labour Organization and did not hesitate in grievances against economically more powerful states.

The main agenda of Indian Foreign Policy

The principles and objectives of Indian Foreign Policy outlined by Jawaharlal Nehru, the Chief architect of India's Foreign Policy, in his broadcast of 7 September 1946, which he was a member of the Interim Government. He said, 'We shall take full part in international conferences as a free nation with our own policy and not merely as a satellite of another nation. We hope to develop close and direct contracts with other nations and to cooperate with them in the furtherance of World Peace and Freedom... We believe that Peace and Freedom are indivisible and the denial of Freedom anywhere must endanger Freedom elsewhere and lead to conflict and war. We are particularly interested in the emancipation of colonial and dependent countries and peoples and in the recognition in theory and practice of equal opportunities for all races. We repudiate utterly the Nazi doctrine of racialism, whosoever and in whatever form it may be practised.'⁵²

Preservation of Territorial Integrity and Freedom of Policy:

One of the first objectives of India's foreign policy has been preservation of territorial integrity of the country, and freedom of policy. Emphasising this point Nehru told the Asian Relations Conference on 22 March 1947, "India and other countries had been used as a pious other nations in their international games, now that they were emerging into independence it was a good reminder to those nations that the newly-independent nations proposed to stand on their own feet and must be free to decide on their own policies and play their part in the maintenance of peace." He was opposed to interference in the internal affairs of other countries and incorporated non-interference in the internal affairs of each other as one of the five principles of Panchsheel.

⁵² Jawaharlal Nehru, India's Foreign Policy, selected speeches (September 1946 April 1961)

Promotion of International Peace:

Nehru was convinced that a war in the nuclear age would be suicidal as it would cause enormous destruction. He therefore pleaded for reduction of international tension and suspension of nuclear tests with a view to achieve complete disarmament. Further world peace was also considered essential for the economic development of the country because only if no war takes place the developed countries shall be able to extend capital and know-how from the developed countries. Highlighting the importance of peace for the development of newly independent countries.

Economic Development of the Country:

To bring strong and improved economic condition for the infant democratic India since independence rose to her voice against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, which had been responsible for keeping the country economically backward? India's decision to keep out of cold war and military alliances was also promoted by the consideration that it wanted to procure economic and technological help from both the super powers. The policy of non-alignment adopted by India also helped India to promote closer trade relations with countries of both blocks.

Protection of Interests of People of Indian Origin Abroad:

India planned her foreign policy in that way which protects the interest of Indian origin, people living in abroad. People in abroad most of the times failed discrimination on different grounds. The government of India sought to protect their interests by impressing on the concern government to do away with the disabilities against them. The two most glaring examples of discrimination against the people of Indian origin were the policy of racial discrimination followed by the government of South Africa and denial civil and political rights to the people of Indian origin in Sri Lanka.

Freedom of Dependent Peoples and Elimination of Racial Discrimination:

The foreign policy of India sought to work for the freedom of the dependent peoples and elimination racial discrimination. India extended full support to the freedom movements in various countries even at the cost of inviting wrath of the colonial powers. This stand of the government of India was quite logical in view of the fact that India had herself suffered colonial rule for several centuries and was fully conscious of the humiliation. The people have to suffer under alien rule. In 1949 Nehru convened a Conference in Delhi to consider the questions of Indonesia's independence from the Dutch. India also fought for end of racial discriminations because it could pose a threat to world peace. While speaking before the Indian Councils Nehru said on 22nd March 1949 that if racial discrimination was to continue in the world, there was bound to be conflict on a big scale "because it (racial discrimination) is a continuous challenge to the self-respect of vast number of people on the world and they will not put up with it ... And that conflict will not be confined to particular areas in South Africa or elsewhere; it will affect people in vast continents."

Support for Disarmament:

India has been a staunch support of disarmament for two reasons. Firstly India regarded disarmament as vital to end prevailing international tension. Secondly it prevented unproductive expenditure on production of arms which can be fruitfully utilised for development and improvement of socio-economic condition of the people. Both these considerations prompted India to support various efforts of UN and other international agencies to bring about disarmament and arms control. India has also strongly supported nuclear disarmament even though it refused to sign the NPT on the ground that the treaty was discriminatory in nature.

Peaceful use of Nuclear Energy:

Though India has strongly opposed nuclear arms race, it has been in favour of development of energy for peaceful purpose. It has favoured transfer of peaceful

nuclear technology to developing countries to speed up the purpose of their development.

India's Foreign Policy in the 1967:

Election Manifestoes:

It is interesting to note that during Fourth General Election the issues relating with foreign affairs were not so important. Though political parties had presented their view in their election manifesto regarding the issue of foreign policy.

The then ruling party Congress presented their view about foreign policy in their Election Manifesto that as:

In 1962, we faced the unexpected and unprovoked invasion of our Motherland by China. Closely following this war the aggression by Pakistan, initially in Kutch and thereafter in Kashmir and other parts of the country. Twice during the last five years, the people of India relied in a remarkable way for the defence of the country ...The nation is pledged to vacate aggression on its territories. The Congress stands committed to redeem that pledge.

The above showed Congress's position about the neighbouring countries China and Pakistan.

The CPI manifesto thus viewed doubt with regard to China and Pakistan in their manifesto, 1967:

Pakistan:

... safeguard the Tashkent Spirit and work for the further realisation of normal relations between India and Pakistan to struggle actively against new attempts by reactionary forces to aggravate and inflame relations between the two countries; ... over the issue of Kashmir efforts should be made for a lasting accord with Pakistan on the basis of

making the existing cease fire line as the international boundary with mutually agreed adjustments.

China:

Despite the continued hostile attitude of China, it is in the interest of the Indian people and the country as a whole to explore all avenues for a peaceful settlement with China, either directly or through the good offices of friendly neutral powers. It too poses a *no war pact with China*.

An interesting aspect of the Party's attitude to China, however, is that while it wants the Indian Government to try to settle problems with China amicably, it condemns the ruling party in the People's Republic of China on various grounds. The following extract from the manifesto is of some interest:

The entire world communist movement united itself round the unanimous decisions of the World Conference of the Communist and Workers Parties in 1957 and 1960 in Moscow. The working class and liberation forces throughout the world were heading for victory against the forces of imperialism and war.

However, the Communist Party of China decided to break away from the World Communist Movement, repudiate the unanimously agreed line of the movement, falsely accused the Soviet Union of having restored capitalism and becoming an ally of American imperialism.

Not content with separating itself from the main current of the world Communist movement it called for the *splitting of the communist parties everywhere*. The Communist Party of China advanced certain special views on ideological, political and organisational questions contrary to the positions of the international communist movement.⁵³

⁵³ Foreign Policy in the 1967 Election Manifestoes. Sisir Gupta in Introduction to International Relations and India's Foreign Policy, ed. by Verindar Grover.

The CPI (Marxist):

In the interest of our own freedom and well being, the party demands that the Government should take the initiative to have direct talks for a peaceful settlement with China. Friendly relations between the two countries are in the interests of the freedom of Asia; only the imperialists gain by a conflict.

The party demands of peaceful settlement of all disputes with Pakistan so that the forces of reaction and imperialism can no longer exploit their disputes to the detriment of the freedom of both countries. The Tashkent Declaration was a step in the interests of both the peoples; a military conflict between the two only plays into the hands of U.S. imperialism. While demanding a peaceful settlement, the party also warns the people that once again interested parties are busy creating a tense atmosphere on our borders and that as the election approach, these efforts will be intensified with a view to reaping electoral advantages.

- (a) Peaceful settlement of disputes with Socialist China and friendship between free India and Socialist China in the interest of Asia freedom. India-China understanding to be made the basis of a broad front against U.S. imperialism.
- (b) Peaceful settlement of dispute with Pakistan in the interests of strengthening the freedom and independence of both countries.

The Communist Viewpoint over Defence Forces:

The armed forces of our country both the ranks and the officer cadre is drawn from all the states and in a way represents the federal unity of India. In the recent conflict they have shown patriotism, skill and heroism.

But in the defence forces still continue many of the inhibitions, nuances and anti-democratic and absolute practices of the old imperial army. India has yet to build her armed forces with a national democratic ideology imbued with pride in our great nation and equipped with India-made weaponry. One top officers and command cadres still

carry the imprint of the British Sandhurst Imperial Army Training: They still tend to constitute an upper caste which is isolated from the lower ranks of the army in all aspects – social, cultural and political.

The Congress leadership with its capitalist landlord class outlook, has failed to build the new national army of a newly-independent, anti-imperialist, democratic and progressive country. Hence this leadership has kept the *Jawan* as a barrack man, isolated from the people, devoid of literature and politics, not allowing him access even to his Parliament member, for whom he is allowed to vote by post. Our soldier – *jawan* must be allowed to become a citizen and defender, democrat and army-man, combined in one, in ideology, outlook and culture. More sons of the working class, peasantry and middle class must be promoted to rank of officers and command corps. Such an army alone can be a mighty bulwark of peace and democracy and national independence.

Defence and Taxes:

Our party supports the strengthening of the defence of our country. At the same time, it is opposed to levying unconscionable taxes on the toiling people in the name of defence. Defence expenditure has become the source of making high profits for money and the utility value of every rupee spent on so called defence i.e. far less than it ought to be, because in the capitalist system, the life of the *jawan* and the defence of the country are also made into a source of profit and graft, which ultimately spells danger to the whole nation.

"Armed Forces and the People":

The Congress Party talks a lot about national defence but the policies it has been pursuing have landed the country into object dependence on Western Powers for defence material which is endangering our independence.

The growing economic dependence on the USA, the miserable progress in industrial development, the shift in foreign policy – all have led to a situation in which we are more dependent than ever for military hardware and strategic weapons on the

imperialists. This dependence prevents us from raising our voice of protest against such manoeuvres of American imperialism as the movement of the Seventh Fleet in the Indian Ocean, though they directly menace our defence. Besides, in the name of securing American help in the India-China conflicts large number of American officers and military missions operate in the country and they know every detail about our defence. There can be an effective defence unless this policy is defeated and the edge of our defence is turned against imperialism.

The Congress Party's administration follows British methods of building a necessary type of army, totally divorced from the people and based on the incentive of jobs and careers. Students for officer' schools and academies are recruited mainly from the upper classes, while those coming from the common people have to undergo a rigorous test of police security. Anyone suspected to have the slightest political awakening is rejected on the basis of police reports.

The *jawan* of the army, coming mostly from the peasantry, is ill-paid and shares the discontent of the ill-paid and down-trodden peasantry. On recruitment he finds a glaring contrast between his scanty pay and the high salaries of the topmost officials.

While he is allowed the right to vote, he is not to be approached by any political party, nor is he to read any political literature. Servicemen are denied the height to contact even their parliamentary representatives for the redress of their grievances.

This however, does not apply to the generals and top officials who in the main, are largely drawn from the bourgeois-landlord classes and get their education in exclusive institutions. They carry on their policies in their own way behind the curtain.

The powers that be are up raid of raising the democratic and patriotic consciousness of the *jawans* and prefer him to be an obedient tool. The steel wall build between the armed forces and the mass of the people by the former British rules is perpetuated. Under the specious plea of maintaining law and order, the armed forces are often pitted against the people fighting for their legitimate demands. Narrow class fear haunts the Congress leaders and the higher national and patriotic interests are subordinated to it.

Regarding defence budget, the Party declared that:

"The annual defence expenditures of more than Rs. 100 crores has, apart from the crushing burdens imposed of the people, led to further dependence on the USA and consequent to its dictates in quick succession at the cost of our sovereignty "

The Congress Party unfold the real features of foreign policy that the basic foreign policy of the party would remain what Jawaharlal Nehru had made it and says:

It is in consonance with the best traditions of India's struggle for freedom and the striving for peace in which all thoughtful people in all parts of the world are engaged in this atomic age. Peaceful co-existence, non-alignment and disarmament are important aspect of this policy of peace and friendship with all countries especially our neighbours. The policy includes abstention from the use or threat of use of force for the settlement of interstate disputes or against the territorial integrity and political independence of other states.

A special paragraph in manifesto says: "The Congress Party continues to lead its support to the United Nations at an effective instrument of world peace.

The Communist Party of India (Marxist):

An independent foreign policy based on opposition to imperialism, especially American imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism and support to all freedom struggles; a policy based on opposition to nuclear war and imperialist wars and supporting peace and peaceful co-existence, a policy of firm friendship with all peace loving countries; firm solidarity with Afro-Asian people; break with the British Commonwealth ...

Firm and unqualified support to the people of Vietnam in their struggle and forthright condemnation of America's aggression. Firm steps to defeat American attempts to spread the war in Asia.

Over the Issue of Foreign Aid and Economic Relations the Congress Party said in their manifesto that:

While recognising that during the initial stage of economic development external assistance plays an important role, it is essential to reduce the period to the minimum and to diminish speedily the amount and range of external assistance. This can be done only by producing to the maximum, increasing our export earnings, reducing our imports of essential and eliminating imports of non-essentials. Whatever external aid we may obtain should be used wholly for the building up of such sectors of our economy as will accelerate our movement towards self-reliance. Machine-building, fertilisers, petroleum, metallurgical industries and development of highly trained personnel are among the steps that will quicken the transition. The Indian National Congress realise that the Spirit of *Swadeshi* needs to be urgently strengthened in the new context of economic and industrial development. The movement for import substitution, which has been facilitated by recent measures of Government and has become even more essential, should be pushed forward to the utmost. The Indian National Congress calls on all sections of the people, and more especially on industry enterprise and on scientists and technologists, to cooperate actively with the Government in this vital task.

In the age of science and technology in which we need the best skills and competences no foreign aid can replace the loss of skills as a result of the drain of some of our ablest students to other countries. The Indian National Congress calls on the Government of India, the governments in the states and on the private industry to create conditions to arrest this.

The Communist Party (Marxist) says:

Moratorium on all foreign payments, stoppage of all further American aid, nationalisation of foreign trade and all foreign capital in plantations, mining, oil, refineries, industry, shipping and trade. The Indian Communist Party in their Manifesto presents that:

The Communist Party of India stands for the total elimination of foreign monopolies from our national economy in order to secure economic independence. All industrial

concerns, financial and business enterprises owned by foreign monopolies – oil, tea and jute plantations etc. will be nationalised.

For the movement, the Communist Party stands for the annulment of all collaboration, agreements which give foreign capital the right to majority participation or contract, ban on fresh collaboration agreements. It demands an immediate ban on remittance of profits, dividends, royalties etc. and repatriation of foreign capital and moratorium on all debt repayments.

The Communist Party of India stands at present for taking over by the state all foreign trade which is mostly controlled by foreign monopolies. Along with this, in order to rapidly reduce our dependence on world imperialist market and to save the country from impressments' exploitation through non-equivocal exchange progressive planned diversion of our foreign trade towards the socialist states and Afro-Asian countries is necessary. It is also necessary to see that all trade is conducted as far as possible on a rupee basis.

The Communist Party of India stands also for organising and rapidly developing the movement for self reliance and import substitution, enlisting the full cooperation of our scientists, technicians, intelligentsia and trade unions and for compulsory employment and utilisation of Indian know-how by Indian industry. In spite of India's friendly relations and economic cooperation's with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, which are undoubtedly very beneficial to our nation, the Congress rules restrict the scope of this cooperation under pressure of India and foreign monopolists and rely heavily on imperialist and even at the cost of national self respect and paramount national interests.

Comparison between the Congress and the Left:

India began its independent existence with the Indian National Congress Supreme at the Centre and in all State Legislatures. In its various manifestations, it has controlled the government for most of the years since Independence in 1947. Founded in 1805 the Indian National Congress known after 1947 as the Congress Party (CP) was the most powerful mass movement fighting for independence in British India. It became the ruling party of free India by reason of its national popularity and because most leaders of the independence movement were among its members, including Indian first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru. In its progression from independence movement to ruling party, the CP spawned many offshoots and continues to do so to this date, as often for personal reasons as far matters of party policy. The first to do so was the Socialist wing that split off shortly after independence to form a party in its own right again several times thereafter.

Other major parties at the time of Independence, the Communist Party of India (CPI), with its origins in the peasants and worker parties of the past, were representing, like them, the Communist left. The CPI began the Independence period under a cloud because of its Moscow directed cooperation with the British during World War II. On the right were parties like the Hindu Mahasabha (HMS) doomed to ignoring when one of its kinds killed Mahatma Gandhi in 1948. Within the political system, the HMS, nonetheless, reflected a vital Hindu nationalist strain that has seen several party iterations in the years since and continues to be force in the Hindi speaking belt of north India. Parties in the left, right and centre have continued to divide or split off over the years, and more recently, with the decline of the Congress Party, there has been a rise in the number of single state linguistic, sectarian, and regional parties capable of governing only at the State level but available for coalition building at the Centre.

The Congress Party platform supports a secular democratic State with Planned Economic and Social Development. In November 1969, as Indira Gandhi consolidated her political position as Prime Minister, she and her supporters split the party. Her splinter group called itself the New Congress Party and advocated a stronger Socialist line with the

other Congress Party group. In elections held in March 1971, New Congress Party (which later resumed calling itself the Congress Party) won an overwhelming majority in the Lok Sabha. Prime Minister Gandhi's declaration of a State of Emergency in 1975, followed by the arrest of thousands of her political foes, led several opposition parties of otherwise divergent viewpoints to form the Janata (People's) coalition, which campaigning against her "dictatorship", scored a major election victory in March 1977. The Janata Government began a judicial enquiry into Mrs. Gandhi's activities as Prime Minister (along with investigations of her son Sanjay and others), denied her a Parliamentary seat that she had won in a by-election in late 1978 and briefly had her jailed.

Rather than disgracing the former Prime Minister, these measures revived her popular following as the Janata coalition leadership began to unravel Mrs. Gandhi and her re-organized Congress I Party – 'I' for Indira – re-emerged as the nation's dominant political force, winning a large majority of seats in elections to the Lok Sabha in January 1980. Congress I subsequently won control of 17 to 22 State Governments.

In the 1990s three changes took place in the government. In elections in the fall of 1989, the Congress I lost its majority, and although it remained the largest single party, Rajiv Gandhi resigned as Prime Minister. Viswanath Prathap (V.P) Singh, leader of the Janata Dal formed a government and became Prime Minister with the help of two other parliamentary groups in December 1989. Eleven months later, he lost a confidence vote and was replaced by Chandra Shekhar, a former Congress leader who formed a government with Congress I support, only to resign himself four months later. During the 1991 election campaign that followed, former Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi was assassinated, but the Congress Party I was swept back into power under P.V. Narashimha Rao, a former minister in both Gandhi governments and Rajiv Gandhi's successor as party leader. Rao became Prime Minister in June 1991.

The election results of June 1991, as modified by Party shifts later that year established the following party standings in the Lok Sabha: Congress (I), 245; The Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), 119; the CPI M 35; the Janata Dal Party (JPP) of V.P. Singh 31; the breakaway Janata Dal (JD) of Ajit Singh 20; the CPI 14; the Taegu Demas 13; the

AIDMK 11; others 38 (including five parties which fewer seats) and nine vacancies. Congress strength rose to 256 by July 1993 when Rao narrowly survived a confidence vote, but in December, Ajit Singh and nine JD members (with 16 other seats vacant). Flux continued in June 1994 when the former Prime Minister V.P. Singh and 13 others left the JDP and sought recognition from the Speaker of the House as a separate Party.

Vajpayee had difficulty holding his Government together aimed several corruption scandals. However, he was replaced in 1996 by Dave Gowda, leader of the dozen small factions that formed the 176 United Front in the Lok Sabha. Gowda lost a no-confidence vote in April 1997 and resigned. He was replaced by Foreign Minister I.K. Gujral. The BJP rose to power as the country's most popular party in the 1996 election. When it won 161 in the Lok Sabha and its leader, A.B. Vajpayee was named Prime Minister. Meanwhile Congress I was in decline as corruption charges rocked the party, and won only 30% of the vote.

Several scandals affecting major political figures erupted in the summer of 1997. In June, Laloo Prasad Yadav, President of the Janata Dal was arrested on conspiracy charges in his home State of Bihar. Though he resigned from the Janata Dal, he subsequently formed the breakaway Rashtriya Janata Dal party. Former Prime Minister Narashimha Rao was charged with corruption and criminal conspiracy. Results of an investigation into destruction of the mosque at Ayodhya in 1992 also resulted in criminal charges being brought against senior BJP figures such as L.K. Advani and Shiv Sena's Bal Thackeray.

In May 1997, Rajiv Gandhi's widow, Sonia Maino, formerly joined the Congress Party I, a move many hoped would help to restore the Party's alienating fortunes. Sitaram Kesari was re-elected President of Congress I in June. Within six months, Congress I brought down the United Front Government after Gujral rejected its demand that DMK, the Tamil Nadu based Party allegedly linked to Rajiv Gandhi's assassination, be expelled from the UF Coalition. As neither Congress I nor the BJP could form a coalition government, new elections were called for February-March 1998. Sonia Gandhi campaigned actively for Congress I, but no party was able to gain an absolute majority in the elections. The BJP emerged as the largest party with 182 seats in the 546 seat Lok Sabha, followed by

Congress I with 142 seats. A.B. Vajpayee, Parliamentary leader of the BJP was appointed Prime Minister and asked to form a coalition government. He succeeded in putting together a fragile 14 party coalition that survived a vote of confidence on 28 March by 13 votes. This narrow Parliamentary majority, however clearly hampered Vajpayee's Legislative Programme. In July for example, the Government was forced to shelve a bill that would have reserved one-third of the seat in the Lok Sabha and state Legislatures – for women because of strong opposition from (mostly male) disputes.

Sonia Gandhi began to take a more active role in Congress Politics in 1998, and shortly after the election, she was elected to the post of President of Congress I. Towards the end of the year, Congress showed signs of recovery by regaining Delhi and Rajasthan, both traditional BJP strongholds in regional elections. However, this did not carry over to the national elections resulting from the fall of Vajpayee's Government in 1999, following the AIDMK leaving the coalition. In the run up to the September-October 1999 elections, both Sonia Gandhi and her daughter actively campaigned for Congress. The party split, however, over the issue of whether a foreign-born individual (i.e. Sonia Gandhi) could become leader of the Country. Gandhi resigned as President of Congress in May 1999, although the Party refused to accept her resignation. Shortly afterwards, Congress I expelled shared power. P.A. Sangma and Tariq Anwar, the chief opponents of Gandhi within the party.

Sonia Gandhi won a seat in Parliament in the October 1999 elections and was also elected the Congress I Parliamentary leader. The Gandhi name, however, did not halt the doctrine of Congress. The Party won only 112 seats (as compared to 142 in the 1998 elections) and with the alien controlled only 135 seats, and once again A.B. Vajpayee was asked to form a Government. He succeeded in putting together a coalition government, the National Democratic Alliance, which controlled 298 seats in the Lok Sabha. For the first time in four years, an Indian government – albeit a coalition government – appeared to have a decisive working majority in the legislature. As the leader of the BJP's moderate wing, Vajpayee has sought to control the party's more extreme Hindu nationalist members.

Left Parties vote varied from nine to seven percent between 1957 and 2004. Between the two CPI has considerably declined, while that of the CPM has improved. It however, between five to six percent from the time of its formation to the present. The electoral support for the Communists in some States, such as Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Punjab, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu has declined. But this loss is more than compensated for by their consideration in Kerala and West Bengal. Most of the Communist members in the Lok Sabha come from the two States of West Bengal and Kerala. That the Congress or no other party could replace the Communist government in West Bengal since 1973 shows the extent to which the Communists entrenched themselves in that State. However, they were not able to grow beyond the three States of Bengal, Kerala and Tripura despite their restore and attempts to do so.

The most vigorous opposition to the Congress on the basis of ideology came from the Communists. Soon after Independence they waged an armed struggle in some parts of the country to overthrow the Indian State, although they soon gave up that course and participated in the first General Election. The ideological debates on the character of the Indian State, path to resolution in India and strategy are factors led to several splits in the Communist Party. However, their participation in elections and success in forming and running government at the State Level firmly placed them in the arena of Parliamentary Politics. India is the only country in world where a Communist Party could come to power through Parliamentary means and control governments within a capitalist state. But the sailing was not easy in the initial years. The dismissal of the Communist Government led by E.M.S. Namboodripad in 1959 sparked a bitter struggle between the CPI and the Congress.

Interestingly, the inner party debates on the character of the Indian State and revolution in the undivided CPI got entwined with the controversy on the character of the Congress Party and cooperation with it. In the process, a major section of the CPI moved closer to the Congress to form a United Front with it. The other section took a hostile attitude, which formed the CPM in 1976. The split in the CPM and the formation of the CPI (ML) and other revolutionary organisations based on Maoism in 1967 and the splits within splits of these groups and parties show the salient of differences over strategy and tactics for the Communists. However, a closer examination of the splits among the

Communists reveals the interpenetration of leadership rivalries, personality clashes, organisational matters and programmatic positions.

Except in the initial years after Independence, ideology did not become a bar to forge alliances among parties. The Communist and the Muslim League fought elections in Kerala together. Both the Congress and the CPI could forge alliances and together they could arrive at electoral understanding with caste loaned politics in that State. The coming together of the Socialists farmer-based Congressmen and the Jana Sangh to form the Janata Party showed that ideology is not a hindrance in party chemistry that the Communist played an important role in bringing the non-Congress non-BJP Parties together and these parties offered the position of Prime Minister to Jyoti Basu, the Polite Bureau Member of the CPM, shows that the ideologies have different meaning on the Indian soil. The case with which the parties had changed sides far long and forged new alliances, and at times with those who were treated untouchables is surprising.

Congress still seems to be a type in itself. Since Independence it remained a loose and open organization, approximately to the four theoretical constructs of party proposed by Eldesveld. Congress leaders tolerate local autonomy, initiative and inertia. Dissent and factional rivalry are recognised. Some treat it as a healthy sigh and desirable one at that some times the top leaders even encourage factional activity at the State Level to ensure that no single leader or faction gets entrenched. The party appeared for long as a coalition of caste and factions without the pretence of organic unity. The party appeared for long as a coalition of caste and factions without the pretence of organic unity. It had also evolved norms for cooption of leaders from different castes and communities. Perhaps because of these the Congress proved to be resilient in Indian politics despite recurring electoral debacles. As recent studies have shown, this feature of the Congress did not work in the States like Bihar, and Uttar Pradesh, which was why the backward classes and Dalits deserted the party in those States.

Parties in India on the whole acted as they agencies of democratic transformation in the country. In a society that had a long history of social inequalities and dogged by poverty and backwardness it is not easy to bring freedoms to all in an equal measures that too swift manner. At the time India became a republic, the democratic political structure

came in a big way. Its polity was much ahead as its social and economic structure. Leaders of India are aware of these contradictions between political democracy and socio-economic structure. Political parties had precisely tried to grapple with this new situation and tasks. Change in social relations and values cannot be brought in a jiffy nor can be forced at will. In any democracy it has to happen only through reconciliation of all sections to the changing realities which are more slow and irritating to those who want swift radical changes. Parties popularised notions of equality and freedom among people and also moderated the extreme demands for individual liberty and social equality. Both change and stability are important. Thus, even those parties that stood for radical changes are compelled to implement incremental changes when they come to power.

Central Government made its effort to reduce the problem of poverty and underdevelopment. But it was stated that Government's role are also important to detect the problematic issue and solve it. Over 200 million people in that nation are living in conditions of object poverty. In India poverty will only be alleviated in the long run as national wealth growth or that revolutionary change will remain a prerequisite for meaningful redistribution. The more sophisticated policy-oriented literature, prosperity "policy package", to alleviate poverty, has often suffered from political naiveté based on the belief that failure to adopt appropriate policies can be blamed on the absence of "political will", as if leaders were free to bring about anything they wished. The alternative line of analysis of this issue requests a focus on the state and societal interactions in the process of planned capitalist development.

It is important to note at the outset that a judgement of India's poverty at a significant problem is not merely an imposed scholarly judgement on observed phenomena. Poverty has long been considered a significant political issue within India. Gandhi and Nation were ideologically always committed to the cause of the poor. Indira Gandhi also made "Garibi Hatao" a central slogan in her mobilization strategy. India's Planning Commission as well as several international organizations that are in a position to influence India's policy thinking, have of late tended to treat poverty as a basic problem. The recognition that there is considerable stubbornness in the country and that this requires state intervention is thus part and parcel of contemporary India's political idioms.

West Bengal the State ruled by the Communist Government continuum the maximum governmental efforts in mitigating rural poverty. The Communist Government of West Bengal of West Bengal, more social-democratic than Communist in practice, possess most of these attributes. This pattern of rule results from the existence of a relatively well institutionalized, dominant political party, and it is here that impressive benefit have been made towards eradicating rural poverty.

With the introduction of Fourth Plan Programmes were taken for re-employment and in the Interim of programmes. Fourth Plan was introduced in March 1969 but in 1961 the Third Plan had also demanded "to utilise to the fullest extent the possible manpower resources of the country and to ensure a substantial expansion in employment opportunities".

But throughout the Plan (Third Plan) period the programme progressed slowly and more as a doing agency distributing bits of money and patronage than or a dynamic development pivot as was envisaged in the Plan. Even, the employment opportunities created were for too insignificant to make any visible in fact anywhere in the countryside.

Congress Government was failed to full implement of the programme and the result was flopped Third Plan. Congress Government had conducted a Programme Evaluation Organisation to find the reasons behind the failure of Third Plan's rural worker programmes.

- (a) Delays in release of funds and technical sanction of schemes were reported during all the years.
- (b) Shortage of technical and experienced staff and rising cost of the schemes were experienced.
- (c) Due to limitations of resources as a result of unexpected developments, the scale of efforts was drastically curtailed and only a sum of Rs. 19 Crores (as against the Plan outlay of Rs. 150 crores) was made available during the whole Plan period.

- (d) Insistence on sharpener as a precondition to execution of specific projects under the programme, not only hampered progress but also led to the exploitation of the very sections of the population for whose benefit the programme was expressed conceived.
- (e) Investments made disintegrated fact due to the almost total neglect of regular repair and maintenance of the workers under the programmes.
- (f) Mobilisation of available manpower resources fell short for lack of emphasis on publicity and training to enthuse people's participation.

In West Bengal it was the Purulia where first Plan of "Garibi Hatao" was introduced for the improvement of derelict lacks in Purulia district and so provides employment to local unskilled labour. The project was failed due to red tape and bureaucratic mishandling.

During Congress rule, Central Governments effort was great to eradicate the rural poverty and increased employment prospect but lack of proper technical programmes were ended in the middle of the terms also made hopeless rural people from the optimism of develop rural India.

During the Congress regime in India critics used to say 'one party dominate' state. And few states after the Fourth General election faced problems because of a non-Congress government. After that Centre-State relations had gained great prominence as an issue in the political system and all political parties had found it necessary to express a position on it. The issue than so prominent before 1971 election where Centre-State relation's problem came into the election manifestoes. After independence, the issue of Centre-State relations was relatively dominated and generally received low political awareness from the political elites and parties. The major reasons for this development was the fact of the dominance of the Indian National Congress over both the Central and almost all the State Governments. The strong-Centre or supported by a strong national party organisation, centralized administration and resources. There were certainly conflicts among States and between specific States and the Centre. Thus, for the dominant party the Centre-States relations were not an issue and the non-Congress

opposition parties were too weak, disorganised and inexperienced to articulate this as an important issue.

An analysis of manifestoes of 17 national and regional parties for the Fourth General Election shows that only four of these parties made special mention of Centre-State relations. They were: Jan Sangh, CPI, CPM and DMK. The Congress Party was not expected to present Centre-State relations as an election issue. Its manifesto, however, made a brief mention of "the relatively under-developed areas in the country". The non-Congress Parties on the other hand, blamed the Congress for all the mess in the country including regional imbalances, linguistic controversies, inter-State disputes on boundaries and rice water and other problems. Since Congress was in power at both levels of the government, this anti-Congress did not, pursue, and signify talking positions on the issue of Centre-State relations.

Some National Parties of India seemed to have recognised that some conflicts between different governments will be inevitable. Therefore it sought to set up a High Power Commission to inquire into and arbitrate on all disputes between the States and the Centre.

The Communist Party of India demanded over through of Congress power and asked for "far reaching radical changes in one present economic and political structure", devoted a separate section to "Justice and More Powers for States" in its manifesto. It said:

The Communist Party of India stands for removal of all injustice and discriminations against states, for removal of regional disparities. It demands wider power and authority, particularly in financial and economic matters, be given to the States of the Indian Union. The Seventh Schedule of the Constitution must be revised and amended so as to enlarge powers of the State and abridge those of the Central Government.

The Left had charged the Congress Party with "disuniting" India. It said "The Congress Government denies real autonomy to the States and Union Territories. By transferring more and more powers to the Centre, the Government is negating the autonomy of constituent units and turning the federal structure of the Indian Union into a unitary

State". The demand for more powers to the States was implied although not specifically stated in the manifesto of the CPM.

The four year period between the Fourth General Election and the Fifth General Election in 1971 was qualitatively significant for both Centre-State relations and the experiences of the political parties. The 1967 election led to loss of Congress power in half of the States although at the Centre, the Congress maintained its predominant position. Later the era of defections in the State Assemblies provided greater opportunities to the non-Congress parties to exercise the power of a hostile Central Government.

The Congress Party led by Indira Gandhi emerged as the successor to the undivided party and continued to control the Central Government. It was therefore natural that to it, the relations between the Centre and States did not appear as an issue of any significance. Hence, like in the past, Centre-State relations did not get a mention in its manifesto. Among the different parties who are advocating varying degrees of greater power to the States, the most virulent attack on Central dominance was made by the CPM – it was because CPM's experience of the Centre's hostility to it, both in West Bengal and Kerala, was still fresh and bitter in the 1971's election.

The Communist Party of India adopted the most moderate line in 1971, although its manifesto was one of the longest only one small paragraph was adapted to Centre-State relation. The CPI demanded a constitutional amendment to provide for more power to the States consistent with the basic unit of the Union. The CPI also demanded that the post of Governor should be abolished. The CPM perceived extreme concentration of both political and economic power in the Centre and sought to change it in favour of the States. It warned that "This monstrous concentration of power in the hand of the Centre is creating the degree of a bureaucratic police state, spelling abrogation of all democratic rights". The CPM also viewed the creation of the Industrial Security Force in Central establishments as "an open assault on the States Power regarding maintenance of law and order". The CPM wanted fundamental change in the system of Centre-State relations and made these specific demands:

- (a) Abolition of the post of Governors and the President's Rule in the States

- (b) Revision of the allocation of powers and functions between the States and Centre with a view to making the States' power real.
- (c) Most of the subjects in the concurrent list of the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution to be transferred to the States'
- (d) Greater resources to the States: 75% share of all the taxes centrally collected to go to the States, to begin with.
- (e) Complete control by the State Governments over all its officials including those who belong to all-India Services.

Communalism is a core problem of Indian politics, and Indian politics is known as the Congress Politics. The opposition always tried to find out the relation but when Congress and the 'Communalism' E.M.S. Namboodripad gave statement that the left forces in the country – which he specified to mean the CPI (M), CPI, RSP and 'other Left Parties' – would have to fight against the "authoritarian and anti people" policies of the Congress (I) on the one hand and the "pre-imperialist, communal and anti-national" policies of the BJP.

In the apportionment of the grounds for opposition as between the Congress (I) and the BJP, communalism has been assigned by Namboodripad to the latter and the Congress (I) absolved of it. The Congress (I) is not as dangerous one. To be sure, this is the outcome not of the ideology of the Congress (I) but of its political calculations. The Congress (I), or to be more precise the Prime Minister, appears to have decided to bare here political appeal to the people, especially in the crucial Hindi speaking areas of the north on her role as the saviour of the country's unity and integrity, threatened by Sikh terrorists in Punjab, by Muslim anti-national elements in Kashmir and by assorted tribal formulations in the north-east - all them aided and abetted by India's external enemies, with Pakistan looking large among these. This is the framework within which Congress (I) propaganda has consciously and literately projected the army action in Punjab and recent developments in Jammu & Kashmir, culminating in the dismissal of the Farooq Abdullah ministry.

Failure to focus attentions sharply on the communal strategy and tactics of the Congress (I) and to make them together with the Party's authoritarian and anti-people policies the basis for the Left parties opposition to it only serves to confuse the political situation.

It was interesting that practice the Left Parties are being led to this. Thus the Left Front in West Bengal, which was dominated by the CPI (M) has decided to launch a state-wide campaign to expose the Congress (I)'s and Indira Gandhi's methods of inciting and instigating forces opposed to secularism. Saroj Mukherjee, West Bengal State Secretary of the CPI (M) and Chairman of the Left Front, planned that it had been decided to launch the progressive because caste, communal and divisive forces are encouraged (by Indira Gandhi) to precipitate one crisis after another so that she can declare 'I am saving the Country'. The CPI (M) General Secretary's statement referred to at the beginning on the other hand, glosses over this 'nefarious game'.

During the Congress regime within the headship of Mrs. Indira Gandhi communal problems of Assam, the Bhiwandi-Bombay complex in Maharashtra, Kashmir and the Punjab and the astute use of religion by the Congress (I) in the most media including reshaping the content of the educational and other schooling process, have revealed the limitations of Communist Parties by India in analysing the use of religion made by the Congress Party to sub serve the interest of the bourgeoisie in India.

The Communist Parties of India have systematically avoided forthright analysis of the use of the religion (particularly by Hinduism) made by the Indian National Congress headed by Jawaharlal Nehru and subsequently by Indira Gandhi to sub serve the interest of the Indian bourgeoisie and to connive and divide they exploited and appraised masses. These parties have not made uphill now a tough class analysis of the reasons which promoted the Indian National Congress headed by Mahatma Gandhi, Nehru and others, vociferous crusaders against communal vivisection of the country, to take a partition India on exactly the same religious-communal basis, and hardly forge a suitable stab apparatus for the Indian Union appropriate for Indian capitalism. These politics have not even thought it necessary from the proletarian class point of view to assess how the Indian National Congress visualised the role, functions and uses of religion in the debates in the Constituent Assembly.

The CPI and CPI (M) needed to the co-state theory of revolution and un-favouring to realise the first stage of revolution basically through the Parliamentary path and it is interesting to see that one section of the bourgeois – that were represented by the Nehru and Indira led Indian National Congress – as basically progressive, anti imperialist, democratic, secular and anti-communal. They are also considered the rest of the bourgeoisies as compradors, closely tied to feudal, semi-feudal and other reactionary sections of the people, stooges and agents of the imperialist bourgeoisie and basically responsible for utilising communal, consist, semi-feudal, religious, obstruct ional ideas and practices obstructing the realisation of the national democratic or the people's democratic revaluation . According to the Communist Parties the comparator, semi-feudal and other sections of the reactionary classes are spearheaded by the RSS and the main fire of the Communist Parties is directed at the RSS and BJP.

The Communist Parties had articulated this position through various documents and the publications and through of number of seminars and conferences organised by the National Integration Committees officially launched by the Congress. In August the background of growing communal and upper caste violence in the country, the Communist Party of India published a pamphlet entitled "National Integration for Democracy and Socialism". It provides a clear insight into Communist Party's analysis of communal, artliest and other forms of movements which according to the party, 'have become the greatest danger to our national unity and hence to our democracy, integrating and national independence.

The Communist Parties have further astutely shifted the analysis of the role of religion in Indian policy, to what they call the role of 'communalism' in Indian polity. The party weeded to the strategic alliance with progressive, national, anti-imperialist section of bourgeoisie for realising the first state of revolutions and that too by Parliamentary methods, have systematically conjured up and strengthened the myth that the Indian National Congress in secular and anti-Communal.

The Congress Government was very cleverly introduced an uncritical, religious content in the educational system, in the name of inculcating moral and spiritual values as well as what is called a spirit of national integration among teachers and students. This in

calculation openly started with Shri Prakash Committee Report published in the late 50's and continues unabated, through a series of measures.

In the name of respect for different religions and also in the name of not hurting the susceptibilities of various religious communities, the Congress Government is very systematically suppressing critical movements which challenge the very basis of religions and the bizarre practises and beliefs prescribed by them. Communist Party has not exposed how this approach harms and insults the susceptibilities of no-believers, humanists, atheists and materialists. Communist Party explained its stand about Communalism. It is said:

The extent to which communal harmony has been ensured in West Bengal during the 25 years rule of the Left Front can be fully understood only in the context of the escalation in communal tension in India in the same period. This period, especially from the mid-1980s, has been the rapid rise of communal forces, represented by the RSS-BJP and other outfits of the Hindu Rights. This process has been accompanied by growing communal polarization and heightened attacks on the minorities in large parts of the country leading to the loss of thousands of innocent lives. The recent State sponsored carnage of minorities in Gujarat. In contrast to this West Bengal has represented a picture of communal amity and peace throughout this period. It is only the principled policies of the Left, backed by a strong secular movement among the people which has kept West Bengal away from the horrifying violence that has accompanied the growth of communalism. Maintenance of communal harmony and defence of rights of the minorities would not have been possible without the Left Front being in power in Bengal during this trying period.

It is not as if communal forces and elements are absent in West Bengal. The opportunistic role of the Congress vis-à-vis communal forces and the alliances of the Trinamul Congress with the BJP have provided scope for communal forces to extend their sphere of activities into West Bengal. Attempts by such forces to create communal tensions and riots have not been lacking and continue till date. In the aftermath of the assassination of Smt. Indira Gandhi concerted attempts were made to unmask anti-Sikh riots. The late 1980s and early 1990s which saw the extensive vote campaign by the

RSS-BJP and their associates, leading to widespread riots were other such occasions. In all these cases the designs of the communal forces were effectively thwarted by the firm intervention of the Left Front Government accompanied large scale mobilisation of cadres of the Left Parties in defence of communal harmony and the minorities at the ground level. The continuous ideological campaign among the people for defence of secularism by both the State Government and Left Parties created the atmosphere in which attempts to disrupt communal harmony could be quickly and decisively deflected.

It is correctly said that protection of the interests of the minorities is the litmus test of democracy which is de facto majority rule. The Left Front has taken several steps to ensure that the minorities get their due share in development. The advance of secular and democratic practice under Left Front dispensation has provided equal opportunities for minorities, especially Muslims who constitute 24% of the State's population. These opportunities have enabled them to launch struggles for better living standard, educational and other facilities and a life of dignity in general Muslim peasants have received their due and proportionate share in the over one million acres of land distributed, without any discrimination. Similarly, large numbers of Muslim peasants are among those one and a half million sharecroppers who have been registered under Operation Barga, thereby assuring them of their agricultural rights and freedom from rapacious exploitation by the land lords.

The Left Front Government has set up a specific department of Minorities Development and Welfare. Working under its aegis, the West Bengal Development and Finance Corporation has started several projects for self-employment to minorities. Rs. 1781 lakhs were disbursed under such schemes in 2001-2002. This allocation for disbursement for the year 2002-2003 has been increased almost three times to Rs. 5083 lakhs. The Government has provided financial assistance towards hostel accommodation for girl students from educationally backward sections of the minorities, besides, providing similar assistance to technical/professional institutions run by organisations of educationally backward minorities and pre-examination coaching to these sections. It also sanctions stipends to minorities for training different crafts and vocations.

The Left Front Government has made a coconscious effort to promote the rights of linguistic minorities in the State. Urdu speaking Muslims constitute both a religious and linguistic minority. Keeping the cultural identity and needs of this section in mind the Left Front Government established the Urdu Academy at same time as the establishment of the Bangla Academy. The Urdu Academy brings out a large number of publications besides providing the text books at subsidised rates for students from the secondary to post-graduate stage. Effective steps have also been taken to promote the Nepali language. Another example of the Government's commitment to meet the cultural requirements of the minorities is that of development and provisions of the Alchiki script for the Santhali language.

At a time when communal forces control the levers of state power and are doing their best to promote communalism and impose their sectarian vision of a unitary form of culture, the Left Front Government stands out a war they example of defence of secularism, communal harmony, the rights of religious minorities and the promotion of the cultural needs and aspirations of different linguistic minorities.

In the 1998 Lok Sabha election Manifesto Communist Party declared about the secularism in this way:

Secularism has been defined as a basic feature of the Constitution by the Supreme Court. This Constitutional Principle expresses the reality of the daily life and experiences of the millions of Indians who live and work harmoniously together irrespective of caste, creed and religion. However, secularism has come under continuous assault by the forces represented by the BJP and its mentor, the RSS. There can be no compromise with those who wish to erode the secular basis of the State and the political system.

The Left Parties will work for:

Legislation for separation of religion and politic.

Prohibition on use of religious issues for electoral purposes by political parties.

References of Ayodhya dispute to the Supreme Court under Article 138(2) for a speedy judicial verdict.

Protection of the basic right of religious beliefs and practicing one's religion.

Implementation of the "Protection of Places of Worship Act" which prohibits change of character of religious places of worship after 1947.

In Manifesto of 2004 Left Parties promised about maintenance of the Secular Value of nations:

CPI (M) is in favour to make "distinguish between politics and religion and to make this separation stable. They are supporters about the enactment of law.

CPI (M) in favour to resolution a bill to protect the hostility over religious places.

Ayodha controversy should be solved by Judicial Department. Ultimate decision of the Court should be obliged by every body.

And in regarding the Foreign Policy CPI (M) said:(2004 Manifesto)

Imperialistic foreign policy of NDA Government has to be changed. CPI (M) will try for the following:

In 1998's Election Manifesto (Lok Sabha) in the area of foreign policy the Left Parties will ensure that:

India is projected at an independent power which plays a constructive role in defending the interests of the Third World and promoting South-South Co-operation.

India does not sign any discriminatory treaty on nuclear weapons like the NPT or the CTBT.

Further, steps are taken to strengthen and improve relation with South-Asia countries and promote SAARC cooperation. Special efforts to improve relations with Pakistan and promote people to people ties.

Relations with India's biggest neighbour, China, are strengthened and economic ties increased. Relations with Russia to be further strengthened.

The Indo-US Military Cooperation Agreement is cancelled.

Nuclear weapons are removed from the US Military base in Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean.

It is a grim reality those fifty years after independence 400 million Indians live in object poverty. India has the largest number of illiterates in the world with only half the population literates. Child malnutrition figures are the highest in the world, excepting Bangladesh.

The policies ushered in, in the name of economic reforms since 1991, have only worsened the situation. Liberalization has meant a bonanza for the big business houses, landlords, financial collators and big graders who make super-profits and accumulate incomes. Under the IMF-World Bank dictated model, the profits for India's economic growth are determined not in the interests of the Indian people but for the narrow affluent section and home and foreign capitalists. By these policies 10 percent of the population have enriched themselves at the expense of the remaining 90 percent of the people.

The Left Parties have consistently advocated an alternative set of policies.

As against the policies of total deregulation of the economy giving full play to the market, rampant privatisation, disbanding of the public sector, indiscriminate entry of foreign capital and import liberalisation; subjecting Indian agriculture to the vagaries of the international market by promoting so called export oriented agriculture and withdrawal of the state from development of infrastructure and public economic and

social investment, the Left Parties advocates an alternative path of self reliant economic development.

Land Reforms: Key to Progress

The main cause for poverty in the unequal and exploitative land relations, parasitic landlordism with it attendant social and economic oppression is the major obstacle to ensuring a better life for the majority of the Indian people.

60 years after independence only 52 lakh acres of surplus land have been taken over and distributed out of a total 75 lakh acres declared surplus which itself is a gross under estimate. On the contrary, under like realisation, land ceiling laws are bin diluted to favour of big business and foreign companies; waste land and degraded forest lands are sought to be allowed to these big companies and that to the landless. It is only the Left-led Governments of West Bengal, Kerala and Tripura which took up land reforms seriously and implemented them. West Bengal alone has distributed 20 percent of the total surplus land distributed in the country. The Left will ensure that there is no dilution of land reform legislation.

The Left Parties will work for:

Speedy and comprehensive measures for implementing radical land reforms.

Takeover and distribution of surplus land above the ceiling, cultivable waste land to be give to the landless;

Correction of land records;

Security for tenants;

Issuing joint pattern for women.

Conclusion:

I would like to conclude my thesis by making it clear that the Congress & the Left parties in India are ideologically different though both the parties differ in their roles. From freedom struggle to the year 1977 India used to be termed as 'One - Party' dominant country but with the coming of Janata party in 1977, other parties came in the political scenario of India. But still the Congress remains the mother party of all the other parties of India. Left party is the only party which is not born from Congress. The Left parties mainly believed in Marxist Socialism & considered the economic policy of the Congress as imperialist policy. In spite the basic differences the Congress and the Left came closer at the central level for the purpose of formation of government although there developed a sort of difference and the left came out from its earlier stand.

However, both the Congress and the Left are away from each other but their close connection is not next to impossible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Books)

- Aggarwal J.C & Chowdhary N.K. Elections in India 1998, Shipra Publications, New Delhi 1998.
- Appadorai A. Domestic Roots of Indian Foreign Policy, Oxford University Press New Delhi 1981.
- Arora B Political Parties Party System: The Emergence of New Coalition Memo 1969.
- B.Bhattachary S. Pursuit of National Interest through Non -Alignment, University Press, Calcutta 1978
- Babu R. B. Globalization and South Asian States, South Asian Publishers, New Delhi 1998
- Bandhopadhyaya J. The Making of Indian Foreign Policy, Calcutta 1979.
- Baral Lok Raj the Politics of Balanced Interdependence Nepal and SAARC Sterling Publishers Private Ltd.: New Delhi 1988

- Bardhan P.K. "India" in Holis Chenery et al,
Redistribution with growth
Oxford University Press: London
1974
- Basu Priya (Ed) India's Financial Sector Recent
Reforms, Future Challenges.
Macmillan India Ltd.: New Delhi
2005
- Berger A. Opposition in a Dominant Party
System, University of
California Press, Barkley 1969
- Bhambri P. The Indian State: fifty years. Shipra
Publishers, New Delhi
1997.
- Bhavani Sengupta the CPI (M): Promises, Prospects, and
Problem Young Asia
Publications: New Delhi 1979
- Bilgrami S. J. R. India and the UN, Jamia Pub. New
Delhi 1969
- Brands H. W. India and the United States: The Cold
Peace, Twayne Publishers,
Boston 1990
- Brass P Caste, Faction and Party in Indian
Politics, Chanakya Publications,
Delhi 1984-85.

- Dasgupta Jyotirindranath Language Conflict and National Development
- Dasgupta C. War and Diplomacy in Kashmir: 1947-48. Sage Publication, New Delhi 2002.
- Dumbrell J. American Foreign Policy: Carter to Clinton. Macmillan, London, 1997.
- Franda Marcus. West Bengal and the Federalising Pressing India. Princeton University Press, Princeton 1968.
- Frankel J. The Making of Foreign Policy, Oxford University Press, London, 1963.
- Ganguly S. US Policy towards South Asia. West View Press, Boulder Colorado 1990
K. Kapur H. India's Foreign policy: 1947-1993, Sage Publication, New Delhi 1994
- Haithcox John Patrick Communism and Nationalism in India , M.N Roy and Comintern Policy 1920 – 1939.Oxford University Press, Bombay. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey: 1971
- Hart Henry(Ed) Indira Gandhi's India Westview Press, Boulder, CO 1976

- Hartmann Horst Political Parties in India. Meenakshi Prakashan. Merrut. Mew Delhi 1977
- Hasan Zoya (Ed) Parties and Politics in India Oxford University Press, New Delhi 2003
- Hennessey J. India and Pakistan in World politics, K. H. Services, London 1950
- Hill C. Changing Politics of Foreign Policy, Macmillan, Hampshire, 2001.
- Jha N.K. Internal Crisis and Indira Gandhi's Foreign Policy, Janaki Prakashan, New Delhi 2985
- Johri J.C. Reflections on Indian Politics S. Chand, Pub. New Delhi 1974
- K. Kohli A. (Ed) The Success of India's Democracy, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2001
- Kochanek S Congress Party of India: The Dynamics of One - Party Democracy. Princeton Press, Princeton, 1968.
- Kochanek A. Stanley The Congress Party in India Princeton University Press, Princeton 1968
- Kothari Rajni The Congress System Revisited. Decennical Review, Asian Survey 14/12, 1974.

- Kothari Rajni Party System and Election Studies,
Asia Publishing House, Bombay
1967.
- Kothari Rajni Cast Politics in India Orient Longman
Ltd.: Hyedabad 1991
- Kothari Rajni the Congress System in India Asian
Survey 1964
- Koushik S. (eds.) Indian Government and politics.
Directorate of Hindi
Implementation. Delhi
University .1990.
- Kumar Pradeep Studies in Indian Federalism. Deep
and Deep Publication 1988.
- Kutsobin P. Ajay K. Ghosh and Communist
Movement. Starling Pub. Pvt.
Ltd. New Delhi 1987
- Lapalombara Joseph & Weiner Myron (Eds) System and National Development
in Asia, Political Parties and
Political Development.
Princeton Press, Princeton 1966
- Lijphart A. Electoral Systems and Party System,
Yale University Press, New
Haven CT 1994.

- Mahashwari S.P. Election politics in National Metropolis, Ritu Publication, New Delhi 1982
- Mohan K.T.J. Independence to Indira and After S. Chand and Company Ltd.: New Delhi 1977
- Mohan Ram Indian Communism: Split within a split. Vikas Pub. Delhi 1969
- Morgenthau H. J. In Defence of the National Interest, Knopf, New York 1951.
- Morris Jones W.H. The Government and Politics of India B.I. Publication: New Delhi 1974
- Morris Jones W.H. Politics mainly Indian. Orient Longman. Hyderabad 1978
- Myrdal G. An Inquiry into the Poverty of Nations, Penguin, Harmondsworth 1968.
- Nizami Taufiq Ahmad the communist party and India's foreign policy. Associated Publishing House. New Delhi 1974

- Palmer N. D. Elections and Political Development: The South Asian Experience, Vikas Publisher, New Delhi 1976
- Palmer N.D. Elections in India: Its Social Basis. K.P. Bagchi Publisher Calcutta 1982.
- Pantham Thomas Political Parties and Democratic Consensus: A study of party organisations in an Indian city. Macmillan Co. of India Ltd. Meerut 1976
- Partha Chatterjee (Ed) State Politics in India Oxford University Press: New Delhi 2007
- Patil V.T. And Jha N. K. (eds.) Peace Co-operative Security in South Asia, P R Publications, New Deli 1999.
- Poulouse T. T. Perspectives of Indias Nuclear Policy, Young Asia Pub., Delhi 1978
- Raghaban G .N. S & Balacandran S. Forty Years of World Largest Democracy: A Survey of Indian Elections, Gian Publishing House New Delhi 1990

- Rajan M.S. Non –Alignment and the Non-Alignment Movement in the Present World Order. Konark Publication, Delhi 1994
- Rao M.V. Short history of the Indian National Congress. S. Chand & Co. New Delhi 1972
- Ray A. Elections: A Democratic Miracle 1952-1996, Horizon Publication, Allahabad 1997.
- Rehaman M.M. The Congress Crisis. Associated Publishing, Delhi 1970.
- Riker H. William Theory of Political Coalitions Gulab Primlani, Oxford and IBH Publishing: New Delhi 1970
- Rose L.E. and Sisson R. War and Secession: Pakistan, India and the Creation of Bangladesh, University of California Press, Berkeley 1990
- Roy Amal Federal Politics and Government Macmillan Company of India: New Delhi 1999.
- Sahni N.C. Coalition Politics in India, New Academic Publishing Company, Jullunder, 1971.

- Sartori G. Parties and Party System
Cambridge University Press:
Cambridge 1976
- Sehadavan P. Conflict and Peace Keeping in
South Asia, Lancers Books, New
Delhi 2001
- Sen S. Agrarian Struggle in Bengal
1946-47 People's Publishing
House: New Delhi 1972
- Sengupta B. South Asian Perspectives: Seven
Nations in Conflict and Co-
operation, BR Publications,
Delhi 1988.
- Sengupta Bhavani Communism in Indian Politics.
Columbia University Press: New
Delhi 1972
- Shadegg S.C. How to Win an Election: The Art
of Political Victory, Toplinger,
and New Delhi 1964.
- Shakir M. State and Politics in Contemporary
India. Ajantha Publisher, Delhi
1986.
- Shan T. India and China, I.C.W.A. New
Delhi 1952.
- Sharma A. Democracy in India and Elections,
Research Institution, Jaipur 1984

- Sharma P.N. Election and National Politics, Shipra Publication, New Delhi 1994
- Sheth D.K. (Ed) Citizens and Parties, Allied, New Delhi 1975
- Singh B. State Politics in India: Explorations in Political Process in Jammu and Kashmir, Macmillan, New Delhi, 1982
- Singh M.P. Lok Sabha Elections 1989: Indian Politics in 1990's, Kalinga Publications, New Delhi 1992.
- Sirsikar V.M. & Fernandez L Indian Political Parties, Mittal Pub. New Delhi, 1999
- Sisson R. India in 1982: A Year of Elections in a Culture of Change, Asian Survey 30, 1990.
- Smith T.M. Elections Developing Countries, Macmillan, London 1960
- Sood P. Politics of Socio-economic changes in India, Marwah Pub., and New Delhi 1979 South Asia Publishers, and Delhi 1998.

- Swarup et al. Women's Political Engagement in India: Some Critical Issues in B.J, Nelsons and Chowdhary (eds.), Women and Politics Worldwide, Oxford University Press Delhi 1997.
- Talwar S.N Under the Banyan tree: The communist movement in India. Allied Pub. New Delhi 1985
- Tathor S. Political Development and Foreign Policy. Viaksa, New Delhi 1982
- Thakur R. The Government and Politics of India, Macmillan, London 1995.
- Thampi Madhabi India and China in the Colonial World Social Science Press: New Delhi 2005 University of California Press, California 1970
- Verma S. P & Bhambri (eds.) Election and Political Consciousness in India. Meenakshi Prakashan, Meerut 1967
- Weiner Myron State Politics in India. Princeton University Press, New Jersey 1967.
- Zaidi A. M. The Great Upheaval '69 – '72' Orientalia, New York 1972

Zirakzadech C.E.

Social Movements in Politics: A
Comparative Study, Addison
Wesley Longman, New York
1997.

JOURNALS

Rajya Sabha Debates Vol.27, 8 Dec. 1959

New Age, 24 Dec.1961

New Age, 9 Dec. 1962

National Herald, 24 August 1968

Ibid, 5 September 1968

Ibid, 10 September 1968

CPI, Programme of CPI, 1951 (Bombay)

New Age, 26 February 1961

New Age, 16 May 1965

New Age, 18 July 1965

New Age, 16 January 1968

Election Manifesto of CPI, 1962, (New Delhi)

New Age, 26 November 1961

New Age, 26 August 1962

New Age, 4 November 1962

India, Lok Sabha Debates, series 3, Vol.12, 23 January 1963,

New Age, 24 February, 1963

New Age, 21 April

“On Sino – Indian Border Conflict” (Pravda’s editorial), New Age,
29 September 1963

Election Manifesto of Indian National Congress, 1977.

India Quarterly, Vol.33, No.2, April – June 1977 (J.

Bandyopadhyaya “The Non- aligned Movement and International
Relations”)

India Today, 16 -30 January, 1979

Asian Affairs, Vol. 62, Part III, October, 1975. (

David Kimche, “From Non-alignment to Commitment: Aspects
of India’s Foreign Policy”)

Publications Division, Government of India. The years of
Endeavour: Selected Speeches of Indira Gandhi. August 1969 –
August 1972, New Delhi 1975

Indian Express, 12 July 1976

Foreign Affairs, Vol. 54, No. 2, January 1976

The Indian Year Book of International Affairs 1953

The Times of India, 28 June 1975

The Times of India, 19 May 1974

The Times of India, 15 December

Stockhome International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) 1975,
(The Non – Proliferation Treaty: Text of Agreement.

The Times of India, 8th March 1978

South Asian Studies. Vol. 34, No. 1, January 1999

The Indian Journal of Political Science.

Mainstream,

Indian Journal of Politics.

