

## 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 Jan 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 15<sup>th</sup> 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 15<sup>th</sup> 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:

<b>Sl. No.</b>	<b>Name of the State</b>	<b>Districts</b>	<b>Blocks</b>
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. Sing 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 15<sup>th</sup> 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 14<sup>th</sup> 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 tier 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 50<sup>th</sup> 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 consisted 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 21<sup>st</sup> 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 7<sup>th</sup> 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 2/3<sup>rd</sup> 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 purposes 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 banned 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 made 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 11<sup>th</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup> 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 40<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebrations of U.N.O.), once again Moscow (on the occasion of Oman Sultan's 5<sup>th</sup> 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 chances 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.