

## **Role of the Left Parties in Domestic Affairs:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Role of the Left parties in International affairs:**

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

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>1</sup> India, Rajya Sabha Debates, Vol. 27, 8 December, 1959, Col. 1765.

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

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>2</sup> New Age (W), 24 December, 1961.

<sup>3</sup> New Age, 9 December, 1962.

<sup>4</sup> CPI Proceedings of the Seventh Congress of the CPI, 1964, Delhi.

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

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

### **Indo-Pak Relations:**

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

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

---

<sup>5</sup> New Age, 18 July, 1954

<sup>6</sup> New Age, 18 July, 1954

<sup>7</sup> CPI, Programme of the CPI, 1951 Bombay.

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

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>8</sup> New Age, 6 May, 1956.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. 8 April, 1956.

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

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

Hiren Mukherjee said:

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. 6 May, 1956.

<sup>12</sup> India Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. 3, No. 7.

<sup>13</sup> New Age, 26 February, 1961

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

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid. 16 May, 1965.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. 18 July, 1965

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

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

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

### **Indo-China Relations:**

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

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

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid. 29 August, 1965

<sup>17</sup> Ibid, 16 January, 1968

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>18</sup> Election Manifesto of CPI, 1962 (New Delhi, 1961).

<sup>19</sup> . New Age, 5 April, 1959.

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

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

On the question of the border conflict with China also, the CPI's attitude in the early stages, was different from that of the other opposition parties. The party completely ruled out the possibility of a threat from China: such a threat was only "mystical", because "Socialist China can never commit aggression against China", was stated by the Central Executive Committee in September 1959.<sup>21</sup> this view was reiterated at the Meerut Session of the National Council (November, 1959). The Nation Council urged that the Government of India and China should start negotiations without either making the acceptance of its own stand by the other as a pre-condition for starting the negotiations.

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

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

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid. 17 May 1959

<sup>21</sup> Ibid. 26 November, 1961.

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

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

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

---

<sup>22</sup> . Ibid. 26 November, 1961.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid. 26 August. 1964.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>25</sup> India Lok Sabha Debate, Series 3, Vol. 22, 1963.

<sup>26</sup> New Age, 24 February 1983.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid, 21 April 1963

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

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

The Right CPI took the position that:

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **THE KOREAN CRISIS:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### The Hungarian Crisis:

<sup>30</sup> Cross roads (Bombay), 3 June 1949.

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

<sup>32</sup> Ajoy Ghosh "Hungary the Lessons", New Age, 4 November 1956.

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### The Czechoslovakian Crisis:

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

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

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

---

<sup>34</sup> National Herald, 24 August 1968

<sup>35</sup> Ibid, 5 September 1968.

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

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>36</sup> . Ibid. 10 September 1968

<sup>37</sup> CPI, Programme of the CPI 1951.

The Commonwealth Link:

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

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

A fully free India outside the Commonwealth and outside all imperialist influence will be a great factor for world peace and freedom of all Asian and Colonial peoples. Hence, the necessity to intensify the fight against British imperialism for quitting the Commonwealth and for the confiscation of British capital; hence the necessity of opposition to every manifestation of subservience to British imperialism in economic, political and military conference under its aegis .....<sup>39</sup>

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

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

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

---

<sup>38</sup> Crosswords 6 May 1949.

<sup>39</sup> CPI Political Resolution adopted at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Congress, December 1953

<sup>40</sup> New Age 10 October 1954

<sup>41</sup> India Lok Sabha Debate Vol. 9 1956

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

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

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

The Hindu 24 February 1957

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

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

---

<sup>42</sup> India Rajya Sabha Debate Vol. XV, Dec. 1956.

<sup>43</sup> India Rajya Sabha Debate Vol. XV, Dec. 1956.

<sup>44</sup> India Rajya Sabha Debate Vol. XV, Dec. 1956.

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

#### Anti-Colonialism:

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

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>45</sup> . Ibid. 24 August 1958

<sup>46</sup> Resolution of the CEC of the CPI" New Age, 18 September 1954

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

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

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

### **Racial Discrimination:**

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

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

---

<sup>47</sup> New Age, 8 January 1961.

<sup>48</sup> CPI, Political Resolution adopted by the Sixth Congress, Vayaya Week, April 1966.

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

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

#### Military Pacts:

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>49</sup> New Age 13 December 1953

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

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

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

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

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

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

Nuclear Weapons:

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid. 3 January 1954.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid. 23 May 1954.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **The main agenda of Indian Foreign Policy**

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

#### **Preservation of Territorial Integrity and Freedom of Policy:**

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

---

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

### **Promotion of International Peace:**

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

### **Economic Development of the Country:**

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

### **Protection of Interests of People of Indian Origin Abroad:**

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

### **Freedom of Dependent Peoples and Elimination of Racial Discrimination:**

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

### **Support for Disarmament:**

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

### **Peaceful use of Nuclear Energy:**

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

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

### **India's Foreign Policy in the 1967:**

#### **Election Manifestoes:**

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Pakistan:**

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

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

## **China:**

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

### **The CPI (Marxist):**

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

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

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

### **The Communist Viewpoint over Defence Forces:**

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

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

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

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

#### Defence and Taxes:

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

#### "Armed Forces and the People":

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regarding defence budget, the Party declared that:

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

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

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

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

The Communist Party of India (Marxist):

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

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

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

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

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

The Communist Party (Marxist) says:

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

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

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

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

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

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