

UNIT 1

Contents

1 Meaning – Nature - Classification	2
2 Challenges of Indian Foreign Policy.....	5
3 Panch Sheel, 1954.....	5
4 Kashmir Issue.....	9

1 Meaning – Nature - Classification

DIPLOMACY

Introduction:

During the modern period, the international relations are maintained by diplomatic ideologies. Since all the nations have to depend upon others for some purpose or other they are particular in adopting their own diplomacy. As diplomacy plays a significant role in their political relations with other countries, we must have a knowledge of diplomacy.

Definition or Meaning:

- Oxford dictionary offers the meaning that diplomacy is “the management of international relations and skill in negotiation”.
- It is derived from the Greek word ‘Diplomad’ meaning a parchment having secret written instructions.
- Harold Nicholson in his work ‘Diplomacy’ has mentioned that it refers to five things.
 - It is associated with foreign policy of the nation.
 - It points out the speeches about the countries.
 - It points out the ways and means to carry out the decisions of the countries in a uniform manner.
 - It points out that it is a foreign service.
 - It refers to the efficient method employed in the talks between the countries.
- As pointed out by Earnest Chalten, it deals with the successful functioning of relationships between countries in an effective way.
- The administration of international relations through talks is now accepted as diplomacy.
- Glichrist has described political diplomacy as the functions of diplomats in general and particular contexts.
- Generally, it means the acceptance and approval obtained from the parties through talks.
- On the basis of national welfare, the strengthening of international relations is known as diplomacy of specific nature.
- The creation and execution of a foreign policy by a nation is also included in diplomacy.
- Avoidance of war by talks is also known as political diplomacy.

- It also means the maintenance of relationship among nations.

Nature of Diplomacy

- (1) The creation of foreign policy is included in diplomacy.
- (2) It maintains the relationship among the nations.
- (3) By diplomacy the feuds and confrontations which arise while dealing with foreign policies by nations are avoided.
- (4) It creates social cohesion among the nations.
- (5) As a brain to man, diplomacy is a must for a nation.

The Contents of Diplomacy:

- As pointed out by Harold Nicholson, political diplomacy comprises of three things. They are:
 - the growth of national and social Institutions.
 - The importance assigned to the views of the public.
 - The development which has emerged in information and publicity.

2.(a) There are differences between diplomacy and foreign policy. (b) Foreign policy offers the necessary functional aspects for the relations. (c) But diplomacy yields the required institutions and individuals. (d) The diplomats have no direct say in the formation of foreign policies because they execute the plans which are all already prepared. (e) Both diplomacy and international relations are related to each other. (f) The weak diplomacy reduces the vigour in the execution of a foreign policy. (g) Strong and powerful diplomacy will eliminate the drawbacks in the foreign policies. (h) While diplomacy deals with the ways and means for its functioning foreign policy offers the plans for the foreign contracts.

Classification of diplomacy:

(A) Secret diplomacy: (a) Such secret diplomacies were popular and prominent before the first world war. (b) In this type of diplomacy, the nobles and high caste people carried out the political activities. (c) Such secret diplomacies created problems to various nations and their people. The Triple Alliance, The Dual Alliance etc. caused first world war. (d) The secret activities led to suspicion among the nations. (e) As the secret diplomacies led to chaos and war conditions that diplomacy is not at all accepted now-a-days.

(B) Open or democratic diplomacy:

(1) Such a diplomacy emerged during the commencement of the 20th century. (2) It deals with the activities carried out by the people. (3) This had the following defects: (a) The people's representatives, who were unaware of the essence of diplomacy, when involved in diplomacy they could not do full justice to that. (b) The diplomats arrive at conclusions only on the basis of the views of public. It takes a long time to arrive at decisions. Thus it leads to delay. (4) It has the following merits: (a) It enables the people of a nation to know about the policies of their country. (b) This is helpful for taking easy and open decisions.

(C) Personal Diplomacy: (1) During the ancient period, the leaders of the countries carried out their diplomatic relations through their ambassadors or diplomats. (2) Today, the development of information and publicity measures have caused changes in the form of diplomacy. (3) A President of a nation can have direct contacts with his counterpart of another nation to take quick decisions after discussions with other leaders. (b) It avoids unnecessary frictions and confrontations among the leaders. (c) There will be ample scope for give and take among the leaders. (d) It allows nations to get some rights and privileges.

Such privileges can be announced only by the leaders of the nations. (e) Personal diplomacy enables the two involved parties to take quick decisions. (f) By this kind of diplomacy, the problems of secret diplomacies can be avoided. (g) The non-availability of any confusion in this will yield perfect decisions. (4) This kind of diplomacy is having its own defects. (a) The decisions by the personalities on their own accord may be hasty. (b) There will be no opportunity for the leaders to discuss the issues with the people. So, their decisions may or may not be apt. (c) There will not be any scope for discussion as done in a conference. (d) Hasty and quick decisions will be always unsure.

(D) Diplomacy by Conference: (1) It informs the decisions taken by many nations through a Conference. (2) The League of Nations, which emerged after the First World War, introduced such a kind of diplomacy. (3) The NATO, SEATO, Warsaw Pact etc. are suitable examples for this. The diplomacy of every nation depends upon the international relations and a country. At present, every nation is much interested in dealing with the political affairs of other nations. It has become now necessary among nations to stabilize their powers by diplomatic relations. The super powers are particular in enhancing their status in the world. The diplomacy of the nations centres around their political uses. In addition to political diplomacies, there are economic and commercial diplomacies. Anyhow, diplomacy creates goodwill and fame for the nation.

2 Challenges of Indian Foreign Policy

These are some of the challenges facing Indian foreign policy.

Major issue-based challenges include, terrorism and security of the country, energy security, food and water security, climate change and Indian diaspora's welfare among other. On the security front, Indian Foreign policy has a twofold objective. First part is to create national defence capabilities to protect India's unity and territorial integrity. Second part of the policy is to push for nuclear disarmament, and propound initiatives which can take the cause further. The fast rate of growing Indian economy demands for more energy resources. India already lacks in petroleum and good quality coal.

Agriculture is more or less stagnant in India. Water is said to be the resource of 21st century. Although the resource is sufficient in the South Asian region but proper cooperation of neighbouring countries in sharing correct hydrological data has to be ensured on priority basis.

Climate change remains the major challenge. Developing countries including India wants larger share of cut from their side in greenhouse gas emission, because they have already used environment and resources for reaching to a level of development where they are. On the other hand, developed countries want to have bounded commitments from developing countries for greenhouse gas reduction.

3 Panch Sheel, 1954

'Panch Sheel' was first enunciated in the Sino-Indian Treaty on Tibet in April 1954. The Sanskrit term Panch Sheel means 'five codes of conduct'. At about this time when Nehru was pointing out the dangers of world extinction through nuclear conflict, Chairman Mao told Nehru that a future nuclear war was only another stage in the inevitable march towards socialism, and that if 300 million Chinese died in it, another 300 million would survive! Nehru constantly emphasized that peaceful co-existence of countries with different ideologies, differing systems, was a necessity and believed that nobody had a monopoly on the truth and that pluralism was a fact of life. To this end he outlined the five principles of peaceful coexistence, or Panch Sheel, for conducting relations among countries. These were

- (i) mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty,
- (ii) non-aggression,
- (iii) noninterference in each other's internal affairs,

- (iv) (iv) equality and mutual benefit, and
- (v) (v) peaceful coexistence

Non-Alignment Movement

Bandung Conference, 1955

Objectives

The first Afro-Asian conference was held in April 1955 in the Indonesian capital Bandung, in which 29 nations participated. The objectives of the conference were to

- (1) promote goodwill and cooperation among the Third World Countries,
- (2) consider social, economic and cultural problems of the Asian and African people;
- (3) view the position of Asia and Africa in their contribution to the promotion of world peace and cooperation.

Importance

President Sukarno of the Indonesian Republic hosted the conference and Nehru, Chou-en-Lai and Nasser of Egypt were some of the dignitaries who actively participated in the conference. Nehru highlighted the relevance of Non-alignment in the contemporary world and pointed out that the strength of the developing countries was in industrial development not of stockpiling weapons of war.

The basic parameters of India's Foreign Policy were explained by Jawaharlal Nehru in September 1946 when he declared:

"We propose, as far as possible, to keep away from the power politics of groups aligned against one another, which have led in the past two World Wars and which may even lead to distress on an even vaster scale. 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 seek no domination over others and we claim no privileged position over other peoples".

In the late 1940s a bi-polar political world emerged. The two big world powers, the U.S.A and Russia had developed nuclear weapons and demonstrated their military might over weaker states. In Eastern Europe the pan-Slav movement gained popularity and Soviet

influence over Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria became paramount. To counter Russian influence in the north-east the U.S.A. extended liberal economic and military assistance to Greece and Turkey and kept them out of the orbit of Soviet Union. In Western Europe, both greater and lesser states turned their eyes towards the U.S.A.

Nehru's main contribution to the evolution of India's foreign policy was the acceptance and implementation of the concept of Non-alignment. Non-alignment meant taking independent decisions on international issues without being tied to any particular country or a group of countries. Thus, Nehru and India's subsequent foreign policy has been in favour of peace and disarmament, racial equality and international co-operation for the peaceful resolution of international disputes.

Nehru's policy of Non-alignment was amply demonstrated during the Korean Crisis. During World War II, U.S.A. occupied South Korea and Russia occupied North Korea. At the Postdam Conference, the 38th parallel of latitude was recognized as the line of control between North Korea and South Korea. In 1950 India warned against the danger of expansion of conflict if the armies of one side were moved closer to the northern border of other. India's impartial approach received recognition when an Indian was chosen the chairman of the United Nations Repatriation Commission to deal with the issue of prisoners of war. Again, India stuck to the policy of Non-alignment during the prolonged political crisis in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. However, India opposed the aggressive attitude and action of the colonial powers. India took a courageous stand when in 1956 the Anglo-French forces invaded Egypt over the Suez Canal crisis. India's moral support to Egypt, both within and outside the UNO, greatly helped in the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Egyptian territory and recognition of Egypt's sovereignty over the Suez Canal.

The first Non-aligned conference was held at Belgrade in Yugoslavia in 1961 in which 25 countries took part. The assembled delegates emphasized the need for periodical consultations among Non-aligned countries. The popularity of the Non-aligned movement attracted more and more countries and at one time about 100 countries were actively associated with it. All along, the main focus of the movement was on independence, peace, disarmament and economic development.

Leaders such as Jawaharlal Nehru, Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt, Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, Ahmed Sukarno of Indonesia and Josip Broz Tito of Yugoslavia played a vital role in the formation of the Non-Alignment Movement.

India and the Commonwealth of Nations

Nehru's Dilemma

The Imperial Conference turned Commonwealth was an association of British colonies and Dominions. The Statute of Westminster (1931) conferred internal autonomy to Dominions within the framework of allegiance to the British Crown. India remained a Dominion till it became a Republic on 26 January 1950. After 15 August 1947, "Nehru had no intention of going back on the resolution of the Constituent Assembly that India should be a free and sovereign republic". Nehru was persuaded to remain in the Commonwealth.

Compelling Reasons

There were some compelling reasons and distinct advantages for India's retaining its link with the Commonwealth: (1) The Commonwealth contact would help retain the loyalty of the higher civil and defence services after independence. (2) It would facilitate negotiations with the Princely States for securing their accession to the Indian Union. (3) It would provide an additional channel for conducting international relations. As a member nation, India could counter the possible Pakistan's attempt to win over the Commonwealth countries against India on the Kashmir issue. (4) It would help improve and strengthen the trade links with the Britain and other member countries. Also India could rely on Britain for its defence needs. (5) The interests of the people of Indian origin who had migrated to Britain and other Commonwealth countries could be protected. (6) It offered good scope for foreign aid from countries like Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand for the developmental needs of India.

Role of India

India played a leading role in Commonwealth relations and was largely responsible in transforming the Commonwealth into the Commonwealth of Nations, a free association of sovereign states. India was successful in making the Commonwealth a bulwark against racialism and can claim credit for the peaceful transfer of power in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) from the white minority government to the black majority government. In 1956, when Britain, France and Israel invaded Egypt, India along with other Commonwealth countries strongly indicted the imposition of imperialistic military solution for the Suez problem, as a result of which Britain agreed to accept U.N.-sponsored ceasefire in the Suez area. In 1962, when India was attacked by China, Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand sympathized with India and extended all possible help. India was severely criticized, especially by the USSR, for remaining in the imperialistic Commonwealth. It was dubbed as a blunder and an outrage on

the national sentiments of self-respecting sovereign Indians. The acceptance of the British King/Queen as the Head of the Commonwealth of Nations amounted to a premium on India's independence. In balance, India was successful in securing friendship and cooperative relationship with member nations besides promoting economic trade and strengthening cultural links with other Commonwealth members.

4 Kashmir Issue

Three-fourths of Kashmir's population was Muslims. The state was strategically located at a vital crossroads where India, Pakistan, China and Afghanistan were destined to meet. Kashmir was ruled by Maharaja Hari Singh, the last successor of Gulab Singh of Dogra dynasty.

When the British Paramountcy lapsed, Maharaja Hari Singh was toying with the idea of maintaining the independence of Kashmir. Hence he rejected the Instrument of Accession forwarded to him by India and Pakistan. However, three days before Partition, the Maharaja proposed a stand-still agreement with India and Pakistan. Pakistan readily accepted the offer, but India did not commit herself for such a deal.

Pakistan accepted agreement with the hope of annexing Kashmir with Pakistan. Since the Maharaja was reluctant to oblige to Pakistan, it exercised economic pressure on Kashmir. Then Pakistan engineered 'a tribal invasion' of Kashmir, on 15 October 1947. By 22 October, the 'raiders' mounted an attack on Kashmir. The tribal operation was carefully planned and meticulously executed. They were on their way to Srinagar, the Venice of the Orient (24 Oct).

Driven to the wall, as it were, Maharaja Hari Singh appealed to India for military help. But the Nehru Government refused to comply with his request unless a decision on Kashmir's accession to India was firmly made. On 26 October 1947 the Maharaja formally acceded Kashmir to India, and agreed to install Sheik Abdulla as head of the state. Jammu and Kashmir became an integral part of India.

The Pathan tribal invasion prepared the ground for the first Indo-Pak War. On 27 October 1947, a day after Kashmir's accession to India, Indian troops were flown to Kashmir. The army saved Kashmir from the Pathan invaders. The timely Indian intervention prevented the Pakistan plan of capturing Srinagar so that Jinnah could make a triumphal entry into the city.' The raiders were driven out of the Kashmir Valley, mostly if not fully.

On 1 January 1948, Nehru took the issue before the U.N. Security Council. In August 1948, the U.N. Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP) proposed the withdrawal of troops including Pakistan's retreat from Gilgit. The United States continued to support Pakistan withdrawal from Kashmir. Mountbatten was eager to settle the Kashmir dispute before he relinquished the governor-generalship in June 1948. India accepted in December 1948 a ceasefire on UNCIP terms. Pakistan had secured an arc of mountains round the Kashmir Valley, known as the 'Northern Areas' plus the western end of the valley, known as 'Azad (free) Kashmir' or Pakistan Occupied Kashmir (POK). India held the rest of Jammu and Kashmir. The ceasefire line remained the line at which firing was supposed to have stopped. In effect, it partitioned the state. The U.N. Corps, the longest serving peacekeeping force, remained there to observe and monitor violations, if any. This had left a legacy of insolvable legal wrangling.