

---

## UNIT 5 POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

---

### Structure

- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Political Parties and Foreign Policy
  - 5.2.1 Party Manifestos
  - 5.2.2 Public Opinion and Parties
- 5.3 Pressure Groups
- 5.4 Media
  - 5.4.1 Print Media
  - 5.4.2 Electronic Media
- 5.5 Social Movements
- 5.6 NGOs
- 5.7 Business
- 5.8 Diaspora
- 5.9 Think Tank
- 5.10 Summary
- 5.11 Exercises

---

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

---

How is a foreign policy issue placed on the agenda of the formal foreign policy makers in India? It is accurate to say that a majority of issues simply arise because other states interested in a policy take initiative that affects Indian interests. Then India reacts. According to Dinesh Singh, former Minister for External Affairs, under Indira Gandhi between 1967 and 1970, Indian foreign policy was “one of carrying on, merely responding to situations.” Thus, much of foreign policy involves India reacting to actions initiated by other nations. Take for instance, menace of cross border terrorism. Every day newspapers’ headlines highlight that terrorists killed five innocents in one place in Kashmir, another day in Jammu. This goes on, and on. Then government has to react. But even when it reacts in a democracy—political parties, groups of people, media—all comment on it, and make suggestions for effective actions.

Normally foreign policy initiative is taken by the government. But occasionally in a democracy that India is, foreign policy initiative emerges from outside the formal apparatus of the government. Jawaharlal Nehru had once told the Constituent Assembly: “External Affairs will follow internal affairs.” Though it is India’s policy in relation to other nations in the world, foreign policy is essentially made keeping in view the interests of the society at large. Hence societal inputs are extremely important in the development of a foreign policy. These inputs come from various sources. People, in a democratic society, are the most important source of foreign policy initiatives. But, views of the people are expressed largely by the political parties and the media—newspapers and other print media, as well as the electronic media.

Political parties are mainly concerned with acquiring power. It is in the process of their endeavour

to acquire political power, or retain it, that the parties take up foreign policy issues and influence the policy-making process. Besides, India, like other modern democratic societies, has a large number of interest/pressure groups. These groups may be in favour of/against a proposed policy, or they themselves may seek to initiate policy to suit their clients, or constituencies.

In addition, media, social activists and movements and non-governmental organisations also contribute to the formulation of foreign policy. They help in regulating India's behaviour towards the outside world. India has also fairly developed expert groups which may be, for the sake of convenience, described as the Think Tank. These groups study various foreign policy issues and convey their well-considered views to the government.

This unit analyses all these institutions in order to help you to understand as to which non-governmental bodies make valuable inputs in foreign policy making

---

## **5.2 POLITICAL PARTIES AND FOREIGN POLICY**

---

In Indian democracy, one or two or many political parties control government of the day. Even when one party controls the government, if it is a two party system, the second party acts as an opposition party and tries to influence nation's foreign policy. The government also anticipates the opposition party's reaction and that itself becomes an influence in the policy process. The opposition party's policy pronouncements also become the policy expectations of the people whenever the opposition party becomes the ruling party. If a party for instance says that it will act to prevent influx of job-seeking people from across Bangladesh, people will hold it to implement the promise when it comes to power. However cynical one might be about working of democracy, the fact is that if a political party fails to fulfil certain important promises, it will lose its credibility sooner than later. This is most unlike the communist regimes where the communist party alone determines the foreign policy. When there are a plethora of political parties as is the case now in India, their influence in the making of policy depends upon their proximity to the seat of power.

Then what is the role of political parties in India? Prior to independence particularly since 1930s, political parties did exist; but, since British, as the colonial power controlled the foreign policy-making, Indians as organised into political parties, did not exercise much influence, let alone control over the making of foreign policy. Yet these political parties, as the purpose of their existence indicated, did try to influence broad parameters of India's external relations. We might say that they acted as pressure groups instead of as vehicles of power.

Thus the Congress Party took pro-democratic stand on the global issues while the Socialists were in favour of socialism. But Sectarian parties like Hindu Mahasabha spoke for the Hindus and Muslim League favoured Islamic causes. The communists obviously took pro-communism stance. Despite that, these parties were against imperialism and colonialism, were one in opposing the European control of Asia and were against British policy in South Africa.

The Congress Party in the initial years in power laid emphasis on anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism, and anti-racism. The general foreign policy objectives of the Congress are the same as stated at the 1948 Congress Working Committee session. The foreign policy of India must necessarily be based on the principles that have guided the Congress in the past years. The principles are the promotion of world peace, the freedom of all nations, racial equality and the ending of imperialism

and colonialism. In particular, the Congress was interested in the freedom of the nations and people of Asia and Africa who have suffered under various forms of colonialism for many generations. It should be the constant aim of the foreign policy of India to maintain friendly and co-operative relations with all nations and to avoid entanglement in military or similar alliances, which tend to divide up the world in rival groups and thus endanger world peace. Maintaining her freedom of action in foreign affairs and in the economic development of the country, India should continue to function as a member state of the United Nations, co-operating with other states in the maintenance of peace and freedom. These principles, it is accurate to say, guided the Congress Party until the mid-1980s.

The government, at a given time, belongs to one or the other political party. Since independence until 1977 and again from 1980 to 1996 the Congress Party held sway over the central government. The Congress Party at its plenary meetings invariably discussed important foreign policy issues of the time and passed broad resolutions based on party consensus.

The first prime minister Jawaharlal Nehru had laid the early foundation of India's foreign policy. His formulation was non-alignment—India as a newly independent nation would not join either of the two military blocs, then led by the US and the Soviet Union. The Congress Party became the advocate of non-alignment. Most of the other parties could only provide a critique of it or point out variation in non-alignment in practice.

The first ever non-Congress government at the central level was one in 1977 led by Morarji Desai under the Janata Government. He was always critical while in opposition of the policy of Non-alignment. But the Janata Party could only add 'genuine' before non-alignment as its foreign policy. It continued foreign policy principles as laid by the Congress Party in the past.

However, as the years passed, the Congress Party in its party meetings continuously reposed its faith in the policy of non-alignment. There was a question mark on the relevance of India's policy of non-alignment after the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991. The Congress Party in its meeting in Tirupati in 1993 reiterated its faith in the policy of Non-alignment. Narasimha Rao, then Prime Minister, spoke vehemently in its favour. The United Front government that followed after 1996 elections also swore to follow the non-alignment. But the government under the BJP-led 12 party alliance, in 1998 did not mention non-alignment in its National Agenda for Governance.

The Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) and its predecessor—Jan Sangh, have been great advocates of the nation possessing nuclear weapons as an instrument of national security. In its election manifesto of 1991, BJP stated that if it comes to power it would give Indian forces "nuclear teeth." The party came to power as a main party in the National Democratic Alliance (NDA) in 1998 with 12 other allies. The alliance issued National Agenda for Governance. The Agenda promised to establish a National Security Council. "This council", the Agenda said, "will undertake India's first ever Strategic Defence Review."

There was a close watch on its activities by then only surviving super power—the US to see whether Indian government would go for nuclear tests. In May 1998, the NDA government carried out nuclear tests in Pokharan and declared India as a nuclear weapons state. It was a shock to the US. But the US had probably calculated that the promised Strategic Defence Review would take place before India plunges to test nuclear weapons. But the decision to test

the nuclear weapons itself was not suddenly taken by the NDA government. The National Agenda referred above had stated that to “ensure the security, territorial integrity and unity of India we will take all necessary steps and exercise all available options. Towards that end we will re-evaluate the nuclear policy and exercise the option to induct nuclear weapons.”

### **5.2.1 Party Manifestos**

One of the major ways in which political parties influence details of foreign policy formulation is through their manifestos issued during the elections. Cynics say that party manifesto is like railway platform (in the US, incidentally, manifesto is called a platform) that is used for the specific purpose of boarding the train (in the case of politics, to get into power) and then all forget the platform. But often, crucial issues raised in the manifesto become rallying points to the political activists to create public opinion in favour of it.

Thus for instance, the Congress (I) in its manifesto for the 1980 general elections had said that if it were elected to power it would extend diplomatic recognition to Heng Samarin government in Kampuchea then installed by Vietnam. Indira Gandhi was returned to power in January 1980. The Communist Party of India (CPI) also highlighted the same issue. The CPI MPs began to raise the issue in the Parliament to pressurise the government, which eventually led her to extend recognition to Heng Samarin government in July 1980.

The BJP, in its manifesto in 1998, had suggested setting up a National Security Council for policy making. The NSC then had found a mention in practically every major political party. As a matter of fact that was one innovative idea introduced by the Janata Dal under the leadership of V. P. Singh in 1989. The intellectuals and security activists then began to demand from the V. P. Singh government that they fulfil the promise. Then in October 1990 for the first time V. P. Singh established a National Security Council. The Congress Party, which had also promised to set up a NSC, did not implement it though it was in power for five years (1991-96). In 1996 when the United Front government came to power, it also did not implement it though it had promised to do so.

Then came the BJP led coalition government, which formulated its National Agenda for Governance and promised to “establish a National Security Council to analyse the military, economic and political threats to the nation and also to continuously advice the government.” The pro-NSC groups brought pressure on the government to fulfil its promise to establish the NSC. Then the NDA government led by the BJP’s Atal Behari Vajpayee in November 1998 created an NSC for effective national security policy formulation.

Smaller political parties may not lead the government, as they cannot win many seats in the parliament. But these parties can and do lay down the outer perimetres for the governments in power.

### **5.2.2 Public Opinion and Parties**

Another important role played by the political parties in general is of creating public opinion in favour of a particular foreign policy. Rightist political parties for instance like now defunct Swatantra Party, the Congress (O) and the Jan Sangh/BJP were in the forefront of advocating India upgrading diplomatic relations with Israel. Morarji Desai, the leader of the Congress (O) and later the

Prime Minister under the Janata Party, even had an unpublicised meeting with then Israeli Defence Minister Moshe Dayan in pursuit of the same policy. Then the Congress (I) Party under Narasimha Rao in 1992 established full diplomatic relations with Israel.

Opposition parties of course logically would however, create public opinion in favour of policies preferred by them. In this connection it is necessary to remember that the Muslim League and smaller Muslim parties have been in the forefront to oppose the upgradation of diplomatic relations with Israel as the latter is seen as anti-Islam because of their on going conflict with Palestinian people and authorities in the West Bank.

Political parties are primarily interested in capturing power. Parties use their own success in managing the foreign affairs as issues in electoral campaign. But with certain exception, no elections are won or lost by a political party because of its advocacy of a foreign policy issue. But every major political party maintains a cell to pursue policy issues in the arena of foreign affairs, conduct research, hold meetings and prepare campaign materials. Thus goes on the role of political parties in the development of foreign policy.

---

## **5.3 PRESSURE GROUPS**

---

The pressure groups are also called interest groups as they function to bring pressure to promote one or cluster of interests. The pressure groups are normally weak in influencing foreign policy in contrast to the domestic policy issues. Yet these groups some time do play a role in influencing foreign policy. There are various interest groups, some visible, while others work clandestinely. There are several societies working for friendship between India and one country or the other. One such society in the past was Indo-Soviet Friendship Society. These friendship societies have their contacts in the Ministry of External Affairs, as well as in the Parliament. These pressure groups work systematically to influence foreign policy-making for or against a country. For example, India delayed establishing diplomatic relations with Israel from 1948 to 1992 due to the activities of certain interest groups.

---

## **5.4 MEDIA**

---

Media involves various instrumentalities. First, there is the print media like newspapers, magazines etc. Second, there is the electronic media like Radio and Television. Third, Internet is emerging as an important segment of media in influencing foreign policy. The media plays a role in highlighting the issues that need attention of policy-makers. They also carry the policy decisions of policy-makers to the people with their own commentary.

### **5.4.1 Print Media**

Let us discuss each of them little more in detail. The newspapers are the oldest. The policy-makers do read newspapers and try to understand the issues. Newspaper editorials and the articles published in the newspapers do have influence in the policy-making process. Many newspapers are owned by certain business houses, or their management and editorial officials have links with one political party or the other. They express the concerned policy or ideology which has its impact on the readers. Certain papers and journals often express subjective views

at the cost of objectivity. This may colour the thinking of policy-makers and parliamentarians.

But it is also true that in general media has limited influence as it has limited access to the information to develop an alternate viewpoint on a policy issue. Thus it prefers to follow the lead given by the policy-makers—at the most by reacting to it either in support or oppose it. To give one example, as long as Indira Gandhi was alive she generally took an anti-US stand on many foreign policy issues. The *Times of India*, which during the Nehru-Gandhi dynastic rule was known as pro-establishment newspaper, then did not suggest the need to improve India-US relations. But once Rajiv Gandhi came to power, with a known pro-West bias, this newspaper's editor was quick to suggest such a need!

The press had some influence in government's approach to foreign policy crises involving the Soviet Union like their military intervention in Hungary (1956) or Czechoslovakia (1968) or Afghanistan (1979). In the case of Afghanistan, Indira Gandhi, taking cognisance of media criticism, began to privately inform the soviet leadership that their presence in Afghanistan is unacceptable to India.

In the recent times, media has become bolder than ever before. The *Times of India* has begun, for instance, what we can call, a New Journalism—wherein news is provided with instant opinions of the editor so that the reader is subjected to the influence of views in addition to the news. Let me give here two typical examples. First, after the news item informing of India buying certain defence items from Russia, it commented: "The acquisition of the submarines and strategic bombers will complete India's nuclear triad. *However, this will also make it vital that we exercise even greater restraint vis a vis this awesome power.*" (Emphasis added). Second example is the news on India's willingness to even start Lahore Bus Service. Editorial comment just below the news was: "Before buying a Lahore bus for Atalji, Delhi should do better to follow protocol and install our High Commissioner in Islamabad." The tone and tenor of these two comments obviously does not concede even an iota of commonsense to the foreign policy-makers!

### 5.4.2 Electronic Media

Electronic media is growing in its influence in the Indian foreign policy making. Literacy being less than fifty percent, the role of electronic media i.e. radio and T.V. is very significant. With the liberalisation of media policy and introduction of private channels in TV, electronic media not only provides foreign affairs related news but also bring to the listeners various points of view including the views of foreigners who are involved in the decision as a second party to the news. The Internet is becoming the latest source of information and news to attentive public. But it is early to assess its impact on foreign policy-making.

Private News Channels, like certain journals and newspapers convey news and views that may create prejudices. Policy-makers, howsoever objective and impartial they may be, cannot help sometimes, getting influenced by the media reporting.

---

## 5.5 SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

---

Indian society is highly fragmented. Each social group, on the basis of its narrow group interest, tries to influence foreign policy. Muslims in India constitute a sizeable segment—around 12



percent—of the society. Their activities within the country and in relation to Islamic countries do influence the foreign policy. Taking note of this fact, the Indian foreign policy-makers until 1992 maintained diplomatic relations with Israel at consular level.

Indian Muslims tend to be seen as speaking for the Muslim world, particularly in favour of Pakistan. When the US attacked Afghanistan many Indian Muslim groups called for the boycott of popular US products like Coke. This pattern was repeated when the US attacked Iraq in March 2003. This attitude of the Muslim community naturally influences government policy towards the Arab world. The government is restrained from acting against perceived interests of Muslim community world over. These may not involve any concrete gains or losses in real terms but mostly only in terms of perceptions.

This is clearly indicated by a statement issued by a Muslim institution called Raza Academy, in Mumbai in May 2003. Brajesh Mishra in Washington, DC during his visit made a statement that India, US and Israel should jointly fight terrorism. But the Academy immediately reacted stating that to “tackle the threat of terrorism India cannot risk taking the help of terrorist themselves.” The academy also held out a threat against the proposed visit by Ariel Sharon, Israeli PM to India stating that it could lead to law and order problems. From this it is clear that though Israelis have in no way harmed Indians, Indian Muslims have internalised Israel’s conflicts with Palestinians as their own.

Some American scholars like Theodore P. Wright compare this approach of Muslim community to foreign policy issues to the Jewish lobbies in the US. The approach of the Jews in the US constrains the US foreign policy towards Israel and Arabs. Similarly, Muslim social groups constrain Indian foreign policy towards the Arab world.

This tradition of Indians supporting Muslim causes goes to the times of Mahatma Gandhi’s support to Khilafat movement in 1919. After independence, in 1967 then EAM, M. C. Chagla condemned Israel for its attack on Arab countries even before other Muslim countries did so. However, Chagla was otherwise more secular in his approach than many of his peers were.

In the last two decades terrorism promoted by Pakistan has created a similar distortion in Muslim attitude to foreign policy issues. The activities, for instance, of the Students Islamic Movement of India (SIMI) in organising bomb blasts in Mumbai and elsewhere at the behest of the Pakistan’s Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) should be seen in this context. This leads to the other segments of Indian society looking at Muslims from distorted view, which could harm the social harmony.

It is not that only Muslim society and groups look as protectors of Muslim interest outside India. Tamils in Tamil Nadu have been equally responsible for twists and turns in Indian foreign policy towards Sri Lanka since that country also has the largest minority population of Tamils. Though India herself was a victim of terrorism promoted by Pakistan in Punjab then, the Tamil organisations in South dragged the Indian policy-makers in the ethnic crisis in Sri Lanka.

While certain communities or social groups might constrain Indian foreign policy, others may help to expand the Indian influence in other countries. Such social movements create awareness on the part of the government on the need to pursue certain foreign policy issues. India has given to the world at large, particularly East and South East Asia, Buddhism as their religion. Buddhist organisations in India advocate improved cultural and social ties with the countries, which are

predominantly Buddhist. Indian government wants to encourage Buddhist tourist routes. These organisations in India and abroad look to one another to maintain goodwill and understanding which helps to some extent government's policy making.

---

## 5.6 NGOs

---

In the last fifty-six years after independence, numerous Non-Government Organisations have come up within the country. Many of these can be compared with Public Action Committees (PACs) or single-issue interest groups in the US. These NGOs have a bearing to some extent on the foreign policy development process in the country. These NGOs, while acting as pressure groups in domestic policy, try to link up with similar NGOs abroad and also with foreign funding agencies and influence the funding or the government policy towards a policy. Best example is that of Medha Patkar's *Narmada Bachao Andolan*. This group even approached the World Bank against funding the Narmada Sarovar Project.

It is difficult to measure the influence of any one group in foreign policy formulation. But such NGOs nowadays are in the forefront on newer issues in foreign affairs. Thus for instance, take the issue of environmental protection. There is the Centre for Science and Environment in Delhi. This issue is anyway interlinked at the national and international level. But most of these NGOs deal with issues, which affect ordinary people in the country like health, education, population, human rights particularly rights of women and several others. There are not many NGOs, which exclusively focus on foreign policy issues.

There are numerous friendship associations connecting the two countries and their people. Some of these are Pakistan-India Forum for Peace and Friendship, which strive to bring about improvement in relations between the two countries. While governments quarrel, a strong undercurrent exists amongst the general public in both countries to improve relations. For some years now, private citizens, intellectuals and retired officials have begun Track II diplomacy, i.e. parallel negotiations to government diplomacy.

There is also an Indo-Arab society as there is the Indo-Israeli Society. There are many of these societies like Indo-Japanese Society etc. We need not have to mention more such groups. But enough if we say that these act as pressure groups to improve relations by explaining the policies of the host country to the Indians. But their influence in the making of foreign policy is minimal.

---

## 5.7 BUSINESS

---

Business groups and associations, which are involved in foreign trade normally take interest in foreign affairs. These groups desire peace in the countries they trade with. There is a theory, which believes that improved trade relations between any two adverse nations help to improve their political relations. It is this belief that makes many to plead for improved trade relations between India and Pakistan, which should help in improving the political relations.

The people involved in business, industry and commerce in India are organised in the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI). The FICCI constantly interacts with the government on a variety of issues relating to trade and industry. While its primary aim is to improve its own business prospects, they also promote goodwill between two countries by



keeping in touch with the government especially with the officials of MEA and Commerce. In this respect they use several devices. The oldest is monetary contributions to political parties and politicians. Politicians consider it prudent to give their contributions to all political parties. Indira Gandhi for instance, felt that business community contributed more money to the right wing—Swatanta party in the 1960s, and introduced a ban on business houses contributing to political parties.

India has launched economic liberalisation, privatisation and globalisation (LPG) process in 1991. Since then we can boldly say that the role of business and business lobbies in the development of foreign policy has definitely increased. Its early indication came when the former PM Narasimha Rao, while visiting the US, laid a major emphasis on his meeting the business groups in that country. His delegation also consisted of a large contingent of Indian businessmen. Improving business relations was stated as his first priority, second was speaking to the Congress and through them to American people and third priority was to have a working session with President Clinton.

He had two meetings with American Chief Executive Officers (CEO) in New York and Houston (Texas) where he was able to generate interest amongst them to invest in India. He was also able to get an 'India Interest Group' set up—a group of CEOs from major multinationals like General Electric, AT & T, Coca Cola, Ford and IBM. These groups obviously act as pro-India pressure groups in the US while the US makes its policy towards India, which in turn become inputs in Indian foreign policy. Since then more Indian businessmen and industrialists have travelled with the PM on his foreign travels than any other group of professionals probably barring media men.

With the LPG, more issues have come up to be determined by the government in relation to the external world. Since the formation of World Trade Organisation (WTO) in 1995 to regulate international trade, more issues have been brought under the purview of this body. The Western powers have also introduced new issues in relation to international trade and commerce. Thus, negatively the issues like child labour and human rights in a trading partner-country are considered as within the global concern and therefore within the purview of the WTO. The West has introduced the concept of service as a trade and thus subject to regulation by the WTO.

Some of these issues put one domestic NGO against another. Those who work in this direction see to it that children below the age of 14 are not employed by certain industries like manufacturers of crackers or blanket weavers. On the other hand, manufacturers of these commodities in a traditional market argue that they provide much needed employment to families; NGOs argue that these children are made to forego their childhood to make a living.

Similar arguments are raised regarding human rights. Working conditions in factories, sex-based discriminatory wages etc have become issues as the Western countries find that the labour in developing countries like India is cheaper and are able to compete with the products of developed countries where labour is expensive. Though the issues raised by the West are genuine, the government is required to make policies keeping in view the demands of the NGOs, social compulsions and Western countries.

---

## **5.8 DIASPORA**

---

There are over twenty million people of Indian origin living in different countries all over the world. They can be considered in two categories: those who went to the foreign countries or were taken as indentured labour by the British, like the people of Indian origin in various African countries or in Fiji Islands are considered as Peoples of Indian Origin (PIO). But those who went voluntarily in the post independence time in search of economic betterment are Non-Resident Indians (NRI). Obviously, in general, the PIOs have a romantic longing for the country of their ancestors while the NRIs have better roots in this country.

What should be or could be their role in the foreign policy-making? Nehru, in the beginning of the independence, asked the PIOs to become fully the part of the country of their residence or adoption. This line of thought was repeated as recently as in 1997 by the then PM, I. K. Gujral in the context of PIOs in South Africa. The question of dual citizenship was ruled out. However with the passage of time, with transport and communications breaking distances and LPG demanding more investments, the feeling of belonging to India is getting stronger or being strengthened. Globalisation has made government to think in terms of a new look at the PIOs. In this regard the organisations representing the PIOs play a major role.

With the emergence of the BJP, and its emphasis on cultural nationalism, the PIO issue has become a sentimental one to the public. In 2002 a committee was appointed under the chairmanship of L. M. Singhvi to examine the issue of the PIOs. It has been decided to observe the ninth of January every year as *Pravasi Bharatiya Divas*; prominent PIOs and NRIs will be honoured and the PIO card scheme would be made more attractive. But the larger issue of security needs to be looked into. During the World War II the US had used American citizens of Japanese origin to spy and gather information in Japan.

But now NRIs have also become a significant group. The NRIs based in US, for instance, are well organised. They were able to bring about a change in the approach of the US towards India. This is evident in the approach with which Bill Clinton began his administration in 1993 when he used every available instrument of foreign policy and bilateral relations to pressurise India on Kashmir, nuclear weapons and human rights record. However by 2000, he was appreciative of the Indian democracy, security compulsions for which India went for nuclear tests and the terrorist threat from across the borders. Since the NRIs have done something good for India naturally they would expect our government to liberalise certain economic conditions for their investments or visa requirement for their visits to India.

---

## 5.9 THINK TANKS

---

The concept of think tank is new in India. In the US there are many specialised institutions like Rand Corporation, which is funded by the US defence department. There are many others in Washington, DC like the American Enterprises Institute, which is a right wing think tank while the Brookings Institution is a liberal think tank. In New York there is the Asia Society and Carnegie Foundation etc. These conduct studies on various subjects and submit them to the government and influential senators. Asia Society for instance conducted a study in 1994, which asked the government to improve relations with India.

India of course has few such think tanks. The most important and visible one is the Institute of Defence Studies and Analysis entirely funded by the Defence Department. This conducts studies

and research that has direct bearing on the policy options. There are others like the Centre for Policy Research in Delhi. However, now New Delhi has many such centres founded by retired foreign secretaries, generals and academics. But their worth as foreign policy think tank is yet to be evaluated. Seminars often organised by the universities have foreign policy experts, including several former Foreign Secretaries. The views formulated in these seminars also influence policy-making.

All these institutions and pressure groups perform more than one role: they do influence the formulation of foreign policy; they also create public opinion in favour or against a policy. They take new policy initiative. Then they create public opinion on the policy issue preferred by them. In this way the policy development process goes on in the country.

---

## **5.10 SUMMARY**

---

The foreign policy-making process is not merely limited to the institutions involved in the making of policy. In democracy policy reflects the aspirations of the people. Therefore, people organised into various forms—political parties, pressure groups, socio-ethnic movements—try to influence foreign policy as much as businessmen, media, specialised think tanks aim at it. The policy-makers cannot consider these as interference in policy making. But they perform their legitimate functions. Such participation by the people through various organised means enlarges the legitimacy of the policy and makes it widely acceptable to the society.

---

## **5.11 EXERCISES**

---

- 1) How do the political parties initiate and influence the making of foreign policy?
- 2) Do the interest groups play a role in the making of a foreign policy? How does the media help in the making of foreign policy?
- 3) Discuss the influence of social and business groups' role in the making of foreign policy.
- 4) Make a case to strengthen the role of think tanks in foreign policy-making.