

## **Status in Organization**

**Shahidul Huq Munshi**

In recent years, many studies have been undertaken with regard to analysis of Status in Organization. It cannot be denied that in human groups and social organization there is hierarchy of relationship in which each person occupies a single position. This paper aims at examining status and its discrepancies in organization.

From Aristotle to Marx to we see that stress on the vertical structure of human groups have been given in terms of a single hierarchy in which each person occupies a single position. We may, though, find some differences about the nature or characteristics of this status structure, yet consensus has been reached to accept the conception of its unidimensional structure.

This concept has been challenged. Among social scientists of the opinion that the unidimensional ideal is not adequate to describe the complexities of group structure, Max Weber is most prominent. They have put forward strong arguments that the structure of social groups involves the co-existence of a number of parallel vertical hierarchies which are interlinked

with one another. In explaining the social status of a person we therefore shall have to take a series of positions in a set of related vertical hierarchies. In this connection, it is of value to study class and caste which are the two conceptual dimensions of social stratification as well as agencies of social mobility.

A number of social scientists have been concerned with the question what happens when a person is faced with discrepancies between where he stands on some status indices and where he stands on others as status is determined by the combined effect of various factors. For example, if three status indices of income, occupation and education are accepted for stratification then how would one's status be precisely determined if he scored low on educational dimension, but high on income index? Several researches suggest that such anomaly and discrepancies of status level may lead to tension in organization, thus jeopardizing the balance of society.

#### Review of Researches on Status Inconsistency

Benoit Smullyam postulated the prevailing notion of status equilibration fifteen years ago or more, calling it the tendency for man's position in different status hierarchies to reach a common level. Monderer, Hartley and Fenchel<sup>2</sup> tested this hypothesis on sample study in the city of New York. They found a highly significant tendency for subjects to have greater status strivings in groups where their status was lowest as compared to groups in which their ranking was high. Riecken and Homans<sup>3</sup> comment in this connexion,

"Where persons feel they have unequal ranks in different groups they want to raise their rank in the groups in which they stand lowest, that is, they try to equilibrate their rank at the highest level."

Adams<sup>4</sup> investigated bomber crews training for Korean combat duty and found a direct linear relationship between measures of status "congruency and social performance" scores. Homans became interested in the status consistency question while investigating interaction patterns in a commercial company. He found that clerical workers in a job that was considered better than another closely related one on some status count, but not on others were prone to complain more than the workers in the other job about things related to status and to make demands that would, if carried out, bring the discrepant status dimension into line.

Lenski's term for the degree of likeness of an individual's position on various status hierarchies is "status crystallization." In one study he checked early in 1951 the voting behaviour of a representative sample of metropolitan Detroit residents and found a significantly greater number of respondents with low crystallization voting for the Democratic party in the 1948 and 1950 general elections. He also found that low crystallization people were significantly more liberal in their responses to such controversial issues as government health insurance and the extension of government powers.

Goffman related degree of status consistency to desire for change in the power distribution in the U.S., Using respondents in a national probability sample

drawn by the University of Michigan Survey Centre. Those with low consistency on educational, occupational and income status scales were high consistency people.

### **Conceptional Framework**

There are many ways of defining the term "status". Benoit Smullyan,<sup>5</sup> for example, considered status to be the relative position of a person in a hierarchy, with hierarchy being defined as a number of individuals ordered on an inferiority-superiority scale with respect to the comparative degree to which they possess or embody some socially approved or generally desired attribute or characteristic. He considered the three chief hierarchies to be economic, political and prestige. In some contrast in the concept of status described by Green<sup>6</sup> "... a position in a social group or grouping, in relations to other positions held by other individuals in the same group or grouping ..."

Kelley and Thibant<sup>7</sup> offer a somewhat similar proposition. Status "generally refers to the value placed upon a specific position within a group by the members of that group. In many instances the high status person has a number of other interrelated characteristics; he has certain privileges not enjoyed by others (which account in part for the high value placed upon the position), he exercises leadership functions and has certain special responsibilities, he is at the centre of the communication network within the group, and he has relative power over other members". The concept of status discussed by Merton<sup>8</sup> is quite similar.

These concepts of status have some differences

and also some similarities. Some refer to characteristics or attributes possessed by an individual, others are concerned with the position an individual may be seen to occupy. All incorporate some notion of relative interpersonal ranking i. e. an individual holds rank in social organization. Thus status figures centrally in social organization. The organizations with which social scientists are mainly concerned includes institution, groups, class, roles and status. This model is used for analysis of either rural or urban, local, governmental, autonomous or semi-autonomous organization. The study of any organization has a frame of reference. Therefore the social organization takes into account social status as a frame of reference.

Social status is a position occupied by a person, family or kinship group in a social system relative to others. This determines rights, duties and other behaviour including the nature and the extent of the relation with persons of others statuses. Social status has a hierarchical distribution in which a few persons occupy the highest position. The simplest theoretical model of the status system would be a distribution in which position is determined competitively by possession of abilities relative to the demand for abilities in society.

The institution private property, inheritance, differential taxation and social services all modify the form of the distribution of statuses. The child is placed in society by its family and kinship group. They determine its education, its initial endowment of wealth and the esteem of the family in which it was born is transmitted to the child. This may include elements of

class, caste, or estate. From this position the child may lose, maintain or improve his status by his achievements in competition with others.

Social status is determined by education, income, possession and the social valuation of occupation and of other activities in society. All modern society have a number of honours systems which introduce the element of social worth in a system which is primarily based on economic competition. The process of status determination operates through the individious comparison of the style of life determined by the factors given above.

#### **Status in Different Society**

In different times and in different societies status was determined by different factors. In Hindu Society caste system determined the status of a person in society. The system existed for some 3000 years and continues to day despite many attempts to get rid of some of its restrictions. In theory all Hindus belong to one fo four main groups, denoted by a colour. These were originally in order of precedence Kshatriyas (a warrior group), the Brahmans (a priestly group), the Vaishyas (trading and manufacturing people) and the Sudras (servants). These are all mentioned in the Hindu writings of sixth century B. C. There are many castes and especially sub-castes. In the 1901 census which tried to establish the order of ranks, 2378 main castes were identified, but the Ahir caste alone was found to have 1700 sub-castes. Membership of a caste or more precisely a subcaste, is hereditary and ascribed. In European society estate determined

one's position in social organization. Estate systems have a long history. They emerged in the Ancient Roman Empire, and persisted in Europe until very recent times. The Medieval era in England, whilst not very clear, may help to illustrate an Estate system, for whilst the king, lords and commons comprise the main Estate division, there was a less clearly defined division into clergy, nobility and commons. The position in France was more rigid, and the system of Estate of Clergy, Nobles and Third Estate remained until 1789. In some parts of Europe, e. g. Sweden there were four Estates. Thus till 1866 there were in that country Nobles, Clergy, Citizens, and Peasants.

#### Modern Trend is Status Determination

In modern times status is determined by variables other than caste and estate since both in Caste and Estate systems social position is normally ascribed, it follows that both will be undermined by pressures tending to promote the value of individual merit and its regular reward. Hence both disintegrate under the impact of capitalism and of industrial capitalism above all which, requiring both specialization of functions and the efficiency of performance, emphasize the desirability of promoting individual merit with the result that, according to Marx, social classes emerge between which there are no legal or supranatural barriers to mobility. Classes, he argues, are defined in terms of their relationship to the instruments of production of wealth. Essential to Marx's thesis are the twin ideas of class conflict and class consciousness.

both of which give rise to individious comparison that can be made between class membership and power. Marx's contention is not irrefutable and his historical prediction of the increasing polarisation of society seems not to have become an observable reality. There is no evidence of the emergenc of a society in which social differences are unknown, but it has become increasingly clear that social status, emphatically has been associated with occupation. Thus if castes are rooted in a ritual institution and Estates in the institution of law, social classes must be seen to spring from the economy. It was Max Weber's achievement, following his reflection on Marx's ideas to see that classes are not social groups but aggregates of people possessing the same life chances and life style. Status group as Weber called them, maintain distinctiveness by occupational connection. As the path to so many occupation is through the educational system we should see this modern development in social change as rooted in both social institutions i. e. economy and education.

#### Construction of Different Status Indices

For the determination of status, ranking of the individuals have been made by the social scientists. They have used different indices to put them on the status scale.

The Warner class indices: Warner and his co-workers had developed what they termed an "Evaluated Participation" (E. P.) measure of class position. E. P. measure is comprised of a half dozen subsidiary rating



techniques, each of them based on personal interviews with representative inhabitants of the community being investigated.

#### Status Factors in Contemporary Society

In contemporary society and in its organization, factors on which status depend are the following :

- 1) initial endowment
- 2) degree of competition
- 3) extra-organizational relationship
- 4) relative importance of the position held by the person
- 5) intra-organizational mobility
- 6) time rate of development, personal skills
- 7) duration of service

1. Initial endowment in its turn depends upon a number of factors e. g.

a) educational level with which a persons enters organization. We speak of education in a broader sense so that we include something more than the formal education. For example, accountant with Bachelor degree may have a status higher than that of another person with a higher degree simply because former has acquired such practical things which are of greater importance to the organization.

b) experience of the person concerned

This is also an important factor that goes to determine status. An example may give us some light. During the Pakistan time there had been two kinds

of civil service examination viz CSS examination and EPCS examination. People recruited through the first type of examination here found to enjoy a higher status than the latter type.

**d) special relationship with the organization**

In some cases a person may have a lofty position within an organization by dint of ownership or such other relationship with the organization concerned.

**2. The degree of competition**

In so far as vertical mobility within an organization, the degree of competition is of particular importance. This may well depend on the number of people competing for a particular higher post. For example, if there are ten competing persons for one post, the probability of each quality for the post  $1/10$  i. e. .1, whereas had there been five persons probability would be, .2.

**3. Extra organizational relationship**

In some cases extra-organizational contacts may be of particular importance in determination of status. In some countries the privately owned banks seek to maximise profit through increasing the volume deposit. People having a higher social status assured in monetary terms, have been found to be given higher status in view of the hope that by using the personal contacts they may be able to contribute to the banks objectives.

**4. Relative Position held by the person**

A simple rule may be that a person holding a higher post could enjoy higher status. But there might

be certain exceptions. For example, a Deputy Secretary who had originally B. A. clerk should not necessarily be having a higher status than a section officer who have come through competitive examination. Again the type of work load taken may be an important factor. A person in managerial position enjoys a greater status as compared to those in clerical staff.

#### 5. Intra-Organizational ability

Certain skillful person may fit skillfully into different position of the same organization. We say roughly that these people have a higher degree of intra-organizational mobility. It may be expected that the organization may put greater weight on such persons.

#### 6. Time rate of development of skill

In so far as skill is an important factor in determining status of a person, the development of personal skill over time will also be of similar importance. Let us consider two persons with differential skill. If the persons having smaller initial endowment has a greater rate of development of skill over time then he may ultimately end up with the higher status than the other.

#### 7. Duration of Service

Vertical mobility in an organization would depend significantly on the duration of service. This is particularly important in the case of governmental organization.

However, in the case of business organization duration of service is of smaller weight as compared to government ones. For in such a case other variables

like skill, social contact, etc intervene. Nevertheless service's duration goes to influence the upward mobility in any type of organization.

### Conclusion

Various status indices and their effect in organization have been dealt with here. Social differentiation is a man-made arrangement—one of many which are to be found wherever people gather in lasting groups. Like (among others) family patterns, government, and economic systems, social differentiation is universal. It is a feature of every society, whatever its size, history, geographic location or technical level.

Each society is socially differentiated with status consciousness. So status differentiation works in the system of governing people, of distributing and exchanging goods, etc. System would not have worked or survived, if status would not have been attached to persons working in different organization.

The behavioral pattern in status-bound society is dynamic. For example, if in relation to ratings on other relevant indices, the educational rating is low, one can go back to school or into special training. If the income rating is low one can ask for a raise or seek a better paying job. If occupation rating is low one may change occupation. If one's occupational position rating is too high, one can ask for a lower level position or seek a job where position is consistent with the other index ratings. If a person who feels that he is being "destatused" because of his occupation may try to persuade those with whom he

interacts that his occupation is really more important than they apparently think. If his income is low, he might try to convince them that money is not everything. Thus status in organization is ladden with ambivalence.

### Reference

1. Adams, S. "Status Congruency as a Variable in Small Group 'Performance'" *Social Forces*. 32: 16-22, 1953.
2. Benoit-Smullyan, E. Status, Status Types and Status Interrelation" *American Sociological Review*. 151-61.
3. Fenchel, G. E. Monderer, J. H. & Hartley, E. L. "Subjective Status and the Equilibration Hypothesis" *Journal of Social Psychology* 46: 476-9, 1951.
4. Homans, G. C. "Status among Clerical Workers" *Human Organization*. 12: 5-10, 1953.
5. Goffman, I. W. "Status Consistency and Preference for Change in Power Distribution", *American Sociological Review*. 22: 275-81, 1957.
6. Green A. W. *Sociology: An Analysis of Life in Modern Society*, Modern Society, New York McGraw Hill, 1956
7. Kelley, H. H. & Thibant, J. W. "Experimental Studies of Group Problem Solving and Process" in G. Lindsay (ed), *Hand Book of Social Psychology Cambridge*. Addison Wealey, 10-15, 1954.
8. Merton, R. K. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Glencoe: Free Press, 1957.
9. Warner W. LLOYD, Meeker, Marchia and Eels, Kenneth *Social Class in America*, ( Chicago : Science Research Associate, 1949).

## **An Assessment of Indian Foreign Policy**

**Md. Abdul Halim**

India is the second most populous country as well as the largest democracy in the world. Forty years after she achieved independence from the British colonial rule, she is the only former colonial territory from the Third World to be reckoned with as a Big Power. In fact, in recent years, she has developed so much in science and technology, especially in the military field, that this vertical development has resulted in exerting its influence horizontally, i. e. in the neighbouring countries in its preliminary phase which may ultimately extend far beyond the subcontinent a fact which may be explained by the lateral pressure theory.<sup>1</sup> That India would in due course of time play a major role in the international arena could be visualized even at the dawn of her independence by her founding fathers. Hence the architect of Indian foreign policy, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, elaborated a broader perspective while formulating her foreign policy. The tradition set by Nehru, the first Prime Minister of India, who helped India develop as a Big Power to play an increasingly important role in

world affairs, has not only been followed by his daughter, Indira Gandhi, and is now being maintained by his grandson, Rajiv Gandhi, both of whom have become Prime Ministers of India in subsequent years, but also enriched by both of them. In the present article, we have set to make a critical assessment of the Indian foreign policy. In doing so, it will be argued that in pursuing her foreign policy, India operates broadly in *three distinct circles*, viz. (i) as a Big Power in the global arena; (ii) as the leader of the non-aligned world; and (iii) as the pre-eminent and hegemonistic power in the subcontinent. First we will attempt to explain why India is destined to play a role in each of the three circles. Then we will examine the methods employed by India in playing her role in each of them. Finally an evaluation will be made about the justification of her actions as well as the extent to which she has succeeded in attaining the objectives of her foreign policy.

To begin with, India joined the rank of a Big Power in the early 1970s and consequently she had to be reckoned with in any calculation of global power. It is proved by the fact that at a time when the US President Richard Nixon was evolving his new China policy in 1971, the Soviet Union found it expedient to conclude the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation with India on August 9, 1971, to maintain, if not the global balance of power, at least the balance of power in Asia. Later on, when India successfully detonated a nuclear device in 1974, her dream of playing a major role in world affairs

came closer to realization. That India would one day try to develop nuclear device is proved by the fact that she has not yet signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1970, nor has she any intention of doing it in future because in the opinion of her Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, it is "so blatantly unfair".<sup>2</sup>

India has inherited the second role of posing as the leader of the non-aligned world from Pandit Nehru who was the main architect of the policy of non-alignment. It is thus natural that she would continue to maintain this position of prestige. In recent years, India had been the chairperson of the non-aligned movement for a term of three years from March 1983 to August 1986, at a time when the movement was threatened to break down as a result of the activities of some of the member countries who were trying to give it either the Eastern or the Western tint according to the camps they themselves were following.

Thirdly and most important of all, India is desirous of playing a big-brotherly role in the subcontinent. She expects that other states of South Asia should treat her as 'elder'. She thinks that owing to the deep historical and cultural links and also geographical proximity with her South Asian neighbours, India as a pre-eminent and hegemonistic power has the natural right to dominate over them.

## II

With the above facts in mind, we now proceed to analyze the nature of relationship that India has developed with each of the three circles, and the methods



she has employed to fulfil the objectives of her foreign policy.

Immediately after independence, Jawaharlal Nehru, while providing the basic framework of Indian foreign policy, declared that "we propose...to look after India's interests in the context of world cooperation and world peace... we intend cooperating with the United States of America. We intend cooperating fully with the Soviet Union."<sup>3</sup> Thus though he was evolving the basic tenets of the policy of non-alignment, he did not mean it to be either neutral or negative. The policy that India has been able to consistently maintain over the years stresses on keeping good relations with both the Super Powers. As Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi in his first broadcast to the nation on November 12, 1984, has reaffirmed:

We highly value the wide ranging and time tested relationship with the Soviet Union, based upon mutual cooperation, friendship *and vital support when most needed* .. With the United States of America, we have a multifaceted relationship. We attach importance to our economic, technological and cultural cooperation with them.<sup>4</sup>

The method followed by India has been to bargain with both the Super Powers by showing her leaning towards each of them in successive turns. For example, India successfully exploited the weakness in the Soviet Union when amidst a change of leadership she apparently showed a leaning towards the west by declining invitation to the Soviet Union, and visiting the United States as well as seeking arms from France soon after

the Soviet invasion in Afghanistan in December 1979 to make a rich bargain in getting "a wide range of sophisticated military equipment — advanced aircraft MIG-22, T-80 tanks, tanks, missiles, the latest sensing system for the Indian navy and submarines".<sup>5</sup> It is worth mentioning here that India is the first country outside the Soviet Union to acquire MIG-29 aircrafts. At the same time, when India could visualize that "American strategic interests in South Asia and in the Indian Ocean rose abruptly after the fall of the Shah of Iran in 1979 and the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan", India quickly grabbed the opportunity in "widening economic ties through trade, investment and joint ventures"<sup>6</sup> with the United States. She even succeeded in concluding on March 8, 1985, a major deal with the United States on the transfer of high technology to India through which she would receive the so called 'super computers'.<sup>7</sup> In exchange, the United States sought reassurance from India that the latter would not provide any naval base or other facilities to the Soviet Union and she would refrain from further development of nuclear weapons. India on her part gave verbal assurances to these effects.

As far as the non-aligned world is concerned, India, in spite of her tradition in initiating the movement, can now hardly make a plausible appeal to uphold the basic principles of nonalignment which include, *inter alia*, respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of other countries, non interference in the internal affairs of other states as well as not to join either of the Super Powers in any

military alliance, because India has already lost her credibility as a true follower of the principles of non-alignment herself by concluding a treaty with the Soviet Union in 1971 article 9 of which includes a military security clause,<sup>8</sup> and also, as will be seen later on, by posing a threat to the security of her neighbours as well as interfering in the internal affairs of a few of them. Perhaps more ignominious has been the fact that though India claims herself to be the leader of the non-aligned world, her actions in some cases hardly do justice to that claim because she very often takes stand in regard to certain non-aligned countries which runs counter to the interest of such countries and is diametrically opposite to that taken by a vast majority of the non-aligned group. Here the method employed by India in regard to the non-aligned world has been one of deriving benefit without much effort and taking risk i. e., India is interested only in keeping the leadership even at the cost of the interest of some of the non-aligned countries without committing herself to the extent that she has to pay the price of risking her relationship with the Soviet Union on behalf of whom she works in the non-aligned group. The situation in Afghanistan, a non-aligned country, after the Soviet invasion there in December, 1979, is a case in point. It was naturally expected that like a vast majority of the non-aligned countries, India would condemn Soviet actions which violated the sovereignty of non-aligned Afghanistan. But in practice, we see that the champion of the cause of non-alignment abstained from voting in the UN General Assembly to successive resolutions which

"demanded the unconditional withdrawal of Soviet troops, and the restoration of the independence and non-aligned status of Afghanistan."<sup>9</sup> In indirectly accepting the Soviet explanation that "the legitimate government of Afghanistan invited the Soviet troops, a contention summarily and consistently rejected by 122 countries"<sup>10</sup> India only alienated herself from the vast majority of non-aligned countries.

In the case of her neighbours in the South Asian region, which naturally was the main focus of attention in the Indian foreign policy from the beginning, she employed the method the essence of which is that India wants to keep these states in an inferior position perpetually without rupturing her relationship with them. India expects that they will cooperate with her even at the cost of their subservience to her. Evidently India always sought to exercise dominating influence over these countries and hence adopted such methods which would either deprive her neighbours of their due share in international resources so that they remain submissive to her, or encourage internal dissensions in these countries so that they cannot enjoy congenial political atmosphere which is necessary to develop their countries and thus ultimately be able to challenge the Indian hegemony. Though the declared policy of India is to "develop the best possible relations with all the countries in our region",<sup>11</sup> in actual practice India has adopted such measures which resulted in strained relationships with at least three of her closest neighbours—Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh. Indian actions in regard to these countries had the

objective of keeping them busy with their internal problem, an elaborated account of which is not possible in this paper. However, we will try to show how India is poking its nose into the affairs of Sri Lanka and Bangladesh.

In Sri Lanka, the Sinhalese and the Tamils have lived together in relative peace and harmony for thousands of years. However, at a time when she was progressing fast on her nation-building activities, India in 1983 began to sow the seeds of discontent in the minds of the Sri Lankan Tamils who had migrated from Southern India long ago in an effort to encourage them to demand a separate state 'based on racist grounds'<sup>12</sup> Since then, India's Tamil Nadu State had begun to provide training facilities and supply arms to Tamil terrorists and also provide sanctuary to those who were driven away by the Sri Lankan government forces. The Sri Lankan government was trying to solve the island's ethnic conflict but in the face of constant pressure from India that she was likely to intervene in the internal affair of Sri Lanka on the pretext of preventing 'genocide' of Tamils rendered the Sri Lankan efforts fruitless. The Indian intention in the ethnic problem in Sri Lanka becomes clear to everybody when the Indian government set up a Special Advisory Group in April, 1985. The Indian government's ulterior motives in fomenting the ethnic conflict in the Emerald Island becomes evident when in the name of solving the problem, the Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi imposed a treaty on the Sri Lankan President Julius Jayewardene on July 29,

1987. One of the provisions of the Treaty empowered the Sri Lankan President that if he felt the necessity, he could seek the assistance of the Indian army to implement the cease-fire between the Sri Lankan government forces and the rebel Tamil guerrillas. On this provision of the Treaty, a contingent of Indian army landed on the Jaffna peninsula in the northern part of Sri Lanka—the area inhabited by the Tamils immediately after the signing of the Treaty. The pretext given for the landing of the Indian army in Jaffna was that the rebel Tamil guerrillas would surrender arms to them. But it is not quite clear—rather it remains a mystery—whether President Jayewardene had asked the Indian army to cross the Palk Straits, and once they had reached Sri Lanka, only God knows when they will return back to India, and even if they return at all, they will do it voluntarily.

Apart from this, as has been succinctly maintained by Dr. Shamsul I. Khan :

...the secret clauses of the peace treaty especially the Indian terms and conditions are becoming known to the public day by day, which in their eyes have reduced Sri Lanka almost to a protectorate of India. According to these clauses, in the future the Sri Lankan army could be trained only in India, Sri Lanka would not maintain any special relationship with a third country which might endanger India's national and geopolitical interest, no foreign power would be allowed to make their bases or to get naval facilities (for military purpose) at the Trincomalee harbour of Sri Lanka and no fore-

ign radio centres including the Voice of America and the Deutsche Welle (Voice of Germany) would be allowed to build up further relay or retransmitting stations in Sri Lanka without the prior permission from India—almost a Monroe doctrine a la Gandhi.<sup>13</sup>

In her relations with Bangladesh, the Indian intention was quite clear from the very beginning. Though Bangladesh is surrounded by Indian territory on three sides, viz., north, east and west, except south wherein lies the Bay of Bengal, India compelled Bangladesh to sign a 25-year treaty styled as the Treaty of Cooperation, Friendship and Peace in March 1972.<sup>14</sup> If we critically examine the treaty very briefly, we find that the treaty was designed to serve the purpose of India more than that of Bangladesh. Although India is very powerful compared to Bangladesh and given the geopolitical realities of Bangladesh, as has just been mentioned, India had nothing to fear from her small neighbour, yet she managed to insert two clauses in the treaty, the first of which had forbidden Bangladesh not to "enter into or participate in any military alliance directed against" India (article 8) and the second one had forbidden Bangladesh not to "undertake any commitment, secret or open, towards one or more states which may be incompatible with the present treaty" (article 10). Apart from this, though the declared policy of the government of Bangladesh was to become the Switzerland of the East, India, in case of her dispute with her other neighbours, succeeded in guaranteeing the positive support of Bangladesh by inserting

another clause in the treaty which stipulates that "In case either party is attacked or threatened with attack the high contracting parties shall immediately enter into mutual consultations in order to take appropriate effective measures to eliminate the threat..." (article 10). The Indian eagerness to close all the options for Bangladesh other than to follow in the foot-prints of India becomes evident when the treaty kept the provision that "The treaty shall come into force with immediate effect from the date of its signature" (article 11) which denied the government of Bangladesh any opportunity to even give a second thought to various provisions of the treaty already signed.

Bangladesh inherited bitter relations with India from her pre-independence days when she was an integral part of former united Pakistan, a country with which India had no love lost ever since these two states became independent from the yoke of British colonial rule in 1947, especially due to the Indian project of the Farakka barrage the construction work of which began in 1951 in the name of diverting the water of the Hoogly-Bhagirathi at Farakka near Murshidabad to make the Calcutta port silt-free to facilitate navigation, the real purpose being to deprive her lower riparian neighbour of her due share in the water of an international river to make a political threat so that she remains perpetually subservient to India. Even during the period of so-called 'honey-mooning' between Dhaka and Delhi during the Mujib regime in Bangladesh, India showed no good intention of supplying Bangladesh of her equitable share of water through



a freely negotiated treaty before the barrage was formally commissioned in 1974. And since the assassination of Mujib in August, 1975, signalling the fall of the Awami League Government in Bangladesh, the relations between these two South Asian neighbours have deteriorated steadily due mainly to such factors as the barbed wire fencing, tribal disturbance, transfer of enclaves, etc., apart from the vital question of Farkakka.

Though the two countries reached an agreement during the Mujib era in 1974 over the transfer of enclaves to the respective countries, Bangladesh has unredressed genuine grievances toward India. The agreement stipulated that India would hand over the Tin-bigha corridor to Bangladesh in return for the latter's transfer of Berubari to India. Though Bangladesh complied with the treaty provision long ago by handing over the Berubari enclave to India, India has not yet reciprocated by honouring the same, and hence the plight of the people of Tin-bigha still persists. This non-compliance by India of her treaty obligation runs counter to fostering good neighbourly relations between the two countries.

The Indian government is displaying its dissatisfaction towards the successive regimes in Bangladesh in the post-Mujib era first by encouraging, training and providing sanctuary to the so-called 'Shanti Bahini', the insurgent Chakma tribesmen in the Chittagong Hill Tracts district to carry out sabotage inside Bangladesh and secondly, by her project of barbed wire fencing on the Indo-Bangladesh border in the name of keeping

out an influx of illegal immigrants from Bangladesh. Perhaps more distressing is the fact that the Indian government indirectly encouraged the Hindu militants in Assam to drive away the Muslims to Bangladesh who went to the hilly area to earn their livelihood long ago during the British colonial rule, and settled there like all other people. Hence no question arises of them being branded as 'foreigners' and not 'local people' and thereby making their lives miseradle in an effort to irritate the government and people of Bangladesh.

Apart from the above, the two governments have so far failed to reach a settlement of their maritime boundary due to the non-cooperation of India who has already established her sovereignty over the Purbasha Island which distinctly lies within Bangladesh boundary. In her last-mentioned action, India has taken resort to a method which virtually amounts to gunboat diplomacy. In all these matters the the Bangladesh government lodged protests with the Indian government, but like India's non-comliance with the 1974 treaty obligations, it simply ignored these.

It is thus clear that India wants to dominate over her South Asian small neighbours. The same is the case with the Indian Ocean which is treated by her as an 'Indian Lake' and hence an exclusive zone of her own interest.

### III

In making the final evaluation of the justification of Indian actions as well as the extent to which she has succeeded in attaining the objectives of her

foreign policy, it may be said that she has always pursued a policy which may be expressed in a single word simply as the policy of expediency. In operating in the global arena, or more appropriately in her relations with both the Super Powers, her goal of eating the cake and having it too has already given rise to some doubts in the minds of both of them. The whole world now knows that India says one thing but has quite different things in mind and also acts in a different way. This is especially true as far as her high sounding drum beating in the non-aligned world is concerned where she can hardly justify her actions as we have seen in the case of Afghanistan. Indian actions in South Asia have been more distressing. Over the past years, India has been exerting lateral pressure in the neighbouring countries. A number of cases may be cited as a demonstration to this. Starting from her forcible occupation of Goa in 1961, she has annexed Sikkim with the Indian Union in 1975,<sup>15</sup> and in recent years has attempted Sikkim-type of actions to her small neighbours like Sri Lanka and Bangladesh. She has already succeeded in stationing her troops in Sri Lanka by fomenting a secessionist movement there through the Sri Lankan Tamils thereby creating a condition in which the Indian Prime Minister could impose a treaty on the Sri Lankan President on July 29, 1987, as has been mentioned earlier. This Indian action should be seen in the light of a statement made by former Indian President Zail Singh in early September, 1987, saying that the quick withdrawal of Indian troops from Bangladesh in 1972 was a mis-

take.<sup>16</sup> It may be argued here that the withdrawal of the Indian army from Bangladesh at that time was bought by Bangladesh at the price of signing the Indo-Bangladesh treaty of March 1972 through which India *tied Bangladesh to her tail* and hence found no reason to spare her troops to '*friendly*' Bangladesh. As far as her relation with Pakistan is concerned, India though already a nuclear power, cannot bear with the prospect of Pakistan's acquisition nuclear capability. Though many observers believe that India and Pakistan "could well live in peace in a situation of nuclear parity" and Pakistan has already offered "inspection of each other's nuclear facilities and the mutual reduction of forces", India suffers from "a military threat from Pakistan and is psychologically wary of Pakistan's nuclear quest and its likely irrational use"<sup>17</sup> and thus India's distrust is at the root of the strained relations between these two neighbours.

All these Indian actions have lowered down her image as a peace-loving country. Evidently India is trying to fool both the Super Powers, the vast majority of the non-aligned countries and her South Asian neighbours, but only time can say how long she can successfully continue this ploy. Apart from being morally unjustified, most of the Indian actions can hardly be termed rational because these are based more on intentions rather than supported by capabilities.<sup>18</sup> Such an ambitious foreign policy has not borne much fruit for India because *she has continued to remain as an underdeveloped country in spite of making much progress in the field of science and technology*. Since

her independence, India has stressed more on her foreign policy matters largely ignoring her domestic well-being and the result has been the *multiplication of her internal problems and dissensions*.

The foregoing lead us to conclude that unless India is prevented from her expansionist design in South Asia and also spreading her growing influence in the Indian Ocean, the repercussions may be far-reaching because in that case, the 'Indira Doctrine,'<sup>1</sup> of India hegemony may extend to the non-aligned countries as well. especially at a time when she has already acquired nuclear knowhow and is trying fast to develop the delivery capabilities. Hence there is the need for concerted international effort first to maintain the balance of power in the subcontinent and then to stop providing military facilities to India so that she cannot pose a threat to international peace and security. To serve the purpose of her future well-being India on her part should contribute by building mutual confidence especially among the South Asian countries through exhibiting the spirit to live and let live.

#### Notes :

1. For the lateral pressure theory, see Robert C. North and Richard Lagerstrom, *War and Domination: A Theory of Lateral Pressure* (New York: General Learning, 1971), and also, Nazli Choucri and Robert C. North, *Nations in Conflict: National Growth and International Violence* San Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Co., 1975)
2. Satish Kumar, "India and the World—Trends and Events", in Satish Kumar (ed.), *Yearbook on India's Foreign Policy, 1984-85* (New Delhi: Sage Publications. 1987), p. 64.

3. Rasheeduddin Khan, "India and the Non-aligned Movement" in *Ibid.*, b. 78.
4. Satish Kumar, *op. cit.*, p. 12.
5. Jayashekar, "Indo-Soviet Relations: Continuing Relevance", in Satish Kumar (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 172.
6. Surjit Mansingh, "New Directions in Indo-US Relations", in *Ibid.*, p. 187.
7. Satish Kumar, *op. cit.*, p. 61.
8. Article 9 of the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation stipulates that "Each High Contracting Party undertakes to abstain from providing any assistance to any third country that engages in armed conflict with the other party. In the event of either being subjected to an attack or a threat thereof, the High Contracting Parties shall immediately enter into mutual consultations in order to remove such threat and to take appropriate effective measures to ensure peace and security of their countries. See Robert Jackson, *South Asian Crisis : India, Pakistan, Bangladesh* (New Delhi : Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., 1978), Appendix 8, p. 160.
9. J. S. Mehta, "The Prospects in Afghanistan : Can India be Indifferent ?", in Satish Kumar (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 136.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 145.
11. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's Reply to the Debate in the Lok Sabha on April 10, 1985, see Satish Kumar (ed.), *op. cit.*, Documents, p. 263.
12. Gurbach an Singh, "The Ethnic Problem in Sri Lanka and Indian Attempts at Mediation", in *Ibid.*, p. 125.
13. Shamsul I. Khan, "Sri Lanka : The price of Dictated Peace", in *Courier* (Dhaka), August 21, 1987, p. 19.
14. For the text of the Treaty, see S. S. Bindra, *Indo-Bangladesh Relations* (Deep and Deep Publications, New Delhi, 1982), pp. 134-137.
15. Sikkim, one of the three Himalayan Kingdoms, was formerly a sovereign state. Since 1950, she became an Indian Pro-

teoreate because her relations with India was governed by a treaty by the terms of which India undertook to defend Sikkim's territorial integrity and to accept responsibility for its foreign relations. However, the 1950 treaty could not save Sikkim from the clutches of India as the latter succeeded in her design of annexing Sikkim to be the 22nd State of the Indian Union under the Constitution (38th Amendment) Act, which was passed by the Indian Parliament on April 26, 1975, and signed by the Indian President on May 16, 1975. See *Keeaing's Contemporary Archives*, p. 27220A.

16. See *Bangladesh Observer*, September 13, 1987, for statements made by a number of Bangladesh politicians condemning Zail Singh's statement.
17. P. M. Pasricha, "Relations with Pakistan", in Satish Kumar (ed.) *op. cit.*, p. 114-115.
18. Cf: Satish Kumar, *op. cit.*, p. 12.
19. Surjit Mansingh, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

