Conclusion:

The dissertation began with the discussion of concept of Internationalism and related concepts. It emphasized the paucity of studies on 'internationalism', Dr. Halliday's observation that it is not a fashionable concept was noted. Dr. Halliday himself referred to three concepts of internationalism.

In the next chapter a review of literature on the subject was undertaken, with special emphasis of works on Anglo-saxon writers. The characteristics of Anglo-American tradition were distinguished from the continental tradition. Broad ideas of some individual Western thinkers were stated. An attempt was also made to see, if from the survey of literature on political thought in India, an Indian theory of inter-state relations existed. Dr. Rana's observation that theory of inter-state relations existed only in ancient India and in the shape of acquisition of and enlargement of power at the expense of surrounding kingdoms existed was considered. An attempt was made to see if the modern Indian thinkers since Raja Ram Mohan Ray expressed their views on internationalism. The various meanings of the concept of 'internationalism' were noted.

The objectives of the dissertation were stated and selection of these three thinkers was justified.
Next followed the method and sources of study. Literature studied on each of these thinkers was mentioned. In the next three chapters, detailed examination of internationalism of Jawaharlal Nehru, Sri Aurobindo and Rabindranath Tagore's concept of internationalism was made. Finally, followed a chapter in which comparison of views the three thinkers on internationalism was made, points of similarities were observed and points of differences noted.

The study revealed internationalist orientation of all the three in terms of both thought and action. Even though Nehru was a politician, Sri Aurobindo, firstly an activist of the nationalist movement and then philosopher and spiritual leader and Tagore, a poet, thus coming from varied background, they all were conscious about need of internationalism both for India and for the world. One reason why these thinkers were selected was that they were not only talking about internationalism but working for its promotion, at a time when India had not even become a nation-state. Nehru openly confesses about lack of internationalist orientation among his colleagues in the Congress party and elsewhere in the nation or even in the world. This was surely harmful as he said the world was becoming international but the structures both political and economic and psychological perception of politicians was nationalistic. This, he said would not do, as India after all was a part of world and the world included India and because of developments in science and technology, every country was your neighbour. Compulsions of nuclear age were also demanding internationalist orientation.
This understanding enabled Nehru to be an internationalist both in the pre-independence and post-independence period. This understanding was shared by Sri Aurobindo and Tagore.

A look at their philosophy and their perception of the need of internationalism, does not leave one with any surprise as to why they were talking of internationalism even before India had achieved freedom and become a nation-state.

One of the objectives of internationalism for Nehru was to prevent national movement from being ego-centric, as all thinkers considered that as dangerous. Tagore was particularly critical of such chauvinism. It is not a surprise that although Sri Aurobindo borrowed a few elements of thought from Hegel, he did not borrow the idea of Welt-Geist (the cosmic spirit) finally resting in India (as it did in Germany in case of Hegel).

Another objective of the internationalism was to prevent India from being isolationist, as this results in stagnation (according to all the three thinkers). At the same time none of the three thinkers wanted India to be a carbon copy of the West (this danger was there as we had many Anglophiles and as our contacts were confined to United Kingdom) as this would defeat the very objective of Indian independence. The way out was to keep the world open so that India could learn many things. Nehru for example derived the goals of the independence movement from his contacts with the outside world, although the means adopted were of local origin or when adopted from outside were suitable to India. Similarly internationalism was considered as supportive of freedom movement, as the phenomenon of imperialism itself was
an international one and therefore attempt to end imperialism had also be undertaken with international support.

There were other reasons as well. Many problems such as the problem of racial unity was a common problem. Tagore considered it as the most important problem facing mankind. For its solution, either we could learn from other people or we could teach to other people. Hence the need of internationalism. Tagore even went to the extent of saying that because of the caste and communal problem, the basis of nationalism was lacking in India. Therefore, internationalism could be useful mutually to India and to the world. Similarly, in the problem of bringing up backward, uneducated and superstitious masses, as all of them realised Soviet Union could teach India a lot.

Internationalism could also enable the victims of colonialism to have sympathy for each other. But at the same time, as India was developing its freedom movement without hatred for British, these thinkers felt that India could moderate the anti-European feelings from taking a violent turn by her example.

Similarly, the dissertation revealed the various other ways in which India could help the cause of internationalism as seen by these three thinkers, even in the pre-independence period. In fact sometimes they appear to be conceiving a messianic role for India.

Internationalism of these three thinkers was also a product of the period of the Renaissance in India. We were a defeated nation. We had to accept the tutelage of colonial power. But the assertion of our greatness could partly reduce our hurt.
psyche. Hence the assertion that India could play and was destined to play an important role in eyes of our own people as well as before the world. Internally, it boosted up our confidence and externally it compelled the world to think of India as an important factor in world history and politics. No wonder Nehru, Sri Aurobindo and Tagore were talking about internationalism before the Indian nation state was established.

There were other factors behind their internationalism as well. The milieu in which they were born and brought up, the impact of Upanishads and other literary sources including Indian and Western sources, the study of Indian and World history, the influence of Indian Renaissance, their temperaments and training all made them internationalists during the freedom struggle itself.

This internationalism of Indian thinkers appears striking also in comparison to western writers. The Western thinkers (not all) had a limited concept of internationalism. They were talking of internationalism for containing Turkey or containing some other European country or for establishing a balance of power or for establishing an empire under the aegis of some country for professed or practical reasons. Very few had peace as the objective of internationalism or human unity as the objective of internationalism, which was the case with Nehru, Sri Aurobindo and Tagore respectively. Their internationalism aimed at solving even problems arising out of crisis of civilization. None of the Western thinkers, which we have examined criticized colonialism as bad in itself. Some of them
were hypocrites and recommended it for civilizing colonies. Their opposition was on practical grounds. Either the colonies did not pay or they brought conflicts. They should be given up only because of that. The biggest sacrifice they could suggest was that they should be better governed or economic monopoly in colonies should end so that European states could live in peace with each other. Their internationalism always remained hegemonic in relation to colonies, till they were forced to make compromises.

On the other hand our three thinkers (unlike Europeans or Chinese or Japanese) did not favour 'hegemonic internationalism' but favoured 'democratic internationalism'.

Moreover, none of our thinkers advocated intervention for the projection of our ideals. Take for example, the Americans either they have been self righteous and preferred isolationism or have advocated intervention for projecting their power or policies. In fact whenever they talk of internationalism, they mean interventionism.

The context in which our thinkers developed their concept of internationalism, their goals, the shape of their internationalism, the basis on which they arrived at internationalism, the emphasis which they put on internationalism, their concern and optimism about it, too distinguished these thinkers from the western thinkers of the liberal internationalist school. Tagore even went to the extent of considering internationalism as a substitute of nationalism. Looking at these one can even talk of an Indian theory of
internationalism. Moreover, very few Western thinkers favoured universal organisations. Even in the second half of 20th century, China was excluded. Before that Russia, Turkey were not favoured. The western conception of international organization was also not democratic and not based on equality but based on hegemony of great powers, although there were few exceptions. Nehru, Tagore and Aurobindo were critical of this. However as 'realists' they accepted the role of great powers. Their own conception of Indian role was not hegemonic either in the political or economic sense, at the most cultural and functional.

Their contributions in the area of theory of internationalism were remarkable:

(a) Although they all came from colonial background, they did not produce theories of imperialism, anti-westernism but produced theories of human progress, welfare and unity.

(b) They did not eulogize wars, struggles and conflicts (which was done by some Japanese or Chinese) and did not recommend them for independent India.

(c) They tried to link the problems of internationalism with Indian philosophy of Upanishads etc. with divinity of man and with process of evolution.

(d) They advocated and gave primacy to non-institutional means for achievement of goals of their scheme although they did not dispense with institutions altogether.

(e) If the idea of peace, brotherhood etc. took time to take roots at the mass level, it did not matter much. They would agree with William Godwin, 'a wise and informed man will not fail
to be votary of liberty and justice... But his attachment will be
to the cause, as the cause of the man and not to the country.
Wherever there are individuals, who understand the value of
political justice and are prepared to assert it, that is his
country'. Did Nehru, Tagore and Sri Aurobindo not belong to this
community of (a kind of internationalism of groups!)
internationalists?

It is true when Nehru became Prime Minister, he did
make compromises because of the exigencies of politics. But there
was never a complete sacrifice of principles, a complete
surrender. If Tagore and Sri Aurobindo (for a longer time) had
survived the post-independence period, they would have acted as
conscience keepers of nation, both in its internal and external
dimension.

They differed from other Indian thinkers as well, many
of whom had a nationalistic concern only. They also struck a
balance between those thinkers who wanted complete adoption of
western culture and institutions and other thinkers who believed
in India only and adopted 'West-touch me not' attitude.