Jawaharlal Nehru’s internationalism was conditioned by his world view. His perception of the world can be divided into two parts, one before India achieved independence and then one which he developed in a period of cold war, which set in roughly around the time of India’s independence. This does not mean that there was a clear break between in his world view between the two periods. However, the conditions during the second period and the problems faced by the world in the second period were different from the conditions and problems of the first period. This had its impact on his world view. Further, in the second period Nehru emerged as the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of India. Although this gave him an opportunity to shape the destiny of India and the world, this also conditioned his outlook, his policies and imposed certain limitations on him. Of course this does not mean that idealism disappeared from his philosophy.

Nehru’s internationalism was shaped by several factors, such as his perception of Indian history and world history, human nature, importance of people, role of leaders, importance of systems, role of power, and of nationalism and national interest. These were some important factors which along with others shaped his world view. Several traditions, both Indian and western were responsible for shaping this. Amongst the Indian
traditions, the Gandhian tradition influenced him the most. The framework which he constructed was not logically consistent but conveyed a sense of what he regarded as essential values. S. Gopal's observation is worth quoting, "It made him a Marxist who rejected regimentation, a socialist who was committed to civil liberties, a radical who accepted non-violence, an international statesman with a total involvement in India and above all, a leader who believed in carrying his people with him even if it slowed down the pace of progress." 1

Jawaharlal's internationalism and its various components were a response to various problems which he felt the world was facing. He was equally concerned about problems of the East in general and India in particular. In response to Indian problems, he looked at the world for solutions. On the other hand, he also felt that East and India in particular had the capacity to offer solutions to the world problems. In fact, there was a constant interaction between his nationalism and his internationalism. Most of the time he felt there was no conflict between these two.

What were the main problems the humanity was facing and the East and India in particular was facing? In his view, there were common problems for all as well as special problems for East including India.
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1 Gopal S.: "The Formative Ideology of Jawaharlal Nehru" in Grover Verinder (ed.) Political Thinkers of Modern India, Vol. 10, (Jawaharlal Nehru), New Delhi, Deep and Deep, 1990, p.120.
Pre-Independence world and India

For thousands of years according to Nehru, the great bulk of mankind has remained in destitution, ignorance, ill health and has been exploited.

Of course, the world has slowly progressed. There has been that growth from animal to man. 'Man’s growth from barbarism to civility is supposed to be the theme of history'. However, according to Nehru, man has not made progress in many ways from animals, particularly in the area of co-operation for common good. In this area even animals like Bee, White Ant and Ant are better than man. He quotes a Sanskrit verse approvingly; "For the family sacrifice the individual, for community the family, for the country the community and for the soul the whole world".

Mankind has not behaved this way.

Man is however gifted with curiosity while the animal is not. His quest has taken two lines. He has tried to understand Nature and has tried to understand himself, meaning 'Know thyself'. He has tried to understand Nature through science. He has harnessed this knowledge to his advantage and won more power for himself. In the East too science had developed in the past. However, it could not continue on its trail possibly for various reasons. The real scientific method however developed in West. Nineteenth century was a remarkable century for many things, but most notably for development of science. In the realm
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of scientific thought, Darwinism was a phenomenon. "One of the results of general acceptance of his theories was to make people believe in the idea of progress which meant that men and society and the world as a whole were marching towards perfection and becoming better and better." ⁴ There seems to have been no such idea in the past in Europe or in Asia or in any of the old civilizations. ⁵ In Europe, people looked upon the past as the ideal period. In India too there was the theory of the golden age. However, Nehru was not convinced about this theory. Our knowledge about past make us believe in this theory. But our knowledge is limited and it may be that with fuller knowledge our outlook may change. ⁶ However, "if progress lead us to destroy each other, as was done in the world war, there is something wrong with the progress." ⁷ As a matter of fact, Nehru is not so confident about future. "We see two processes going on today in the world, two rival and contradictory processes. One to the progression of co-operation and reason, and the building up of the structure of the civilization; the other a destructive process, a tearing up of everything, an attempt by mankind to commit suicide. And both will go faster and faster ... which will win?" ⁸ Further, the theory of progress became justification of one class ruling over another. ⁹ However, he is happy that because of this theory " the idea of a static or unchanging or even deteriorating society was pushed aside... in its place came the
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idea of a dynamic and changing society." However, inspite of progress of science, the hope it raised for an El Dorado, the majority of mankind still lived in destitution and misery. The question is why? history according to Nehru is not pleasant. Why?

According to Nehru, partly, the human nature is to be blamed. "Man, inspite of his great and vaunted progress, is still a very unpleasant and selfish animal". He sees a silver line of progress here and there as in India under Gandhi's leadership. However, he sees a "long and dismal record of selfishness, quarrelsomeness and inhumanity of man." Even in India "many of our countrymen think in terms of a sect or a religious group or narrow class and forget the larger good."

At the same time human nature is not all that bad. "In spite of innumerable failings, man throughout the ages, has sacrificed his life and all he held dear for an ideal, for truth, for country and honour. That ideal may change but the capacity for self-sacrifice remains." Whatever Gods there be", he adds, "there is something God like in man, as there is something of the devil in him." However, the question was "was human nature so essentially bad that it would take ages of training, through suffering and misfortunes before it could behave reasonably and raise man above that creature of lust and violence
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and deceit he now was? And, meanwhile, was every effort to change it radically in the present or near future doomed to failure? "18 He adds, "the right means might well be beyond the capacity of infirm and selfish human nature".

Then a kind of determinism creeps into philosophy of Nehru. "A very great deal appears certainly to be determined by past complex of events which bear down and often overwhelm the individual."19 "Possibly", he adds, "even the inner urge that he experiences, that apparent exercise of free will is itself conditioned. "20 He quotes Schopenhauer approvingly, 'a man can do what he will, but not will as he will.'21 Probably, the same kind of realization of importance of forces lead him to blame systems for misfortune and exploitation of man. Exploitation has been the lot of working class and poor in all ages.22 This is one of his reasons for preference for Marxism. "Injustice", he says, "is not a matter for anger or good virtuous advice."23 "The fault always lies with the system, not with the individuals."24 Therefore it is only the British imperialism, capitalism or Zamindari system to be blamed and not an individual Britisher, a capitalist or a Zamindar. Therefore a systemic ailment could end only with the replacement of old system after it had run its course.25 Even though he is willing to concede that the condition
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of the working class is better than at time in the past ages, he is not willing to absolve the capitalist system for its exploitation of its workers. The system is the corruptible factor.

Among the systems Nehru found fault with, one was the capitalist system. If history and civilization was a study of progress of co-operation between man and man, the laissez-faire and new capitalism resulting from industrial revolution brought the law of jungle. 26 "Pig Philosophy", Nehru uses expression used by Carlyle, created a system laid down by manufacturers. In this system the owners of factories objected even to compulsory sanitation of private houses and interference with adulteration of goods.

It does not mean that capitalism was without merits. Like Marx, Nehru too found some advantages of capitalism. It taught organization. It brought co-operation in large undertakings. It brought about efficiency and punctuality. Above all, it solved the problem of production (at least in theory). 27 However, it has failed to solve many problems. The major problem which has not been solved by capitalism is the problem of distribution. 28 There is a conflict here according to Nehru, between capitalist form of society and the latest technique and method of production. The problem of food rotting while people starved and abundance of food on the one hand and scarcity of goods on the other, Nehru saw as one of the fatal contradictions of the capitalist system. The only country which did not seem to
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have suffered from depression when there was a crisis in capitalism, was the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{29} With the masses having developed aspirations for higher living standards, in Nehru's view, capitalism no longer seemed to have chances of survival. It is true Nehru concedes that capitalism has survived many crisis. But it was due to the colonies which capitalist countries had acquired in the past. This would have gone on and on. But the chief difficulty now was the fierce competition of imperialist powers for a larger share of cake.\textsuperscript{30} Another was the new nationalism in colonial countries and the growth of colonial industries which began to supply their own markets.\textsuperscript{31} All these lead to war I. But even war did not solve the problem.\textsuperscript{32} One huge area, Soviet Union, went out of capitalist world completely and ceased to be a market. Further, the fact that capitalism and the resulting imperialism were internal phenomena, and the depression of 1929 which was a by-product of capitalism had an international impact meant that solution required was of international nature. However, as each capitalist country adopted a national solution this made matter worse and led to continuous conflict between capitalist nations.\textsuperscript{33} Capitalism led inevitably to imperialism. There was a demand for raw materials and for market everywhere. This led to scramble for territories. Nehru described the 19th century as century of imperialism. Here, 'religion, science, the love of one's own country were prostituted
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to one end - the exploitation of weaker and industrially more backward peoples of the earth.\textsuperscript{34}

This imperialism helped the workers of the capitalist countries but only marginally. It increased the difference between rich and poor. Nehru quotes Disraeli, approvingly, "two nations between whom there is no intercourse and sympathy".\textsuperscript{35}

Imperialism led to raising of the standard of people in developed countries at the expense of exploited people in Asia, Africa and other non-industrial areas. Further, as in the case of British control over India, Nehru remarked "If Britain had not undertaken this great burden of India .... India might not only have been freer and more prosperous but also far more advanced in science and art and all that makes life worth living". Were it not for this imperialistic interference, the peoples of this area (Asia-Africa) would have advanced like Japan, adopting in due course science and technology that made it possible for the West to move ahead. During the Era of capitalist imperialism, "Europe has changed out of recognition, Japan has transformed itself with amazing speed, America has become the wealthiest country in the world." \textsuperscript{36} After all, "India was, in fact, as advanced industrially, commercially, and financially as any country prior to industrial revolution." \textsuperscript{37} Further, no such development could have taken place unless the country enjoyed long periods of stable and peaceful government. Moreover under normal conditions,
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it would have undergone change and adapted to new industrial conditions. 38

Nehru also thought of relationship between capitalism and democracy. Democracy as a theory according to Nehru had revolutionary implications. He admitted that men in fact were unequal and yet it stated that each one of them should be treated as having equal political and social value. 39 This equality was to be established by giving each man a vote. However, in practice it was seen to be a shadow without substance, as the vote did not make any difference to an ordinary man in his daily life. However, democracy gave a good deal of personal freedom. Further, democratic ideas were an intellectual reaction against kings and autocracy, that is against conditions existing prior to industrialisation. But these were completely changed by industrialisation. Democracy was thus for many decades carrying on the traditions and ideas of French Revolution. Thus capitalism and democracy derived their inspiration from a similar ideology. However, according to Nehru, later on many people felt that democracy presumed equality but capitalism created inequality and therefore a basic contradiction developed. As Willard Range observed in Nehru’s perception, “democracy stressed control by many while capitalism stressed control by few.” 40

Finally, capitalism also was responsible for Fascism. 41 It is not a phenomena peculiar to Italy but one which appears where certain social and economic conditions appear. Whenever
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workers become powerful and actually threaten the state, the capitalist state tries to save itself by organizing a mass movement by using lower middle class, unemployed, backward and unorganised workers. "Fascism," Nehru observed, "appears when the class conflicts between an advancing socialism and an entrenched capitalism become bitter and critical". He adds, "So long as capitalism can use the machinery of democratic institutions to hold power and keep down labour, democracy is allowed to flourish. When this is not possible then capitalism discards democracy and adopts the open fascist method of violence, and terror." Fascism glorified violence, ridiculed pacifism and was extremely nationalistic which according to Nehru went against the world tending towards interdependence. Fascism also glorified state, believed in sacrificing individual and ridiculed democracy. Not only is individual sacrificed, it is described as self-realisation. To illustrate, he quotes Gentile, "My personality is not suppressed but uplifted, strengthened, enlarged by being merged and restored in that of the family, the state, the spirit." Capitalism was also responsible for wars, though not exclusively. There have been wars and wars, the dynastic wars, the religious wars, the wars involving conflicts of nationalities. According to Nehru economic factors were most important as causes of war. Nationalistic wars too were in the final analysis due to economic factors.
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imperialism and imperialism led to wars. Chamberlin was concerned with saving the interest of British Capitalist class rather than Britain. That is why he preferred economic and political collaboration with Fascism. The real interests of Britain demanded a coalition between Britain and Soviet Union. World war II was the result.

As a matter of fact Nehru felt that capitalist system would have died had not United states kept it alive by loans to Europe.

Capitalism was immoral too, as it was predicated on "acquisitive instinct". It believed in acquisition of profits, sources of raw material, markets, labour. A system to limit the acquisitiveness of man was necessary.

Capitalism was also responsible for the growth of nationalism. Nationalism in the sense of love of one's country was already there. Capitalism however led to intensification of nationalism. It also made it narrower. It bound together and separated (nationalism). It was not merely a love of one's country but a hatred of other. This was ultimately responsible for the world war I. This was strange, for speeding up of communications was presumed to reduce prejudices and narrowmindedness. To some extent this did take place but the whole structure of capitalist society led to friction between nation and nation, class and class, man and man.
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According to Nehru nationalism was another weakness of the present world system. It is true that Nehru considered intensification of nationalistic rivalries, a result of capitalism. However nationalism was older, did not always assume the same shape, did not always result in similar consequences. Some times he takes a positive view of nationalism, other times a negative view. Possibly he says, "the essential characteristic of national consciousness is a sense of belonging together and of together facing the rest of mankind." He described it in his 'Discovery of India' as "essentially a group memory of past achievements, traditions and experiences." In Europe, it was the strong centralized monarchies which helped to develop the idea of nationalism. The idea took root in 18th century. Later on in 19th century, nationalism became a goddess for whom people were willing to sacrifice their lives. At times he defines nationalism as struggle for independence. Often he distinguishes between this simple nationalism and one with social and economic content. His preference is for the latter type. He would even say, "the whole idea underlying the demand for independence was this: to make people realise that we were struggling for entirely different political structure and not just an Indianised edition (with British control behind the scenes) of the present order, which Dominion status signifies." As a matter of fact, he observes, this type of nationalism developed exclusively for
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independence helped the spread of communalism. Similarly because of his commitment to nationalism with socio-economic content, he considers nationalism in general as a matter related to well to do classes. Therefore ordinary folk like workers, peasants and others are not interested in it. However Nehru also regarded nationalism in conjunction with a particular stage of historical development in a particular country and was conscious of the weakness of the phenomenon of nationalism.

In the West, he wrote a few months before the war, nationalism had been a source of good in the 18th and 19th century, the inspiration of unity, democracy and the flowering of culture. By 1930s, however, it had become the parent of aggressiveness, intolerance and racial discrimination, serving as a camouflage for the most reactionary features of European life.

Nationalism according to Nehru is one factor which by its "narrow outlook has made us think of separate countries far more than of oneness of the world and the common interests of countries." At one place, Nehru describes "nationalism as a disease and absorbs all over attention and will continue to do so, until we get political freedom." He quotes Bernard Shaw approvingly: 'a conquered nation is like a man with cancer; he can think of nothing else..... There is indeed no greater curse to a nation than a nationalist movement, which is only the agonizing..."
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symptom of a suppressed natural function. Conquered nations lose their place in the world's march."59 Nationalism according to Nehru created double standards of morality. To quote him, 'with the growth of nationalism, the idea of my country right or wrong' developed, and nations gloried in doing things which in case of individuals were considered bad and immoral. Thus a strange contrast grew between morality of individuals and nations. There was a vast difference between the two and the very vices of individuals became virtues of nations."60 He quotes an author approvingly, 'civilisation has become a device for delegating vices of individuals to larger and larger communities.'61

These vicious and immoral nations, considered it a sign of independence, "to adopt an offensive and intolerant attitude towards others...(as) there was no central authority to tell them to behave, for were they not independent, and would not interference be resented? The only check on their behaviour was fear of consequences." 62

Nationalism according to Nehru is always selfish. Each sub-national group is also selfish. Nehru believes, 'A group or community is always selfish, just as a nation is selfish, although individuals in a group or community may take an unselfish view.'63 Thus nationalism or sub-nationalism becomes a disruptive force.64
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As a result of the above, nationalism becomes an instrument of great power politics. Further, nationalism according to Nehru was inward looking with a tendency to go to the past. It was not looking towards the future.

According to Orest Martyshin, Nehru was critical of three forms of narrow nationalism. He did not want to let national self assertion turn into aggressiveness and hostility towards other nations. Another form of narrow nationalism was the people's desire to withdraw into the shell of its history and traditions. For example the 1921 movement of non-co-operation in India was "a strange mixture of nationalism and politics, religion, mysticism and faratism. Behind all this there was agrarian trouble and in big cities a rising working class movement. And yet this nationalism itself was a composite force and behind it could be distinguished a Hindu Nationalism, a Muslim Nationalism partly looking beyond the frontiers of India and what was more in consonance with the spirit of times, an Indian nationalism. For the true being they overlapped and all pulled together... and Gandhi became a symbolic expression of the confused desires of peoples." Finally, Nehru back in 1920s' and 1930s' was fully aware of the class contradictions and the limited character of nationalism. He quotes Nehru's following remark, 'nationalism hides a host of differences under a cover of anti-feeling against the imperialist oppressor' and 'it covers a multitude of conflicts and even, I am sorry to say, self-seeking groups and individuals'. This does not mean that...
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Nationalism of all types is bad. Nationalism in East grew as a force to counter the nationalism which was aggressive, imperialistic and racial. Nationalism in East produced unity, vitality and cultural renaissance. As a matter of fact he mentions rise of nationalism in East as one of the major events of fourteen years after the war, the other three being: the rise of Soviet Union, economic domination by U.S.A; and the European triangle. In terms of power politics, Nehru felt that domestic struggle of two important countries India and China could change the world balance of power.

Development of Eastern nationalism was simultaneous. "It was like an electric current passing through them all at the same time." Another noteworthy feature of the Eastern nationalism was the similarity of methods employed. There were insurrections and violent rebellions in many of these countries, but gradually they came to rely more and more on a policy of non-co-operation and boycott. The pattern being initially set by India.

Further, according to Nehru internationalism of the west has been phoney. Internationalism of the western socialist gave way to nationalistic fervour during the first world war; similarly Britain's willingness to give dominion status only to India before independence and attempt to create British commonwealth is hardly an example of internationalism but only an extension of a
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narrow British nationalism. On the other hand, he has hope in ideas of internationalism as put forward by East and in particular by India.

This does not mean that nationalism in East and India in particular would not have any difficulties. In his book 'The Discovery of India' he refers to some of these features: (1) Nationalism with its reliance on looking at past may induce the country to isolate her from external influences. India did that in the past and suffered. He quotes Vivekanad approvingly, 'the fact of our isolation from all the other nations of the world is the cause of our degeneration and its only remedy is getting back into current of the rest of the world, motion is the sign of life'. (2) In case of Indian nationalism, the nationalism of a country got identified with the nationalism of the majority. In India, the nationalism took a Hinduised look. It took on a religious, revivalist character. It could be one of the causes of alienation of the Muslims. However, on the same ground Nehru rejected creation of Pakistan. Nationalism based on religion in his view was out of date. (3) A major difficulty with the Indian nationalism in particular was that large number of Indian intellectuals, to the end of the 19th century developed faith in imperialistic internationalism. They believed in virtues of British rule, did not desire independence and believed in
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retaining the British connection. This was the position of Indian liberals.

(4) Even the congress (which was the organization spearheading the movement towards national independence) did not have many members like Nehru, having knowledge of international situation or had a world perspective on events at home and abroad. Their nationalism was not linked with internationalism (with the exception of Subash Bose). Their energies were devoted to India's freedom only. They looked at the issue exclusively from the nationalist point of view. They never faced the dilemma of choosing between nationalism and internationalism. Nehru always tried to link nationalism and internationalism. There he was constantly tormented between these two currents. An important question is although nationalism in East and in particular in India was immune from weaknesses of nationalism in the west. Or granting that it was passing through a period of vitality, strength and cultural renaissance, was it not likely to degenerate into nationalism of the West? Was there a law regarding birth, development and decay of nationalism or at least regarding development and decay of nationalism? According to Brecher, in Nehru's view nationalism ultimately becomes identified with reaction and even in its liberating phase, it is a narrow creed.

Logically, however this equation of capitalism leading to imperialism and intensified nationalism and all these leading to wars and conflicts between nations could be avoided, if one did

90 Ibid., p.426.
82 Ibid., p.257.
not adopt a capitalist system. It is true he did not regard nationalism as some sort of religious faith but rather as a phenomenon in a specific situation and had a historical perspective. He could relate movement of humanity to socialism. He was at times even skeptical about combining nationalism with socialism. As he put it, "nationalism can only go far in a socialistic or proletarian direction by ceasing to be nationalism." However, at other places he is not pessimistic. He recognizes the power of nationalism, "whenever a crisis has arisen, nationalism has emerged again and dominated the scene." The most striking example that comes to his mind is the example of Soviet Union. "It has " according to Nehru, "become more nationalist minded and the appeal of the fatherland is now much stronger than the appeal of industrial proletariat." He does not feel that the nationalistic outlook of Soviet Union will be a reversion to old style nationalism. The thing which comforts him is that return of Russian nationalism has taken place without giving up in any way its essential social and economic structure." This means that nationalism and socialism can be combined.

Throughout his adult life, these two ideologies, nationalism and socialism were to vie for primacy in his thought and action. In early phase of life, according to Brecher, nationalism was more compelling motive, though he has
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consistently maintained his allegiance to both. His attempt was to combine these two. May be we can quote seely’s quotation regarding relationship between history and politics in a different way to explain the attitude of Nehru.

"Socialism without nationalism has no roots and Nationalism without socialism has no fruits." Nehru, however, was not that much worried about the nationalism of the East also going the Western way for various reasons: (1) Independence itself must be a solution to the problem of nationalism. "Nationalism tends to fade away after political freedom." We know of course that this was not an opinion he consistently held.

(2) Nationalism, need not always be excessive. That it could be combined with internationalism, meaning that nationalism of various countries need not come into conflict. That was his objective and he wanted to work for it. In Willard Range’s words, he believed that "it(nationalism) must never be allowed to develop to the point where the rights of other people are ignored or to the point where hatred, suspicion and fear of other people develop".

(3) Nationalism looked like a concept creating trouble because it was identified with the concept of national interest. This national interest was determined by its political leaders. Unfortunately, none of the politicians understood the real interests of their people. May be because they were not in touch with people. This meant the basic interests of states were
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not in conflict. Right type of leadership in charge of states with proper knowledge of and concern for interests of common man was required.

(4) He also believed that East was beginning with a clean slate. The European tradition was that of conflict and strife. Of course he is aware that power politics is a universal phenomenon; although he thinks some amount of power is necessary also; although he realizes that power corrupts everywhere, what he objects to in Europe is the elevation of power-politics to a way of life and supported by elaborate theories. Further, there is no attempt to change the old approach. As he rightly puts it, "in the west, future has been envisaged more and more as a retention of the past." This is particularly true of those in power. He is critical of the Realist like Spykman, on this account; "it is a curious realism that sticks to the empty shell of past and ignores or refuses to understand the hard facts of the present, which are not only political and economic but also include the feelings and urges of vast numbers of people." On the other hand, the East does not have this historical habit of conflict. Nehru took great satisfaction about the method of achieving Indian independence. No freedom movement resulted in achieving its objective with so little bitterness. Nehru was hopeful that past relationship with Britain was not going to condition Indo-British relations.

Similarly, he felt that in the post-independence period Asian countries would be able to overcome the isolation imposed
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on them by imperialists and fruitfully co-operate with each other. What else did Nehru find objectionable in the world as he saw it? He saw violence everywhere between nations, classes and races. As a matter of fact, "all life is full of conflict and violence... It is very life blood of the modern state and social system. The national state itself exists because of offensive and defensive violence." 94 He adds, "governments are notoriously based on violence, not only the open violence of the armed forces, but far more dangerous violence, subtly exercised, of spies, informers... religious and other forms of fear, economic destitution and starvation." 95 'Peace today' according to Nehru is itself merely an interval between two wars. 96 Further, violence as challenge to existing institutions has gained weight. 97 According to Nehru, "neither the growth of reason, nor the religious outlook or morality have checked this tendency to violence." 98 Individuals have progressed and gone up in human scale, society as a whole has progressed and to a very small extent begun to attempt the control of primitive and barbarian instincts." But on the whole groups and communities have not improved greatly. The individual in becoming more civilized has passed on many of his primitive passions and vices to the community and as violence always attracts the morally second rate, "the leaders of these communities are seldom their best men and women". 99 The sources of violence are both external and internal.
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Because of the possibility of aggression, every state at least for the purpose of defence has to keep instruments of coercion. This cannot be avoided. The necessity for this will only disappear when there is only a single world-state. Similarly, as economic interests shape the political views of groups and classes, here too, neither reason nor moral considerations can override these interests. Collective power of imperialism or class domination can never be dislodged unless power is raised against it. He quotes Niebuhr approvingly: 'Since reason is always to some degree the servant of interest in a social situation, social justice can not be resolved by moral or rational situation alone. Conflict is inevitable, and in this conflict power must be challenged by power.'

Violence has played a great part in world's history and will continue to do so for a considerable time. To ignore violence is to ignore life. Nehru does not find it to be bad intrinsically. Violence or non-violence must be considered good or bad in relation to objectives, circumstances and other factors.

Another problem which Nehru finds to be almost insoluble is the problem of fear. Fear is the most basic threat to the survival of the modern world. Fear leads to war, as it did in case of world war I, and world war II. Fear clouds man's vision, promotes hatred, makes them inhuman beast and causes a
decline in intellectual and moral standards. He has seen more of fear in Europe as they are "have" nations and are afraid of losing their possessions.

Many people fear new ideas. When societies do not accept ideas of change in changed circumstances, revolutions result. Fear is also the cause of more fear. It creates a vicious circle. He observed, 'fear builds up its phantoms more fearsome than reality itself and reality, devoid of fear loses much of its terror.' This complex of fear exists primarily because men try to achieve their goals by wrong means. Wrong means used by one party results in the wrong use of similar means and thus a circle is created. A global climate of fear is evident. Fear of giving up to the other party's ideology or to its interest or its power leads to militarisation. This leads to war. Of course, hatred, bitterness and conflict resulting from fear is more dangerous. This is unproductive as 'it harms the thinker more than the other side'. One reason why he values Gandhi so highly is because of his contribution in making Indians fearless against Britishers.
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Nehru also comes out clearly against the contemporary habit of nations to carry on crusades. Crusades result in counter or rival crusades and ultimately result in conflict. \(^{118}\) Once upon time crusading was undertaken by different religions. Now was the turn of economic ideologies to acquire that force. This crusading element creates troubles. His typical remark is: 'I am not quite sure which creates more trouble, the good crusaders who believe in their way of life and wish to impose it on others or the evil persons. The evil at least are known to be evil'. \(^{119}\) One reason why he is not in favour of crusading ideologies is that he is not convinced that what is good for some European countries is also good for Asia. But in addition to that he is against the imposition of west or domination by West of Asia. As he put it before Inter Asian Relations conference which met at Delhi in 1949, 'For too long have we of Asia been petitioners in western courts and chancelleries...we do not intend to be playthings of others.' \(^{120}\)

Another weakness of the old world order was the dominance of colonialism. He was highly critical of British rule in India. He is not ignorant of the benefits of the British rule. Rule of law, personal liberties and political unity have been mentioned by others among them. However according to Nehru, the first two have not been evident for many years. \(^{121}\) Political unity was achieved incidently. In later years, when that unity

---

allied itself to nationalism and challenged alien rule, government deliberately promoted disunity. 122 Similarly, industrial growth was throttled till circumstances forced their hands. 123 Overall record of British in terms of welfare of people was not good. 124 A servile state with government using bureaucracy to perpetuate itself resulted. 125 Nehru is however quick to point out two things: (1) The changes that have taken place in India during the last century or more have been world changes common to most countries in the East and West. 126 (2) Nehru does not blame the British people for our ills. He blames the systems. As a matter of fact the responsibility must be shouldered by us. It was a consequence of our own weakness. "An Authoritarian system of government especially one that is foreign, must encourage a psychology of subservience and try to limit the mental outlook and horizon of the people." 127

On the whole, however, Nehru's assessment of colonialism was close to that given by Karl Marx, who with India as an example showed that in some ways the British conquerors were the involuntary bearers of progress. 128 Nehru was one of the first representatives of the national liberation movements in Afro-Asian countries who turned his attention to new forms of imperialist exploitation, which were not directly linked to colonial domination. In an article, 'The changing faces of
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Imperialism' written in 1928, in which he borrowed an Argentine writer Manuel Ugarte's expression against U.S. domination in Latin America: "In older times Imperialism was satisfied with no less than a general levy of the inhabitants of a conquered territory to make them serve as slaves; later on it took possession of the land, leaving the people a certain autonomy; today it contents itself. With taking hold of certain sources of wealth, leaving the land and inhabitants to themselves. By doing so, Nehru observes, 'it can exploit the country fully to its advantage and can largely control it, and at the same time to shoulder no responsibility for governing and repressing that country. In effect both land and people are controlled with least amount of trouble.'

Nehru felt that the British type of Imperialism was passing away giving place to a more advanced and perfect type. British Imperialism was being compelled to remodel its methods of colonial exploitation. He called for measures to prevent the old imperialism being replaced by new imperialism. As a result of his understanding of the phenomenon of imperialism, Nehru saw no other way but to ask for independence of India. Between Imperialism and Independence, there could be no compromise. They are two incompatibles. Imperialism was by its nature so bad that it corrupted even progressive elements of society. Therefore end of imperialism would mean liberation of imperialist countries as well.

It also meant that political independence was a basic human necessity against domination and exploitation, though not a sufficient one. Economic independence, too was equally essential and without it political independence may become useless.

Eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were centuries of Europe. These countries dominated the world because of application of reason, science and because of development of industries. Progress in communications helped them.¹³²

In terms of politics, European politics and as a result of that world politics was dominated by a system of great powers.¹³³ Gradually nations took the place of kings and it is these nations who had powers. Of course this was one of the factors which led to the first world war.

The political system of Europe was dominated by great powers. "The poorer small nations are ignored except those that misbehave."¹³⁴ This was not of course in any way his giving a 'good behaviour' certificate to small nations. As he put it, "all the small countries are not paragons of virtue."¹³⁵

These powers made pacts and alliances and treaties with each other. This was an example of symptomatic treatment and did not treat deep-seated causes. It was a patchwork on the surface.¹³⁶ Further, they were guided by pure self-interest of a narrow type.¹³⁷
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In general "politics then were a curious and intricate web of intrigue and counter intrigue and deception and bluff, all in the secret and behind the veil. They would not last long if they saw the light of the day."\textsuperscript{138}

An important question now would be, how did he view the League of Nations which was created after the first world war? Did he perceive it as contributing to the world order?

Nehru felt that the post first world war I period was divided into three parties: the victors, the vanquished and the Soviet Union. The vanquished considered League as an instrument of victors. The Soviet Union considered it as an anti-soviet show. Even the Eastern nations looked upon League with some suspicion and considered it as a tool of imperialist powers.\textsuperscript{139}

Of course, even at the constitutional or theoretical level, League was not very ambitious.\textsuperscript{140} For example it did not try to end war, it sought to put difficulties in its way, so that the passage of time and efforts at conciliation might soothe away war passions. Nor did it try to remove the causes of war. League also failed as an instrument of internationalism because of its machinery. The League could decide on important matters unanimously. This meant that there was no coercion by a majority of vote. "It meant that national Sovereignties remained as independent and almost as irresponsible as before."\textsuperscript{141}

Of course League did useful work in non-political field and brought states together at the political level. However Nehru
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observed," it failed completely in achieving its real object, the preservation of peace or even lessening the chances of war."

The League became an instrument of great powers, especially of England and France. It maintained status Quo in Europe. Its doctrine of non-interference meant that the status Quo would continue in colonies also.¹⁴³

An important question now would be did he see any positive features in the world order of his times? Then how did he see the overall picture?

An important positive force according to Nehru was socialism, more particularly Marxism. He feels a certain inevitability about coming of socialism in the world. He says, "we must realise that the philosophy of socialism has gradually permeated the entire structure of society, the world over and almost the only points are pace and methods of advance to its full realisation. India will have to go that way too, if she seeks to end her poverty and inequality, though she may evolve her own methods and may adapt the ideal to the genuine of her race."¹⁴⁴ There were two old lines of thought in the pre-Marxist socialist thought. One came from Plato, who regarded common ownership as a pre-requisite for an ideal organization of society and for the comprehensive development of man. The latter was viewed outside any connection with the position of the oppressed. Here socialism was synonymous with the triumph of science and
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progress and was viewed in an abstract way, away from the social
problems of the epoch. The other line of thought came from Thomas
Moore. It was distinguished for its sensitive response to any
social injustice and interpreted socialism not only as a rational
organization of society but also as a method of abolishing
exploitation and inequality. Marxism has given a scientific
characterization to these two strands. Thus, as per first strand
socialism is the symbol of abstract human progress. The socialism
of the second kind is the banner of revolutionary progress. 145

All his life Nehru was divided between these two trends,
which took precedence over each other at different times.

What particularly impressed Nehru about Marxism was that
"It is a way of interpreting history and politics and economics
and human life and human desires. It is a theory as well as a
call to action. It is a philosophy which has something to say
about most of the activities of man's life. It is an attempt to
reducing human history, past, present and future to a rigid
logical system with something of the inevitability of fate.
Whether life is so very logical, after all, and so dependent on
hard and fast rules and systems do not seem very obvious." 146

What impressed Nehru most was his scientific approach to
things. 147 Also Marx's reliance on systemic causation and
systemic solution met with his Gandhian upbringing of 1920s'.
Therefore socialism as an ideology and system, according to
Nehru was an anti-dote to the ideology and system of
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capitalism. The challenge in the West was met by an answer from the west itself.

Of course, the more important thing was the use of ideology for the rise and consolidation of Soviet Union in spite of enormous difficulties.\(^{148}\) It is true, he conceded Europe was richer than Russia. The comparison, however, is not proper. "To compare a youth," he observed, "carrying a heavy burden but full of life and vigour, with an aged person, with little or no energy left and going forward, not without pride, but inevitably to the end of his present state."\(^{149}\)

In addition, Soviet Union's acting as friend of East impressed him. Large number of Eastern delegations visited Soviet Union in 1929. Soviet Union's help given to Turkey, Persia and Afghanistan is also referred by Nehru.\(^{150}\) Although Nehru, did not consider co-existence between capitalism and communism as possible earlier,\(^{151}\) he appreciated Soviet policy of peace with other nations which became possible because Soviet Union wanted to recuperate and the great task of building up a huge country on socialistic lines absorbed their attention.\(^{152}\) 'Idea of world revolution' too had faded out for the time being.\(^{153}\) Even with Eastern countries Russia developed a policy of friendship and cooperation, although they were governed under the capitalist system.\(^{154}\) As against this West was always trying to build up an even Anti-Soviet front. They used League of Nations for that.

---
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purpose. It is true, "Bolsheviks were encouraging the oppressed and exploited people both the subject peoples in colonial countries and workers in factories to rise against the exploiters." ^155 But, Nehru observed, "the imperialist powers on the other hand and especially England, were continually intriguing against the very existence of Soviets." ^156 They were so much afraid of soviet ideas and propaganda, that they launched a continuous and largely untrue propaganda against Russia and circulated most amazing stories about Soviet villainy. ^157 The language used by British against soviet leaders made Nehru apprehensive about future relationship between capitalist and communist countries. ^158

Thus Nehru's image of Soviet Union is a growing and successful nation, which has solved the problem of industrial growth, which had worked wonders in the field of education, health and also in the area of nationalities. This last needs a comment or two. The nationalities in republics, enjoyed so much autonomy that they could carry on their work and education in their own language so that they could enjoy cultural progress. They have in his view achieved remarkable progress. Moreover, "inspite of this lack of uniformity in the Union, the different parts are coming far nearer to each other than they ever did under the Tsars." ^159 The reason is that they have common ideals and they are all working together in a common enterprise. Each Union Republic has in theory

^155 Ibid., p.844.
^156 Ibid., p.844.
^157 Ibid., p.846.
^158 Ibid., p.846.
^159 Ibid., p.850.
the right to separate from the Union...but there is little chance of doing so, because of the great advantages of federation of socialist republics in the face of the history of the capitalist world." 160 Thus his image of Union of Soviet Republics is an idealistic one, symbolizing unity with diversity and progress through co-operation. Further, in a union, here a powerful state or states do not keep other states backward but try to bring them to level of equality.

Further, Soviet planning was an example of the application of methods of science to human and social affairs. 161 No such thing had been done before in any country, even the most advance ones. 161a Here of course he recognises that the five year plan "brought much suffering and difficulties and dislocation". 162 However what impressed him was the overall result. Further Soviet Union remained the only country unaffected by depression, but it did not escape the result of depression. 163

Thus his image of Russia is that of a country who has achieved immense success inspite of many odds. Further, it was a backward country achieving progress very rapidly. Even violence used internally was for creating a new order. 164 This ideal order, still a developing order was facing a decaying order of capitalism. As a matter of fact the decaying order was worried about its own existence because of presence of superior order.
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That is why the developing order was besieged by the old order. In terms of international behaviour, it was the soviet order that had genuine grievances, and not the other party. To put it in Nehru's words, "Soviet Russia has been behaving internationally very much as a satisfied power avoiding all trouble, and trying to keep peace at all costs. This is the opposite of revolutionary policy which would aim at fomenting revolution in other countries. It is a national policy of building up socialism in a single country and avoiding complications outside. Necessarily this results in compromises with imperialist and capitalist powers. But essential socialist basis of the soviet economy continues and success of this is itself the most powerful argument in favour of socialism." 165 As a matter of fact internationalism was the need of the country. However, Nehru's views on relationship between imperialism and socialism may also be examined. His papers dating back to 1927 twice mention, the theoretical possibility of imperialist trends developing on the foundation of socialism. One such reference was made in the Report on the "congress of the oppressed Nations" in Brussels written for the INC leadership. There is another reference in an article "A Foreign Policy for India". In Report on Brussels Congress, he did consider the possibility of soviet Union developing imperialist tendencies. 166 In the article, unpublished at the time, he observed, "it is conceivable, of course that two socialist countries might attempt to exploit each other or a

In both cases Nehru pointed out that at present and for a long time to come, it was not likely to happen and that representatives of working class were unequivocally against exploitation of one country by another. Manifestation of imperialistic tendencies, if one has to go by the tenor of his thinking on the basis of writing, would amount to negation of socialism.

It is not military power of Soviet Union, which attracted Nehru but Soviet Union as a new civilization with the objective of removing human misery that impressed Nehru. In his ‘Discovery of India’ he said that he sensed vital energy in three people—Americans—Russians—the Chinese. ‘Russians have been reincarnated anew, in a manner for which there is no example in history’.

Another positive phenomenon according to Nehru was the growing interdependence of the world. To put in his words, "the modern world is interdependent, each part is intimately connected with the other and there are ever so many international activities. This means that troubles of one country have their immediate reactions in other countries." He believes in a kind of inevitability about it. Of course, he was not happy about the reactions of various governments towards this growing interdependence. Realizing the growing interdependence, he says, "the world today is becoming and has largely become a single
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unit that is to say, that life and activities, production, distribution, consumption, etc., all tend to be international and worldwide, and this trend is increasing." 171 The basic dilemma however is, "inspite of all this internationalism, governments and policies continue to be narrowly nationalistic. Indeed this narrow nationalism has become worse and more aggressive during the post war years and is today a dominating factor in the world. The result is a continuous conflict between actual international events of the world and the nationalistic policy of the governments." 172 He makes an interesting observation, "you may look upon the international activities of the world as a river following down to the sea, and the rational policies as attempts to stop it and dam it and divert it and even to make it flow backwards. It is obvious that the river is not going to flow backwards, nor is it going to be stoped. But it may occasionally be diverted a little—or a dam may result in floods." 173 He is obviously against tariff walls and economic nationalism, which according to him benefit only dominant classes. 174 Economic nationalism not only prevents international trade but also encourages monopolies at home. 175 "It is the inevitable consequence of the growth of science and development of capitalism and yet it strikes at the root of capitalism." 176 Modern imperialism itself is a form of economic nationalism. 177
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Similarly in dealing with depression, also, he does not find the approach of European governments to be proper. He observes, "the crisis and depression are world wide and one would imagine that the remedy must be an international remedy." If the world trade is shrinking, tariff can not be the answer. On the contrary, it further lessened international trade.

Similarly, at another place also he observes, "the whole past tendency has been towards greater independence between nations, a greater internationalism. Even though separate independent national states remains, an enormous and intricate structure of international relations and trade grew up. The process went so far as to conflict with national states and with nationalism itself....Capitalism having had its day, had reached the stage when it was time for it to retire in favour of socialism. But unhappily such a voluntary retirement never takes place. Because crises and collapse threatened it, it has withdrawn into its own shell, and tried to reverse the past tendency towards interdependence." At another place, he states, "the world is essentially international today, although its political structure lags behind and is narrowly national." He tells Karanjia also, "while technology has leapt forward, it has left politics behind."

Another factor, a positive factor, was of mass aspirations. There were demands for food, clothing, housing and
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health services for all. He also refers to strong urge for change in his conversations with Tibor Mende. That urge is especially effective in democratic apparatus and Soviet Union. The role of people does not consist simply of making demands. Even when the programmes are formulated, involvement of people is essential for its success. Nehru feels that it is recognised not only in democratic countries but also in authoritarian countries. The difference is that in authoritarian countries, decisions of leaders are imposed on people but it is accompanied by propaganda and persuasion. It is a revolution which begins from the top and affects the bottom. In a democratic way, people are aroused by reason, argument, persuasion, by certain propaganda. This too starts at top but really functions at bottom. This is more important than political leadership or ideological re-alignment for introducing 'change orientation among people'.

Another positive factor is the spirit of the age. He does not think that history will repeat itself. This is specially in the context of European domination of Asia. "These two or three hundred years represents a chapter in a long story; a chapter which is ending." The reason is, "the spirit of the present age is opposed to any kind of domination, economic, class or racial. There is a strong urge to resist this kind of domination." He does not think that European domination will

---
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be replaced by any other domination. He adds, "I don't think that there will be a satisfactory peace or equilibrium in the world till this domination aspect is removed. The only important question for him is with what type of instrument this domination should be removed. It is possible that with violence also domination can be removed. But that is not the only way. However, violence creates two problems. Firstly, "it not only results in upsets and disequilibrium but in trails of conflict and bitterness which are even worse than the preceding state of affairs". Secondly, "in the present age symbolized by atomic energy and by the atom bomb—conflict has become so dangerous that leads to disaster on an enormous scale." Similarly, at another place he remarks, "it is impossible to think of solutions in terms of violence at all." Almost anticipating Gorbachev, he adds, "from any point of view, the concept of class struggles or wars has been outdated as too dangerous at a time when not only nations but groups or even individuals can be put in possession of weapons of enormous destructive potentiality." Another, probably the most important positive factor was the emergence of Asia. He takes a critical view of history, "for long periods and stretches of time, Asia had been dominant...indeed, 'Europe for long was like a colony of Asia.' Talking of the present in 'Glimpses', he referred to
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the changed situation where 'Asia looked like extension of Europe.' It would be foolish in his view to be taken by 'glitter of Europe' and forget the greatness of Asian continent which produced the founders of great religions. Times were still changing. 'Asia was going to play a great part in future.' 199 Even 1000 years after Christ, between Europe and Asia, the comparison would be to the advantage of Asia. It is true, he observed in 'Glimpses', "India and China, the two cradles of ancient civilization, are in trouble." 200 "These troubles", he noted, "are not merely those of invasior from outside but the more real troubles which sap away the inner life and strength." As a matter of fact, it is this which led to loss of freedom. 201 "It is true that seljuqs rise to power but their rise is simply due to their fighting qualities." but "they do not bring a new wave of civilization with them or new impetus for culture." 202 In general, "civilizations like empires fall not so much because of the strength of the enemy outside, as through the weakness and decay inside." 203 "It is amazing," Nehru observed, "that in India and China, the exhaustion came so late and it has never been complete." 204 An unfortunate result was that, when India was attacked from outside it shut itself around herself. 205 On the other hand, although Europe was quarrelsome and backward, she was experiencing some kind of energy and life. 206 However, a new
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creative spirit and life was emerging in Asia and Europe was showing
signs of decay. Asia according to Nehru was important because
of freedom movements but not exclusively because of that. Wider
and deeper even than these nationalistic ideas are the new social
ideas of equality which want to put end to all imperialism
and exploitation. He affirms, "there should be no question in
future of Europe dominating Asia or Asia dominating Europe, or
any country exploiting another." Industrial Europe on the other
hand, although had developed because of progress of science and
rationalistic outlook and extended itself because of fast
development of means of communication and had become a mellow and
cultured civilization," was based on exploitation of many
countries and many peoples. Moreover, the modern west, with
all its great and manifold achievements does not appear to have
been a conspicuous success or to have thus far solved the
problems of life". He adds, "conflict is inherent in it and
periodically it indulges in self-destruction on a colossal
scale. It lacks something to give it stability, some basic
principles to give meaning to life." Nehru clearly saw the
decline of west because of one more reason, "technology and
industrial growth had brought power to number of western peoples
and countries. It is exceedingly unlikely that this source of power
will remain monopoly of a few nations. Hence the political and
economic dominance of Europe over great parts of the world must
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inevitably decline." However Asia, was not going to repeat the European mistakes. One reason is, "they have become increasingly conscious of themselves and of their destiny," but "at the same time have become world conscious." He describes Asian psyche very succinctly. For them, he says, inevitably, the test of each move or happening is, "does it help towards our liberation? Does it end the domination of one country over the other? Will it allow us to live freely, the life of our choice in co-operation with others? Does it bring equality and equal opportunity for nations as well as groups within each nation? Does it hold forth the promise of an early liquidation of poverty and illiteracy? They are nationalists but their nationalism seeks no dominance over, or interference with others. They welcome all attempts at world co-operation and the establishment of an international order, but they wonder and suspect, if this may not be another device for continuing the old domination." He adds, "conditions and problems differ greatly in the various countries of Asia, but throughout this vast area, .... common threads of sentiment and invisible links hold them together." At other place also he remarks, "I think that Asia will be basically more inclined towards peace than towards conflict... Not that we are more peaceful... But the backgrounds, present conditions and present thinking lead people naturally towards a peaceful life and towards peaceful conditions." Of course he has an open mind.
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about the future role of Asia. "Remember always that with its
primary necessities fulfilled, West can play around with other
problems. What will happen in Asia when we fulfill this primary
task, it is difficult to say." 219 However, he is optimistic 219
specifically about India. He attributes it partly to Gandhi's
influence. 220 "He created connecting links between conflicting
elements. I would not say that all conflicts are thus avoided. But
the door is always open." 221 He adds, "even our most reactionary
people in India--I mean socially reactionary--are not so rigid in
their reaction as they are probably in Europe or America. And even
our most advanced people--the communists or others, what ever
they may be--are somehow influenced by Gandhi." 222

As a matter of fact, the violence takes place only as
and when the West tries to obstruct the march of freedom in East,
which has as its ultimate objective, removal of poverty of
people. 223 However, Nehru sees another fact of the Asian Resurgence
also. "The so called revolt in Asia is the striving of legitimate
pride of ancient people against the arrogance of certain western
nations." 224

What is the ultimate picture of world scene Nehru
perceived of in the pre independence period?

In his survey of 19th century or of 100 years preceding
the first world war, Nehru described the century as the century of
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imperialism, of course imperialism itself resulting from capitalism.\textsuperscript{225} (although he also realised it was also a jumble of many tendencies.\textsuperscript{226}) He also described it as a century of democracy.\textsuperscript{227} However, political democracy could not solve the problems of poverty or class conflict or of distribution and therefore "ideology of socialism developed, child of capitalism and the enemy of it and perhaps destined to supplant it."\textsuperscript{228} In the East, imperialism also gave rise to nationalism. In short in the pre-first world period, there were two types of major conflicts. One was between imperialism and nationalism. Another was between capitalism and socialism.

During the inter war period the picture changes slightly for Nehru. He sees 20th century as a final renouncement of the popular ideal of 19th century, namely that of democracy.\textsuperscript{229} It was denounced by both fascism and communism. Fascism developed in European countries as well as in their dependencies and colonies. In Nehru's view fascism developed because of failure of democracy to help the capitalist in putting down labour. On the other hand, communism developed because of the failure of democratic capitalism to serve the cause of working class.\textsuperscript{230} They were new forms of dictatorships witnessed in the 20th century. In assessing the world situation, Nehru has his own bag of inevitables and irreconciliables. For example he feels that 'the conflict between capitalism and democracy is inherent and
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continuous' and therefore capitalism must result in fascism. Similarly, capitalism and communism cannot have a permanent peace. It can only be temporary, a truce. The victors and vanquished of the world war may come together but not the capitalist and the communist. As far as the capitalist countries are concerned, both Britain and France were afraid of Nazi Germany. These two were the decaying empires and facing the twilight of the capitalism at home as well. In 'Glimpses', he saw the shadow of war on the world. The world was full of conflicts, the political, the economic, the racial. However, he observes, "it is said that the greatest of these conflicts the most fundamental of them, is the one between imperialism and fascism on the one side and communism on the other." The world war would see the final extinction of capitalism. As he saw it, the choice before the world was between some form of communism and some form of fascism. His preference was entirely for the former. Communism had good ends, Fascism did not have even good ends. Fascism was the greatest menace, the source of war, enemy of freedom, democracy, peace and of mass welfare. Therefore imperialist democracies and Soviet Union should have joined hands to defeat fascists. But because of desire to save colonies, U.K. and France faltered. (Gopal, p.251) If he wrote off U.K.,
France among the capitalist countries, what did he think of future? Even though United States was 'typical of the failure of capitalism', she is "making a brave effort to pull together and preserve the capitalist system" the result of that experiment was yet to be seen.238 However, "nothing can take away from America, the great advantages that she possesses".239 U.S.A. and the Soviet Union were bound to play a vastly important part in the world affairs of future.240

Among the other features of world scene, Nehru took particular note of the Great Depression of 1929, whose interdependence made it world-wide which required a world-wide remedy. But the capitalist world's failure to pull together and its tendency to look for the remedy in economic nationalism, which was hardly a remedy.241 On the other hand, even in the absence of world socialism, Soviet Union's ability to keep away depression influenced him greatly.

Although, Nehru was greatly impressed by the benefits of modern science, its bad applications worried him. Science had added to the horrors of war and has increased powers of states, which even otherwise are instruments of coercion.242 Pointing out the importance of non-violent struggle, he remarks, "It is now impossible for an unarmed or armed crowd to fight with an organized and well equipped state force."243 Unless, the army
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turns against the government, it can not be defeated. He adds, 'hence the necessity has arisen for people, struggling for freedom, to seek other and more peaceful methods of mass action.'

Science thus, according to Nehru leads to groups or oligarchies controlling states and to the destruction of individual liberty. At other place too he observes, 'the normal tendency should be for decentralization of all kinds of power' (as power corrupts) but technological development inevitably leads to centralization, which comes in the way of individual freedom. According to Nehru, freedom for creative genius was essential for progress.

If Nehru was not at all impressed by League of Nations, he was also not optimistic about any proposals of "Pan-Europe" movement. He observes, 'the pan Europe movement... is really an effort to form anti-soviet bloc.' He further felt that national hatreds between countries were too powerful and economically not beneficial. The future trade, in his view would be north-south and not east-west.

In a post-script written on his birthday of 1938 he observed, "the present world conflict is not between communism and socialism on the one hand and fascism on the other. It is between democracy and fascism, and all the forces of democracy line up and become anti-fascists. Spain today is the supreme example of this." He adds a qualification, however. "But behind that
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democracy lies inevitably the idea of extension of democracy (both internally and externally). It was the policy of friendship between U.K., France and Germany and Italy that led to failure of collective security of the League of Nations. Only Soviet Union and U.S.A. were the barriers to fascism.

After having discussed Nehru's view's about the prevailing world order and its positive and negative aspects, it now remains to discuss Nehru's preferred world order, its objectives, its instrumentalities and its feasibility as Nehru observed it. The present discussion remains confined to the pre-independence period. Nehru wants a better world. "The world has progressed greatly or a far happier place than it was, but it is very far from perfection". An analysis of Nehru's thoughts reveals three ultimate objectives. Firstly, he wants a world in which every man, women and child should have a decent material standard of living. "History is after all man's struggle for man's living". Secondly, he wants a world in which every individual race and nation would have equal opportunity to develop a "good" life. It would be a world without domination. Thirdly, he is interested in a world which every individual should be able to enjoy basic human freedoms, especially self-expression and self-development. These are the avowed objectives of the mankind as a whole. On the whole mankind has developed, too. Originally man had to struggle even for food. Gradually development of agriculture, industry and more and more sophisticated methods of
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production helped men not only to solve the problem of basic necessities but provided him with leisure which led to development of arts. Nehru does not talk of conquest of nature. He adds, "this is loose talk and is not quite correct. It is far better to say that man has begun to understand Nature and the more he has understood, the more he has been able to co-operate with nature and utilize it for his own purpose." As a result of this civilization developed but man's culture did not develop. He says, "culture and civilization are difficult to define. But among the many things that culture includes are certainly restraint over on oneself and consideration for others. If a person has not got this self-restraint... one can say that he is uncultured. "The problem with man is that when they gain control over forces of nature, they become arrogant and overbearing to others" and "they forget that civilized man must not only control Nature, but also control himself." (‘Glimpses’, p.450)

In his view of world order, he would prefer a not to have certain features. Among the periods in history not liked by Nehru were the Middle Ages, when every question, whether it was political or economic was considered from the point of view of religion. About the development of nationalism e.g., he did not like development of nationalism on the basis of religion. His complaint against the early waves of nationalism in India were that they were religious and Hindu therefore could not become

256 Ibid., p.34.
257 Ibid., p.337.
waves of Indian Nationalism. Similarly, he was not in favour of Muslim nationalism in India and creation of Pakistan and even Pan-Islamic movements like khilafat movement. The support of Congress to that movement, "threw up the more bigoted and the more conservative Moslems in the front". Such Pan-religious movement could also be used by imperialists for their advantage.

Although he wants a world order in which every man would have a decent living, he would not want his new civilization to be excessively materialistic. He did not feel that a good deal of material comfort was good either for individual or for nation. He told Tibor Mende, "I am not interested in many aspects of American life. For instance, I am not interested in providing every person in India with a motor car, with a washing machine or with a refrigerator. It is not that I am against material comfort but I am not sure that it is too good to have too much of it." He is interested in freedom of Asian countries but also of African countries. But he does not like the situation where either a local or foreign elite not interested in mass welfare, not in touch with masses continue to govern the so-called independent countries. Similarly about India also, he said, "the necessary result is that we must not only fight British dominion in India on nationalistic grounds—but also on social and industrial grounds. England may well permit us to have a
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large measure of political liberty, but this will be worth little, if she holds economic dominion over us." 263

Further his conception of world order would not bear any imposition of one country's ideology, culture, system or philosophy on others. On his visit to United States, he said, "I think it is a wrong approach for any country or any people to expect complete agreement with another country or people about all things or expect a duplication of their own ways and methods of thinking and action and life in another country." 264 Similarly in a speech to the Indian Council of World Affairs in 1949, he observed, "most of the troubles arise from one country imposing its will and its way of living on another countries." 265 In the same speech he said, "this world is a diverse place.... There are forces strong enough to unify it today and probably it will come together, and the diversity will probably grow less. It would be unfortunate if it were to disappear one day and we were to become one regimented whole; it is a terrible thought." 266 Apart from his preference for a multi-cultured world as being good in itself, it also has utilitarian appeal for Nehru. He said for example in a speech to constituent Assembly on March 3, 1949, "The various ideologies, that confront the world today, the various isms which threaten the conflict, may have a great deal to commend themselves, but all of them have been derived from the background of Europe...is not completely from the background of India or the world...So we should approach these problems, whether domestic or
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international in our own way... if by any chance we align
ourselves with any group. I have not the shadow of doubt that
from a larger point of view, not only of India but of world
peace, it will do harm. Because then we lose that tremendous
vantage ground that we have of using such influence as we
possess."

Finally, he would not like his world order to come into
operation with violent means. "National independence", he said in
his speech to All Bengal Students Conference in
September, 1928," should not mean for us merely an addition to the
warring group of nations". He wants independence for all the
colonies but at the same time he does not want present anarchy of
sovereign states to continue with its hatreds, fears and conflicts
(Norman Dorothy Vol. I p.386)

Any world organization representing a world order, may
be, a commonwealth, should not have a few other things. It need
not be completely universal but at the same time not
exclusivist. Nations should not be excluded. It should not be a
select group."That may reduce the danger of war with in a group
but increases the danger of war between groups." It should not
be imperialistic and may involve shedding in common of some
attributes of national sovereignty. He values stability of
civilizations highly. However, mere stability is no virtue. He
observes,"We may feel pleased at the continuity of our
civilization, but that is small comfort when civilization itself
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has run to seed. Perhaps it might have been better if we had sudden breaks with the past. This might have shaken us up and given new life and vitality" ("Glimpses", p.111). Similarly, he mentions, ("in Discovery" p.565) "without dynamic outlook there is stagnation and decay, without some fixed basis of principle there is likely to be disintegration and destruction".

From the world order, which he does not approve, arises, the question of world order desired by him, the basis of such a world order, and the forces which would shape it, difficulties in the process of creating such a world order. After all what is his philosophy of life?

He does not feel that a new order can begin on a clean slate or as he says it in his 'The Discovery of India', "the past is ever with us and all that we are and that have comes from the past. We are its product and we live immersed in it." 272 Yet whether the past or supernatural element or God determines the course of affairs or not and whether there is human freedom or not, he does not know. 273 'A very great deal appears to be determined by the past complex of events.... Possibly even the inner urge is itself conditioned. 274 What however repels him is that absolute determinism leads inevitably to complete inaction. 275 He says, 'the call of action has long been with me, not action divorced from thought, but rather following from it in one continuous sequence.' 276 He adds, "I do not believe in
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negation or abstention from life. I have loved life,... I seek to experience it.... that very desire leads me to play with life, to peep over its edges, not to be a slave to it." Nehru, moreover is interested only in this world, in this life and not in some other world in future life. He observes, "there has been in the past and there is today even among some people, an absorption in finding an answer to the riddle of this universe. This leads them away from the individual and social problems of the day... Thus one drifts away from even the attempt to think rationally and scientifically and takes refuge in the irrationalism, superstition and unreasonable and inequitable social prejudices and practices." Often, he is taken in by urge to understand mysteries. But "the way to that understanding seems to me essentially the way to science, the way of objective approach." This does not mean that Nehru was unaware of the limitations of science. "It was obvious", he observed, "there was a vast unknown region all around us, and science, with its magnificent achievement knew the little enough about it."

Further, "the normal methods of science, in its dealings with the visible world and the processes of life, were not wholly adapted to the physical, the artistic, spiritual and other elements of the invisible world. Life does not consist entirely of what we see, hear and feel." To add, "science does not tell us much, or for the matter of that anything about the purpose of life."  
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On the other hand, 'Religion... did not attract me. It seemed to be closely associated with superstitious practices. Another difficulty was, religion merges into mysticism and metaphysics and philosophy. There have been great mystics... Yet mysticism irritates it. It appears to be vague and soft and flabby, not a rigorous discipline of the mind but a surrender of mental faculties and a living in a sea of emotional experience.' He adds, "Metaphysics and philosophy or a metaphysical philosophy have a greater appeal to the mind... All thinking persons, to a greater or less degree, dabble in metaphysics and philosophy, for not to do so is to ignore many of the aspects of this universe of ours." Similarly, in his 'Autobiography' also, he observed "almost always, it seemed to stand for blind belief and reaction, dogma and bigotry, superstition and exploitation and the preservation of vested "interests". He is not oblivious of the other side of the religion, "I knew that there was something else in it, something which supplied a deep inner craving of human beings." Amongst, the religions, the church in England, has served the purposes of British imperialism and given both capitalism and imperialism, a moral and Christian covering. Protestantism gave place to sentimentality and big business. Roman Catholicism seemed to be the only living religion, but it like Islam and popular Hinduism offered, a safe anchorage from doubts and mental conflict, an

283 Ibid., pp.26-27.
283a Ibid., p.27.
285 Ibid., p.375.
286 Ibid., p.376.

214
assurance of future life which will make up for the deficiencies of this life.'  But Nehru's preference was for 'the open sea, with all its storms and interests'.

He has far more serious criticisms to offer for the religion. Religion to him, "seems to be the enemy of clear thought, for it is based not only on the acceptance without demur of certain fixed and unalterable theories and dogmas, but also on sentiment and motion and passion." This is far removed according to him from spiritually and things of spirit. Religious outlook closed its eyes to reality and prevented the spiritual and moral progress of people judged by this world's standards. He observes, "religion as practiced deals with matters rather unrelated to our normal lives and thus adopts an ivory tower attitude or is allied to certain social usages which don't fit in the present age." "Moral standards", he observed, "have no relation to social needs but are based on a highly metaphysical doctrine of sin. And organized religion becomes ... thus inevitably a reactionary force opposing change and progress." Nehru accepts that men of religion often are of highest moral and spiritual type but 'the religious man is concerned far more with his own salvation than with the good of the society.'

Religion according to Nehru probably consists of inner development of consciousness of man in a certain direction which is good, and this influences external environment and the reverse

---
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is also true. However, although he accepts the possibility, that individuals can rise above circumstances and environment and reach great inner heights. But for large groups and nations a certain measure of external development is essential before the inner evolution can take place.\textsuperscript{292}

Nehru's own preferences is for "the traditional Chinese outlook, fundamentally ethical and yet irreligious or tinged with religious skepticism... It is the Tao, the path to be followed and the way of life that interests me; how to understand life, not to reject it but to accept it, to conform to it and to improve it."\textsuperscript{293} At other place, he writes, "the real problems remain problems of individual and social life, of harmonious living, of a proper balancing of an individual's inner and outer life, of an adjustment of the relationship between individuals and groups, of a continuous becoming something better and higher of social development, of the ceaseless adventure of man."\textsuperscript{294} In this, methods of science must be applied, of course he does not rule out intuition and other methods of sensing the truth and reality. "They are" according to him even "necessary for the purpose of science."\textsuperscript{295} He adds, "but always we must hold to our anchor of precise objective knowledge tested by reason and even more so by experiment and practice..." and concludes, "a living philosophy must answer the problems of today."\textsuperscript{296} The thing of course which pleases him most is invasion of area of
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metaphysics by science. Of course this does not mean that Nehru is completely optimistic about science’s ability to solve the mysterious problems or science’s help in improving human welfare. After all it provides means and not ends. Human beings have godlike as well as devilish qualities. Science for Nehru must be related to social and political happenings and to the economic structure of the world. ‘It is time’, he said, while addressing 34th session of the Indian science congress at Delhi in January in 1947, ‘science developed a certain philosophy and unity’. Nehru felt that in the context of Hiroshima, two questions became important in relation to the development of science. One was the question of means. Whether any means should be employed to achieve desired ends. Secondly, it seemed that the world was on the threshold of a new age in the sense of enormous power resources being put at the disposal of the community. It was something like bursting of the gunpowder on the world. It also meant, according to Nehru that, "if development was to take place, it must be co-ordinated, be planned and it must be related." He observed at another place, "science is advancing far beyond the comprehension of a very great part of the human race and posing problems which most of us are incapable of understanding much less of solving. Hence the inner conflict and tumult of our time. On the one side, there is this great and over powering progress in science and technology and of their manifold consequences; on the otherhand,

297 Ibid., p.32.
298 Ibid., p.33.
299 Arjun Dev (Compiler): Jawaharlal Nehru –Years of Struggle (Selected Readings), New Delhi, National Book Trust, 1989, p.169.
300 Ibid., pp.169-170.
a certain mental exhaustion of the civilization itself".301

Similarly he has no objection to religion if it comes to
mean ethical means in politics,302 in the Gandhian sense or as a
perspective in shifting episodes of life or search for truth at
all costs for improvement of human society or an end higher than
humanity.303 Similarly at other place he says,' whether religion
is necessary or not,a certain faith in a worthwhile ideal is
essential to give substance to our lives and to hold us
together.'304 This sort of identification became a part of
Nehru's philosophy. In his article,'Basic Approach', Nehru took
it for a fact that religious discipline and the force of habit
were wearing off, while their place was not taken by any other
moral or spiritual discipline. He said,"Rationalism... with all
its virtues somehow deals with the surface of things, without
uncovering the inner core."305 Similarly, he observed at another
place, that although religious approach to spiritual principles
was narrow because of its multitude of forms and ceremonials, he
knew no other way of maintaining moral and spiritual standards
apart from religion.306 In 1939, he said,"science today challenges
the concept of religion. But if religion deals not with dogmas and
ceremonials but rather with higher things of life there should be
no conflict with science or interests between religions".307 In
his letters to Will Durant, he wrote that he considered religion

303 Ibid., p.380.
305 Ibid., p.115.
306 Nehru Jawaharlal M: Planning and Development, Speeches of
Nehru (1952-56), Delhi, Publishing Division, 1956, pp.15-20.
and morality as synonymous. It seems Nehru never gave up the religious colouring of ethical concepts and that he always adhered to the idea lie set in conversation with Brecher that, if there is divine essence in the world, every individual possess a bit of it... and he can develop it. In his article 'Basic Approach' written in 1958, he put the same idea of the social programme of class reconciliation: 'This argument leads to the old vedantic conception that everything, whether sentient or insentient finds a place in the organic whole: that everything has a spark of what might be called the divine impulse or the basic energy or life force which pervades the universe... if we believed in this all pervading concept of principle of life, it might help us to get rid of some of our narrowness of race, caste or class and make us more tolerant and understanding in our approaches to life's problems. Nehru's views on several matters in relation to the world order were constantly in a state of flux. As Martyshin has observed, he saw no virtue in the reluctance to enrich or change one's views. To him that signified narrowmindedness rather than anything else. All his life, he sought to retain his ability to absorb the new, not to fall behind the changes taking place around them. In this sense, Nehru was a conscious dialectician. Nationalism was a powerful factor in influencing Nehru's views. As a matter of fact after his entry in politics,

nationalism remained the most dominant force influencing his thought. This continued till 1927. Politics at that stage meant moderate nationalist activities and therefore did not mean much. Of course he was a nationalist and did not find any fault with it except that "nationalist struggle though life giving is a narrow creed and absorbs too much energy and attention to allow of other activities". Of course, he was influenced by that other factor which again remained one of the dominant factors influencing his thoughts, the factor of socialism. But it consisted of "vague ideas, more humanitarian and utopian than scientific". This state continued till the non-cooperation movement of 1920s. Although Gandhiji's entry into Indian Politics galvanised the masses into action and led to successes but as he observed later, "it seems surprisingly now, how completely we ignored the theoretical aspects, the philosophy of our movement as well as the definite objective that we should have. Of course we all grew eloquent about swaraj but each one of us probably interpreted the word in his own way." As a matter of fact the success of the movement to what-ever extent it was due to "the revivast element in our movement, a feeling that non-violence as conceived for political or economic movements or for righting wrongs was a new message which our people were destined to give to the world. We became victims to the curious illusion of all peoples and all nations that in some way they are a chosen race." However, the withdrawal of the movement was justified by
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Nehru, as due to absence of principles and objectives in masses, to put his views in his words, 'a vague swaraj with no clear ideology behind it and a particular technique of non-violent struggle. The latter method would naturally have gone if the country had taken to sporadic violence on any big scale, and as to the former, there was little to hold on. The people generally were not strong enough to carry on the struggle for long and inspite of almost universal discontent with foreign rule and sympathy with congress,....They could not last. Even the crowds that went to the prison, did so on the spur of the movement, expecting the whole thing to be over very soon." 315 The reasons for the failure of the Round Table Conference could be considered true for the freedom movement in general of this period. It was failure of the people because of lack of ideological background, because the people were not strong enough to discard vested interests, because of excess of religiosity of people and because of the case with which communal feelings could be aroused. 316 The failure of the non-cooperation movement left Jawaharlal searching for context, goals and concepts for India. 317 Failure of the movement, he attributed to a lack of ideology but the movement itself created problems, such as the problem of communal violence. Moreover, the positive side of non-cooperation movement called for rejection of every thing western and for seeking one's identity in swadeshi-everything Indian in language, culture, tradition and religion. Uptill now English language, culture and
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tradition had united middle classes of India. Now there was the question of evolving an Indian culture acceptable to every one in a land of many religions, innumerable languages and different historical traditions.

Congress of Oppressed Nationalities at Brussels in February 1927 proved to be a milestone in the development of Nehru’s thought, notably in his espousal of socialism and a broad international outlook.

Before 1919, Jawaharlal’s political reflections included his aversion for the British Empire and his attachment to individualism and democracy. Democracy in Britain was choked by combined forces of capitalism, militarism, an overgrown bureaucracy and a capitalist press. The problem was to free this democracy from these evil influences. His appreciation of Russian Revolution was generated more by his intense dislike for capitalist imperialism than by his understanding of merits of Bolshevism. His love for individual liberty counselled him against orthodox socialism: “Life under socialism would be a joyless and soulless thing.” His individualism did not push him towards anarchism: “Pure Anarchism postulates a community of saints and few of us, if any, with the exception of Mr. Gadhvi, have any claims to sainthood.” In 1919, he was converted to truth, satyagraha and non-violence.

One of the important gains of the conference was the idea of common struggle against imperialism. Although the fabric of imperialism looked imposing, any dent in it would lead to its total destruction. Amongst the imperialist countries, the strongest imperialism was that of Britain, and India its cornerstone. He observed very pertinently, "both Egypt and other parts of Africa have suffered domination because British imperialism wanted to strengthen its hold on India and to protect its sea routes to that country. The importance of India and her future for this International Congress is thus obvious." Similarly, "China's successful fight is the most hopeful sign of future downfall of imperialism." Further, "as of old, imperialism is trying to utilize one subject country to coerce another, but in spite of her weakness, India is not so weak today as to permit herself to be employed as a pawn in the imperialist game."

The goal for India was freedom. As he observed, 'we want the fullest freedom for our country, naturally...not only (with respect to ) international control, but (to) making connections with our neighbours and other lands, as we wish. Because we believe that this .... International congress affords a possibility of combined work, we welcome it and greet it.'

Brussels Congress also gave him idea of an Afro-Asian group of nations. Because of the imperialism, the Asian countries could not meet anywhere in Asia. Because of the Brussels Congress, the idea of meeting of the group and cooperating with each other
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developed. The Bandung conference of 1955, represented fruition of the idea.

Meeting at Brussels, also resulted in concept of Indo-China friendship at the core of his Pan-Asian feeling. Ill-will between India and China was blamed on the British. It was therefore urgent and essential that Indian people should be educated regarding China and British imperialism should be simultaneously engaged on two of its most vital parts. An ambulance unit of twenty to twenty-five volunteers was conceived as an instrument of Indian good will to China and for broadening the horizon of Indian nationalism.

Although at this time, the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communist Party were acting in alliance, Nehru predicted that, "a victory for the Chinese meant the creation of a great Soviet Republic in the East closely allied with Russia and together with it gradually dominating the whole of Asia and Europe." 326 He observed further, "this does not mean that the Chinese republic would be fashioned wholly on the lines laid down by Marx. Even Soviet Russia, owing to the pressure of the peasantry, has had to give up part of its communism, in China...the peaparturer." 327 It is an astounding observation considering that at this time Stalin's agents were dominating the Chinese Communist Party. Moreover Britain even with the aid of other European countries would be unable to contain bloc of Russia and China. "What is more likely
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is that England in order to save herself from extinction will become a satellite of United States and incite the imperialism and capitalism of America to fight by her side." His meeting with South American leadership convinced him that Britain was fast losing its leadership to the United States." The great problem of near future will be American imperialism, even more than British imperialism, or it may be that the two will join together to create a powerful Anglo-saxon bloc to dominate the world." If Jawaharlal's predictions did not come true immediately, in the long term he proved correct and proved him to be one of the most far reaching prophets in the world affairs in our age. 328

Although friendship with all the countries formed the core of foreign policy conceived by Jawaharlal Nehru, but there was a definite bias towards Soviet Union and China. There were many reasons for this bias. Soviet Union's non-imperialistic and non-racial outlook was one reason: "The principles and what is more, the practice of Soviet Russia have always with one exception, been in favour of the fullest self-determination of various peoples. She has always been for the oppressed and the exploited." 329 Friendship with Russia involved the question of India's security. "Russia cannot be ignored by us, because she is a neighbour, a powerful neighbour which may be friendly to us or may be a thorn in our side." 330 Russia and India had many things in common. "The two countries were too similar to be exploited by each other." 331 India had many things to learn
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from Russia, specially as it was a conservative people and looked to past. Indeed, the whole world had a lot to learn from the Soviet Union. Finally, "Russia has succeeded in avoiding war even at the cost of having to swallow her anger.” He conceived of Soviet Union without Bolshevism, theoretically but not in practice. However, he saw the possibility of India developing good relations with Russia, even if India were wholly opposed to communism.

The Brussels Congress’s Manifesto was based on the Marxist Leninist theory of imperialism. It asserted that European capitalism had battered on the exploitation of countries in Asia, Africa, and America. In its latest phase of finance capitalism, a few individuals controlled the world. But the war and the movement for national emancipation showed that it could not continue for ever. But the imperialist would not give up easily. Although Nehru was not responsible for formulation of Manifesto, he agreed with its broad essentials.

Of course in colonial countries nationalism automatically and rightly took precedence over all other ideologies, but such nationalism should have a broad basis, derive its strength from masses, and work especially for them. The resolution on India, drafted and moved by Nehru at the Congress declared that ‘this congress... trusts that the Indian national movement will
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base its program on the full emancipation of the peasants and workers of India, without which there can be no real freedom. The Indian national movement must align itself with peasants and workers. This would have two advantages: First, it would give the national movement, the substance of real unity and secondly, would annihilate communalism.

Nehru felt that it would be hypocritical to call a national movement reactionary, though he admitted that in independent countries like Greece, Poland, Italy, Spain, Hungary or Germany such movements were tending to become dictatorial, anti-international and unprogressive and were falling to capitalistic and imperialistic fold.

The Indian national movement had to be at once uncompromisingly anti-capitalist, anti-feudal, anti-bourgeois and of course anti-imperialist.

The movement must aim at establishing a democratic socialist republic in a fully independent India and must reject dominion status within the British Commonwealth. A dominion status might mean retaining of control of defence and foreign policy of India by British. Looking at imperialist systems governed by autarchy and economic imperialism, dominion status meant isolation and not internationalism. Nehru recognized the possibility of Canada, Australia and South Africa getting autonomy from Dominion status because of their sentimental ties.

---

with Britain. India would remain an outsider and would tip the balance against Britain because of her population and resources would become a partner, a position which he could not imagine Britain would permit. Such a demand was a vivid illustration of our own mental degradation and of the injury that England had done to us. Of course, once India was out of imperial stronghold, she would co-operate with Britain as an equal.

It was for this purpose that he organised 'Independence for' India League? Its objective was not only to achieve independence but also to change the capitalist and feudal basis. "The whole idea underlying the demand for independence was this: to make people realise that we were struggling for an entirely different political (and also economic) structure and not just an Indianised addition of the present order, which the dominion status signifies". Thus, for Jawaharlal, independence was a composite ideal. The League was supposed to be an active element within the party and general catalyst in the nation. However, it could not succeed because Congress itself was not committed to the ideal. It came to consist of disgruntled politicians and could not develop a cadre.

Although he expressed socialism as an ideal for Indian National movement and wished to retain connection with League against Imperialism, he had apprehensions that Russian foreign policy might influence it. Similarly, although he liked communism as an ideal and was impressed by Russian achievements,
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he said," Communists often irritated me by their dictatorial ways, their aggressive and rather vulgar methods, their habit of denouncing everybody who did not agree with them. The history of past few years in China has shown that these methods have failed and brought reaction. Ultimately, the League veered more towards communism and even ex-communicated Jawaharlal. India according to Jawaharlal could represent a model. A goal of fully independent India, with mass education releasing people from clutches of religion and other social evils and industrialism based not on capitalism but on socialism, while still leaving some room for individual initiative. A movement on these basis could challenge not only British Imperialism, Indian conservatism and communalism. For support of the movement he would rely on educated youth, peasants and labourers to dispense with the upper class element in the national movement. But he intended these changes to take place within the congress organization itself, for he never thought of starting a rival party.

At the international level, he felt that world peace was a noble objective which could be achieved through a world organization consisting of large federal units and functioning more independently of European powers, the great powers. If such a world body came into existence, India would be part of its sovereignty to it. However, this organization could not be a British Commonwealth based on Empire. It could not be League of Nations which favoured preservation of status Quo. He conceived the idea of an Asian bloc also. Freedom of India however was a
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first pre-requisite.

As far as nationalism based on religion is concerned, he considered it out dated and gave examples of Turkey, Egypt and Persia and therefore was not worried about Pan-Islamic movements etc.*

Ultimately however he feels that not a regional body or a world organization but a world state is required. He gives two reasons. Firstly, individuals have progressed and gone up in higher scale and probably there are more of higher type of individuals today than at any period of history, but groups and communities have not improved greatly. This is because economic interests shape the political views of groups and classes. He quotes Neibuhr approvingly "since reason is always to some extent the servant of the interest in a given situation, "problem of social justice cannot be solved by moral or rational situation alone." Secondly, some form of coercion is required and as governments are likely to exceed the limit as power corrupts and degrades, till such a time as every human being in the state is perfect, wholly unselfish and devoted to the common good and as some coercion will have to be exercised on outside groups who make predatory attacks, the necessity for this will only disappear when there is a single world-state.*

In any case Jawaharlal Nehru was confident about need for internationalism. When Gandhiji expressed his reservation about the League of Imperialism for various reasons, one reason was that
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it might encourage people "to look to external forces and external aid for salvation instead of seeking to achieve it by evolving internal strength." 348

Nehru in reply pointed out, "I welcome all legitimate methods of getting into touch with other countries and peoples so that we may be able to understand their viewpoint and world politics generally. I do not think it is desirable nor indeed it is possible, of India to plough a lonely furrow now or in the future. It is solely with a view to self-education and self-improvement that I desire external contacts. I am afraid we are terribly narrow in our outlook and sooner we get rid of this narrowness, the better. Our salvation can come only from internal strength that may evolve but one of the methods of evolving such strength should be study of other peoples and their ideas." 349

Similarly, in an article in "New Era" Nehru outlined the need for international contacts. As the independence of India itself was a world problem, there was need to appreciate the forces moulding the world. 350

Among the groups favouring the development of international contacts, he made reference about three groups. One group favoured co-operation with all anti-imperialist forces to combat imperialism. The second group favoured an Asiatic federation and the third group favoured the utilisation of the

The opinion of these groups is contrasted with the opinion of Mahatma Gandhi quoted before. An important argument made by Nehru is that foreign rule results in the concentration of all activities by the colony in the area of struggle for freedom. The struggle for political freedom brings with it an intense desire for one's own culture and traditions. The hatred of foreign rule extends to the foreigners' ways and institutions and escape is sought from them in the dreams of the past when the foreigner was not there (Ram Raj). And this very looking back make us still more stagnant and rigid and incapable of creative work. Similarly in his address to All-Bengal students conference at Calcutta in 1938, he described the main problem before India in these terms: "I have laid stress on internationalism, although it may be distant ideal. But the world is already largely international, although we may not realise it. And situated as we are, reaction against foreign rule is apt to make us narrowly (nationalistic)....self-admiration is always a dangerous thing in an individual. It is equally dangerous in (a) nation, for it makes us self-satisfied and indolent, and the world passes by leaving it, leaving it behind." Therefore his admiration was for Vivekanand and Rabindranath Tagore, the internationalists. Of course, these two derived the roots of their internationalism from Vedanta. However, he was worried about Indian nationalism being dominated by Hindus and having Hinduised look, because this prevented Indian
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nationalism from emerging, not to talk of a combination of nationalism and internationalism. 354 His major criticism of British rule rest on it resulting in cutting of contacts between Asian countries and India’s contacts being confined to British and not even being extended to other Europeans. Further, "in his conversation with Tabor Mende, he gave one more reason for need of internationalism." India has always tended to remain in her shells; perhaps even more so than other countries. A big country, a big area tends to do that. A small country is forced to think of others. On the other hand, modern conditions force one to think of outside world." 355 His major contribution to Indian nationalism according to Nehru in his own words: "I have certainly been instrumental—even in the days of our struggle—to make Indians think of others, of outside world." 356 According to him because of his approach, even a tongawala in Delhi thinks of external policy. An average man even a villager thinks of world more than ever before. Among the Asian countries, he observed in his article in 'New Era', Afghanistan's progress was due to the world contacts she developed and Nepal's stagnation due to the absence of world contacts. Another example was that of Japan. "but Japan survived it and had internal peace and recovered from long wars." 357 Although, Nehru appreciated the reasons for closing of Japan, namely to keep of foreigners, he did not appreciate the act of shutting of." This cutting off is an extra ordinary thing. At no period in recorded history and in no country, is
there another example of this. Even mysterious Tibet or Central Africa communicated often enough with their neighbours (Japan even cut itself off from her neighbours Korea and China). It is a dangerous thing to isolate oneself; dangerous both for an individual and for a nation. Although the seclusion did provide her with some advantages, she lagged behind in several ways. It was only her opening up to West that helped her to forge ahead.

On the other hand Nehru does not feel that internationalism in the sense of foreign contacts is always good. It could result in a country being a colony. China in Nehru's view was a large continental country with a typical geographic position and could not shut herself up, not that this would be desirable. Similarly the Muslim conquest resulted in India's retirement into shell with many negative consequences (Glimpses p. 157, 180, 181). Further not all forms of contacts are good. It is true that Nehru appreciated Japan's westernisation but not her aggressive behaviour, which too she imported from West (was that behaviour itself not the result of western economic and industrial system?). Nehru was for cultural contacts and not for cultural egotism, he was for a rational and scientific outlook on life and society, ideas of individual and social freedom (including in politics) and spirit of creativity of youth and adventure. 358

If these could be imbibed by Asia, so far so good. Similarly although he considered as undesirable Indian contempt for money making and fighting classes, he did not favour adoption of bania civilization of West but preferred socialism of

358 This is recurrent at several places in 'Glimpses'
our culture is such a feeble thing, the sooner it dies the better. But if there is any life left in it, it will derive fresh vigour from the healthy impact of other forces... But the surest way of killing this culture of ours is to isolate it. In relation to India, he observed, "our approach to the knowledge in the past was a synthetic one but limited to India,... That limitation continued and the synthetic approach gave place gradually to a more analytical one. We have now to lay great stress on the synthetic aspect and make the whole world our field of study." We should, said Nehru, continue to welcome and absorb other cultures.

However, Jawaharlal Nehru's internationalism as he described it, "is not without its roots or anchorage." It has to grow out of national cultures and can flourish today on the basis of freedom and equality and true internationalism.

In the same book, he writes elsewhere, "(India) today she swings between a blind adherence to her old customs and a slavish imitation of foreign ways. In neither of this can she find relief or life or growth."

Nehru's ideal internationalism is not elite based but mass based. He observed, "The day of a narrow culture confined to a small fastidious group is past. We have to think in terms of people generally and their culture must be a continuation and development of past trends and must also represent their urges

---
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and creative tendencies." He refers to Emerson's warning to Americans not to depend too much culturally on Europe and quotes him approvingly, the spirit of which can be captured in part reproduced here: "The soul is no traveler; the wise man stays at home and when his necessities, his duties, on any occasion call him from his house or into foreign fields, he is at home still and shall make man sensible by the expression of his countenance that he goes the missionary of wisdom and virtue and visits cities and men like a sovereign and not like an interloper and valet." Luckily, Nehru feels we do not have to go abroad in search of the past and the distant.

Another factor which shaped Nehru's political philosophy was socialism, specifically scientific socialism. The stage which began in 1927 lasted till independence. Martyshin of course divides it into two parts. According to him early 1930s marked the peak of his interest in scientific socialism, while in mid 1940s the propaganda of socialism no longer held a permanent place in his pronouncements. This was caused not by change in Nehru's world outlook but by considerations of political expediency. The Tripura crisis (1939) showed that the right wing and Gandhians in congress were no longer willing to put up with growing strength of Left and the attempt of the latter to force their political line upon the INC were fraught with a split in the organization, the unity of which in Nehru's opinion had to be preserved at all costs in order to assure the success of the struggle for independence.
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At one stage Nehru conceived of socialism as a replacement of nationalism. In his 'Autobiography', he refers to his attempts to make INC socialistic but acknowledged his failure by saying "It was a vain hope, for nationalism can only go far in a socialistic or proletarian direction by ceasing to be nationalism." On the other hand INC as its very name suggested was a nationalist organization. In his new nationalism even of the East was anti-imperialistic and hide various class-contradictions. However, the middle class nationalism could not unify masses for a long time. Only a Socialist nationalism could provide mass support. However, Socialism as a philosophy believed in cutting across the nations, linkages between classes. Therefore those who favoured mass welfare or welfare of proletariat or of peasantry would consider nationalism undesirable.

As a matter of fact Nehru's internationalism was related to socialism. In a letter to Lord Lothian, he referred to two ideals which were moving most intelligent and sensitive persons: the ideal of world state replacing the anarchy of sovereign states and the socialistic ideal. However if the nation-states were created out of or developed strong hatreds, antipathies, fears and conflicts because of phenomenon of imperialism (which in Nehru's view was the product of capitalism), problems would be created. The League of Nations represented the World order idea (in theory, if not in actual practice). But, "the League does not look beyond the present capitalist system; indeed it does not contemplate even ending of imperialism. It is essentially based on
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status Quo and its chief function is to preserve it.".370 Therefore, "even if the people behind the League honestly desired the ending of anarchy of sovereign states or were pushed by public opinion in that direction, could they succeed in their objective without changing fundamentally the social order - without in other words accepting socialism."371 In short internationalism or a genuine world state cannot be produced without international socialism. The League only represents a vague sentiment in favour of world order and peace. 'It helps sometimes in mobilising that sentiment and in postponing conflict'.372

We have referred to Nehru's two versions of socialism. In 1920s and 1930s his preference was for socialism as radical restructuring of socio-economic structure. This was based on his belief that capitalism could not reform itself and was dying. The World war I and the Great Depression provided examples of this. If F.D.R could retrieve situation in America it was only with the help of state intervention. On the other hand, Soviet Russia could escape depression.

Within capitalist countries conflict between 'haves and have nots' was increasing resulting in Fascism. At international level capitalism resulted in imperialism and world war I.

Socialism and nationalism too were rivals (European example also proved that) although as a man of action, he tried to combine both in India. It was also because of his belief that
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socialist ideals could arouse masses to national goals. Only socialism could provide a stable basis for nationalism. However in the pre-independence period, the goal of freedom being the primary goal, socialism could recede in the background. Partly, it happened because Nehru did not think socialism could develop in colonial India.

Therefore socialism in Europe as well as in free third world countries only could lead to genuine internationalism.

In terms of civilizations, in Nehru’s view history had provided cycles of resurgence of oriental and occidental civilizations. There was a time when Asia dominated Europe. Then in turn, the picture as he saw it, Europe came to dominate Asia. Dominance according to him was not result of only military prowess. Nor does that sort of dominance impress Nehru. Progress and decay of civilizations was due to a certain vitality or loss of it. Similarly, civilizations were not completely good or bad. The picture of civilizations as he saw it in a period before Indian independence was also composite. The Western civilization had led to development of capitalism, nation-state and imperialism, imperial rivalries and led to wars, even to world wars. In colonies, this order led to exploitation, slavery and sapping of their spirit. At home capitalism led to exploitation of certain groups, class conflicts and raised the possibility of class war. Above all it led to making democracies redundant, made parliaments unpopular and established the foundations of Fascism. Democracy and empires go
ill together since the days of Athens. The imperial outlook led to a certain narrowness in outlook. Even the self interest was narrowly perceived. Therefore the end of imperialism was on cards. Above all this -capitalistic-imperialistic-nationalistic civilization of the West encouraged undesirable instincts: "covetousness, selfishness, acquisitiveness, fierce conflicts for personal gain, the ruthless struggles of groups and classes, the inhuman suppression and exploitation of one group by another and the terrible wars." These wars led to death. But we were going to die anyway. But worse, it led to trail of hatred and bitterness.

Imperialism created problems in their colonies as well as alien rule always brings with it many disadvantages. It led to governments encouraging reactionary elements in order to earn their loyalty. 'Corruption, cruelty, callousness and complete disregard of public welfare flourish and poison the air'.

Of course this does not mean that West was all bad and that it had nothing to offer. It did not mean that East was immune from the defects from which West suffered. Speaking of Indian landlords or industrialists, Nehru would say they were even worse than their Western counterpart.

Similarly whether talking of West or of East, Nehru did not presume them to be monolithic groups, although each of these groups had certain common tendencies and both these groups differed from each other. Further, the defects witnessed in these groups were due to the systems and not due to the individuals or

people in general. Nehru observed, "I do not understand the use of the words orient and occident except in the sense that Europe and America are highly industrialized and Asia is backward in this respect." Similarly he adds, "every country and people in the East and the West has had an individuality, a message and has attempted to solve life's problems each in his own way".  

West for example at a certain stage in history went ahead in mechanical advance but in East, people either were not involved in developing mechanical instruments or they lost that art or that science in case of certain people. They did not bother to inquire about it. Similarly, in case of British conquest of India, Nehru attributed it to a discipline and superior techniques. West, was dynamic, modern, East was static and medieval. Similarly, at other place he describes West as a civilization with "a dynamic outlook, engrossed in changing world.....It was active...Because it was dynamic, it was progressive." On the other hand an Eastern country like India are likely to be "static, self absorbed and inclined to narcissism." Inspite of decline of West, the way Nehru saw it, yet because it is dynamic and full of life and curiosity there is hope for it. It is science, growth of technology and industrialisation that West has to offer to the East. This was partly due to tendency of the West to rely on rationalism as opposed to blind faith, which developed in the 17th and 18th
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The West also developed a tendency of toleration in religion and considering politics and economics, separately from religion. Nehru described this process: "Science sapped the foundations of old belief in Europe; the new industry and economics presented new problems which filled people's mind. So people in Europe gave up (not entirely) the habit of breaking of each other's heads on questions of belief or dogma." Of course he realises, this was a slow process. India too (for that matter other eastern countries as well) is placed in a stage where Europe was in 16th century. The difference between West and East was essentially between an industrial and mechanised West and largely agricultural and pre-industrial East. Similarly although west gave rise to capitalism, imperialism, it gave an anti-dote to people in terms of socialism. Not only the West developed science and industry and improved a lot of its people, it also came to dominate East because of its progress in science and industries. But now the situation was changing. To put it in his words, "Technological and industrial growth have brought power to a number of Western peoples and countries. It is exceedingly unlikely that this source of power will remain the monopoly of few nations. Hence the political and economic dominance of Europe over other parts of the world must decline." Similarly in conversation with Tabor Mende also, he emphasized that with technological development differences between West and East will be removed to a considerable extent.

---
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The spirit of rationalism and development of science and technology has not been the monopoly of West. The countries in East too had such periods, such periods of curiosity and vitality. For example, after the collapse of classical civilization in Europe, it was the Arabs who kept the flame of scientific knowledge alight through middle ages of course there was nothing in India comparable to the development of experimental science seen in Hellenism. But India had the scientific temper, approach. He described the approach, "There is an emphasis on truth, a dependence on it, a passion for it, in these early adventures of the Indian mind. Dogma or revelation are passed by as something for lesser minds. The approach was one of the experiment based on personal experience... What that experience was and whether it was a vision or realisation of some aspects of truth and reality or was merely a phantasm of the imagination, I do not know. What interest me more is the approach which was not authoritarian or dogmatic but was an attempt to discover for oneself what lay behind the external aspect of life." Moreover, in ancient India the philosophy of life was not confined to few philosophers but percolated to masses. Similarly, "the Upanishads are instinct with a spirit of inquiry, of mental adventure, of a passion for finding truth about things. The search for truth is not by objective methods of modern science, yet there is an element of scientific method in the approach. No dogma is allowed to come in the way."
Further, "It was the Philosophical approach and not the religious one I like the vigour of thought, the questioning, the rationalistic background." Of course later on this spirit declined. He discusses the reasons as well. Firstly, it is true that ideology of Upanishads was beyond the comprehension of ordinary people. A creative minority is always small in numbers, but if it is in tune with majority, and is always trying to pull the latter up and make it advance, so that the gap between the two is lessened, a stable and progressive culture results. Without that creative minority civilization must decay. But it may also decay if...... that minority loses its creativeness. Further there was tolerance of every belief and practice. Nehru suspects that in case of India, the creative minority itself lost vitality. Further, the Indian social structure, with caste and its rigidities could also be considered as being responsible for loss of creativity. This was the case of India, the causes of decline of whose vitality he was primarily interested in, in his book, 'The Discovery of India'. But other civilizations in East too had a scientific temper or approach, the loss of which sapped the vitality of various peoples.

However, East too had something to offer. Their cultures had continuity to offer. It considered reality only in terms of ultimate purposes in life. Besides in theory at least in talking of philosophy of Upanishads, Nehru said, "this realisation that all things have that same(divine) essence, removes the barriers which
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separate us from them and produces a sense of unity with humanity and nature, a unity which underlines the diversity of the external world." This metaphysical democracy, as Nehru calls it, must have produced tolerance and reasonableness in Indian as well as Chinese civilization. Above all, ancient civilizations like China and India reflected wisdom and maturity. In case of India, Nehru was impressed by a tender humanity, a varied and tolerant culture, a deep understanding of life and its mysterious ways. Above all East had the capacity, the tendency to synthesize even cultures in various countries of the East, were themselves products of synthesis.

In short Nehru saw good points in both Western as well as Eastern civilization but was not enamoured of both. He wanted to create a new civilization out of synthesis of good elements of both. Time and circumstances required it. Both West and East could and should understand this and profitably adopt it. It did not mean there was a universal panacea for all. Each country did not have same history, same circumstances, same requirements. He did not want to give a complete design, only a framework, a method a way of thinking. The basis of that civilization would be scientific temper. To put it in his own words, "It is the scientific approach, the adventurous and yet critical temper of science, the search for truth and knowledge, the refusal to accept anything without testing and trial, the capacity to change previous conclusions in the face of new evidence, the reliance on
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observed fact and not on pre conceived theory, the hard
discipline of the mind--all this is necessary not merely for the
application of science but for life itself and for the solution
of its many problems."392 By this criteria even scientists would
fail. There is very little evidence of scientific temper around
us. But it is the need of the hour. 'It is the temper of free
man' and should be applied even in greater measure to tenets of
philosophy and religion. In short, Nehru wants a commonwealth of
human beings based on scientific temper.

Although he talked of need for scientific progress, he
agreed that though scientific progress had been made, problems of
mankind had not been solved. "Perhaps more synthesis and a little
humility towards the wisdom of the past, which after all is the
accumulated experience of the human race would help us gain a new
perspective and greater harmony."393 This was specially necessary
for peoples who lived a "fevered" life (people in West). On the
other hand countries like India needed to look more at the present
than at the past.

One of the basis of Nehru's new civilization was that
human beings behaved rationally. Progress of a country or of the
whole world depends on it. However, in actual practice
they seldom behaved in that way. Socio-economic and political
structures are created to serve the needs of a particular period.
However, even when they have outlived their utility, they
continue to be in existence. This is dictated by the progress of
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technology and industrialisation. For example Nehru felt that capitalist system was redundant and continuation of imperialism was bound to lead to conflicts. However, he saw the history of the pre-independence period as attempts by Western nations to preserve both. Nationalism was a positive force, as it gave impetus to articulation and mobilisation of masses on that ground, uniting separate cultures, sub-cultures and even religions on a common cause. However, the imperialist countries tried to prevent the growth of nationalism and encouraged communalism. But in Nehru's view 'the modern industrial world has really advanced beyond the stage of nationalism.' This was clearly evident in the economic sphere. The modern world was becoming interdependent but the response of nation-states towards this was economic nationalism, which not only did not solve the problems of the capitalist world but created conflicts between them. The problem was thus of creating new structures or following new policies or of strangling the growth of science. The last he considered as silly or inconceivable. The real difficulty comes in trying to solve the problem scientifically and reasonably. "For in doing so many vested interests are affected and they are powerful enough to control their governments." Soviet Union is trying to solve the problem scientifically, but not able to do it, in the absence of international socialism. National isolation or intensification of nationalism as the fascists were doing were not going to provide solutions. On the contrary this solution
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could lead to disaster, and destruction of civilization itself for that on its ashes an international socialist order may emerge(?)

One reason why nations are not able to behave is that they take a narrow view of self interest. For example it is in Britain’s interest to seek end of colonialism and seek voluntary co-operation on the basis of equality because domination would not be possible with the growth of nationalism in colonies. "All this seems obvious and yet the long record of past happenings tells us that mind of man lags behind the course of events and adjusts itself only slowly to them." Britain Under Churchill’s leadership was not willing to give up colonies. End of war found Nehru unhappy, as he thought, in England, America and Russia, the old game of power politics was coming back on a gigantic scale. In Nehru’s view, "self-interest should drive every nation to this wider cooperation in order to escape disaster in future and build its own free life on the basis of others' freedom". However, self-interest of the ‘realist’ "is limited by myths and dogmas, and regards ideas and forms suited to one age, as immutable and as unchanging parts of human nature and society, forgetting that nothing is so changeable as human nature and society." According to Nehru, the ‘Realist view’ considered war as necessary, imperialism as a sign of progressivism, profit motive as a dominating tendency and emphasized racialism. East too is not free from ideas such as permanence of religious forms and social institutions. In the West fascism became dominant tendency.
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having contempt for humanism. Indeed humanism which coloured the outlook of Europe for so long is a vanishing tradition there.  

Further, according to Nehru, the 'realists' consider values of justice, fairness and tolerance only to the extent that they contribute to it or do not interfere with the power objective. He quotes Spykman as saying, "the search for power is not made for achievement of moral values, moral values are used to facilitate the attainment of power." Referring to Lippman's version of three or four orbits, he sees it as a continuation of power politics on a vaster scale, and 'it is difficult to understand how any world peace or cooperation can emerge out of it'. Nehru is not against 'realism' but his realism is different from that of so-called realists. "Realism of course there must be, for no nation can base its domestic or foreign policy on mere good will and flights of imagination. But it is a curious realism that sticks to the empty shell of the past and refuses to understand hard facts of the present, which are not only political and economic but also includes feelings and urges of vast numbers of people." As states consider only their interests or conceive it narrowly, it was bound to come in to conflict with interests of others. Fear was the obvious result. Among the major powers of his time, England, Germany, U.S.S.R. and even U.S.A. was afraid of being encircled by others. Since the world happens to be round every country is encircled by others. To avoid such encirclements by methods of power politics, there must be alliances and
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counter alliances, expansion and conquest. But however huge a country's domination, there is always the danger of encirclement who have been left out. There is no alternative between world conquest and world association; there is no choice of a middle course. \(^{407}\) It is because nations have perceived their interests narrowly or wrongly that wars have resulted. In Nehru's view, some kind of internationalism was absolutely necessary if national interests were perceived rightly. Unfortunately this has not happened. In this sense there can be no conflict between internationalism and nationalism. "Individuals and nations may become internationally minded and may even be prepared to sacrifice personal and immediate interest for a larger costs but not so nations. It is only when international interests are believed to be in line with national interests that they arouse enthusiasm." \(^{408}\) He found numerous examples of sacrifice of internationalism for narrow nationalistic purposes e.g. England and France's betrayal of Republican Spain, Czechoslovakia, America's preference for isolationism till Pearl Harbour inspite of her sympathy for U.K., France and inspite of her hatred of Nazism, Fasicism, Soviet Russia's ambivalent attitude towards Germany till she was attacked by her.

It was the narrow version of nationalism that led to isolationist policies or imperialist policies, although in Nehru's view both these policies are outdated. He disliked an imperialistic internationalism. He criticises attempts of liberals pacifists and even so called socialists to divide Indians

\(^{407}\) Ibid., p.540.
\(^{408}\) Ibid., p.419.
for narrow nationalism in the shape of their demand for independence. He quotes Trotsky approvingly when latter says, 'the desire of a ruling group to maintain status Quo, frequently dresses up as a superiority to nationalism, just as a desire of a victorious nation to hang on its booty easily takes the form of pacifism.' He suspected that British commonwealth of nations was an example of 'phony internationalism.' He criticized Indian Liberals for adopting this British oriented internationalism. Similarly, "If we claim independence today, it is with no desire for isolation. On the contrary we are perfectly willing to surrender part of that independence, in common with other countries to a real international order." Dominions status was for him was an attempt at isolation and not wider international system.

In Nehru's view foreign policies of European countries provided examples of numerous failures. In his view foreign policies of all great powers have failed, 'form the point of view of moving towards world peace or preventing world war or succeeded even from the mere opportunist and individual point of view of that country.' However, as far as responsibility for world peace is concerned, responsibility lie with great powers. we are not influential enough to affect international events very much. The foreign policies of European powers led to military

---
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pacts, militarisation, conflicts, wars. Peace could not be preserved. It led to hatred and bitterness. Similarly, it did not help in preserving their own independence—at times and resulted in slavery for others. The international institution they set up (the League of nations) lay in ruins. Similarly even their peace pacts did not lead to success. The reason was that either in theory their policies were formulated with a narrow view of self-interest or in practice, they were executed within the framework of narrowly conceived national interest. Therefore not only the world needed a new civilization, a different system of international relations was needed. The old system produced wars, domination, exploitation and revolutions. This resulted from various factors. Failure of systems in response to change in various forces was the prime cause. But some weakness in human nature, accidents were also responsible. In addition, bad management, lack of enlightened leadership, failure of leaders to carry masses with them (although there were occasions when masses acted before they acted) and wrong methods applied also were responsible.

We will now talk about the last two. Nehru considers the role of leaders very important. If he is critical of leadership of Hitler, Mussolini, Chamberlain and Jinnah and realises the impact of such bad leadership, he is full of praise for Soviet leadership and for Lenin in particular. The Soviet leadership, he hoped can keep the Soviet Union on the path of internationalism, even though he saw the resurgence of nationalistic trends. He is highly appreciative of Gandhiji’s contribution in two areas: namely
making Indian nationalism more internationally oriented and his emphasis on morality in politics.

Regarding the first, he said, "His (Gandhiji's) nationalism had a certain world outlook and was entirely free from aggressive intent."  

Similarly for his goal, Gandhiji kept the idea of world based on voluntary interdependence. He quotes Gandhiji approvingly, "My idea of nationalism is that my country may become free that if need be the whole of country may die so that human race may live. There is no room for race hatred here. Let that be our nationalism."  

Regarding second, Nehru said that politicians in general have to adopt expediency as measure of action, because 'they can not act purely on their own, and they have to make others act and so they have to consider the limitations of others and their understanding of and receptivity to truth.'  

Similarly Gandhiji, too, had to adapt himself to others. Nehru than raises a general question, 'How far a single individual can influence a people's thought and ideology?'. He finds it difficult to answer. For, 'it may be that they have emphasized and brought out something that already existed in the mind of people'. Gandhiji's influence has been profound. In his view, 'It has not been limited to those who agree with him, it extends to those who disagree with him and criticise him'. "Many have been appreciably raised to higher levels of moral and ethical action, many more have been forced to think at least in those items, and that thought itself has some effect on action and behaviour". Politics cease to be expediency and opportunity as usually they have been every...
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where and there is a continuous moral tussle preceding thought and action. Expediency can never be ignored, but it is toned down by other considerations and a longer view of more distant consequences. 419

The enlightened view of National interest and the increasing interdependence of the world resulting from impact of technology demanded some form of internationalism. This should not only be reflected in enlightened foreign policies but also some organizational form. He quotes H.G. Wells with approval that humanity is at the end of an age of fragmentation in the management of its affairs. He feels that the end of the national state is inevitable. 420 The main problem is that of creating collectivism which neither degrades nor enslaves. 421 He does not consider Pakistan as a rational entity (pre-partition days). "The national state is too small a unit today and small states have no independent existence." 422 Multi national states and loose federations would be, he felt, the order of the day. The principle of self-determination raised two problems, firstly if it resulted in creation of several small states, would they be viable in the inter-dependent world and secondly, there was the problem of its application, whether it was to be applied to the whole countries or to regions, in any case creating problems for minorities. 423 Units larger than nation states could reduce the fear of minorities. A free and united India with autonomy for
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states to secede after ten years in accordance with will of people, was his solution.\textsuperscript{424} In fact he anticipated Gorbachev in this method.

He considered G.D.Cole’s suggestion for a supra-national areas, as likely but did not think it was advisable. His preference is for world unity and world organization. Similarly, commonwealths of countries consisting of colonial masters and colonies encouraged interdependence within the bloc but isolation from other countries. Similarly Clarence Streit’s proposal for a union of western democracies excluded too much of the world. Nehru did not disapprove regional co-operation but it should not take place at the cost of world co-operation. Another vital element of Nehru’s conception of world order is the element of tolerance. He developed this element as a part of his thought, more in the post-independence period. In the pre-second world war period, he did not think that Capitalism and Communism or Fascism and Communism could co-exist together. He felt that between them there could be temporary truce. This could be partly attributed to his being not in charge of administration, partly due to nature of the world which he faced, which was a non-nuclear world, partly due to his opinion that capitalism was not reformable or would not reform, partly because it was the age of imperialism and Nehru did not think that imperialists would give up, although as a thinker, he felt that death of colonialism was inevitable and it was only a question of time.

However even at that stage Nehru’s bent of mind could be

\textsuperscript{424} Ibid., p.534.
seen. Toleration was an absolute necessity because of the very nature of truth. "Truth as ultimate reality if such there is must be eternal... But... the finite mind of man can only grasp at most some small aspect of it limited by time and space and by the state of development of that mind and the prevailing ideology of the period." This made toleration absolutely essential. Further, toleration was the anti-thesis of dogmatism which Nehru despised. Toleration was also required as counter weight to excessive egoistic claims made by separate nationalisms and to nationalism based on racialism. It was essential even in countries of East where nationalism was growing. It was also necessary for development of comprehensive and secular nationalism.

Tolerance is also considered essential by Nehru as all countries adopt ideologies and systems needed by them and suited to their requirements. Similarly, each country could adopt methods suited to its genius and in harmony with its needs. This did not mean that countries could not learn from each other, specially if they had similar problems and circumstances. But this also meant that one need not be critical of others. The Americans adopted capitalism because of local requirements. The Russians and the Chinese, communism but with different methods. But this also meant that India could adopt her own model. Further, Nehru felt that others could learn from us also. Therefore toleration and openness meant not only peace but also progress. A civilization pervaded by toleration by definition would be a warless
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Further exchange of ideas based on tolerance would lead to progress. In case of Nehru who wanted to create a civilization out of synthesis of good points of West and East, it was an absolute necessity "speaking for myself", he said "my religion is toleration of all religions, creeds and philosophies". But it was also strategically useful. He told Mende, lack of tolerance would result in to 'my objecting to what they do, would lead to their objecting to what I do.' Tolerance was also essential as it resulted in a plural society which was far more interesting and exciting than a drab and regimented world produced by intolerance.

Another element of world order envisaged by Nehru was a system of democratic socialism. Capitalism led to modern imperialism, fascism, conflicts and wars and could not solve the problems of distribution. Similarly communism (sometimes identified with socialism) as an ideal was good but the methods adopted by communists were not liked by Nehru. Communists were also dogmatic. "Marxist socialism has to be adapted to the new scientific era which has progressed beyond Industrial Revolution which was responsible for Marxism." Much of what happened in communist countries in terms of individual liberty and initiative was also not liked by Nehru. However Marx's understanding of social phenomena and scientific method impressed Nehru. Even success or failure of the Russian social experiments do not

affect the validity of Marxian theory.\footnote{Ibid., p.592.} As far as pre-independence period is concerned, Nehru stated the goal as "creation of classes society with equal economic justice and opportunity for all, a society organised on a planned basis for raising of mankind to a higher material and cultural levels, to a cultivation of spiritual values, of cooperation, unselfishness, the spirit of service, the desire to do right, good will and love—ultimately a world order."\footnote{Ibid., p.1552} These ends Nehru felt sound fanciful and Utopian but must be kept in view.

Obviously, Nehru felt Gandhiji differed from him in terms of ends of world order, systems which he favoured and the means he recommended. For example," he has no desire to raise the standards of masses beyond a point, for higher standards and leisure may lead to self indulgence and sin. It is bad enough that the handful of the well-to do are self indulgent, it would be much worse if their numbers were added to."\footnote{Ibid., p.576} Therefore significance of science and industrial technology was much less for Gandhiji. Therefore for Gandhiji, promise of socialism was no attraction. In addition Gandhiji suspected socialism because of its association with violence. Capitalism was only partly tolerable because it circumscribed the evil. He favoured the idea of trusteeship. Further, politicians serving people did not have to raise the level of the people mentally but to go down to their level. Moreover Gandhiji's philosophy relied on the improvement of individuals and not on improvement of

\begin{thebibliography}
\item \footnote{Ibid., p.592.}
\item \footnote{Ibid., p.1552.}
\item \footnote{Ibid., p.576.}
\end{thebibliography}
environment. Finally, Gandhiji favoured narrowest antarchy, not only a self sufficient nation but almost a self sufficient village. Nehru’s conception of world order was different from Gandhiji on each of these points.

Nehru’s own model as was seen n after his assumption of Prime Minister’s office was that of mixed economy, a combination of elements of capitalism and socialism with less emphasis on capitalism in some sectors. However, he was not willing to subordinate democratic framework. Even if it involved delay, which he felt would not be considerable, and prevent any major economic advance. He did not want Asia to repeat the economic model of West. After all these various models are time and circumstances bound.

Further, he identified humanity with democracy. “The weaknesses of democracy,” Nehru said, “are the weaknesses of human nature. Humanity with all that is good or bad or indifferent about it, finds its reflection in democracy... in long run it gives it the immense strength.” He also described it as ‘a continuity of our national policies against reaction’. There was enough rationale for changing Marxist Communist Model. He gave three reasons (1) Gandhian model of non-violence had worked in the context of freedom, it could and would work in the context of socio-economic change. (2) Marx’s philosophy was formulated when there was no democracy, no franchise, no working class movement and organizations. (3) Discovery of nuclear weapons made

436 Ibid., p.62.
concept of class struggle and capital-socialist conflict
dangerous.\(^{437}\) Finally, even advancing beyond Marxism was a
must. "Perhaps," he told R.K. Karanjia, "a new base of
civilization will evolve adapted to the new age of science and
technology and with it will develop new ideologies and a broader
philosophy.\(^{438}\) His preference was for new forms of collective life
in a socialist structure. A very pertinent point he made was;
whether one has to deal with the atom bomb or our social
structure or any other problem, one aspect that is becoming more
and more important is the ethical aspect. If we have the atom bomb
or nuclear energy or space rockets, the main problem is how to
use them. All these discoveries take you outside the economic
domain.\(^{438a}\) There must be a new approach, a moral or an ethical
approach, "otherwise.. the whole thing degenerates into power
rivalries which beset the development of our scientific and
technical age."\(^{439}\) Nehru's conception of world order had a special
emphasis on means. For solving international problems, certain
methods should be avoided. Nehru for example always felt that
military approach should be avoided (of course, there were
exceptions). This did not mean that use of force for defense
against internal disorder was ruled out. Similarly, "violence has
played a great part in world's history. It is today playing an
equally important part and probably it will continue to do so for
a considerable time."\(^{440}\) But violence brings in its trail, a
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lot of evil consequences, worse are the motives of hatred, cruelty, revenge and punishment which often accompany violence. 441 Bad means were bound to spoil good ends. 442 If war was bad and brought evil consequences, non-violence was a moral equivalent of war which if properly implemented would not only not bring such evil consequence but had good effects. 443 Further, as far as struggle for independence is concerned it proved effective several times. 444 Even if one party insisted on peaceful methods, the other would have to reciprocate.

Military approaches were based on fear and created fear and ultimately made wars inevitable and uncontrollable. They spoiled the psychological environment. When you are thinking of war, you prepare for it and make it certain.

Pacts and alliances were part of military approach. Since the days of Bismark, they only produced intrigues, deception, bluff, increased fear and suspicion, led to militarisation and war. 445 Similarly alliances and pacts were flimsy and ephemeral things.

Balance of power, power politics, geo-politics and so-called realism again are military approaches bent upon not recognizing the changes which have taken place in the world, create fear psychosis and lead to conflicts and wars. What was required was not a military approach but a psychological approach, which did not frighten the countries, which did not
consider war as inevitable and considered peace as possible and induced people to work for it.

India's Contribution to the cause of Internationalism:

Nehru perceived India's contribution in the following ways:
(a) Addressing convocation of Aligarh Muslim University in 1948, he said 'I am proud of India not only because of her magnificent heritage but also because of remarkable capacity to add to it by keeping the doors and windows of her mind and spirit open to fresh and invigorating winds from distant land.... there is a continuing synthesis in India's real history'. Therefore Indian culture was ready to take but also to give.

(b) It was an old and mature civilization, in touch with principles of life and therefore could provide much needed stability which Western civilization lacked, if a new civilization was to emerge.

(c) Indian freedom movement was a contribution to the cause of internationalism: (1) 'Internationalism could develop only in a free country, for all the thought and energy of a subject country are directed towards the achievement of its freedom and yet it is surprising how internationally minded we grew inspite of our intense nationalism'.


(2) Our freedom movement was an example of mature movement which did not result in bitterness between the imperial power and its colony.

(3) Lastly, our freedom movement stressed the importance of

means. It is true Nehru, himself did not rule out use of violence in world politics. But the movement did result in India demanding world disarmament and stress on peaceful settlement of disputes.

(4) Indian freedom movement and Nehru's understanding of history led him to think that one of the major causes of war was domination by one country over another. This led to India playing a very active role in decolonisation in the post-independence period. Similarly as Indian people suffered from racialism, it led to demand for end of apartheid in the post-independence period.

(5) Indian freedom movement provided the concept of national socialism as its main objective for third world countries,

(6) The movement was again an example of secular nationalism, although the content in this context was not well defined. However it was not an example of a chauvinistic nationalism.

(7) Finally, India's bias in favour of Russia and China in international sphere and pursuit of non-alignment in the post-independence period in a manner which was prejudicial to West, has again been a legacy of Freedom Movement.

(8) India provided an example of internationalism based on mass support. For example Nehru's refusal to involve India on the side of Britain in the war was based on his feeling that it would be difficult to convince people about our participation in a war with Britain when the war aims had not been clarified. It was essential to change the moral basis of war.\textsuperscript{447} This was essential both from the broader and the narrower point of
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view. 'Every where people fought bravely, when they were moved by love of country, fear of aggression and desire to preserve their ways of life'. Similarly, there was another approach also in relation to the war. 'Why antagonize powerful nations like Italy, Germany and Japan, every enemy of Britain should be treated as a friend; idealism has no place in politics, which concerns itself with power and the opportune use of it'. However, 'these objections were overwhelmed by the mass sentiment, the congress had created and hardly ever gave public expression to their views'. He refers to various articles written by Gandhiji in this connection and claims some credit for persuading Gandhiji to move in the internationalist direction. This internationalist sentiment among people was so strong that even Subash Bose could not oppose expression of sentiments of sympathy for victims of Nazi and Fascist aggression, although the sentiment in favour of India's freedom and against British imperialism was equally strong.

Nehru's Internationalism in the post-independence period.

Nehru was perturbed by wars. But he realized that perpetual peace was not likely to be established unless the causes of war were removed. He mentioned three causes. Attempt by a country to dominate other country was one cause. Belief by some races in their racial superiority and their contempt for other causes was another cause. Finally, misery and wants of people in many countries and in particular in Asia and Africa was likely to
be the third cause of war. However, the immediate problem was negative, prevention of world war.

The entire context of the post-second world war had changed and changed significantly from the pre-war period in many ways. However, as in the pre-second world period, the response of countries to these changes was not only not adequate to these changes, in some ways, it was dysfunctional as well.

The world in the post-second world war period was a nuclear world. Mainly, he perceived that it was not a question of capitalism versus communism but was a question of bomb versus humanity. 451

The supreme question that one has to face today in the world is how to avoid a world war, as this was likely to lead to unparalleled destruction in an age of tremendous pace of technological development... The development of communications and the huge strides taken in the art of warfare throw us together. This has created a situation in which world war should it occur, will cause such destruction that no objective for which it is fought can be realised through it. 452

The concentration of power in the hands of these great nations, also made war disastrous, if it took place. 453

These powerful countries, namely U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. were opposed to each other in terms of ideology also and were acting as crusaders. Nehru was opposed to this manichean view of...
world politics. It prevented understanding between the two. The imposition of one's ideology on others was not possible because in case of U.S.-Soviet rivalry, their ideologies were backed by power and in the case of newly independent countries, the crusading ideology had to face the ideology of nationalism. He told Mende, crusading would lead to mutual interference, conflict and war or at least mutual hatred and dislike.\footnote{Mende, \textit{Op.Cit.}, pp.88-89., p.142.} The mutual hatred of each other in cold war was accompanied by wrong approach adopted by politicians. He divided them in to two groups. There was a group which considered war as unavoidable and was preparing for it not only in military but also in the psychological sense. He considered this fatalistic approach as wrong.\footnote{Speeches, Vol. I, \textit{Op.Cit.}, p.264.} It brought a war nearer. The correct approach was not to consider war as inevitable.

Military approach did not confine itself to building up national strength individually. The approach resulted in building up system of alliances. Nehru considered alliances as neither useful nor desirable. Alliances did not contribute much to the strength of super power because there was little strength to contribute.\footnote{Nehru Jawaharlal M. : \textit{Indian Foreign Policy—Selected Speeches}, September 1946- April 1961, p.88. (Hereafter referred to as 'Indian Foreign Policy') } There was a tendency to expand the area of defence. There was also a possibility that intervention by allies, may not remain confined to defence of borders of concerned countries against external aggression and may even take place in case of internal disturbance. Further and most disturbing of all...
was that area of defence would include colonial possessions as well.\textsuperscript{457} In addition," the danger is that any odd member of one of these pacts can set in motion something which would gradually pull out not only members of that pact, but some other interrelated pact of which they are common members." "Countries get interlocked with each other, each pulls in a different direction and in a crisis they are pulled away in direction, they never thought of going."\textsuperscript{458} This was more likely to take place when people enter into these pacts with different motives.\textsuperscript{459} Finally, recent history will testify as to how readily some great nations have shifted their allegiance and how they have had alliances; enemies have come together as allies and then become enemies again.\textsuperscript{459a} Moreover, the system of alliances was likely to lead to a false sense of security and Maginot Line complex and dependence on others for one's security.\textsuperscript{460} Overall, alliances only increased tension in the area concerned and in the whole world as such.

Not only those who believe in military approaches prepare for war, they go much further all the time. " They talk all the time of war, they blame the other party all the time. They try to make out that other party is completely wrong all the time or is a war monger and so on."\textsuperscript{461} In his view, as the world was on the verge of world war, this name calling did not help.

\textsuperscript{457} Ibid., pp.88-91.
\textsuperscript{458} Ibid., p.95.
\textsuperscript{459} Ibid., p.94.
\textsuperscript{460} Ibid., p.98.
Illustrating this, he said, "If we want a war to come sooner rather than later and if the present situation is merely a manoeuver to provide a political justification for military action, then of course, no more need be said; but if we seek to avoid war then we must avoid the kind of approach that creates bitterness." 462

In addition to the above mentioned defects in the approaches of nations towards each other, there was the approach of fear, which was the worst of all the approaches. As per this approach, "one party gets afraid, one nation gets afraid, then the other gets afraid and so the fear rises to a crescendo and leads to deplorable consequences... While one must take all steps to prevent an evil happening, one must also shed fear and act with a great deal of confidence to others who are afraid." 463 He considered war as result of various causes, but at one place, he said, "I do not think today it is economic conflict or even political conflict that is going to lead to war but rather the overmastering fear that the other party is increasing its strength gradually and would become so strong as to be unassailable and so each party goes on arming with the deadliest weapons." 464 Bipolarism, militarisation and nuclear weapons, ideological hostility, system of alliances and fear completed the picture of world war. It created tensions everywhere. "The question of cold war covers every question in the world today, whether it is in the near East or in the Middle East or in the
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Far East or whether it is these military pacts or groups. Every issue is to form part of cold war. It becomes difficult even to consider the question in the United Nations, separated from this approach of cold war." 465 Cold war, system of alliances, approaches based on use of force and fear were accompanied by what he described as a very limited approach in which "each country seems to imagine that we are more or less the center of the world." 466 and "there is this attitude in peoples minds to regiment it and shape it after one particular pattern" and "that leads to conflict, apart from the fact that it is not, psychologically speaking, a right approach." 467 His main regret is that "we are striving for one world and what with the development of the communications, we come close to one another but that knowledge is often extra-ordinarily superficial." The main requirement in his view is understanding and for all of us "to give up the idea of improving others and improve ourselves instead." 468 Another important problem in the post-independence period was the question of Western domination over East or the issue of proper relationship between Europe and Asia. It was a question of readjustment of the relations. European approach toward politics was the legacy of past conflicts, of power politics. Their basic needs having been satisfied, they could afford it. On the otherhand, Asia was not directly concerned with power politics. At least she "did not have past inheritance to
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The conflicts between Asian countries were neither old nor so profound. An important question now for Asian countries was how to pursue policies in conformity with Asian traditions. In case of India for example, the task was to follow the footsteps of Mahatma Gandhi and to do utmost to follow the traditions of prophet cum statesman or politician. Another problem was to follow an indigenous ideology, which could borrow good elements from ideologies, but not in toto. The various ideologies that confronted the world were derived from the background of Europe.

This did not mean that problems of Asia and Europe were completely different. The one common issue was that of avoiding the third world war. However it is to the Asia that Nehru looks for solution. "The West", he says," has driven us into wars and conflicts without number, there is talk of further wars in the atomic age that is upon us. In this atomic age, Asia will have to function effectively in the maintenance of peace. Indeed there can be no peace unless Asia plays her part."  

A more immediate problem was the liberation of Asian countries, still not free. But it was also important to preserve the freedom of countries already liberated. He was afraid of reimposition of colonialism. 'I regret that some such attempts continue to be made in Asia'. Further, unlike in the West, Nehru did not see communism as the main danger facing the world. In his view the main ideologies in clash in Asia were imperialism.
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and nationalism." In any Asian country, a movement will succeed or fail in the measure that it associates itself with deep-seated urge of nationalism." This did not mean that," I consider nationalism to be a commendable ideology". But it was a factor to be recognized. Anything which revived the memory of colonialism produced strong reaction. Further, this was simply not possible." Asian strength exists," he said," in the negative sense of resisting. Not of attacking but of creating conditions which make things very difficult for the other country." The main worrying problem he told Mende was that, one still finds a lack of realization in European countries or in America that Asian problems cannot be decided without Asia." Dr. Pande, Nehru's biographer feels that "Asia provided the territorial expanse of Nehru's involvement." What ever happened in Asia, specially Western intervention, was of utmost concern to Nehru. His Pan-Asianism became less strong after Bandung conference. Nehru's main concern with Asia brought him into conflict with America.

Keeping Asia free and peaceful were the two main concerns of Nehru since independence to 1958. The problem of peace became important, as it was threatened with rise of communist forces. This in turn drew the Americans and Russians on to the Asian stage."In this Asian drama, Nehru played many roles but principally those of mitigator of fear of communism among Asian nations, a peace maker between two blocs, and a
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proud and sensitive nationalist. He maintained a unique ideological consistency between his different roles but when there arose a conflict, he chose, sometimes reluctantly to act in India's national interest."\textsuperscript{477}

He recognised the communist danger to Asia. However, his instrument to contain communism was different from one adopted by U.S.A. The U.S. created Baghdad Pact and SEATO and used military aid as an important instrument. Nehru felt however that this would make Asian countries weak, subservient, lead to entanglement in war and would involve loss of freedom in peace.\textsuperscript{478} On the other hand, Nehru considered nationalism as a better instrument to contain communism and considered non-alignment and collective peace an answer to Dulles's collective(?) security. According to Dr. Pande, Nehru's biographer, Nehru's leadership 'could be held responsible in great measure for putting into disuse these military pacts.'\textsuperscript{479}

Talking to R.K. Karanjia, Nehru identified three major challenges of times, the challenge of cold war was most important of all. Secondly, there was the anti-colonial struggle. The crux of the matter was that, "we have to force the attainment of freedom and also ensure that some unimaginative die-hard imperial powers may not provoke violence by colonial people against them as the world already hangs perilously on the brink of disaster". "The third challenge was that of setting a pattern of development for new countries in such a way as the vast masses in developing
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countries to develop economically and industrially without any violent internal or external conflict."

Now we take up the third issue for discussion. In 1920s and 1930s, Nehru proceeded from a clear cut understanding that capitalism was the anti-thesis of socialism and unhesitatingly though theoretically, opted for the latter. In 1940s and early 1950s, he failed to raise the question of socialism. He talked only of the "middle way", the "ideal of welfare state" and about a society which "is not dominated by the urge for profit motive and by individual greed" and which is based on co-operative effort and equal opportunities for all. (The idea of 'middle way', partly emerged because now he gave up the idea that capitalism was un reformable, in fact it had reformed itself.)

Only in 1955, the idea of 'socialist pattern of society' emerged. According to Martyshin, from that point till his death in 1964, an attempt was made by him to modify the idea of socialistic pattern of society." The idea of the "middle way" was bolstered in Nehru's mind by the fact that capitalism was changing its face and was moving towards socialism. Similarly "his widely professed intolerance of the rigidly doctrinaire, dogmatic forms of socialism and his calls for pragmatism rendered the concept of socialism amorphous and indefinite." 'Welfare state', 'socialist pattern of society', 'socialism', these would be the three main stages of development of socialism.
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Nehru's preferred order was democratic socialism or parliamentary socialism. According to Martyshin, 'His socialism had emerged within the framework of national movement and remained within his framework and never became an element of genuine socialist movement.'

However, he could convince congress to adopt this. This was his achievement. In the pre-independence period, Nehru argued that there was a consensus about socialism everywhere. The only points of difference were the pace of change and methods used to bring about socialism. In the post-independence period, he came out clearly in favour of democratic socialism and had a feeling that even in 'democratic' socialism, the place of change would not be that slow, similarly, at the time of Russian Revolution, 'the precise problems of democracy and authoritarianism did not trouble me, they did not come up before me. These developed in me only later.'

However, in the post-independence period, he did not consider it desirable to give up democratic framework, as one could go for radical economic changes within the democratic framework. Similarly, although he did not talk of 'Indian Socialism', in practice he developed that also and accepted possibility of various roads to socialism.

Nehru continued his theme of interdependence of world in the post-independence period as well. This was true in terms of politics as well as economics. "The peace of one country cannot be assured, unless there is peace everywhere also. In this narrow and contracting world, war and peace and freedom are becoming
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indivisible.... There can be no peace and security if vast numbers of people in various parts of the world live in poverty and misery. Nor, indeed can there be a balanced economy for the whole world if the underdeveloped parts continue to upset that balance and drag down even the more prosperous nations."\(^{486}\) However, in interdependent world, Nehru does not see any conflict at the theoretical level, "technological advance and industrialization in this (undeveloped regions) will not mean any injury to these countries which are highly industrialised. Industrial trade grows as more and more countries produce more goods and supply the wants of mankind."\(^{487}\) In this narrowing contracting and interdependent world, there is a place for 'nationalism' but not for 'narrow nationalism' and 'aggressive nationalism'. In his view "we have arrived at a stage in human affairs when the ideal of one world and some kind of World Federation seem to be essential", though he admitted there were many obstacles. In his view this ideal of one world had to be the ultimate objective and "we should work for that ideal and not for any grouping which comes in the way of this larger world group." His support for United Nations was based on this but "in order to have One World, we must also in Asia, think of countries of Asia co-operating together for that larger ideal."\(^{488}\)

Addressing the World Federalists' conference in New Delhi in 1963, he agreed with the participants regarding the need of stable world order. He gave two reasons. Firstly, 'it is the only
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objective which we can have, because of the dangerous possibilities of wars now a days'. Secondly, 'the whole history of human race points to ever widening circles of co-operation and in some ways, also of larger circles of peace and order.' Of course, his ideal of world state would have place for nation state. If it came into existence, it must have a police force - and must be based on 'more or less demilitarized humanity' (fear was the chief cause of conflicts and war and disarmament could reduce fear). At another place, too, he considered world government as must and cure for world's sickness, the machinery for which could be devised, by an extension of federal principle, a growth of idea underlying the United Nations, giving each unit, freedom to fashion its destiny according to its genius but subject always to the basic covenant of world government.

Although, Nehru was extremely critical of the League of Nations, he found U.N.O. to be better than League of Nations. At its inauguration, it was based on the presumption of universality. Its great virtue was, "countries differing from one another in the structure of government, economic and political policy and in great many others were able to come together under its huge umbrella. Once in a while, he would even wonder if a world body consisting of units of wide variety could function. He was optimistic about it and in any case co-existence of variety of systems was unavoidable if peace was to be preserved. The second virtue of U.N.O. was that it believed in "maintenance

---

of peace... and the solution of disputes by peaceful means as far as possible." He approved even veto power, as recognition of reality but also as helpful in avoiding world war, which would automatically result from action against a great power. It had a practical value as well." In a purely domestic assembly there is no reason why the Big powers should have a privileged position. Nevertheless it is obvious that Big powers have a special position in world today and if they fall out there is trouble which the smaller nations can not check.... It is no use ignoring them, though a misuse of veto should certainly be criticized and objected to. " A secession by any major power from U.N.O. would obviously have far reaching consequences... It may gradually fade away like the League of Nations in the late thirties. In a highly surcharged atmosphere of cold war, attempt at abolition of veto was likely to lead to secession. Therefore, he was for U.N., for great power presence in it, for veto."Our attitude should be of bringing together great powers and not of adding to their ill feeling for each other." Further it induced states with different systems to work for unanimity. He was in favour of universality of membership. Keeping China out of U.N.O. was a theoretical as well as practical mistake. After all, League failed partially because of lack of universality. The second thing he disliked about
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U.N.O. was its engagement in war sponsoring activity. (example of Korea). After all as a disciple of Gandhiji Nehru was bound to stress the importance of means. Thirdly, he felt that because of circumstances of its creation, the balance in U.N. was in favour of Europe and America. It should be corrected.

On the whole U.N.O. was a positive factor in the post war II World order. The very presence of U.N.O. contributed to the growth of world community. It does so in several ways. The General Assembly for example has emerged as barometer of world public opinion, some kind of conscience for the world. He was speaking about Suez and Hungarian crisis. As a result of that every country weak or strong will have to think twice before it does something which enrages world opinion. Secondly, the U.N.O. is a restraining factor in countries desiring to interfere in the independence of countries. Finally, U.N.O. was active, now not only in peace-keeping but in peace-making. All these have contributed to the growth of the world community. This he said, should help representative of each country to think of oneself, not only as representative of a nation but also of a world community. The evolution of U.N.O. as in the direction of peace-making was a must, as wars not only were disastrous but even when they ended in victory, created more difficult problems afterwards.

U.N.O. and cold war were strictly opposed to each other. "Cold war is the very negation of what the United Nations
stands for. It is a negation of what the constitution of UNESCO says: that wars begin in the minds of men. Cold war means nourishing the idea of war in the minds of men." 499

Next was the question of Indian policy in relation to the prevailing world politics in the post-independence period.

In a world full of tension, fear and hatred, war was likely and with the use of nuclear weapons, it was likely to lead to destruction of civilization. Nehru realised the limitations of India in preventing such an occurrence." Yet every little effort counts, and in any event, I do not see why our efforts should not be in that direction and why we should take it for granted that war is inevitable." 500 This did not mean that states wanted wars deliberately but somehow they were drifting towards it. Wrong approaches were making things worse." I wish we did not overwhelm ourselves with passion and anger at a critical time. We should, instead, look to our own actions and learn again that wrong doing can not be counteracted by further wrong doing; nor can violence be ultimately conquered by violence. 501 The only approach was that of peaceful settlement of disputes, of negotiation.

In the meantime to prevent a drift towards war, what was required was," a passion for peace and for civilized behaviour in international affairs. It is the temper of peace and not the temper of war that we want". 502 This temper was essential even in resisting evil and aggression. At another place he said," however
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good our motives may be and however noble the objective, if the means are wrong, we can never achieve that objective. If we seek peace we must labour for peace and not for war. 503

Alignment was a symbol of war time psychology and hence could not be in harmony with the temper of peace. It ought to be avoided.

India’s role in these circumstances was to be negative. "we can not influence other countries by force or arms or pressure or money." "Expressing our opinions in strong language has little meaning unless we are in a position to do something about it." 504 Shouting was not a sign of maturity.

"Two giant countries" he said, "dislike each other, try to undermine each other and yet are terribly afraid of each other. We seem to be surrounded by fear and hatred.

we can not do much about it, but it is certainly within our power not to do anything or say anything which will increase the fear and hatred. We should not indulge in context of shouting, cursing and slandering which seems to have replaced diplomacy. Where we can help positively, we should help, although there is always the risk that our attempts may fail. We have been very cautious about our positive steps. We have however endeavored with a great deal of success not to take part in controversies or in running other nations down." 505

Through our foreign policy, too we could contribute to the cause of internationalism, both negatively as well as positively. He defined nonalignment in different ways and did

503 Ibid., p.419.
504 Ibid., p.343.
505 Ibid., pp.343-344.
give variety of definitions at different times depending upon circumstances. Behind foreign policy, he said, "lie all manner of things." Basically it had a negative meaning in the sense of being non-aligned with great power blocs of the world. In this sense of course it could be considered as useful to India. But was it useful to the world? To put the argument in his own words, "if we were to join one military group rather than the other it was liable to increase and not diminish the risk of major clash between them." 506

But non-alignment contributed to the cause of internationalism in other ways as well. Dr. A. P. Rana, who has analyzed Nehru's foreign policy in terms of capability analysis, too feels that policy of non-alignment helped improve the international system by introducing 'a measure of restraint in the conduct of cold war' which was essential for mankind's survival and he rightly argues that if non-alignment generated any capability for India, it was not 'for increasing turbulence in the world'. On the contrary, "such power could coerce the great powers into a greater sense of responsibility towards the weaker sections of the international community, it could bring great powers an awareness that extensive competition all over the world for areas of influence would only jeopardize their safety instead of ensuring it." 507

Similarly, while addressing the conference of Non-aligned Nations at Belgrade in 1961 he referred to a positive

role for non-aligned nations, '(non-aligned nations mean nations which object to lining up for war purposes)', to military blocs... we keep away from such an approach and we want to throw our weight in favour of peace. In effect therefore, when there is a crisis involving the possibility of war, the very fact that we are unaligned should stir us to feel that more than ever it is up to us to do whatever we can to prevent such a calamity coming down upon us. If in this crisis some action of ours helps to remove the fear of war, then we are justified and strengthened ourselves." 508 Of course we realised that ultimate key to the problem of peace was with two great powers but did not underrate the role of non-aligned countries as 'moral force'.

In an article in 'Foreign Affairs' (April 1963) titled 'Changing India' he described the rationale of non-alignment and how it was useful to the world as well and contrasted this with the Chinese approach to World Affairs. The domestic and foreign policy of a nation had its "roots in past history and way of thinking as well as in fundamental national exigencies." India followed domestic policy of democratic planning as well as an external policy of non-alignment. India's overriding interest was in raising the standard of living of her people, to carry out necessary structural reforms with maximum popular participation. In foreign affairs, 'we had no interest other than to cultivate friendly co-operation with all countries and to help to keep world peace as the sine qua non of everything else'. 509
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This attitude, he said no doubt displeased some people to begin with but it has been of service to the cause of world peace at some critical moments in recent history. It is because India was seen to be contributing to world peace through non-alignment that China attacked her.

Chinese policy towards India, Nehru felt developed from her general analysis of international situation and reflected the aims and assumptions behind her foreign policy. Nehru's analysis of Chinese foreign policy, cogently argued can best be recaptured in his own words, "This policy itself while formally subscribing to such ideas as peace and co-existence—though in the special Chinese meaning of these terms—leaves no room for non-alignment. If the world is viewed as divided essentially between imperialists and communists, between whom war not only is inevitable in the end, but between whom tension in some form must be kept alive and even intensified as opportunity occurs, then there is indeed no place, in it for the non-aligned. The non-aligned nations must in this context, seem to be occupying an unstable, anomalous position from which if they could be dislodged either by cajolery or coercion, the result would be to accentuate the polarisation of world forces. It is logical to conclude that China's multiple campaign against India is such an outstanding member of the non-aligned community that her defection, whether voluntary or enforced, can not fail to bring grave and far reaching consequences."

Similarly China's challenge was also to India's preferred values like tolerance,
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dignity of individual and peaceful methods in domestic life.\textsuperscript{511}

On the other hand, Nehru's panacea for improvement of international system was the idea of peaceful co-existence. It was well served by non-aligned foreign policy. Non-alignment itself implied co-existence. It implied independent judgment and not joining crusading ideological groups in absolute terms, irrespective of the merit of any view or ignoring consequences. As he told Adlai Stevenson in an interview, "there is no difficulty in choosing between right and wrong if the question appears in that sense. It does not always appear clearly in that way. Between white and black there are many shades of grey."\textsuperscript{512}

He defined peaceful co-existence to R.K. Karanjia as, 'a mental or spiritual attitude which synthesizes differences and contradictions, tries to understand and accommodate different religions, ideologies, political social and economic systems and refuses to think in terms of conflict or military solutions.'\textsuperscript{513}

It implied even right of self determination for peoples of East Europe.\textsuperscript{514}

Although Nehru always pleaded for recognizing the presence of conflicts of various types and was not in favour of ignoring them, he did not feel that they were irreconcilable (though in pre-independence period he felt some conflicts were irreconcilable). In any case as a man of action, he never believed in closing the door to negotiation in conflict situations. He told Tibor Mende, that because of Gandhiji's
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influence, the dual conception of thesis and anti-thesis was not understood by Indians. 'That dual conception is not quite understood, that is why we can not understand to appreciate cold war mentality.'

But Nehru's approach went beyond the mere acceptance of co-existence. He told Karanjia, "our policy has been to build bridges and to create links between the opposing groups of nations".

That is why Nehru tried to play actively the role of mediator in East West politics. He acquired his status partly as Dr. Pande says sometimes because of his ideas but always for his sincerity, integrity and moderation. He had been critical of Anglo-American bloc but he had stronger links with that bloc than the Soviet bloc. Fear of each other led to hostility between U.S.A. and Soviet Union. Arising out of fear was 'vacuum theory'. The only way to lessen this fear was mutual contacts. Nehru actively worked for promoting summit conferences. A rapport had to be established. In October 1960, he supported resolution sponsored by five non-aligned nations for a meeting between top U.S. and Soviet leaders. He was critical of Soviet nuclear tests as this was a bad sign as far as progress of disarmament was concerned.

He did not feel that American foreign policy was as rigid as be thought it to be as revealed in Suez crisis. Russians, too, since the death of Stalin had revealed flexibility.

If Russia behaved badly on occasions, he was willing to pardon it on ground of her siege mentality.

He interpreted Cuban crisis as a healthy sign as showing unwillingness of U.S. and Soviet governments to go for a nuclear war. Similarly, he considered Nuclear Test Ban Treaty as a landmark.

He found similarities between American and Soviet people and felt that they were moving in the same direction. In an address to the collegiate council of U.N.O. in 1961, he said, "essentially I am thinking of one common feature today in the Soviet Union and American, namely the concentration of technical and scientific development as means to progress. The Russians, inspite of their political differences are full of admiration for technological civilization which the United States has built up. They want to do even better. Theirs is a competitive approach. It is because of this, I think that once they get over present day political difficulties, the people of Soviet Union and United States are likely to come nearer to each other than possibly other countries might." Prophetic Words!

As far as relationship between these two was concerned, his main objectives were two, firstly, he did not want their relationship to degenerate from cold war into hot war, as although cold war was bad enough but hot war would be worse and secondly, he did not want the area of cold war to, but the 'area of peace' to enlarge. A detailed study of foreign policy action of India is beyond the scope of this dissertation and is

available in several works. However, broadly speaking in Korean crisis, she tried to localize the war. In case of Indio-china she had several motivations. To quote Rana, who has ably summarized it, "the old form of colonialist threat as represented by France, had to be opposed; the forces of extra territorial communism were to be met, not by direct military opposition from either the old colonial power or from international opponents of communism, for this would either help international Communist forces entrench themselves there (at the expense of more genuine nationalism) or lead to neo-colonialist control of the area by Western powers or to its division into spheres of influence and control, thus extending the cold war into one of the most sensitive areas of Asia." 519

India played a mediatory role not only in disputes involving two super powers but even in those involving colonial powers and others. She was a champion of freedom for the third world countries. She wanted to prevent reemergence of colonial rule in any form. However, she did not want ant-colonial feeling to become wild and violent and bridge the gap between different races. In short, here too she was for moderation and mediation. 520 On occasions, Nehru was used by others as a mediator for their own purposes but as Dr. Gopal put it, 'he was willing to be used'. 521 At the same time as was seen in Korean crisis, he did not impose himself on others and often went for dignified withdrawal as well. 522 Nehru was a sort of interpreter.
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of various rival powers to each other, discuss the sensitivities of different parties to each other and at the same time pointed out bonafides of each party. When he went to China, he pointed out American sensitivity to communism, the role of local communist parties but at the same time assured the Chinese that Americans did not want war. 523 When he went to Russia and talked to Khrushchev and Bulganin, he drew attention to the more helpful elements in the United States policy: the eclipse of Knowland and Macarthy, the differences between Dulles and Eisenhower and the more conciliatory attitude of the latter and the friendliness of the people of U.S.A. When he went on his way back from Moscow to India, via London, he conveyed to the West, his understanding that a real change had taken place in Moscow and that Soviet policy now projected idea of co-existence. British Prime Minister Macmillian appreciated Nehru's efforts and observed, 'how closely the Russian approach followed the line indicated by the Prime Minister'. 524 Similarly when he talked to Dulles, he referred to changes that had taken place at the 20th century congress, although Dulles said it would take a generation before such changes could take effect. 525 When he visited U.S.A. in 1961, he stressed to U.S. leaders the urgency as well as feasibility of Russo-American rapprochement. A change had already taken place in Moscow and Russians desired peaceful co-existence and deviations could be understood only in terms of siege complex from which she suffered.
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He was not oblivious to the limitations of his approach. ‘Great powers know their interests and act on them ’. However, circumstances and a proper approach could help reduce their tensions. Between the minds of great powers, there was an iron curtain. Nehru helped in ‘bringing about mutual comprehension’, but this was not a small service. Nehru helped in narrowing interstices between U.S.A. and Soviet Union. The patient, soft, behind the curtain diplomacy of non-alignment was successful and led Dr. Radhakrishnan to remark that if non-alignment did not exist, it would have had to be invented. Besides playing a mediating role in various situations and between various countries, Nehru wanted to promote internationalism through other avenues as well. One of the institutional means was commonwealth. He told Karanjia, ‘such associations are preferable to the more binding kind of alliance or blocs ’ and one good thing about commonwealth was that, it reverses the other process of military or economic blocking together what might be called the purposes of cold war’. 526 The main advantage of Commonwealth was that, it was ‘connection’ and not ‘isolation’ but not ‘binding’. It was not as ‘a defence bloc against communism’ as some wanted it to be. As R.J. Moore described it, ‘he achieved Commonwealth membership with non-alignment unsullied’. 527 However, in a way, by commonwealth helping India in her economic problems and there by preventing the spread of communism, in one way or another, the new commonwealth did assume the role of a viable alternative to

Further, it became a multi-racial association, which touched world problems, without passion or prejudice, in a friendly way and with a touch of healing and not in a cold war fashion.

As we have seen in the pre-independence period Nehru was suspicious of any scheme of British Commonwealth. However, even in pre-independence period, he was not opposed to co-operation of states on the basis of equality. It was largely because of his effort that British commonwealth could be converted into commonwealth of Nations. Even when he approved the original commonwealth he had several objectives in mind. He reminded Indians that commonwealth was not a super-state. It was an opportunity 'to heal old wounds' in relation to Great Britain. It was also an attempt to lessen the tensions in the world, which was full of suspicions and hatred. It was a voluntary association, which preserved freedom and could bring special advantages to member nations, if they wanted. It did not mean any compromise, even on racial issue. Again, it was an attempt to strengthen the association which existed.

But it was much more. It was an approach, a different approach from the usual approach of cursing and castigating other nations. It showed that India was confident and 'prepared to cooperate even with those with whom she had been fighting in the past'. Commonwealth represented faith, understanding, tolerance and decency of nations. It was an attempt to consider issues
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not from the narrow nationalistic angle with a self-righteousness but 'to deal with issues objectively and passionately but also with goodwill of others who may not suspect us of any ill will derived from the past'.\textsuperscript{531} It helped India economically as well. Therefore it was 'a profitable business and which was good on moral grounds'.\textsuperscript{532} Dr. Aspi Rana sees other merits in commonwealth as well. After the second world war, the system of nation-state was being extended to third world countries. Commonwealth helped in system maintenance in case of these states. 'If Commonwealth's membership included such a large non-aligned state as India, and in an increasing number of other non-aligned states as they gained independence, the association could generate a commitment which it would be increasingly difficult for the more powerful states within it to disengage from.'\textsuperscript{533} It is true that U.N. could generate same ethos but it was pervaded by cold war. On the other hand in commonwealth, 'there could be much infighting but it was of a different order,' as the two cold warriors were not members of commonwealth. Although friends of U.S. were there, within commonwealth, there would be greater restraints to conduct cold war. On the other hand, through them American policies could be influenced.

But commonwealth not only performed system maintenance function, it had the potentiality of contribution to the growth of international system as well. 'The possibilities that Commonwealth promised of facilitating trade transactions across
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diverse state boundaries, the common rights of citizenship it held out, the functional exchanges it made possible between citizens of states with varied cultures and later of states with varied forms of government, the erosion however rudimentary, of the state sovereignties in the right direction which it facilitated, the vagueness and amorphousness of the association which permitted these sovereignties to yield here and there, their zealousness to transnational functional demands—were gains, however tentative, halting and marginal in directions of system growth. This did not mean that Nehru was systematically thinking on theories of conflict, integration or interdependence, but to point out that ideas were here in his mind and that he was perceptive about the developing trends. Then there was the question of the membership of U.N.O. In 1963, the very fact of its survival impressed him. Not only that it had helped solve many problems, 'particularly in keeping peace in a big way'. It had good work as well in areas of colonialism, imperialism and racialism, inspite of prevailing fears and hatreds. Nehru had faith in U.N. and thought it was capable of improvement.

Under Nehru, India's main work at the United Nations was in three areas. India took leadership in hastening the process of decolonisation. However, he tried to see that this process did not lead to unnecessary bitterness and violence between developed and developing nations. This was so, as except in case of Indonesia and in Suez, which caused anxiety to him, Nehru did not feel that colonialism had a chance, although he could understand the sensitivity of countries with colonial past.

Then there was the area of peace keeping. Nehru did not conceive of U.N.O. in terms of enforcement mechanisms. In his time, India's participation in Suez and in Congo were motivated by the need to de-escalate - to defuse violent conflict and create a buffer force. However, he took care to see that activity remained a peace-keeping activity, took place with concern of country where peace-keeping force was to be stationed and that peace-keeping activity came to an end the moment the concerned state demanded its end. Further, the peace-keeping forces were not to include any of the more powerful military states. Thus he tried to prevent presence and perpetuation of Big powers under United Nations aegis. 535

In the area of disarmament, India took the stand that nothing but complete disarmament was necessary, arms-control was not very useful, although partial disarmament could create a better environment for complete disarmament. A fevered peace meant only survival and not in a healthy way. However as Rana rightly puts it, 'her performance in the United Nations in relation to disarmament and arms control was influenced more by her emotional; antipathy to the prospect of a large scale destruction of human life and civilization, than by skill, ability and insight she had displayed in other areas of her participation in the United Nations'. 536

On the whole Nehru's objectives as far as the international system were following. Independence of colonies and their acquiring the status of nation-state was pleasing to Nehru.
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However, past experience of colonialism made him sensitive. There was a fear of imperialism entering in a new form and he was one of the first third world leaders to visualize it. (in some case it could re-enter in old form as well). This Nehru was determined to prevent. However, he did not want only number of nation states to increase. They should not be carbon copies of West. Nationalism should not run amuck in case of these countries. He wanted them not to break links even with imperial countries — their former masters or leave a trail of hatred, bitterness and follow European legacy. At the same time, these nation-states should not go through capitalist—colonialist-imperialist cycle. He was optimistic and thought with a different historical, cultural background and with different types of needs, they would not do it. However, his objective was to mitigate the evils of nationalism. Ultimately only a world government was the answer or a world federation would do. Two world wars and a cold war of course emphasized the need for radical solutions. However, the world was too full of fears, dislikes, hatreds and bitterness to permit them. Therefore for the time-being second best would do. These together with the help of world forces would create better environment and could pave the way for world government. For the present, U.N.O. and structures like commonwealth of nations would have to be utilized. For creation of a new world order, Asia had a role to play, although his enthusiasm for Asia lessened after Bandung. On the otherhand, non-aligned movement could contribute to the cause of world peace and internationalism both negatively and positively. India had a special role in the promotion of new
world order. Through a foreign policy orientation of non-alignment, by playing a mediatory role between two cold warriors, by working for creation and preservation of decolonised world without creating bitterness and violence, by promoting peace-keeping activities, by supporting the cause of disarmament and by working for the success of Commonwealth and U.N.O. India could work for creation of new world order. His emphasis was on methods and means. Although he realised that non-violence was neither a panacea nor a practical proposition. India herself had to maintain a good army, even if only for defence. But violence and wars did not solve the problem. In a nuclear age violence could destroy civilization itself. To live under a mushroom cloud of atom was a sign of barbarism. Therefore his ultimate aim was nuclear weapon free world. But till that became possible, it was India’s moral duty to prevent the catastrophe of a nuclear war.

He realized India’s limitations. But as a man of action, he was prepared to do what he could. Basically, he did not think that there was a conflict of interests between nations. It was a question of proper perspective. For the present however nation states lacked faith in each other. It was his endeavour to see that they saw each other in better light. Methods of peaceful settlement could help the statesmen in this. Right type of approach was to be accompanied by the use of right type of institutions. Institutions which were based on the military approach could only be justified in certain situations, although ultimately they were bound to prove disfunctional. But institutions like SEATO and Baghadad Pact, neither provided security nor brought peace. On the other hand, they increased the
chances of war. U.N.O., Commonwealth of nations, Non-aligned conferences were the institutions to be preferred.

India had much to contribute besides following the policy of non-alignment, adopting right factors and actively working for success of some institutions. For example he told R.K. Karanjia that modern science and technology with pressures of social justice had blunted the sharper ages of ideological conflict. He was expecting some synthesis to emerge. May be, it is our destiny to help reconcile the conflicting ideologies of today. One reason why U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. had shown interest in our development, was that in the social and economic system which India was evolving, they saw a 'third way', 'a middle way', as a solution to their own problems and difficulties.

He assessed India's contribution to the cause of internationalism in three ways. By acting as 'a bridge' of communication between conflicting ideologies, India had helped blunt the sharper edges of ideological conflict. (of course other forces were working for that). He thought that India has created a 'peace club' against a 'nuclear club' or a 'cold war club'. He thought the Panchsheel was an effective answer to clausewitzian ideology. It reflected spirit of times and projected creative and co-operative urges of modern science and technology. Secondly India has tried to ensure that process of
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decolonisation remained non-violent and that it did not leave a trail of hatred. India's third contribution lay in 'setting a pattern of development for new free countries in such a way as the vast masses in developing countries to develop economically and industrially without any violent internal or external conflict.' 542

Nehru's Internationalism and Domestic policy:

Nehru's internationalism was also related to his domestic concerns. In fact in order to have a model for national development, he developed his international contacts in the beginning. The issue of freedom of India was related to that of other countries. It was also related to the international nature of capitalism, imperialism. Therefore freedom struggle had to be viewed in terms of international co-operation. Similarly, problems of China, Abyssinia, Spain, Central Europe, India were part of one problem. These countries had to be freed from fascism and imperialism which he said were 'twin brothers'. Soviet Union was a positive factor in terms of her policies as well as check on capitalist countries.

After independence also Nehru viewed the freedom in third world countries as related. For India, foreign policy of non-alignment Nehru felt that other third world countries could do that. Similarly non-alignment also theoretically helped in reconciling extreme views on our relationship with the supper powers. Similarly, friendship with Soviet Union could help Nehru in silencing communist critics. Moreover, friendship with Soviet

542 Ibid., p.56.

298
Union was considered as supportive of socialism (at home) which was one of the conceptual pillars of Nehru's thought. It also ensured credibility of non-alignment in eyes of Indian people when Indo-China conflict raised serious questions about it. Similarly Nehru's membership of the commonwealth and friendship with U.S.A. could help India get scientific and technological aid, which was absolutely essential for progress of India.

Nehru's friendship with Arab countries thought Nehru would establish India's credentials as secular country abroad but more important at home. Though the obsession with Kashmir and credibility about secularism involved India in various international complications.

On the whole Nehru's interest and involvement in internationalism prevented India from developing ego centric nationalism. At the same time as a result of this outlook, India either did not pay sufficient attention to regional issues, did not consider them on merit or considered them as an offshoot of cold war.

An Overview and a Critique of Nehru's Concept of Internationalism

In this chapter a study of Nehru's ideas on internationalism, their evolution, the factors influencing them, both in the pre-independence and post-independence was made.

His views on internationalism were conditioned by his world view. For formulation of this world view, Nehru relied among other things on study of world history. The present state of world was not satisfactory. Man's progress in the area of cooperation was not good. For this human nature was to be blamed.
But the main responsibility was to be placed on institutions created by man. One such institution was Capitalism, which led to Colonialism, Imperialism and Fascism and to conflicts and wars. Intensification of nationalism was also a byproduct of capitalism, although when the interests of the capitalist classes were at stake even nationalism could be ignored. Nationalism as a phenomena and nation state as an institution created problems. They suffered from different defects.

This does not mean that Nehru did not see any good in these institutions. Capitalism and nationalism had merits. Even colonialism helped in a way. However, these institutions either they outlived their utility or did not keep pace with changing world forces or they became perverted or did not develop further. This resulted in crisis. Nehru would under this circumstances like these institutions to be either replaced or would prefer to create either totally new institutions or institutions based on synthesis of institutions. This does not mean that he believed in a universal panacea for all. Nehru would not like to live in a world based on uniformity. However, he was all for open interaction between societies. This was the need of the hour. However this interaction was to be based on equality. Nehru was all for internationalism in the sense of give and take between nations on the basis of equality. His internationalism was based on equality of nations. It was not based on cultural imperialism of a nation or a race. His internationalism was also voluntary and not based on any coercion or hegemony. Western internationalism was basically nationalism in a different grab.
The greatest concession that a western imperialism could give was to give something to another western imperialism, with a view to preserving its own imperialism. But it could never think of welfare of subject peoples. Although ironically by brainwashing, it some how made even the subject peoples think that western imperialism was in their interest. Further, this interaction was compulsory. On the otherhand Nehru's concept of internationalism was based on voluntary exchange, mutual give and take in fact based on synthesis of best elements of different civilizations, such as Western, Indian, Chinese and Arab civilizations. Each nation could depending upon its needs, adopt from its own past (and preserving the best of her traditions) as well as from others. On the whole, Nehru was not impressed by mere military might, although he could not ignore it either. Curiosity, scientific outlook, development of technology and material progress impressed Nehru. However, this was not enough. Western civilization excelled in all these. However, inspite of this it faced several wars including two world wars and even a major economic depression. Moreover, the Western man also faced crisis of spirit. This state of affairs could end only with the end of capitalism, which he felt was anyway approaching its end. Similarly, end of imperialism was also in the interest of West itself. Socialism within and between nations could solve the problems. In the post war world there was an imminent danger of world war as the world was under mushroom shadow of nuclear weapons. It was a crisis of spirit for the civilization in general. Here, the East would be affected, even though the fault may be that of West, or may be of human nature. May be it was a
crisis due to human nature itself. History consisted of two fold challenges faced by man. Firstly, he had to control nature. Although he succeeded in this, new problems were created in the process. Secondly attempts by man to control his own nature had also failed. A human society unselfish, non-exploitative, non-violent, co-operative was the ideal. It would remain an ideal to aspire for, work for but Nehru was not that optimistic about its realisation. Yet as a man of action, Nehru thought if one could move in that direction, even if not continuously and rapidly but gradually and slowly it was worth while. The crisis of civilization was also a crisis of leadership. The leaders of his generation did not understand the true interests of their nations. They took a very narrow view and misguided people. Here and there, leaders like Gandhi showed that life and approach of millions of people could be changed. Although he realised that such leaders were exceptions. However, he felt that Gandhian methods could be exported from domestic to international arena with profit.

In general also Nehru felt that East could help in this civilizational crisis. East had an old, mature and stable civilization which was aware of the ultimate purposes of life. West could progress but not survive without the values of life. East too had things to learn from West. She had either lacked or lost the science and scientific spirit. West could teach her technology.

The tradition of west was full of conflicts. This was reflected in a system of international relations established by
them. It was intensely nationalistic, intolerant, imperialistic, exploitative, based on fear, violence and hatred. Above all it was great-power dominated. League itself was dominated by big powers. Marxism as a philosophy and Soviet Union as a state were redeeming features. Soviet Union was a socialist, non-imperialistic state which followed a policy of peaceful coexistence and friendship with exploited countries and was capable of escaping from economic disaster which capitalist countries. To Nehru, Soviet Union looked like an alternative model of civilization. However, in the pre-independence period, Nehru felt that the Soviet civilization faced a problem of survival because of western hostility. In general Nehru was not optimistic either about reform either of the western civilization or of western system of international relations. Even if the west could recapture some of the values like tolerance, humanity, which she cherished in the past, it would be worth while.

But Nehru's preference was for a new civilization in the creation of which East too could continue. If Western tradition was full of conflict, the Eastern tradition was different. It was mature, non-violent, tolerant, aware of final principles of life. But it was not a one way affair. What the East lacked, the West could provide; the spirit of youth, adventure, dynamism—of science and scientific invention and material progress.

Negatively, Nehru would not like a world order based on religion or on pan-religious movements. It would provide a man with a decent living but would not be excessively materialistic. It would be a multicultured world of civilizations, not living in isolation but open to and voluntarily interacting, with a spirit
of humility. It would neither welcome crusading of any type of ideology, nor permit use of violence for imposition of any system. It would have place for religion but neither as a shield to cover any vested interests or systems, nor as support-structure for status quo. Religion was to be important not for individual salvation but for good of society. Religion could be good ethics. His world order would be mainly but not exclusively based on science.

Several factors influenced Nehru's views on internationalism. Gandhisim, experience of working in freedom movement, socialism, Marxism, his travels abroad, his perception of imperialism and of British rule in particular, his analysis of working of capitalism and of socialism, his perception of Soviet Union as a civilization and as a state were some factors.

He perceived nationalism as a positive factor up to a stage but a reactionary force afterwards, or at least not itself adequate till supplemented by internationalism. Both were essential. True internationalism could not develop till countries were free. But egocentric nationalism without internationalism was neither desirable nor in tune with times.

The ultimate stage of that internationalism would be a world government or a world federal government. It would have place neither for aggressive nor for isolationalist nationalism. In pre-independence period he felt that world government would have to be a socialist government or if it took the place of world federal government even national governments would have to be socialist in nature. In between world government and nation-
state, he visualized the possibility of other circles of cooperation, such as regional federations. He also visualized the possibility that regional units larger than nation-states could help solve even communal problem. However, his preference was always for universal organizations. (In any case, in pre-independence period he thought that nation-state was too small a unit to prove useful in changing times.) He knew that like League and U.N.O., such organizations could be dominated by great powers but then without them they would not come into existence or fail. The universality in membership, critical world public opinion, a vigilant nationalism would be checks on great powers. He did not believe in 'realism' which emphasized the game of balance of power and sought security through alliances and counter-alliances. It was the stupidity of statesmen which led them to believe in it.

The world was changing. The rising tide of nationalism in the East meant the end of colonialism was approaching. However this did not mean that there should be a mere proliferation of nation states or that classical Western nation-state in all its manifestations should be reproduced in East. In the pre-independence period independence of the third world countries specially of Asia and of India in particular was his goal. There were things about which these nation states had to worry. They had to preserve their freedom. They should not indulge in war and become imperialistic as in the West. Looking at the Asian tradition, he felt, they would not. For the time being their concerns would be different. He would not predict about their future orientation. However there was a thing which worried him
more. The nations states of East could adopt an isolationist attitude which characterized their behaviour at some stage in their national life. The growth of nationalism, based on eulogising their own greatness or based on religious revivalism could lead to this. He was neither in favour of creating nation states which were stagnant nor in favour of nation states without roots. None of these could create true internationalism.

In the pre-independence period world forces were encouraging interdependence and making the system of nation-state redundant. That is why he was not favour of Pakistan or small states created even on the basis of self determination.

Socialism was another factor which influenced Nehru's philosophy. In pre-independence period meaning of socialism changed for him at different times. However, he was convinced, socialism in the sense of radical restructuring of society could not go well together with nationalism which was a political phenomena which combined under its umbrella, all kinds of elements. "We can speak of nationalism only in reference to cases when in the presence of existing or nascent antagonistic classes, efforts are being made to achieve national goals on the basis of national unity interpreted as rejection of class struggle in a varying degree and indifferent terms". 'The advancement of nation as a fetishistic object of loyalty in contradiction to class consciousness and to the detriment of working people's interests is a genetic feature of nationalism'.

543 In the pre-independence period both socialism and

nationalism used for his favour, although in case of conflict, nationalism was considered more important partly because socialism can only function when India is free'. However, as a man of action, he tried to give a socialist colour to INC. Even at international level, socialism was considered essential for internationalism. After all if peace was the desired objective, capitalistic and imperialistic order could not provide peace. It only led to wars.

An important question is why Nehru's preference for international socialist order could not lead him to revolutionary internationalism, even in the pre-independence period. The main reason was that although he did approve of communism or socialism as an ideal, he disapproved of means used by communists. For him like a true Gandhian means were also important, though ends may be more important and bad means might vitiate ends as well. In addition, he was too much of a Western liberal, a democrat, an individualist by temperament to approve the intolerance, bad language and mannerisms of communists. Further, although he favoured a socialist order as a panacea for solution of national and international problems, he did not recommend a uniform formula as far as means were concerned. Each country had its own tradition and peculiar circumstances. A major obstacle in creating new world order was the lag between changing world forces and socio-economic and political structures which were rooted in the past. This could only be resolved by adopting proper structures in tune with times.

Nehru's preferred world order in the pre-independence period was based on socialism at domestic and world level, tolerance, non-violence, rationalism, enlightened statesmanship, internationalism, equality, support of people and therefore on democracy at the level of decision making.

In the post-independence period, Nehru was even more convinced about civilizational crisis facing the world in a nuclear world. The fate of different parts of world was more linked than ever before. However, the politicians had not become any wiser. They were governed by same military approaches leading to hatred, fear and fatalism (which had become more dangerous now). In these circumstances Nehru felt that fanaticism was dated. Capitalism was improving. World had advanced beyond Marxism, too. Hence a new ideology based on changed circumstances was essential. Nehru favoured ideology of democratic socialism which he felt the world could adopt with profit. But it was also not a universal panacea. In case if U.S.A. and West Europe and Soviet Union and her allies did not want to go the Indian way, they could adopt a policy of peaceful co-existence, which was the minimum necessary for survival.

The post-independence period saw the world more narrowing, contracting and interdependent. The age of narrow nationalism was over. U.N.O. represented the spirit of world opinion and had to be supported. It had worked better than League of Nations, although it too had its limitations. In addition, an approach of peaceful settlement of disputes was required.
India too could contribute to the internationalist cause. Even in the pre-independence period, Nehru felt that Asia in general and India in particular did not have a tradition of conflict, war, tolerance. Further, under the impact of Gandhiji Indian people had been trained, to use morality and non-violence in politics and favour internationalism. Their nationalism was moderated by internationalism. Even when India's interest was involved, she did not ignore international considerations, although the final choice may have smacked of nationalism. India's freedom struggle itself was a contribution to the cause of internationalism in several ways.

In the post-independence period too, she contributed both negatively and positively to the cause of internationalism. Negatively, India could contribute by not adding anything to prevailing tension, fear, hatred by not using bad language, by not condemning, by not name calling, by following a policy of non-alignment, by not joining military blocs. But non-alignment also changed the great powers in the long run, by forcing them to become more restrained. This was a positive contribution. Using our mediation, by building bridges and by increasing mutual comprehension between two cold warriors also, India contributed to the cause of internationalism. The reduction of anxiety, fear, misunderstanding was the basis on which ultimately cold war would end.

The cause of internationalism was promoted by India's participation in commonwealth and U.N.O. and by working for peace, decolonisation, end of racism and for disarmament. These were examples of co-operative internationalism. Friendship between
India and China too could be a forerunner of a new era of peace, stability and co-operation in Asia and in world (After Chinese invasion, the perception changed).

Finally, India could provide West and Soviet Union with a new model of democratic socialism and thereby benefit both sides.

All these contributions were not to be made by India on the basis of any narrowly perceived self-interest. 'India', he said, in a speech to the Constituent Assembly in 1949, 'can play a big part and perhaps an effective part, in helping to avoid war'. But this again did not mean any privileges. 'If we have to play that part, we have to look at questions from the bigger point of view and not from small difficulties and problems'.

Probably, if India criticized others, it was not from any 'claim to superior vantage point for India to advise or criticise the rest of the world. I think we are merely trying not to get excited'. In a world of conflicting and crusading ideologies 'whatever we may do in our limited outlook and failings, we have had a philosophy which is a live and let live philosophy of life'.

Nehru's Perception of Indian role, therefore is not hegemonic. If India dominated South-East Asia it was because of her culture, because they found it to be better. It was not political imperialism. Similarly, if India tried to play a role in world now it was partly because she had something to give.
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something to contribute. Her geography, history and culture made that role functional and situational.

That responsibility consisted of leading Asia and later of leading nonaligned countries of course, but for What? It was in case of Asia and Africa of helping states to gain and preserve independence, without fear and help these states to keep their states as 'areas of peace'.

In general he felt a responsibility for underdogs of the world. The reason being, 'progressively people see that within United Nations, things are done for from the idealistic, the moral way, or in terms of underdog, the smaller nations or the Asian nations'. 548

Similarly in case of any leadership at world level also the objective was to prevent a nuclear war, create better environment when there was a greater possibility of many of their problems being solved if not all.

'What are we interested in world affairs for? We seek no domination over any country? We do not wish to interfere in affairs of any country, domestic or another. Our main stake in world affairs is peace, to see that there is equality and that there is racial equality and that people who are still subjected should be free. For the rest, we do not desire to interfere in world affairs'. 549

This does not mean that India's contribution to internationalism was totally devoid of any concern for self
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interest of India. The point is that Nehru always believed in
pursuit of enlightened self-interest. His 'realism' was different
from Western 'realism'. The Western theories of 'realism' relied
on balance of power, military solution to problems, vacuum theory
and spheres of influence, containment of military power by
military power, system of alliances and either no negotiation with
antagonists or negotiation based on strength. Nehru's perception
was that 'security' in this sense was 'false' and would remain
'elusive' and this 'realism' would disturb peace. It was really
not a 'rational' approach and he was confident it was
dysfunctional. "One of the chief difficulties in the wide world
today is that grave political problems are considered from the
military point of view only. This comes in the way of any other
kind of approach which takes into consideration many other
factors". On the otherhand, Panchsheel ensured security of each
nation not at the cost of others but by contributing to security
of others. It enlarged the area of peace without relying on
military approach to solution of political disputes. This
approach rested on peaceful settlement of disputes.

An overview of Nehru's views on internationalism leads
us to a question - what type of internationalist he was? In his
discussion with Tibor Mende, Mende asked a pertinent question
whether he was not a nineteenth century liberal humanist whose
philosophy was based on three main assumptions: belief in the
inevitability of human progress, faith in the perfectibility of
individual and belief that force could be progressively be
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eliminated as an arbiter of human relations'. Nehru replied in affirmative, 'I was born in the 19th century, so that perhaps, I have a bit of nineteenth century in me'. 551 Although Nehru agreed that he was slightly disillusioned about inevitability of progress, on the whole he was still optimistic about survival of mankind and that 'if mankind survives it will survive at each step at a relatively higher plane'. Even if it doesn’t what can one do, 'except that one tries to work for ends which will avoid the greater dangers'. 552

Nehru was not only not for hegemonic internationalism, he was opposed to it. If he talked of a special role for India there was no concept of Indian domination over any body. Geographically India was situated in a strategically vital position. In terms of population and resources India had a big potential. It was a big country and whatever happened here could not but have impact on Asia. She had 'a noble heritage of cultural forms'. In addition to that, she had 'accumulated cultural and spiritual experience of ages'. She had 'capacity to progress in scientific theory and application'. She had 'capacity and experience of synthesis' and she was herself likely to be not a national state but a multinational state. Therefore in pre-independence period Nehru thought of a role for India in the international field. Only international pressure (British) or domestic disunity could prevent India from performing a great role.
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Even in the post-independence period, he had a clear perception about India's role in world affairs. Non-alignment in the negative and positive aspect, her mediatory role, participation in U.N.O., commonwealth were aspects of this. But India by playing this role in the post-second world war context had nothing to gain in narrow terms. Even if she gained security, preserved peace and independence, it was never at the cost of the world. Rather he conceived world peace as a primary objective of times and India's role helped in preserving world peace. India's objective as a nation-state could not be achieved without peace. If at all Nehru can be accused of anything by some people it was that probably he conceived for India a role larger than was warranted by her capacity. Although, in his speeches, conversations, interviews, he was categorical in saying that world peace was mainly the business of great powers. Similarly the extent to which non-alignment was responsible for preserving world peace can be debated (the true value of non-alignment can be understood only by imagining post-second world war world without non-alignment), but nobody can accuse India of gaining something by policy of non-alignment at the cost of the world. In a speech to the Constituent Assembly, he said: "the freedom that has come to India by virtue of many things—history, tradition, resources, our geographical position, our great potential and all that—inevitably leads India to play a part in world affairs, and because we have to play that inevitable part, we have another and greater responsibility." 553
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We see Wilsonian idealism in Nehru, but Wilson would advocate even military intervention for protection of such values in other countries. Nehru did not advocate that even at the conceptual level. He felt India had good deal to offer even to super powers, including a new model of development. That was purely a voluntary matter. In his approach, we find a reliance on spread of ideas by example. Probably, one can criticise Nehru by saying what else could he have done in relation to super powers? He told members of Lok Sabha, in 1957, "We are too humble to pursue a crusading policy. We know our limitations. But where world peace is naturally we want to have our say, as a member of world community. Where India's interests are directly threatened, whether in Goa or in Pakistan, we must have our say, a positive say." 554 Now which issue involved world peace? What did India's interest mean? Did it involve protection of values cherished by India and followed by Neighbours of India and given up or not at all followed by India? What did 'say' mean? Was it verbal only or military as well? What if this 'say' was considered as interference by others? These issues raised questions of interpretation and perception and could easily become controversial and at times look like 'crusading'.

Similarly his internationalism did not assume a form of revolutionary internationalism.

In terms of objective, Nehru had adopted communism or socialism as the ultimate objective in the pre-independence period, although as a Gandhian, Nehru did not approve of means used by communists. This was ultimately to replace nationalism.
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In the pre-independence period he considered colonialism as an obstacle to socialism. There was even an expectation, that having achieved independence nationalism would burn itself out. Internationalism in the pre-independence period meant two things: avoidance of isolationalism, enlightened nationalism and socialism or communism at world level. However after independence objective of socialism at world level disappears as part of internationalism. The question of violent way to socialism had been given up in the pre-independence period itself. Now even as an objective at world level, it was given up. Nationalism was accepted as a vital force and socialism was considered at national level but not as substitute for nationalism but as supplementary to nationalism. On the otherhand internationalism now meant avoidance of isolationalism, world peace, world co-operation, creation or use of international institutions. It also meant a new synthetic civilization, symbolizing a new man combining materialistic and spiritual elements, a man rational and scientific but ethical and in harmony with ultimate principles of life, in short a fully integrated man; a civilization tolerant, free from fear and hatred; free from domination and exploitation, a civilization based on national socialism which left lot of room for individual creativity.

Thus Nehru can be described as liberal internationalist. Was he different from other Anglo-American thinkers belonging to this tradition? What were the points of similarities? We have already seen that not all Anglo-American thinkers thought alike. However broadly speaking all of them accepted the necessity of a
nation state system. Their objective was to preserve the nation state system or organize it in a better way for some desired objective or to check its excesses. Not all desired world government. Not all considered it possible. Those who desired world government, thought time was not ripe for it. Some preferred regional organization for a united Europe.

The objective of thinkers varied. Peace was the main objective, only for a few. For some it was a subsidiary objective. Preservation of Christianity, creation of a united Europe or such creation under leadership of some state, preservation of freedom, better organization of Europe with the outside world, were the other objectives.

In the post-second world war period and specially in case of American thinkers, internationalism meant abandonment of isolationism and American involvement in world affairs, with a view to check Soviet power and spread of communist ideology and communist systems.

Talking about America, the example of Wilson comes to mind. In the course of war and later as an advocate of League of Nations he became 'a symbol of certain idealistic attitude to foreign affairs.' He said, 'a nation ought not to pursue interests to the detriment of others; we wish nothing that can be had only at the expense of other people'. In Wilson's view U.S.A. could provide an example to other nations of honourable and peaceful behaviour. Further, 'we are the mediating nation of the world'. Partly because 'we are compounded of nations of the world'. Therefore 'we can understand all the nations, not separately as partisans but unitedly as knowing, comprehending and embodying...
them all. America has no 'ambitions to be a world power'. America, he said stood for certain ideals and she would if need be, 'surrender territory, rather than ideals'. For these ideals of peace, independence, she was prepared to intervene, specially to protect small countries. But even when we intervene, 'our motive will not be revenge or victorious assertion of physical might of the nation but only the vindication of right'. In the post-war world, he worked for 'peace without victory' 'an enduring peace', 'a peace based on consent of concerned people'. 'Self-determination', he said 'is an imperative principle which statesmen can ignore at their own peril'. 'Nations must be governed by high code of honour that we demand of individuals'. 'A concert for peace can never be maintained except by concert of democratic nations.' 'The interests of other nations are our own'. This does not mean that Wilson in practice was only an idealist. He did want to reform rules governing states. But he was both a realist and an idealist. The chaos of 1914-17 strengthened the feeling that what was good for U.S.A. was also good for world. 554a On the other hand, not even other moderate thinkers shared Wilson's idealism. Non-isolation for Wilson had become a dogma, a kind of fatalism. Lippman wanted to know what was to be put in place of isolationism. Further, not many others shared blinding prejudice about frontiers, armaments, alliances. Anti-fascism was put in place of isolationism. Though after second world war, containment and military approaches had a consensus behind it. An important reason was that in the post-war world, not many Americans

believed the Wilsonian belief about harmony of interests between nations.

Where do we place Nehru? In 1936, Niebuhr, enumerated six features of liberalism: (1) injustice is caused by ignorance and will yield to education and greater intelligence. (2) civilization is becoming gradually moral. (3) the character of individuals, not social systems will guarantee social justice, (4) appeals to brotherhood and goodwill are bound to be effective in the end; if they have been ineffective today, we need only more and better appeals; (5) goodness makes for happiness and increased knowledge of this belief will overcome human selfishness. (6) War is stupid and will yield to reason. 555

This does not mean that all the liberal thinkers have been in complete agreement regarding these beliefs. Niebuhr who quoted the above articles of liberal faith believed, the failure of liberalism results from its blindness to 'perennial difference between human actions and aspirations, the perennial source of conflict between life and life, the inevitable tragedy of human existence, the irreducible irrationality of human behaviour and the tortuous character of human history'. 556

Nehru too, although basically a liberal did not believe in liberal creeds in toto. For example, he believed that mankind had made progress and civilization had improved. This does not mean that it was a case of continuous progress. Similarly he put faith in man but felt that among the two fold challenges man had faced, his progress in controlling nature was admirable but in
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the process had created problems. Secondly, his record in controlling his own nature was dismal. \textsuperscript{557} That is why human civilization in his day was facing the biggest challenge, the problem of civilizational survival. But at the same time he was optimistic. Mankind would survive at a higher level. Not because man had improved. As a matter of fact like a Marxian he put more faith in systems. Certain systems were based on and encouraged certain instincts, e.g. capitalist system was based on acquisitive instinct. Western civilization, with all its achievements and with its atomic bombs had proved inadequate. Communism was supposed to create better man but because of its suppression of freedom, neglect of moral and spiritual side of man, with its emphasis on violence and foul language was not adequate. Further both these civilizations were self-righteous, and therefore Nehru found them to be unscientific, unreasonable and uncivilized. Civilization after all meant certain restraint and considerations for others. \textsuperscript{558} ‘It was the approach of the tolerance, of feeling that others might have some share of truth also.’ \textsuperscript{559} Further he felt that ‘we have arrived at a stage in the modern world when an attempt at forcible imposition of ideas on large sections of people was bound to fail. \textsuperscript{560} Hegemonic internationalism was bound to fail. He illustrates it by giving example of Hungary. ‘Ten years have passed since the last
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war and even after ten years in Hungry, the people could not be
converted to that particular theory. Under the circumstances
a civilization based on co-existence in terms of thought and
action was essential. He was thus an exponent, not of hegemonic
but of democratic internationalism.

Then there was the question of leadership. Man like
Lenin or Gandhi could raise the level of large number of men. Of
course, there was the question of how an imperfect man could
create a perfect system? Nehru had however faith in powerful
world forces whose operation would lead world to a superior
level. Not all the world forces were helpful. Therefore, role of
leaders and masses was important. Leaders could opt for right
type of systems and right types of policies.

Nehru considered role of masses important not only in
domestic change but also in international change. If led by right
type of leaders they would support correct policies. He himself
was one such leader. He had prepared Indian people for democratic
socialism but more important he had prepared congress party and
still more important an average man for a supplementary dose of
internationalism. Of course, people themselves have a certain
vitality. Communication and education are also essential for the
world. Because even greatness of a country does not endow it with
greater understanding. Knowledge may promote toleration, but only
if it promotes understanding. Sometimes, it may promote
antipathies as well. But ignorance was no blessing.

Thus Jawaharlal Nehru can be described as a philosopher who subscribed to the cause of liberal internationalism, who believed in a kind of inevitability of human progress and in perfectibility of individual with faith in ultimate elimination of war. Like a liberal who believes in harmony of interests between individuals, he believed in harmony of interests of nations. If the world was full of conflicts, it was only a matter of misperception by governments and of pressure by vested interests. Like other liberal internationalists, whose main features of thought we have examined, he too believed that change of governments, or creation of more enlightened governments would alter the situation. Like his Western counterparts, he too emphasized the role of public opinion. Of course, unlike some of his Western counterparts, he believed that government should control private enterprise for social justice at home and peace abroad.

Like some Western thinkers, Nehru found that although, times required a world government, because of human failings such a system could not be created. It remained a desirable objective. But his main objective was till mankind was prepared to accept that, it had to survive. For this survival statesmen had to follow rules of prudence. In this too, he was very much a liberal internationalist in the Anglo-American tradition described by Wolfers. But he differed greatly from the continental tradition. That tradition as Wolfers emphasized was the tradition of 'necessity'. On the otherhand, Nehru like Anglo-American thinkers believed in philosophy of 'choice'. This does
not mean that Anglo-American thinkers or statesmen were a kind of monolithic group. In fact Nehru was trying to fight the 'fatalistic' tendency regarding the inevitability of war between the communist and the anti-communist world. Peaceful co-existence in thought and action was his solution. In terms of thought, he was completely opposed to interventionist internationalism of the American type, even of the Wilsonian type because prudence required non-interference in each other's affairs. The original tradition of tolerance had been lost by West. Therefore the West required a return to that tradition both at the intellectual level as well as at the more 'practical' level (in terms of 'prudence'), as far as international affairs were concerned.

This was probably Nehru's or Indian contribution to the cause of liberal internationalism. He said, 'we are not a crusading nation'. If he preached any crusade, it was a 'peace crusade' in peaceful language and tone. All societies had probably the same ends. Mainly, it was human betterment. Nehru, however did not agree with the concept of human betterment propounded either by the capitalist or by the communist world. Therefore in Nehru's view even in relation to the end India had a different vision.

But in terms of means as well India had a contribution to make to the cause of internationalism. Here Gandhiji's stress on means was very relevant. Communist societies provided evidence of how even good ends could be spoiled by means. Capitalist societies had produced wars in succession. Nehru was even worried that the 'fatalistic' approach of the capitalist world, might lead to a nuclear war.
Good ends, Nehru felt, could not be promoted by evil means. Nehru was again in this sense a liberal of the Anglo-American variety. There was nothing like the emphasis on 'necessity' or inevitability of the continental tradition of foreign affairs. Regarding 'ends' but more so about 'means' he felt, the 'choice' was always available. This again proves Nehru too be a liberal internationalist. But he had a contribution to make, which could be described as an Indian contribution to the enrichment of Western tradition of liberal internationalism.

Nehru's concept of internationalism can be criticized on the following grounds.

(1) It was based on several facile assumptions. One such assumption was that Western tradition was full of conflicts. Not much can be expected therefore from West in future. On the other hand, the East did not have a history of conflicts and therefore would be free of conflicts and would have lessons to teach to West.

In fact, there was no reason to imagine that the newly emerging nation states would live in peace with each other. Geographically, they did not have an isolated location like the United States of America. Once they become independent, the common factor of anti-colonialism uniting them was likely to disappear. Within these nation-states therefore the bond of nationalism which had united various elements was also likely to weaken. The problems of nation building were also not likely to remain confined within their own borders. There was a possibility that ego-centric nationalism of these countries was likely to
take an aggressive shape. Nehru did visualise this possibility and one of his major contribution was that he tried to prevent Indian nationalism from becoming ego-centric. But what was the guarantee that leaders of other newly emerging nation states would do the same. In fact he had himself observed that Jinnah did not have this internationalist orientation.

(2) Further, there seems to be a kind of theoretical assumption in Nehru’s philosophy that there was no conflict of interests between states and that ‘realism’ implied co-operation between states. However, in practice, not all states would find co-operation to be in their interest at all times. European states did not perceive cooperation to be in their interest, although they did co-operate occasionally and although there was as we have seen a tradition of thought which thought of European union as a solution to various problems. Only after the second world war, there was a sincere belief and sustained effort to cooperate. Occasional co-operation between U.S.A. and Soviet Union was not unknown. They neither perceived conflict of interests nor harmony of interests on all occasions.

In fact Nehru’s perception on this as well as on some other matters operates at two levels. There is an idealistic angle in the sense that wars are harmful, and peace and co-operation are beneficial. In an academic sense everybody may agree with this proposition. But he also justifies it from ‘opportunistic’ angle. Here not all may agree.

(3) Nehru’s perception in this matter can only be understood in terms of values of Nehru. Only if peace is perceived as the value can conflicts between states be considered unreal or as resulting
from misperception of politicians. However, we have seen that neither some Western thinkers, nor statesmen have considered peace as the objective of internationalism. It is true that Nehru was very conscious about nuclear danger. But even in a nuclear age, the Western statesmen did not consider peace to be the ultimate value. For them either their ideology or their national interest (which ever way you look at it) was the main concern. It is true that compulsions of arms race and danger of nuclear war forced them to develop detente between them. But peace was never a passion with them. Negatively, they avoided war. But within that framework they continued their competition with more or less intensity with different type of means. If peace had been their main concern, cold war would not have developed. As a result of that U.S.-Soviet co-operation has become circumstantial.

(4) An additional reason for this Nehruvian perception was that for Nehru, 'idealism was realism of tomorrow' but most people and leaders live for today. Even if we accept the possibility that mankind may come to imbibe the idea of co-operation in future, there was no certainty about it. After all Nehru's own argument has been that record of mankind has not been good on this count. It is true, ultimately Nehru has proved right. The instability of deterrence and right type of initiative has led it seems, to the end of the cold war. As Pande, his biographer has aptly put it, 'the present for him was always in the melting pot... not all of the present distressed him. But communalism, capitalism, colonialism, racialism were dying... cold war was a temporary phase.... These were the inevitable trends of history'.
However, because of this, he underestimated some of the facts of the world he did not like. His achievement therefore lay 'more in preventing distractions from course of human progress than in urging it forward' (both in domestic and in international field) because his approach was evolutionary and not revolutionary. 'It was sufficient for a statesman to hold the ring while the natural goodness of man, his reason...unchained from shackles of ignorance and prejudice, steadily ameliorated his own condition'. We may add he believed world forces were acting in that direction too.

(5) As Nehru did not see any real conflict of interests between parties, his emphasis for solution of these problems got confined to a certain methodology. Reduction of fear, reduction of armaments, mediation and negotiation, tolerance, a certain restraint in language these were some elements of that methodology. It is true that these elements may prevent escalation of conflicts. It is possible that they may help the parties to live with dispute. But when the disputes are either too much politicised or when parties feel a certain basic conflict of interests and when both are unwilling to compromise, a resort to military approaches cannot be ruled out; whether it may bring success or not.

It is also not proper to say that military approaches are no good. Even he conceded that a certain amount of deterrence created by nuclear weapons prevented war. Of course he would not agree that it could bring long term peace.

Nehru's main concern was peace and to bring the world out of fear of nuclear war. His concern like Kant was with
perpetual peace. Military approaches have been tried and failed. They could not bring perpetual peace, which required the removal of causes of war. Poverty, colonialism, domination, fear, intolerance were few causes of war, he mentioned. Looking even at these causes, removal of war seemed unlikely. But there were other causes as well. Nationalism, irredentism, search for glory, economic advantages, religious fanaticism, one could go on adding. One probably feels that perpetual peace between all is not possible. Even a world government even if it came into being will only turn international wars into civil wars. But as long as nation states remained, idea of national interest would remain. It would not be possible for all statesmen to see harmony of interests between states. As long as conflict of interests remained, military approaches could not be ruled out. Nor they have failed in all cases of their use.

Nearer home, even Nehru (and his daughter too) tried military approaches, whatever may be the circumstances of their use.

One can understand his aversion to military approaches, in terms of several factors. It is open to objection, however not only in practical but also in theoretical terms. He had said several times that individuals had delegated their weaknesses to collective entities like nations and states and that these collective entities were likely to be far more egotistic, selfish and brutal. One wonders whether such entities could solve their problems by mere techniques of negotiation, restraint in language etc. In fact, theoretically one can visualise that these
entities possessing power could be checked only by power of other such entities. Therefore balance of power was not dated but relevant. It could be a mere power game but it could also serve other ends. In the post Gorbachevian period, it is easy to condemn techniques of balance of power and even nuclear deterrence. But looking at the way, states are scared of dominance of U.S.A. in a unipolar world and the way many third world states feel that disappearance of Soviet Union as an important factor in world politics would not only damage their national interests (in fact it helped Nehru's India in several ways) but would be a recipe for unjust world-shows that many states benefited from balance of power and military approaches.

Nehru believed in creating a synthetic civilization, rather a new civilization based on good elements of both Western and Eastern civilization. However, his view is slightly biased towards East and against West. Similarly, in any synthesis of Euro-American and Soviet civilization, there was a bias against former and for latter.

As far as Europe and Asia was concerned, Nehru was positively inclined in favour of East and in particularly in favour of Asia, although he did not disregard contributions made by Europe. In the post independence period his main emphasis was on insulating Asia from Euro-centered approach, and from European problems and European legacy of conflicts and of capitalism, imperialism and fascism, prevent reemergence of European domination. This did not mean that he wanted to isolate Asia from Europe. It was not even possible to isolate any parts of world. Economic help was badly needed in Asia. Industrialisation
was increasing gap between developed and developing countries and there was no option but for the latter to industrialise.

Among the Western countries, he had a particular dislike for the British in the pre-independence period. Britain was colonial, imperial (a particular contempt for Labour Party because he expected them to favour international socialism and take anti imperial attitude), opportunistic and was turning fascist at home and abroad. However, in the post independence period, he developed best of the relations with U.K.

U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. Nehru treated differently. They did not have a legacy of conflict. They did not have an imperial background and the resulting distrust of people (of colonies). They had many things in common—a dynamic outlook and vast resources, a social fluidity, an absence of medieval background, a faith in science and its applications and widespread education and opportunities for people. Both had defects. One had purely political democracy, another lacked it. Both had shown expansionist tendencies in different form. However, Nehru’s preference would be more for Soviet Union than for U.S.A. This was partly due to the capitalist system that America had adopted.

It is true that in the pre-independence period Nehru did talk of advantages brought out by capitalism. But mainly it failed to solve many problems including the problem of distribution. Depression and other things showed that capitalism was in the final stage. Although he he did recognise in the post-independence period that capitalism could and did reform itself.

But only by adopting socialist features. Unlike in pre-independence period, he felt that capitalism and democracy could survive together. In fact it is democracy that forced down many of the evils of capitalism. Although he did prefer democracy but it was partly an instrument to clip the wings of capitalist class. This did not mean that he advocated a whole hearted adoption of socialist system. The point I want to stress is that although his preference was for a world order, a new civilization in which different sides would be in a position to give and take. In his view probably, in this exchange Soviet Union had more to contribute. It is true that West had contributed democracy. But it was mainly political democracy. Nehru never considered it as sufficient. Nehru tried to distinguish between capitalism and democracy. However what the West could contribute towards creation of new civilization was capitalist democracy. This was not desirable in his view. Similarly by its association with veto powers U.S.A. was building bases, creating alliances, increasing tension and indirectly encouraging or trying to help preserve the colonial order.

On the otherhand Soviet Union had done a lot in the area of production, distribution. Its socialist economy did not necessarily lead to expansion. It could even escape from depression. It had done a lot in the field of education and in the area of nationalities. It was a satiated power, followed policy of co-existence and was neither an imperial nor a colonial power by and large. Many of the virtues of Soviet Union could be attributed to the socialist system. Although Nehru was quick to point out, failure of Soviet experiment would not mean failure of
socialist experiment. He wrote in 'Discovery', "No other country today presents such a politically solid and economically well-balanced picture as Soviet Union, although some of the developments there in recent years have come as a shock to many of its old admirers." (p. 541) He pleaded either ignorance of facts whenever adverse reports came about Soviet Union or urged that a lot of it was Western propaganda. Developments in Soviet Union has proved Nehru wrong on several matters.

Therefore it seems in the mutual exchange, give and take and interaction between countries, states and civilizations which he advocated, West had much less to contribute towards the creation of this type internationalism in comparison with Russia. Nehru's bias could be partly explained in terms of Nehru's observations about capitalism being made in the weak days of capitalism and when the worst of communism was yet to come.

This lopsided perception of internationalism could well be compared with Mr. Chevardnadze's perception of internationalism published in an article 'Edward Chevardnadze's Choice' in a Soviet monthly, "International Affairs", of November 1991.

In replying to a question about the Soviet Union and the world in the year 2001, Chevardnadze said, "There will be a different civilization, as far as I can say. Not only here in our country but virtually everywhere at world level. I am certain the new world order will grow much stronger. The world will become controllable....... The process of shaping the national Sovereignty and
independence of states and republics arouses a lot of emotion. But the people’s thinking will change.... They will realise that they can not do without integration, which is an imperative of our times, and exigency of contemporary human progress.... But will our country have socialism or capitalism or something else ? It will be a synthesis of what humanity, human civilization has accumulated, of progressive positive experience. All republics or the whole country should borrow from capitalism whatever is reasonable in market relations. We are awakened to this belatedly. But where are those things to come from. From the more advanced countries. The experience they have gained is vast and unique. Or take property relations. We used to dread them but now we see that they are indispensable for human progress as are many other things". (p 9)

This looks like a more balanced perception of internationalism in the sense of creating a new civilization out of synthesis of some civilizations. However, in the above paragraph, none of the virtues of socialism are specifically mentioned for adoption by that new civilization.