CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The concluding chapter is divided into four parts in order to present and relate the ideas of the classical theorists, Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) and Hugo Grotius (1583-1679) with those of Gandhi (1869-1948), Jawaharlal Nehru (1889-1964) and Ram Manohar Lohia (1910-1967) in a systematic way.

The first part rationalises as to how Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia articulate their ideas on the problematique of international order and world peace against the backdrop of the similar problematique as responded by the three western thinkers viz. Hobbes, Kant and Grotius - almost three hundred years ago. These three thinkers provided conceptual categories which facilitate comparison and help in defining the paradigms of international relations political theory.

The second part conceptualizes views of Indian thinkers and their perception on the notion of international society, its nature, its functioning and (dis)organizing principles.

The third part conceptualizes the ideas of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia on the (dis)order in international society and their conception on international society which further shape following sub-categories: what is
order; what are the institutions which maintain it; whether it is progressive or regressive; whether they want to maintain that order or want to improve and transcend it; and their strategy of improvement (or transformation).

The fourth part conceptualizes their ideas in terms of new values, which they suggest in order to reorganize international society. This is a unique contribution of the Indian Peace Studies to the area of peace research in problematique of global order and peace, not attended by the Indian scholars for want of disparateness of ideas of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia.

In order to have a glance on the span of thinking from Hobbes to Lohia on such a vital problematique, an appendix is attached which furnishes in a tabular form a comprehensive enclosed overview and a comparative analysis of all the thinkers at the end of the chapter.

This study focusses on global order and peace mainly because it is a problem of all times pestering and hammering the human mind, and the grim reality of today is that there is no central agency at the global level to ensure peace and order as we find within the national societies of nation-states.

The main dicotomy between the national and international society is characterized by the concept of 'civil society' and 'anarchy' respectively. The basic pursuance of the national (domestic) society is to achieve "good
life" and that of the international society is "the survival of a state." Hence the problem arises who creates 'order' in an anarchical society and 'how' it is maintained so that the war can be prevented and peace can be preserved. In other words, the fundamental focus is to find out how the international anarchy is conceived by Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia as to how it is managed and how it ought to be managed in the interest of permanent peace. The focus is how to create order in the absence of world government so that anarchical society can be transformed into a civil society.

As mentioned in the introduction, the main purpose of this study is to conceptualize ideas of Indian thinkers, Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia around this problematique by addressing the most fundamental theoretical question of the discipline of international relations: what do they mean by international society?
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Comparative Categories

In this part, the conceptions of Thomas Hobbes, Immanuel Kant, Hugo Grotius, Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and Ram Manohar Lohia are poured into four categories with a view to juxtaposing their conceptions of international society. Following the classical tradition of theorizing these categories are put in three sub-sections. First, the causes of war and conditions of peace and order, second, the identification of essential actors of the international society. (The classical theoretical tradition
considers 'the sovereign states' as the essential actors or unit of analysis) and the third the formulation of their world view. The dominant image of the world in classical tradition is a system of sovereign states characterized by 'international anarchy.'

I. The Causes of War and Conditions of Peace

Thomas Hobbes

Hobbes locates the causes of war in human nature. Human beings fight for greed, pride and covetousness. In Hobbes views, the international society is in a state of nature, i.e. in a pre-contractual stage. This implies chaos and disorder. Lack of order is associated with the situation of state of war. Nevertheless, for Hobbes a posture of war is a permanent and typical characteristic of international politics. He however, neither proposes a plan for perpetual peace nor evolve any strategy for eliminating the phenomena of war from international relations. But he does provokes us to think of an alternative mode of conflict management at international level.

Immanuel Kant

Kant, like Hobbes, defines this essential problematique in terms of war and conditions of peace and order. He also locates causes of war in human nature. Lust for power, glory and wealth are the main causes of war. Kant maintains that human nature can be improved by
education. The human mind needs to be constantly hammered and reminded of higher and finer values. In this way he can be led away from objects which creep into his nature eventually leading to war. Kant is of the opinion that wars are basically the blunders committed by princes. If people are given power to declare war, they will be reluctant to do so for several reasons.

His ultimate goal is to create a global community of individuals. Kant holds that republic nations only can be assigned membership of his confederation. They will then, feel secured, not by any supernatural authority imposed on them, but by mutual recognition, among the confederate states, of their rights and duties vis-à-vis other nationals. Kant assumes that this sort of individual-to-individual contact between states would produce pacific relations between states which would respect rule of law at home and abroad. Thus, gradually a global civil society will emerge.

Hugo Grotius

Grotius also defines the essential problematique very much in terms of the phenomena of war and conditions of peace and order. However, he does not provide an inquiry into causes of war. He is concerned more with imposing limits on the recourse to and the conduct of war. In fact, Grotius begins with the assumption that war is inevitable and indeed is in perfect accord with the first principle of
nature, for the aim of war is the preservation of life and limb (of the sovereign state in the society of states). Nevertheless, he distinguishes between just and unjust wars positing that the law of nations sanctions only such wars which are fought to assert or defend the community or the societal rights. Thus Grotius believes that war may occur but it should be subjected to legal and moral regulation both as to the cause, for which it is fought and the way in which it is fought. Grotius understands the phenomena of war not just a deviation, but a reflection of incompleteness and inadequacies of the norms prescribed to provide a good deal of order in international society.

The Grotian tradition does not believe in Hobbesian assertion, "the war of all against all," but presumes sovereign states as "the family of nations." Grotius further presumes that the sovereign states themselves are interested in preserving order. It is evident in their diplomatic treaty and other institutions. Grotius is convinced that the totality of international relations is subject to the rule of law. Thus, he provides a notion of natural law as normative framework for the nation-states to behave like a society and not merely as a system.

Gandhi

Gandhi like Hobbes, Kant and Grotius defines the essential problematique in terms of war and conditions of peace, stability and
order. He provides an in-depth analysis of the causes of war and discusses the reasons for the break down of international order. Gandhi, like Kant locates the basic causes of war in human nature. He blames the unrighteousness on the part of the national leaders and their faith in violence to fulfill their ambitions. Lust for power and wealth, in Gandhi's views, result into exploitation and desire to dominate others in this way human nature is the root cause of outbreak of war. Besides human nature, he also blames injustice inbuilt within the nation-state system. In order to turn international nation-state system into international society, the ordering units (nation-states) must function harmoniously. This harmony can be created provided 'order' is created on the principle of 'natural law' and maintained through some value-systems, viz. non-violence and justice.

Nevertheless, Gandhi presumes that some sort of order prevails in relations between nation-states. In Gandhi's view it is precarious and inadequate. Thus Gandhi's orientation of international order is mainly connected with the problem of disequilibrium among nations. He calls for the elimination of all forms of violence which create disequilibrium, both overtly and covertly at all levels of human life. Thus, Gandhi's conception of order refers to natural harmony without distortion. His conception of order also refers to the necessity of meshing various parts in such a way that they interact without distortion. Moreover, Gandhi also wants that it should reflect some idea of justice, otherwise it will not last for ever. Gandhi's conception of order, in short, is connected with the idea of a
particular equilibrium - international or human. Harmony between the units of international society (between nation-states) can preserve peace.

Nehru

Nehru, blames the human nature basically for outbreak of war. he specifically blames lust for power, greed and self-interest breeding in one's nature. But he goes one step further to point out that psychological affliction of fear is the chief cause of war. In Nehru's views, the psychosis of fear affects men's thinking. It is fear that promotes hatred of nation against another.

Along with psychological factors, Nehru blames political and economic factors too for outbreak of war.

Nehru was convinced that peace does not prevail in international society because the nation-states adopt a wrong means to preserve peace, such as, the devises of alliances and counter alliances, the balance of power, deterrent etc. Moreover, they prepare for war in order to preserve peace. He appeals that good means must be employed for good ends.
Unlike his precessors - Hobbes, Grotius, Kant, Gandhi and Nehru, Lohia does not address the causes of war and the problem of security directly. He, therefore does not give a forthright answer to the problematique. To him the problematique of war and peace are the problem of reorganization of entire human society. The solutions which he suggests at two levels are also related to restructuring international order at the international societal level composed of nation-states as well as reorganizing human society at global level.

He, however, does not analyze the problematique of war in terms of human psychology. He rather looks at the phenomena of war as a product of the unjust order created by the international society composed of nation-states.

Lohia's concerns are mainly two: First, concentration of powers in the hands of a few nations, chiefly European at the international level. Second, many in the human society are denied the opportunity to realize their inner potential. In order to create a just society, Lohia advocates decentralization of power at all levels so that a genuine equality amongst the nations and individuals can be maintained and the true liberty can be experienced by all. If it is done, atmosphere will be created in which every individual will be able to realize his inner potential fully and it is Lohia's ideal that society ought to be is composed of happy men.
II. The Unit of Analysis or The Essential Actors

To classical thinkers: Hobbes, Kant and Grotius, the main unit of analysis is sovereign states, states and system of states, the essential actors and their behaviour remain the central focus of the study of international politics. The problem and proposed remedies are discussed in terms of actions of states within the context of a European state system. Only sovereign states are the members of the society. Eighteenth century thinkers acknowledged neither the existence nor importance of non-state actors, as they are understood today.

Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia too define the essential problematique in terms of sovereign states and the system of states. They also consider sovereign states as the only members of the society. The status of nation-states in the new context. During the time of classical lived the society of states was limited to Europe. That tradition continued even in the time of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia. Hence, the three of them want that the society of states be expanded to Asia and Africa.

One distinct difference is that Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia refer to the League of Nations and the United Nations Organization as non-state actors. Lohia goes one step further to suggest political processes should be managed at international level.
Thomas Hobbes, Kant and Grotius speak of the European system, and not of a global system as it exists today. They considered the rest of the world (Africa-Asia) as uncivilized (savages). The notion of independent states operating within some sort of order was common to thinkers of the classical tradition. However, these three of them disagreed regarding the degree of order and "society" among the states remained and still continues, to be the issue of the debate. So the key question dividing them is the degree of order, and the presence or absence of the quality of a "society" of states. One thing needs to be noted that although all three presume an anarchical nature of the existing international society to start with, Grotius, does not admit it openly nor does he talk about the central government at the global level.

The dominant presumptions of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia are the same that international politics is monopolized by the great power in the absence of a world government. Ironically, Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia dubbed the great powers as uncivilized and savages without overtly using there words because they dominated the rest of the world for their selfish interest. They do not respect human dignity and perpetuate injustice on them with the help of armaments and misinterpreting 'notion of nationalism.' They too agree with the existence of 'anarchy' at international level. But they blame the dominant power to perpetuate anarchy as it functions in their interest.
They are thoroughly dissatisfied with the 'order' created and controlled by the dominant powers. Hence, all of them suggest changes in the status-quo, and never speak in terms of system maintenance as it is. But they call for system improvement. They even go further and write extensively about transcending the nation-states system. All of them, in final analysis opt for not only classless but even stateless society mainly organized around the notion of 'human dignity.'
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The Notion of International Society: Anarchical and Hegemonial

Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia (intuitively) perceived that the international society is mainly composed of nation-states in which the people's welfare is not given due attention. They resent the neglect of the welfare of the mankind. Hence all of them focus upon the improvement in the functioning of the nation-state system. Their first priority, therefore, is improvement and systemic changes in the system, rather than transformation of the system. Nevertheless, they do suggest strategies for the system transformation. So that the system can, function in the interest of humanity and the dominating interests of nation-states considering survival their priority may be curbed and minimized in their influence. They expressed their profound dissatisfaction that in international relations and in its functioning people (individuals) have been neglected as if they do not matter.
Three of them also understand anarchical nature of international society and in the absence of the central authority, the great powers manage the political affairs of the world in their own interest at the cost of others. In Gandhi's views, it is not the entire nation but a small group of the powerful people who control the destiny of mankind. This dominant group neglect the majority of the people residing even within their own states, and develop a vested interest in perpetuating their hold on the nation as it helps them to control the world at large. Hence, in order to perpetuate their hold on the national society, they exploit the people's feeling of nationalism. They misinterpret nationalism and, thus, misguide the masses who are ignorant of international relations. This group of people create an anarchy within the nation, which is further reflected in the international society. Gandhi suggests that all the human beings are bound by the invisible principle of national law. It is principle of harmony and mutual interdependence of all elements on the globe. Gandhi wants us to be conscious about it as it is the truth. Gandhi wants, therefore, the nation-state system to function according to the principle of truth so that stable global order and a genuine peace can be created for every one on the earth.

Nehru and Lohia on the other hand, blame the nation-state system for the anarchical nature of the international society. They believe that the functioning of the system is monopolized by a few nations. They dominate the rest of the world and become prosperous at the cost of the other nations. It happens because the decision-making at the international level, rests with those few. Therefore, Nehru wants that international society
should be democratized. Being a liberal thinker, he does not advocate the confrontationist approach between the core powers and the peripheral powers. He opts for an institutional approach. He wants that the final decision-making power should be shifted from the great powers to the United Nations organization. He wants other nations to adopt a persuasive and peaceful approach.

In contrast to Nehru, Lohia advocates the confrontationist approach by emergence of the Third Camp (against the Eastern (USSR) and the Western Camp) equally powerful, militarily and otherwise. Lohia believes that the great powers will listen to the peripheral powers, provided the third camp learns to talk to them on equal footings. If the near parity is created between the haves and the have-nots, the international society will move in the direction of democratization.

However, all of them—Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia—condemn the great powers for mismanagement of the global political life and their methods of exploiting the anarchical nature of society for their own advantage.
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Meaning, Nature and Maintenance of (Dis)Order and the Methods to Improve Or Transcend It

Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia believe that nation-states definitely create order as they are active units of the system. No one of them, therefore
wish to do away with nation-state system. Nevertheless, they suggest different strategies to improve and transcend it. They are of the view that in the absence of the central authority at the global level, the order is maintained mainly by the 'violent means.' They disapprove of it, and suggest different ways of doing away with system of armaments, arms race and weapon culture. The nation-states have immense faith in (physical) "force" (or threat to use force) to keep order in international society. Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia want nation-states to generate moral strength from within than in the means of destruction. They warn them against indiscriminate use of violence in a thermo-nuclear age lest they will destroy themselves and bring total destruction of the earth. Weapons which are sheer means of destruction - are neutral in terms of values and ethical standards - it is man who uses them has to make value judgement in this regard.

Nehru being a serious follower of history did realise that time has come to take initiative in preventing the cycle of the balance of power. Balance of power despite being responsible for the two world wars - perpetuates as the sole means of resolving conflicts and maintenance of order. If the sovereign state system is to be restored to its genuine objective (regulating inter-state relations without taking recourse to weapons or war) than the Balance of power needs to be replaced by more civilized ways of interaction.

Gandhi and Nehru specifically blame human nature for outbreak of war. Gandhi appeals for introspection, while Nehru pleads to confine politics
within the bounds of the United Nations organization. Nehru thinks that, at least, the international institution (like UNO) will be able to institutionalize the game of power politics as the great powers will check-mate each other even through the veto-power and war will not break out. For Nehru though the Gandhian scheme of peace which rested on non-violent means was ideal - the international environment was not conducive for such an experiment and therefore it was necessary to entrust the great powers with sense of responsibility under the UN armed with the Veto power. Lohia holds a different view that the Great Powers, mainly European, are interested in perpetuating unjust order in international society. As the present order functions in their interest, they will never give it up. He insists that they should be forced to change the order. Unless the third world countries reciprocate the great powers - policies in the same measure - they will continue to dictate and dominate. He pleads for the unity of the non-aligned countries which would develop equally powerful front against the two great powers the USA and the USSR. It will create a symmetrical situation vis-a-vis the great powers. they, then, will be forced to negotiate with the peripheral powers on the principle of equality. The great powers will also be compelled to democratize the international order and, as a result, just international society will emerge.

Thus, Lohia opts for a 'power approach,' against Nehru's 'institutional approach,' and Gandhi's moralistic approach. The trio of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia collectively resent ideologies of imperialism, colonialism, capitalism and communism which exploit the order in
international society. Apart from the merits or demerits of these ideologies, they condemn them as great powers use them for perpetuating their hold on the nation-state system. In the same fashion, they condemned peace treaties, and the international institutions, (the League of the UNO), which the great powers conceived in the name of creating a new world order. Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia expose their game to perpetuate their dominance on the system and suggest modification, especially in the structure of the UNO.

Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia perceives that the existing order is a viable alternative methods of improving as well as transcending the nation-states system.

**Strategy of Improving the Functioning of the System**

Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia further perceived the nation-state system as conducive neither to the attainment of global peace and justice nor to the fulfilment of social, economic, political aspirations of newly decolonized states. Consequently, they devote a considerable amount of effort to conceive reforms or to suggest alternative to the nation-state system.

Several similarities can be noticed in their conceptualization of the changes required in the nation-state system. Each of them makes his contribution indicating his individual, social and cultural predilections. All three advocate expansion of the nation-state system which was confined
to Western Europe. In fact throughout their lives they worked and fought for decolonization, as well for asserting a place at the UNO as its member. If it is done, the principle of equality within the comity of nations would be accepted. In that case, justice would prevail within the nation-state system. They also suggest and strongly plead for total disarmament as the arm-race would not allow nation-state system to function in the interest of all. Its operating in a way breeds injustice and inequality. Moreover they wanted that cooperation should be basis of its functioning.

In order to transcend the system, Gandhi emphasis an individual approach while Nehru and Lohia opt for 'institutional' approach. Gandhi does not have faith in the League or the UNO as it reflected only the power reality. Gandhi wants the two processes the decentralization of power and resocialization of man - be operationalize simultaneously, to transcend the system. Primarily, Nehru and Lohia advocate the political approach to peace. They seek peace through 'states' and other institutions. They suggest either improvement in their functioning or creation of alternative institutions, national or international. By suggesting the creation of other institutions, (World Parliament, World Economic Development Council, etc.) they think that they would create an alternative power structure, as these institutions would undermine the role the state as a powerful institution. Nehru-Lohia differ from Gandhi in their approach as they suggest a quite opposite framework for transforming the system. However, they remarkably agree to each other in aims and objectives of creating a just and global order and peace.
India's Contribution to Peace—Studies in Term of New Values

Being a prophet of peace, Gandhi operates at two levels: individual as well as societal. At individual level, he blames a small group of people which operates at the national level for the decision-making. The same group is responsible for malfunctioning of the international society. He appeals to them to give up their greed and lust for power. He wants them to take out 'fear' from their heart, put an end to violence and keep themselves and their nations free. Gandhi urges them to have more faith in themselves than in a system of armament, as weapon can not generate peace. Peace can be generated by a man with confidence in himself.

Thus Gandhi goes one step further than Immanuel Kant to suggest a creation of Pacific Union (confederation) of the sovereign states.

Nehru's entire efforts are directed to avoid the outbreak of the Third World War. Being a practising politician, he suggests norms called, "Panchsheel" so that a deadly game of politics may be regulated and war can atleast be postponed, if not avoided altogether.

Nehru's time was the time of the Cold War politics. It would have led to the Third World War. He strongly preached everywhere and practised, wherever possible, the value of cooperation among the nation-states. He strived for replacement of the politics of confrontationist by the politics of cooperation.
Lohia, being an agitationalist politician, suggests to create unity among the deprived powers and to cultivate political will to confront the big powers. He wants the nonaligned nations to acquire more and more strength to confront their big brothers so that they can yield to the demand of the peripheral powers.

Contribution of Lohia lies in his suggestion of total reorganization of human society based on the principle of 'total efficiency' and not on that of 'maximum efficiency.' In other words, he strongly advocates that the society should be so organized that every individual can develop his/her personality fully without any hitch or hinderence.

The Indian Peace Studies brings out the inadequacies of the nature of international society as well as the mismanagement of international order. The trio of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia strongly advocate the reorganization of the existing human society based on the organizing principles of rationality, cooperation and the dignity of human being.

However idealistic their approach to peace may appear the fact remains that the ultimate triumph of what constitutes and distinguishes human being from other animal - must come to play its role. Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia - in their own way - somewhat unconsciously come very close to what Hobbes, Kant and Grotius had perceived as the eternal clash within the realm of moris physical and mental world and how he has been struggling to liberate himself from the clutches of baser instinct. Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia take that struggle further with a firm conviction to restore natural humanness
to human being by suggesting ways and means of shunning the impact of negative forces. Thus the thesis makes a modest attempt to reconcile the great ideas irrespective of their sources and vindicates that 'the universal man' exists and scholars have to continue to locate him in their own respective milieu and that is what has been the motivating force behind this dissertation.