GLOBAL ORDER AND PEACE: A STUDY OF THE PERSPECTIVES OF
GANDHI, NEHRU AND LOHIA

INTRODUCTION

Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia were neither philosophers, theorists nor system builders. All of them were men of action. As a matter of fact action of any kind is never possible until a theory of some kind is presupposed, truly or falsely. To each of them, actively associated with the struggle for independence, politics was an art realized in action, not a science insisting upon a theory to ground action. Each of them possessed a great and abiding intuitional insight into the nature of Indian and international reality which is valid even today. It is, therefore, impossible to deny that they had any contribution in shaping the tradition of Science of Politics. The main hypothesis of this dissertation is that hitherto an international dimension of their political thinking is neglected. It is presumed here that their reference to the international dimension of the nation-state is not peripheral to their thought system. They have thought deeply and expressed extensively, either orally or through their writings, on the problematique of 'Global Order and Peace' within the parameter of the nation-state system. To date, no academic study in India so far has attempted to reconstruct their thinking into a theoretical framework which would consolidate the notion of international society. This study is a modest attempt to explore research in this direction. Their ideas are available piecemeal scattered over their writings and actions. To understand them and derive concepts from them, they need to be assembled,
assimilated and analysed and the undercurrent need to be discovered. This involves penetrating them beyond the obvious concerns of their programmes of action and uncovering the analytical foundations on which they were based. Only in this way we can hopefully infer the rationale of how they wanted to tackle the contending problems of global order and peace.

The concepts and analysis evolving out of thinking of these political celebrities require to be translated into the vocabulary of contemporary literature. They also need to be related to the conceptual analytical framework of Western thinkers in order to ascertain non-Western, or especially Indian, thinking on peace. Hence, the thinking of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia is scrutinized within the theoretical framework evolved by the Western thinkers: Thomas Hobbes, Immanuel Kant and Hugo Grotius.

Theoretically the fundamental question of all social sciences has remained the same, i.e., the creation of a good life. The corpus of 'International Order' theorizing is very much concerned with the substantive goal of creating conditions for the good life for individual human beings. The main thrust of this dissertation is to analyse the nature of international order, both in terms of theoretical accounts of its working and historical examinations of its operational principles. However, the focus will continuously be upon the nature of international order and its potential for reform and how Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia view it.

The central problem of the world order is related with the causes of war and the conditions of peace. The causes of war are undoubtedly many and
diverse, but the real problem is how to think about war and peace, knowing fully well that the nature of our analysis itself may significantly affect the conclusion of an inquiry. This study, therefore, relate this problem to the nature of international society that Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia had intuitively conceived. It also considers how the world order is maintained or ought to be maintained, not only for the survival of the nation-states, but to promote the "common good" of the mankind on the globe.

These political leaders were significantly active on national and international scene for a considerable time. The prime period of their lives were spent fighting against the British, 'the mightiest empire' and 'the Great Power' of their times. They were successful even to cause the decline of the British Empire. India's independence had set the ball rolling for decolonization process throughout Asia and Africa. Mainly during their active political lives, the two world-wars occurred and the two major international organizations namely the League of Nations and the United Nations emerged to create an alternative world order and peace. They were, thus, witness to many important international events which changed the map of the world and the destiny of millions of people.

The trio of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia was partially educated in European universities. Consequently, they fell under the influence of many world famous writers and scholars and statesmen. While fighting against the British Raj, at home, they took out their own News Papers in order to circulate their reflections on those international events, which caused great and far-fetching effect on the history of international relations.
The rise of Asian power - Japan (1905), the victory of the Communism in Russia (1917) and in China (1948); the rise and fall of Fascism and Nazism in Germany and Italy; the inhuman aspect of Fascism; the massacre of Jews in Germany; the rape of Czechoslovakia; the impotence of England and France against ghastly and cowardly acts of Hitler - all these affected each of them and each had a sharp reaction to those events. To date, no adequate attention has been paid to the international dimension of their thoughts. Infact, the main stream of their thinking was geared towards global order and peace.

No academic study in India attempts to reconstruct this contribution and identify it as a distinctively Indian contribution to the area of peace studies. This study is an exploratory attempt to signify the contribution as bridging a critical gap, however, tentatively, in the Indian contribution to International Relations Studies and Peace Research in particular.

Substantively, all three leaders show the manner in which it may be possible to "think globally and act locally" and "to see the 'macrocsm' in the 'microcosm.' They always view Indian national struggle for independence as a part of the international movement against imperialism and a movement towards the creation of a just global society. They never view India's struggle for freedom in isolation but as a part of the world movement for freedom and equality and for democratizing the international society, then dominated by the imperial powers, viz. England and France.
Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia, in their speeches and writing, nevertheless, react to the international events of their times but basically they were addressing the basic issues of "state" and "society" from international point of view. They were aware of international order within which they were operating. They also knew which agency would maintain international order and so determined to improve or, if not, then even uproot the prevailing unjust and dominant international order.

This study, therefore, is an attempt to work out a perspective evolved by Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia individually regarding the nature and functioning of international society. The problematique of order and peace is always concerned with the nature and functioning of the international society. Hence this study raises some fundamental questions regarding international society and tries to obtain relevant answers from the thinking of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia. The most fundamental question in the study of international relations is, 'what is meant by international society?' and 'how it operates according to Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia?'

The second question addresses to views of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia on the existing order which is the outcome of the nature of international society. Order, however, can not exist in the absence of 'society,' for the latter provide the essential normative framework for relations of any regularity and certainly of the least complexity. The question regarding international order is addressed to three of them to ascertain whether the existing order is viewed by them as progressive or regressive? Progress means irreversible ameliorative change in the existing order. If they were
dissatisfied with the operation of the nation-state system, what type of systemic change they would suggest? Would they really suggest any improvement in the existing international order (or disorder)? What were the main reasons they would have analysed for (dis)order in international society? Finally, this study attempts to find out, whether they suggest any new approach or strategy (which we call distinctly Indian) to transform the existing "society of states" (international order) into a "society of mankind."? (world order). In other words, this theoretical inquiry addresses to their position as regards to: (1) system maintenance?; (2) system change?; or (3) system transformation?

The above theoretical questions are addressed to Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia with a view to finding out what is their conception of "common good," or a "good life" in a global society.

National Society and International Society

There is a dichotomy between politics in domestic society and that in "international society." The main distinguishing factor between the two is their "ends" and the "units" which participate in politics. The end (aim) of participating in politics in international society is basically to survive as a sovereign unit. It is not the people who directly participate in international politics. It is through the unit (actor), i.e., is the 'state.' It is on the basis of this criterion that a distinction is often made between national politics or domestic politics on the one hand and
International politics on the other. The methods prohibited in international politics are fewer than those prohibited in national politics. Methods like direct violence, fraud, and corruption are prohibited by municipal law in national politics. But in case of international politics, war has been permissible in one sense or another as a natural instrument of foreign policy.

Secondly the national law is the basis of national politics, while the basis of international politics is the international law. The national law as a general rule has been more comprehensive and much more effectively enforceable than the international law. Thus national politics has a greater basis of order and a greater degree of regularity than international politics has. In international society one sovereign state threatens the another state and all the states function under constant threat. On the contrary, the threat in national politics is not directly to the survival of a state. The threat is experienced by a group of people who hold power within the state from another group of people who aspire to capture power.

The modes of operation of national society and international society are different. National or domestic society politics is conceived in terms of persuasion, peaceful legislation and administration, and periodic elections especially in democratic countries. In international society, politics deals with sharp ends of power politics i.e. 'use of force,' and 'the threat to use force.' In this sense, international politics and national politics operate at different levels involving different issues,
different goals, and different interests. (The main distinguishing factors are borrowed from a theoretical book written by Mahendra Kumar (ed., 1994) entitled 'Non-violence: Contemporary Issues and Challenges, Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi.') In fact, much of the distinction between domestic and international politics, whether in their subject matter or in the mode of their operation arises from the fundamental reality that within a nation there exists an effective central authority (government) while no effective government operates over nations (Hadley Bull, Anarchical Society).

A domestic society connotes to "civil society" and an "international society" is an embodiment of "state of nature" (of Hobbes)? The basic value of a domestic society is to achieve "good life" and there prevails a consensus on the concept of "good life." In an international society, the basic problem is that of survival of a state. Hence, an international society constantly experiences tension towards achieving the goal of "good life." Western scholars like Hobbes, Kant and Grotius have tried to address their tension in their own way. But in the last chapter an attempt has been made to find out how this problematique (good life) is addressed by Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia in order to resolve this enigmatic tension. As theoretically the most fundamental question of all social sciences has remained the same, that is a creation of good life on their planet.

The international dimensions of the thoughts of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia are not examined in isolation. They are viewed, examined, categorized and related to dominant schools of thought conceptualized as
'Realism,' 'Rationalism' and 'Revolutionism.' They are associated, hence, respectively with the viewpoints of Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), and Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). Conceptualization of international society by each of them, more or less, captures the reality of international relations. They were among the first few western thinkers who coherently think on the issue of international relations and their line of thinking developed and got identified with schools of realism, rationalism and revolutionism respectively. Many other thinkers, lateron, interpreted and reinterpreted their views on the reality of international relations. They became well-known neo-realists, neo-Grotian and neo-Kantian. The views of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia are considered in relation to these established view points. Thus, this study is an attempt to continue this great theoretical discourse on the problematique of international relations by assimilating discourses of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia.

I, as a researcher, acknowledge that the three schools of thought are not exhaustive and exclusive. It is also accepted that many eminent writers and historical personalities do not fit comfortably into any trend or tradition. Inspite of these limitations, the categories of Hobbes, Kant and Grotius are preferred mainly because they provide useful insights into many of the fundamental issues in international relations. While interpreted as analyses of ideal types, the works of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia are illuminating. The classical categories of inquiry, when applied to the international dimension of their thoughts, offer an important insights into the nature and functioning of international society. The preliminary readings of, and on, or Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia convincingly proves me that
they apart from being activists, were visionary thinkers who, in their vision of the world, could stand apart from the common place assumptions of their times. They could conceive alternatives to established ways of doing things in the field of international relations. They urged their contemporaries to move forward in the direction of new and better goals and also suggested, to some extent, practiced means by which those goals may be achieved.

The Chapterization

This study is divided into five chapters: Chapter 1: Theoretical Framework; Chapter 2: Gandhi's Conception of International Society; Chapter 3: Nehru's Conception of International Society; Chapter 4: Lohia's Conception of International Society; and Chapter 5: Conclusion.

The first chapter defines and codifies the three dominant schools of thought in the light of the conception of international society. They are categorized as Realist, Rationalist, and Revolutionary. These western schools of thought are represented chiefly by Hobbes (Machiavelli), Hugo Grotius and Kant. Their views are further divided into two subcategories:

(i) Functioning of the International Society:
Organizing and Operational Principles of International Society.

(ii) Strategy suggested (or not suggested) for transforming international society while ascertaining their views on "good life."
The second, third and fourth chapters discuss the views of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia respectively keeping in view the theoretical categories and subcategories outlined in the first chapter. These chapters conceptualize views of these thinkers' thinkings on the reality of international relations as experienced and reacted to by each of them. Thus, these chapters are structured within the framework of the first chapter. In the concluding chapter, an effort has been made to focus on a comparative framework, their differences from the western thinkers (Hobbes, Kant and Grotius) so that uniqueness of Indian thinking on the problematics of global order and peace may be ascertained. In other words, the originality of the proposed research rests on encapsulating three trends of Indian political activists viz. Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia within the broad spectrum of international relations. In a modest way, the study may be termed as original as far as the comparative perspective of western and Indian thinking is concerned with regard to International Relations.

Methodology

The subject matter of an empirical study is a matter of experience and observation. It is based on findings of a researcher. It may propound a theory - related with the phenomena observed and studied. The problem of methodology arises specially in an empirical study. An empirical research is as such interested in studying a particular phenomenon viz. International Terrorism. On studying it a researcher may evolve an empirical theory out of findings. However, the present study falls in a category of classical tradition of international relations studies.
The classical theory connotes to the tradition of speculation about the relations between states' and about the 'society of states.' According to Martin Wight, the most fundamental question one raises in international theory is 'what is international society?'

Moreover, the classical approach theorizes from philosophy, history and law and it is built on the normative concerns. The classical theory mainly concerns itself, with what R. H. Jackson refers to, as theory about 'good life.' The classical theory differs from the empirical theory mainly on the ground that it makes, descriptive and explanatory statements about the structure, units, processes of international politics transcending time, location, and personality and it does not neglects the normative concerns.

The scholars who are working in the classical tradition define the problematique in terms of the causes of war and the conditions of peace, security, or order. States are regarded as essential actors and, hence, essential units of analysis, while the dominant image of the world is a system of sovereign states, characterized by international anarchy or the absence of centralize authority.

This study attempts to study thoughts of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia within the classical tradition. The dominant paradigm revolves round three basic notions: (i) states recognize no higher authority; (ii) states live in a state of nature; and (iii) resulting security dilemma forces them to continue to live in a state of nature. Thoughts of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia
are scrutinized within this parameter. Hence, the problem of methodology (as being understood in a traditional sense: quantitative or qualitative) does not arise.

This study, nevertheless, is a library study but not at all an arm chair one churning out material based on historical narration. It is not a descriptive study, but an indepth analytical and prescriptive one. Methodologically the study is within the construct of the subject matter viz. two schools representing Western and Eastern thinking. Eastern thinking is basically constructed on 'the concepts derived by intuition,' not necessarily on 'intellection.' Modern science prefers "concepts by intellection," to "the concepts by intuition." It makes increasing use of the concept by intellection, whereas art, music, religion, aesthetics make increasing use of concepts by intuition. For example, there is a basic difference between SATYA (truth) a concept by intuition and truth, a concept of intellection. The former is derived basically from Eastern thinking and it is liable to direct verification of its practioner. While the latter is an empirical 'truth' of modern science and it is open only to indirect verification for confirmation. Thus it creates a dilemma how to study the ideas of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia on international relations, as one has to face two different ontological and epistomological positions. One faces such dilemma in cases when concepts are converted by a thinker for his purpose. For instance, Gandhi, no doubt, accepts certain concepts from Western thinkers like Tolstoy, Thoreau or Ruskin, but he converts them to their equivalents in terms of concepts by intuition to fit them within his own system. Similarly, Nehru's concept of "Panchsheel," derived from
Buddhist tradition is applied to conducting bilateral relations between two nations in international relations.

In order to solve the problem of epistemology, the study, therefore, takes the views of the 'realist,' 'revolutionary' and 'rational' schools of thinking as the base in the light of which thinking of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia are studied. It also relates their concepts to the nature of international society. In the concluding chapter, the positions of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia are scrutinized in order to ascertain as to how far their intuitive based concepts are resulted into intellection orientation. The purpose of this study is not merely to deal with conversion, but to find out in what way India's contribution to the cosmos of international relations in the field of peace research is unique.

Sources

The primary source material is the writings of the thinkers themselves. All three of them were prolific writers as they were educated in Western universities. Especially, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia had even obtained his Ph.D. degree from German University. Autobiography and biographies of Gandhi and Nehru respectively are also considered. The Gandhian and Nehruvian institutes have published anthology of their writings on international relations, which have also been incorporated in the analysis.
The secondary source material on their works (writings) is not adequately available, except a few articles. No adequate attention has been paid to the international dimension of their thoughts. The study is, therefore, much constrained for want of adequate material.

Eventually, the introduction may be summed up with due clarification of the concepts considered in this study viz. 'Order;' 'International Order;' 'World Order;' 'System;' and 'Society.'

Order

The concept of 'order' in the literature of international relations studies is a complex term. It is always understood as antonym of 'disorder.' Thus, it has clear implication of enforcement of law. Hence, in the term law and order it goes together with law. It has thus a legal implication. 'Order' is an asset to a society as it brings 'stability' in its domestic and social spheres. The domestic society is a civil society, which is governed by laws of the land. Order in that context, thus, connotes to the centralized authority. The concept of order in the literature of international relations is used inter-changeably, sometimes as an 'international order' and sometimes as a 'world order.' In the literature of 'world order,' it becomes more dynamic concept as it envisages change on a much larger scale in international relations. It becomes a movement for a just world order and 'order' becomes a value laden terminology.
Especially in this study, the concept of order has been taken both as 'process' and as 'substance.' Order in the sense of 'process' means formal in character. It emphasizes on 'means' rather than on 'ends.' Order in the sense of 'substance' means it is not enough to do things in order (in a systematic way). What is done should be such as to merit the world orderly. Thus the concept of order does not refer to any stratified or systematic arrangement. This thesis presumes that there is some sort of order in the existing nation-state system which is referred to as international order. There is no world order as the international society is not yet composed of humanity as a unified family of man. International order simply refers to the fact that the states (nations) cooperate or inter-act and produce a situation in international relations. This is a prescriptive conception which involves value preference as order itself. Defining 'order' in precise terms would limit the inherent flexibility of the concept of order. The purpose in this thesis is to examine various modes of order as perceived by Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia. And to put it somewhat paradoxically, the fact remains that it is the prevailing state of disorder which stimulates great minds to think of order — thus the concept of order is within the framework of causation — every action good or bad has its cause and effects and order — disorder is no exception.

According to Hoffmann, Order has five meanings in the literature of International Relations: Two of them are purely descriptive viz. Order as any arrangement of reality; and Order as the relations between the parts; two are analytical — partly descriptive and partly normative; viz. order as the minimum condition for existence, and order as the minimum condition for
coexistence. The fifth meaning is purely normative, i.e., order as the condition for the good life. This work takes into account the descriptive as well as prescriptive meanings of 'order,' but eventually attempts to conceptualize the perspectives of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia in light of the fifth and the last conception of order.

**International Order**

This term refers to nation-state system. The states (about 185 as on today) are sole participator, independent, territorially limited and politically organized in international relations. They have their own governments (majority of them are nondemocratic) and they inter-act among themselves. These states (not the people) are involved in conflicts as well as in cooperation. The people who reside within the territory of a state are considered 'citizens' of that state and they have rights and duties within the state only. These rights and duties are not trans-national. Their citizenship is confined to the state only to which they belong and to which they adhere their objectives. Nations pursue their respective national interests by peaceful means (diplomacy) or by resorting to coercive methods, (in overt or covert manner - warfare). They build up their national power by organizing their coercive resources. States are interested more in 'security' than in 'peace.' Some authors believe that states provide the basis of the prevailing pattern of international society. According to Hedley Bull, sovereign states create international order and their discontinuity might destroy the stability of the international system as a whole.
The World Order

The concept of 'World Order' is different from that of 'International Order.' The world order refers to the human society as a whole. This analytical category does not differentiate 'man' amongst citizens. It stands for order in the human society as a whole. It is a wider concept than order amongst sovereign states. It refers to the different principles of organization. The world order exponents deal with the issues and problems of global security and not with those of national security. The final goal is to achieve "human unity" based on the dignity of individual human being. It stands for 'global village.' The world order is 'human centric' and not 'state-centric.' The 'World Order' is more fundamental than International Order' and morally it is prior to international order.

International System and Society

According to Hedley Bull, "A system of states (or international system) is formed when two or more states have sufficient contact between them, and have sufficient impact on one another's decisions, to cause them to behave - at least in some measure - as parts of a whole... A society of states (or international society) exists when a group of states (already forming a system) conscious of certain common interests and common values, form a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another, and share in the working of common institutions."
Lastly, this work does not intend to undertake indepth study of the views of Thomas Hobbes, Immanuel Kant or Grotius, but only to construct a framework of analysis out of their views which impinges upon the aspect of the international relations. The main focus is the views of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia. Their views are studied within the above framework.