This chapter examines international dimension of Nehru's views on international society. The four basic theoretical inquiries addressed to his conception are: (a) how does he conceive the international society and how (dis)order maintained in that society; (b) which strategy he suggests to affect the change in the present (dis)order; (c) how is an individual an important component of international society has to change himself; (d) how the mankind has to transform itself to create an international society of mankind to replace the existing society of states.

Nature and Functioning of International Society: Organizing and Operational Principles of Society

In Nehru's views, international society is primarily composed of nation-state. He gives secondary importance to the people who reside within the boundaries of nation-states. The main focus of Nehru's thinking was the operation of nation-states and their institutions. According to Nehru, the nation-states (system) does not function in isolation. It operates within the global atmosphere. The global atmosphere gives birth to new realities, Nehru called it new civilization, with which the nation-state are not able cope with. Its response is not adequate enough to meet the challenge of
realities. Hence, the objective reality takes over them. The society of nation-state has to take the cognizance of the new forces shaping reality (science, technology, public opinion, internationalism etc.) and needs to accommodate these forces. To Nehru, the basis of nation-states remains nationalism and sovereignty, but their meaning and context has to be changed. Hence, Nehru suggests change in the operational milieu of nation-state so that they should not become dysfunctional or destroy themselves. We will discuss Nehru's suggestions of operational principles.

According to Nehru the nation-states have two basis, viz. nationalism and sovereignty. Nationalism and sovereignty are the backbone on which strength of a nation is organized. They gave them (states) status and a membership in the comity of nations. They earn them a legitimate membership of the international society. If the international society has to continue its survival, Nehru thinks, the force of nationalism has to develop its international dimension giving up its narrow vision. The attribute of sovereignty, no doubt, helps the nation to preserve its autonomy within the comity of nations. But the time has come to modify its absolute character and a nation has to give up a part of its sovereignty if the international society has to survive and, subsequently, to prosper.

**Changing Meaning and Role of Nationalism**

Nehru recognizes the role of nationalism in a nation-state system. He agrees that nationalism is a factor binding people of the sovereign states
together, from within. It is an emotional force within a domestic society. He considers it virtuous too. Nehru attributes certain virtues in nationalism as it contributes "vigour, growth, unity, self esteem to those who ever cared to be guided by it."

To Nehru, nationalism is a good servant and a bad master. On elaborating the strength and weakness of the force of nationalism, Nehru states, "Nationalism, of course, is a curious phenomenon which at a certain stage in a country's history gives life, growth, strength and unity but at the same time, it has tendency to limit one, because one thinks of one's country as something different from the rest of the world.... The result is that the same nationalism which is the symbol of growth for a people becomes a symbol of the cessation of that growth in the mind. Nationalism, when it becomes successful, sometimes goes on spreading in an aggressive way and becomes a danger internationally."

Thus, Nehru recognizes the inherent strength and weaknesses of the force of nationalism and advocates some sort of balance between the two inherent tendencies of nationalism. He cautions that if some measures are not taken the goodness of it (force of nationalism) will turn into evil. He wrote, ".... some kind of balance must be found. Otherwise something that was good can turn into evil."

While comparing nationalism with internationalism Nehru agrees with those who believe that internationalism is a thing of future, and nationalism must fade away. What worries Nehru is that whenever a country...
or the world faces a crisis (war) nationalism becomes immediately dominant. In time of war, people turn to nationalism immediately. Every country that was involved in the Second World War became tremendously nationalistic. Nationalist framework did provide sense of security to states but in the process each nation was seeking security under its own umbrella. This individualist notion of nationalism divided states and internationalism could never become a genuine concern and force or states.

Nehru visualizes two tendencies namely nationalism and internationalism. According to him both these develop simultaneously in the international society. Nehru sees internationalism in the activities of proletarian elements of the world. It develops perhaps more significantly in the realm of finance, trade, and commerce. Nehru recognizes the growth of internationalism in the development of science, new commerce, the radio and cinema etc.

Hence, to Nehru problem is how to reconcile these two conflicting conceptions - nationalism and internationalism. Nehru write, "Nationalism obviously is something deep down in human nature. We can not uproot it and there is no reason why we should try to uproot it, because nationalism ultimately depends on all that is best in us." Speaking on another occasion he once said, "On the other hand internationalism is not only good but essential in the world today. And yet some kind of vague internationalism without definite contacts and bonds with nationalism is almost an airy nothing. How to combine the two?"
It seems Nehru eventually arrives at a conclusion that internationalism as evolving with the passage of time has yet to acquire a concrete shape. While nationalism is a concrete thing. It is binding people and giving them identity. Since nationalism is an integral part of the people - who have already achieved nationhood - it is to stay side by side with a modern state.

Nehru suggests ways and means to combine the two. He suggests that it should be freed from imperialism and racialism and made subject to rationalism. If this is done nationalism can become a building bloc of a future peaceful global order and a stable international society can be created out of it.

In Nehru's view, the nationalism is mixed with imperialism and racialism. It teaches exploitation of the powerless by powerful nations. To Nehru, a true international order can emerge provided the exploitation of the weak and the powerless by the powerful comes to end. He firmly believes that the problem of racialism is mixed with nationalism. This problem, therefore, needs to be solved urgently. It should be solved in such a way that it leaves no hatred behind which can embitters relations between nations.

Even if nationalism is freed from imperialism as well as from racialism, Nehru still holds it to be narrow, unless it is subject to rationalism. In order to evolve a rational nationalism, one must keep one thing in mind that nations and their nationalism are not ends in
themselves. He wants nations to grow out of their narrow grooves of thought and action, and pay attention to the synthesis between national interest and international interest. Being a pragmatic idealist, he does not mind giving primacy to the national interest by keeping in mind the interdependence of states and remembering that the welfare of one's own state is intertwined with the welfare of the whole world community. According to him this is not narrowness. He thus, advocates a balance between nationalism and internationalism. The primacy of national interest is the rule for Nehru but also he wants that it must be synchronized with the international interest. This requires promoting maximum cooperation between nations. The nation-state should not operate only on the basis of nationalism if it wants to survive, but at the same time each nation has had to take into account the interests of the other nations as well. The nation-states unite the people living within their territory in terms of the similarities of their problems and aspirations.

Nehru firmly believes that nationalism, devoid of internationalism, would not serve the purpose. Now the time has come, due to the development of science and technology, that either nations can survive or perish jointly in the atomic age. Secondly, nation-states have become interdependent economically and otherwise. Hence, whatever problems were considered national yesterday have become global problems today.

Nehru discards modern realism based on the ideas of Machiavelli (and Hobbes). Nehru believes that Machiavelli taught us to look upon 'state' as "a separate thing" as if it is distinctly a separate part of the society of
nations. He does not teach us to look at one's national interest in terms of the larger good of the world.

All the major problems man face today are global problems. Even local problems are now tied up with "dozens and dozens of other questions that agitate the world. To him, there is nothing like Indian, Asian, European problems. Virtually all problems are global and they can be solved only on a world scale. Hence, Nehru advocates to teaching 'world history' to the students in the school and colleges along with the history of an individual's country. The history of one country cannot be understood without examining it in the international context, a view Nehru holds. Identity of the people does matter in the creation of nation-state, but having served its purpose (sense of physical and emotional belonging, in order to keep pace with the changing time, it is essential to have a much wider perspective of nation - a perspective which can accommodate others.

Competition

Being the Prime Minister as well as the Foreign Minister of India, at one time, Nehru was operating India's foreign policy within the international system. But he was not satisfied the way the sovereign states were operating. According to him it would breed violence and war. It would vulgarize people all over the world. The nation-state system he opines, makes nations brutal in thought, speech and action. It encourages competition instead of cooperation among them. Nehru thinks that an old
order based on competition, need to be replaced by a new order based on cooperation. He does not advocate cooperation of two or more powerful nations for exploitation, or some regional cooperation. If it happens, Nehru believes it will result in a struggle for power, and the world will be worse off than it was before. He firmly maintains that the basic need is global cooperation, and the idea of one world should be kept paramount.

For nations it is imperative to learn to tolerate, and to peacefully coexist resulting in the extension of an idea of national into international relations. "It means an attitude of live and let live and a belief in the power of example and persuasion rather than in arbitrament by force. This quotation of Nehru clarifies that he clearly distinguishes national life (society) from international society. He advocates that as communities tolerate each other within the nation, the nation must learn to tolerate each other (as individual state) within global society so that the peaceful coexistence between the nations can be ensured. The nation-state has only to emulate their own example.

Nehru argues that if we look at the problems in the global context, there was no real conflict between the basic national interests of states. But they give priorities to their problems differently. Hence their perceptions of national interests differ. This varied scheme of priorities make it hard for states to cooperate smoothly. The great need, therefore, to day is that nation-state system should United Nations of the world for some meaningful form of cooperation.
In economic sphere too, Nehru argues underdeveloped nations of the third world are dragged on to the path of progress. They must be helped to rise. Only by helping them to rise, all humanity would rise with them. Nehru believes that if one part of the world goes down economically, the entire world will be affected adversely by it. Hence, rich nations should help the poor, not out of generosity, but out of enlightened self-interest.

In Nehru's views, international cooperation means international tolerance. We are today, by and large, sufficiently civilized in the context of our national communities to tolerate and regard others as the basis of communal life within our national societies. Without it, national groups and, certainly democratic institutions, can not survive.

Nehru does not question the rationale of the emergence of the nation-states system. He does not even object to its not being dynamic with the changing time and circumstances. It was status-quoist. Those states which have the privilege of being a part of the Westphalia system have adopted somewhat a fragmented view of the world. The European states have the advantage of at least 300 years in terms of their sovereign independent statehood. They have been perpetuating economic imperialism by greater cooperation among themselves. This has produced greater cooperation within the area of autarchy, but autarchy has ultimately created isolation from the rest of the world. Nehru says, "I do not believe in a narrow autarchy. But the internationalism that I look forward to is not one of common
subjection, imposed from above but a union and a cooperation of free nations for the common good. It is this kind of world order that will bring peace and progress to mankind.

As we saw earlier, Nehru stands for nation-state system (and its continuation) but his main thrust is to improve the status-quoist system. The Westphalian system has been confined to only Western Europe. In other words, Nehru once demanded the imperialist powers to free Afro-Asian nations and to assign them a status of sovereign independent nations. He advocates the expansion of nation-state system throughout the globe. Nehru's main objective in advocating freedom for every country including India was, in the words of Professor A. P. Rana, "the extension of the Western Westphalia to the rest of the World." The Western Westphalia freed the Western European states from the Roman Empire as well as from the overlordship of the Church authority in seventeenth century. In the same way Nehru wanted that the Western Powers should free all the nations of Asia and Africa from its subjugation. While referring to this demand of Nehru, Professor A. P. Rana, calls it "Eastern Westphalia." Thus Nehru pleaded for the universalization of the international society. The central point in the formation of the present modern state system is the liberation of states. States which were under some form of subjugation. Eastern Westphalia will complete the circle by releasing remaining states from subjugation.

Before 1950s, Nehru was advocating the universalization of international society and after 1950s, he was advocating democratization of
the international society. The decolonization process which started in late forties and fifties, had given birth to many small sovereign states. But they were not treated equally. They were not given chance to participate in the decision-making process at global level. He was committed to the democratization of international society. It was evident in his opposition to any kind of hegemonic internationalism. Nehru believed that if they were not granted an equal status in the comity of nations, he wrote, "small states in the world of tomorrow have no future in store and they are sure to be reduced to the satellite states..." Having this conviction in mind, he advocated a free and equal status of every nations, small or big in the international institutions like the United Nations Organization (UNO) or the British commonwealth. Unless it is done, in Nehru's views, no durable international order can be created.

Power Politics

Nehru knew that the main driving force of the three hundred year old sovereign state system was power-politics. He was also aware of the changing nature of power-politics. He, therefore, advocated a different sort of game of power politics mainly based on diplomacy. With the advent of the weapon system of mass destruction and the enlightened public opinion demanding higher standard of living, as Nehru believes, these new forces have created new demand on the nation-states system.
According to Nehru, after the Second World War, the international relations no longer remained the old game of chess. It was no longer a game in which nations could come together for some territorial possession or some other gain. Many new factors and actors emerged on the world stage that made relations among state something quite different from what they had been. It accentuated the need for a quite different inter-state system. The new factor of public opinion on a mass scale demanded a higher standard of living and better condition for the people from the government of a country. The foreign policies of the governments today, therefore, are being determined by this demand everywhere.

While commenting on the likely impact of the atomic weapons on international relations, Nehru said that the new weapon system had changed the character of the game of power politics. The notion of 'power for power's sake' has become out of date. The nuclear weapons changed the tone and the texture of international politics. Hence, according to the need of hour was a new international order. He advocated a new order which could accommodate the twin desires of the masses: not to have large scale suicidal war; and desire for a higher standard of living.

Nehru looks at the game of power politics as an ephemeral historical accident and that it can be totally abolished. He firmly believes that power politics can be moderated, the degree of hostility can be decreased, the diplomacy of accommodation can be practiced within the general framework of power. He declares faith in man. Man's attitudes, institutions and methods can be improved even if they can not be perfected. It needs to
be borne in mind that Nehruvian approach does not in reality forbid the use of power politics so long man's attitude, institutions and methods do not change. Nehru, however, "forbids the use of only those types of power that involve physical violence and that are unworkable without an atmosphere of hostility. All other types of power - economic, psychological, and moral - are permissible provided they are used according to certain guiding principles such as honesty, truth and so on." Nehru, thus, does not believe that power politics is inherent in the nature of organized society, hence, (in Nehru's views) it can be modified and ultimately abolished.

Nehru does not make any suggestion as to how power of non-violence can be applied in international relations although he had seen its meaningful application in the national struggle. He is, however, in favour of economic sanction to check aggressor states. And he is also in favour of applying the force of world public opinion. He does not have objection to the technique of foreign aid and the dissemination of information to foreign peoples provided certain rules are followed.

Nehruvian approach of power politics means to abandon military alliance and military power in the interest of the world. However, he is in favour of keeping it intact for use in emergency. No nation can brandish it, as is a usual custom to support her foreign policy. Simultaneously, a nation has to abandon the age old practice of keeping her own people united and loyal to it by inappropriate campaign of portraying foreign states as enemies and spreading hatred against them.
Now the problem arises, if military power is permitted to use in emergency, how much of it a nation can keep? Nehru seems to have the following answer: (i) nation needs power enough to defeat an attacker, cost of attack should be so high and its reward so low that attack will not be worth; (ii) the weakening of a state's military power might be offset automatically by the strengthening of some other forms of power, i.e., its moral and psychological influence will increase. It is also possible that transferring money from military programme to economic and social betterment might increase her economic and social influence. In propounding this thesis Nehru seems to presume that "much of the military power now existing has proved to be useless in many situations because no one dares to use it."

To sum up, Nehru does not advocate power-politics backed by weapons. To him, the days of military power are over as the atomic weapons can't be used. Hence, he advocates non-military power, that is, economic power. The power of purse will bring social improvement (internally) as well as political influence vis-a-vis other nations.

Being a professional politician and a seasoned statesman, Nehru knew that the road to war goes through conflicting perceptions which is unavoidable. According to him, if perception is corrected, conflicts can also be resolved to everyone's advantage. Nehru thinks there are really no basis for conflicts among either individuals or states. What he pleads is a dialogue between the parties in dispute in a climate of mutual good will and benefit. The stoics school of thought has always believed that if all
individuals and states could discover their real interests they would all live in harmony. Nehru pleads that this should be one of the organizing principles of international order.

Nehru seems to condemn the methods which are used in the existing international order. They are the method of violence, force, crusading, organizing alliances and counter alliances etc. All these methods are implied in the term power-politics. Nehru outright rejects that form of power-politics of the existing international order.

Nehru has formed, what A. P. Rana calls, "a menacing view to power politics and the balance of power." Nehru thinks that the theory of balance of power inevitably leads to conflict and war.

Nehru rejects the concept of foreign policy based on the traditional concept of power-politics. In his opinion, the present reality of international politics, does not take us anywhere. On the contrary, it works against the true national interest in the long run. This type of reality degrades morality and justice to the secondary consideration. In context of new civilization, major objective of foreign policy should not be only power. It must promote values like justice, fairness and tolerance. The power (political) approach, in Nehru's views, put the aspirations, idealism and morality of the masses in the background.
The current nation-states system, Nehru views, which is based on the principles of competition, conflict and exploitation is further buttressed by the different political ideologies which they prescribe not only for themselves but for other nations too. A nation adopts a particular ideology, viz. Fascism, Nazism, Capitalism, or Communism, for their emancipation. But it also wants to impose its ideology on other nation-state. Ideologies have become a tool in the hands of nation-states for the game of power-politics. It divides nations and never creates a climate of cooperation among them. It should be noted that Nehru did not blame people for adopting those ideologies. He blames different conflicting systems which different ideologies create in international relations as none of the existing ideologies, was Capitalism, Fascism (Nazism) or Communism can unite nation-state. They do not respond to the new realities. He, therefore, advocates an ideology of democratic socialism which can address the new politico-economic reality and help to create a new and stable world order. Let us examine Nehru's views on different ideologies one by one. Any ideology which dehumanizes man and his fellow human beings as mere means to ends may not survive long. Such ideologies have seeds of their own destruction. Nehru's apprehension were vindicated when Nazism and Fascism collapsed. Probably, the same may be the fate communism might have to meet.

The Germans, Japanese and Italians were living under the Fascist system which impelled them to behave as they did. According to Nehru, it is a system which denies freedom and is based on violence and aggression.
Nehru, therefore, refuses to condemn individual German or Japanese, for the horrors the systems and caused in the world. To him, whether an individual, German or Japanese is good or bad is irrelevant, for 'evil lies in the system.' Nehru does not have faith in the Fascist as a system as it has not intention to solve the global problems of exploitation, poverty and misery. On the contrary, it adds to the problems.

Nehru keeps a soft corner for Marxism and appreciates the Russian experiment with Marxism. One aspect of Marxism which impressed him is its historical interpretation of the forces of the world history.

Economic System

Nehru held the view that it was capitalism which was largely responsible for the excessive nationalism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The capitalistic system is responsible also for modern imperialism as it divides nations. Modern technological development can evolve a global economy which would cater to the needs of the mankind properly. But the modern capitalism comes in the way and does not allow emergence of a global economic system based on justice. It happens because the vested interests that controlled the governments of various capitalist nations rejected the idea of internationalism. On the contrary, they have promoted economic nationalism, hence, industrialized nations have become more intense rivals than ever before. According to Nehru, the capitalistic system has shown no capacity to adjust to the new era of science.
Nehru, therefore, wants capitalism to make way in favour of socialism which stands at the threshold carrying idea of international economic cooperation. The contention is that capitalism did not modify itself according to the growing impact of science. Similarly, Communism did not adopt itself to the growing demands of consumernism which rest on market, competition, investment and lack of state control. It is in this content one may agree that Nehru looked for middle path of socialism where the best of both the systems, (capitalism and Communism) may be incorporated (Private and Public Sectors).

Nehru agrees fully with Marx's perception of history as a struggle between the few who own the means of production and the large masses of who own nothing. He never accepts Marx uncritically. He finally comes to the conclusion that Marxism might have done some good to the Russian society in defeating the old forces of feudalism, imperialism and colonialism, but Marxism as a comprehensive and systematic philosophy of society is 'out of date.'

Nehru has special attraction for democratic system and, hence, advocated democracy for independent India. But he was disillusioned with the Western democracies when they started appeasing the fascist forces. He feared that the communist forces will win and will take over and dominate the world. Nehru was further disappointed when the democracies showed no sign of fighting for a new order. Those like England, France etc. rather fought to maintain the old worn-out order of the past-feudalism, colonialism, etc.
A year after the end of the Second World War, Nehru reiterated his charge that the allies had not fought the war to produce a new civilization. The Western democracies just expressed lip sympathy to democracy, freedom and peace as they refused to accelerate the process of decolonization.

With the advent of the Cold War (1950s), Nehru was disillusioned with democracy in England, France and the USA when he saw that the wartime allies were again preparing for a new war instead of a new world order. To him, it was a further evidence that the people of the world were betrayed. The Allied powers stood and fought in the name of democracy against fascism. But on winning the war, they were reluctant to give up their colonies. They had procured the support of the colonized people during the war. They had told them that they were fighting for the survival of democracy. They had also assured them that they would be granted freedom, if they would win. Nehru felt betrayed when he saw no chance of assurances coming true.

Economic System

In 1930s, the laissez-faire type of capitalism was prevalent. Nehru thought that this type of capitalism would disappear. This old type of capitalism, to him, was "a kind of luxury system for well-to-do nations." According to him, the laissez-faire type of capitalism proved that it had its own limitations and disabilities. It failed to cope with the challenge
of the great depression of 1930s. The days of capitalism were over and whatever remnant of it were left, required to be modified by greater planning and control as the Russian had done it successfully.

Nehru, therefore, convincingly, advocates to replace capitalism by socialism. To him, socialism is more than an economic doctrine. It was a philosophy of life. He writes, "I see no way of ending the poverty, the vast unemployment, the degradation and the subjection of the Indian people. Except through socialism. That involves vast and revolutionary changes in our political and social structure, the ending of vested interests in land and industry, as well as the feudal autocratic Indian states system. That means the ending of private property, except in a restricted sense, and the replacement of the present profit system by a higher ideal of cooperative service. It means ultimately a change in our instincts and habits and desires. In short, it means a new civilization, radically different from the present capitalist order.

The quotation clearly indicates Nehru's strong conviction in favour of socialism which is beyond the tenets of mere economic salvation - it could usher in a new civilization in the world.

While addressing the All India Congress committee on 4th January 1957, he defined the democratic socialism as follows:

1. The substitution of cooperation in place of acquisitiveness;
2. Equal opportunity for development of personality to every one; and
3. The democratic process of peaceful and legitimate methods to achieve these two goals.
In short, to Nehru, socialism with human face was more acceptable rather than under the cover of more authoritarian governance. The new civilization was required to discard old systems and to create a new political, economic and social systems based on equality, progress, science, cooperation and freedom.

Nehru on War

Nehru ascribes different causes to different types of war. But basically he believes that the root cause of any war is psychological in nature. Nations, like individuals, fear each other, and live in constant insecurity. The most fundamental cause of war, to Nehru, not lust for power, greed etc., but 'fear' of each other. It breeds war within the international society. Secondly, Nehru believes that the wars break out because existing institutions fail to cope with the new reality or situation. The people demand a new order based on justice, and the nation-states fail to respond to it. This results into a warfare. The causes of war, therefore, keep changing according to the period of history. Once upon a time in history, religion and kings were generating order in society, but when they lost their hold wars were fought in the name of religion. In some period wars were essentially religious or dynastic in nature.

In Nehru's view, in his time wars were essentially economic or political in nature. The old order was based on imperialism, colonialism, racialism and capitalism hence it was responsible for the outbreak of wars, especially the first world war.
Nehru compares capitalism with modern imperialism and holds it chiefly responsible for the modern war. By narrating a history of imperialism Nehru ascertains how and why modern imperialism caused wars. In his letters (1933) to his daughter, Indira (1933), he describes three kinds of imperialism: crude, subtle and perfect. In a crude form of imperialism, the victorious powers annex both the conquered land and its peoples, making them slaves. In a subtle form, the imperialists annex only the conquered land but the people are not enslaved. In this form, people are exploited by various strategies taxation, trade controls etc. Britishers applied such exploitative strategies in India before the First World War. The third type of imperialism, according to Nehru, is the perfect one as it is invisible by its very nature. It is noticed slowly by people and, hence, their resentment against a foreign power groups slowly. This is sheer economic imperialism popularly known as capitalism. In this form of capitalism, the dominant country (viz. USA in Latin America) is interested only in economic sphere, i.e. only in profit. They are interested only in controlling the economy of a nation. Nehru firmly maintains that whatever might be the form of imperialism, the common characteristic is exploitation of one group of people by the other.

Imperialism gave birth to two historical situations, the colonies of the imperialists power remained backward and exploited. This made people conscious against the dominant imperialists powers. They got united under the force of nationalism to throw away imperialists power. The underdeveloped and backward people started challenging the basis of old order and demanded a new political and economic order based on justice.
This situation disturbed the old 'peaceful equilibrium' and gave birth to an explosive situation. Secondly, the other independent countries like, Germany, Italy and Japan united under fascist forces and started challenging the imperialist powers like, the UK, France, and the USA. The Fascists started challenging them by military means and thus the seeds of the Second World War were sown. Nehru blamed England and France for not heeding advice of the President Wilson for the creation of a just world order based on decolonization, universal democracy, total disarmament and the collective security system. But they (England and France refused to ignored the advice of Wilson. Hence the old order continued.

Nehru on Peace Treaties

The treaty of Versailles, according to Nehru, preserved the old order and gave extension of life to that outdated order. Referring to Versailles treaty, he writes, "We have lived in this era of Versailles treaty, these twenty years and each succeeding year has brought war and revolution, horror and misery to the peoples of the world. And yet the old guard politicians who had brought the war and made this peace continued in command and stuck complacently to their old ways which had so often brought disaster...." The dominating fact in the world today is the break up of the old order, both political and economic, and these broken eggs can not be put together again. The British Empire, representing this dying order, will pass away, and the present economic system will give place to another." The rise of Mussolini in Italy and Hitler in Germany, was the
result of, according to Nehru, the British refusal to accept the forces of change which would usher in a new equitable world order. Preservation of status-quo and refusal to satisfy the aspirations of the Fascism — these two finally led the world to conflict. Even after the Second World War, to Nehru's disappointment, the trend remain the same. Nehru reiterated that the allies had fought the (second) war not to produce a new civilization. The Western democracies just expressed lip sympathy to democracy, freedom and peace.

With the advent of the Cold War, Nehru got disillusioned with democracy when he saw that the wartime allies were again preparing for a new war instead of trying for a new world order. The dominant theme of the cold war was militarism. Nehru's apprehension was that the Cold War would perpetuate the cycle of exploitation in yet another form — neocolonialism. The emerging Third World countries would be subjugated under the dominance of the developed countries for reason of economic assistance and other help. They (the Third World) also had the legacy of conflicts which would further provide an opportunity to USA and other western powers to divide them and supply them with weapons and, in turn, seek their dependence. These relations would be motivated purely by economic and military consideration. The developed world would take the advantage of resources which the Third World could not exploit due to lack of technology and expertise such — dependence would facilitate the military needs of the cold warriors at the cost of the Third World.
With the end of colonialism and racialism, Nehru perceives, raising of the living standards of people in underdeveloped countries and the promotion of the temper of peace in as wide an area as possible will help to tackle the roots of conflict.

Nehru is convinced that colonialism and imperialism were stumbling blocks to world peace. The great powers have a tendency to influence, coerce and dominate over small powers. To Nehru, imperialism was a phase of capitalism. He argues that imperialism has an inherent characteristic of capitalism. Nehru derives lessons from history that imperialism breeds unhealthy competition which results in war among the powers. Peace "can only come when the causes of war are removed. So long as there is the domination of one country over another, or the exploitation of one class by another there will always be to subvert the existing order and no stable equilibrium can endure. Out of imperialism and capitalism peace can never come." To Nehru, a true international order can emerge provided the exploitation of the weak and the powerless by the powerful comes to an end. The abject poverty and untold misery of humankind must be abolished. There can never be stability and peace so long as the vast majority of the human race do not secure freedom from want.

Nehru thinks that it is not only economic exploitation but economic backwardness which undermines the cause of peace.
Racialism

Racialism is a threat to world peace. Nehru believes in the dignity of man and equality of all human beings, irrespective of their racial origin. According to him, racial discrimination is bound to lead to strife and conflicts because it continues to challenge the self-respect of a vast number of people in the world. Peace in the world can not be maintained if the bulk of humanity in the third world is enslaved and oppressed.

Nehru firmly believes that if the problem of racial discrimination is not solved in time, it will lead to disasters of the first magnitude as the problem of racialism is mixed with nationalism. This problem, therefore, needs to be solved urgently. It should be solved in such a way that it should leave hatred behind which may embitter relations between the nations. Appealing on humanitarian ground Nehru writes, "We have to recognize, of course, that, there are countries in this world which are highly developed in many ways, others less developed. They are not all the same, but all of them are human beings, trying to live with dignity of man not putting up with anything else. That is certain."

For Nehru the dignity of human being is a basic thing. If it is not preserved peace can never be maintained. The abolition of the racial discrimination will be a step in the direction of evolving a peaceful order.
Primarily, the nation-state system occupies the mind of Nehru and he wants to reach to the people through the nation-states. But he does not neglect the role an individual can play in bringing about a new global order. The nation-states system and the individual are parts of the atmosphere composed of psychological, social, political and economic forces. They, unknowingly, interact with these forces. These forces are given birth by, what Nehru calls the new civilization. The new civilization is based on the forces of science, technology and rationalism. They have changed the contexts of human life on the earth. According to Nehru, the new civilization has potential to solve the age-old problems of poverty, ignorance, and exploitation. With the help of technology and science everyone on the earth could be fed and granted a decent way of living. It is capable of producing a different kind of world, a new civilization. In order to create a new world order, the forces of new civilization need to be understood and be utilized for the welfare of the mankind. In order to create a new world order, in Nehru's views the individual needs to be changed. The individual has to understand the forces of science and technology, and accordingly, he has to change his attitude as well as his behaviour.

Nehru has a pessimistic view of human nature. However, his pessimism is not like that of Hobbes. He grants that man is basically passive but he is capable of change if he so decides. According to him, man by birth is not good or bad. He is born with neutral nature. His attitudes and
behaviour are later on conditioned and determined by the cultural environment within which he is born and reared. He, therefore, stands for change in environmental milieu along with individual. He wants that the two processes should go together. In a letter to his daughter, Indira Gandhi, (1933), he writes about human nature, "man, in spite of his great and vaunted progress, is still very unpleasant and selfish animal."

Nehru desires to create a "new man" which should be rationale, fearless, and have tolerance. If he becomes like that he will automatically be cooperative and self-disciplined.

Rationalism

Rationalism of Nehru is directly connected with the spirit of scientific inquiry. He does not want people to rely on the authority and faith of religion, which have enchained their minds in superstition, myth, magic and dogmas. He once told Michael Breacher that "no country or people who are slave to dogma," can progress. Science is never dogmatized. It does not require acceptance, or faith, or obedience to authority. Science calls for doubting, questioning, and rational inquiry. Science has respect for the human mind and is tolerant of varying opinions.

Nehru does not want mere application of science in the name of scientist and rationalist. He wants the acceptance of scientific approach as a way of life. He wanted a new civilization composed of men who are
critical in their thinking. The scientific man will refuse to accept things without testing, without trial, as well as he must be in an everlasting search for new knowledge. To him, mere agreement without critical thinking is meaningless.

Yet Nehru cautions that by mere adopting scientific approach man will not be able to solve all his problems. He, therefore, wants science to be allied with philosophy. He advocates democracy and discards authoritarianism because democracy is based on rationalism while authoritarianism was based on dogma. Democratic search for truth is the very things authoritarianism forbids. Secondly the individual freedom is ensured and encouraged by rationalism and scientism. He loves a world based on reason and science as he thinks that only through these approaches, the problems of misery and ignorance of the masses an be solved.

Fear

According to Nehru the major obstacle to a rational civilization and a rational system of world order is great psychological fixation of fear. It is fear, that is the most basic threat to the survival of the modern world. Fear perverts the behaviour of both individuals and nations. Nations fear nations. The rich fear the poor and blocs of states fear other blocs. The East fears the West and West fears the East. The entire atmosphere of the world is soaked in fear. Fear forbids the use of logic. It reverts men into barbarism, forgetting all civilization they have learned. Fear is the cause
of greater tragedies. It is also the cause of more intense fear. The NATO has been created and Germany has been rearmed by the West because of the fear of communism taking over the world.

Nehru argues that man's primary difficulty is psychological. The root cause of many difficulties in society is rooted deep in human psyche which is obsessed with fear complex. The first step to be taken to resolve conflict is to change that attitude. The fear complex exists primarily because men attempt to achieve their goals by wrong means. They literally frighten their fellow men. The global climate of fear evident in the world is man-made. If it can be removed the world order based on justice and non-violence can be restored.

Tolerance

The second virtue Nehru wants people to imbibe with is the habit of tolerance. People should be tolerant of each others' ideas, ideologies, ways of life and religions and so on. The best life is a life surrounded by a veritable kaleidoscope of behaviour, institutions, systems, ideologies, and practices.

A major cause of intolerance, to Nehru, is that people too often confuse the superficial differences among people with basic differences. The differences in ways of eating, drinking and dressing are superficial differences and not basic in nature. In fact, most men are similar in their
basic characteristics, that they have more or less the same urges, the same desires, and everyone, except few, wants peace in the world. He does not want trouble. He wants to live this peaceful domestic life. Thus basic urges and thoughts of all are more or less alike.

The superficial differences produce the terrible fear of one people for another. They fear the unknown and they misunderstand them. This repeatedly produces conflicts. Nehru thinks that the differences were essential for a satisfactory world society. Diversity is a good teacher, he argues. By tolerating differences in states and people, men learn much from each other, even from those with whom they disagree; and that contributes to the progress of all society.

Tolerance is essential for peace. Nehru says, if we really want to avoid war, we have to learn to tolerate much that we do not like and refrain from interfering in each others' affairs. Otherwise peace is impossible. According to Nehru, tolerant people are not aggressive and nor do they try to impose their views or way of life on other peoples-nations.

To Nehru, tolerance is not limitless virtue. Sometimes there emerges in international society an ideology, a government, or a situation that can not be tolerated. A case in point is Fascism based on aggression and violence. It could not be tolerated by the community of nations. It is dangerous for other nation's survival. In that, intervention is justified.
This is an exception. In Nehru's design of the world order, tolerance is the highest virtue for every individual, community, group or a nation.

Nehru's Strategy for 'Change'

Nehru advocates and tries personally to bring about changes in the nation-state system as well as in the individual. Hence, we need to look at Nehru's philosophy of change one by one, in the following pages.

Nation-State System

Nehru does not favor doing away with the nation-state system per se. He wants to maintain the nation-state system but he is not in favor of the way in which the system is operating. He, therefore, suggests new ways and means for its operation as well as he seeks to bring about changes in the environment within which it is operating. Accordingly he suggested that the nation-state system can not function in isolation. The system operates through the environment. Now the issue is what to change? The nation-states system or the environment in which it has to operate? Nehru provides a clear answer. He favours the change both in environment and in the nation state system. The nation-state system has its origin in history. It is almost three hundred years old. So far it has shown resilience and not yet outgrown its utility. It is functional, hence it can not be uprooted overnight. But Nehru thinks its operational milieu could be changed hence he suggests changes in psychological atmosphere from that permeated
Panchsheel: A Code of Conduct for Nation-State System

With the advent of the Westphalia system of nation-state, some 'rules of the game' emerged for the maintenance of international order. By these rules the nation-state had to regulate their conduct. These type of regulatory principles include general norm of behaviour. These rules evolved as a result of formal and informal understanding, are treated in the 'spirit' of agreements, different kind of tacit understanding. Their shared feature is that they guide the conduct of states in their relations to each other. They also help to prevent conflict and facilitate cooperation. From 1648 to 1945, these normative principles functioned, evolved, decayed, maintained and communicated until the advent of the age of balance of terror.

In the age of nuclear terror, particularly during the period of the Cold War, Nehru thought that a new code of conduct was necessary to evolve. Hence, converted the ethical principles—Panchsheel—of Lord Buddha into the political principles in order to conduct the game of power-politics in international field in later half of this century.
Panchsheel of Nehru provides a common framework within which the modern sovereign nation-state system with a nuclear teeth can conduct their relation so that the most feared nuclear war can be averted. They are:

1. mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty;
2. mutual nonaggression;
3. mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs;
4. equality and mutual benefit; and
5. peaceful coexistence.

These principles of 'Panchsheel' are promising good conduct in the interest of progress, prosperity and peace to the nations of the world. Nehru opines that if these principles are accepted they will wipe out hatred, distrust, insecurity and mutual antagonism from the body politics of international relations. In fact, Panchsheel is a code of conduct for the nations of the world in order to 'live and let live' in this most dangerous world.

Panchsheel subscribes good conduct on the part of the participators in the game of politics. Needless to say it is that good conduct is essential for one's amicable and friendly relationship with other nations. These principles will remove fear while conducting relations, will keep violence at bay and will promise that sovereignty of each nation will remain intact. Panchsheel is free from dogma and other ideologies and preserve freedom for those who uphold them. In the background of the Cold War intensely fought, Nehru offered tolerance, cooperation and respect for each other's way of life, views, and outlooks. Nehru's was a non-dogmatic approach to the world peace. Panchsheel advocates a positive philosophy of peace.
From a common place point of view, the Panchsheel seems to be a simple idea but they were formulated by taking into account the reality of international politics. As they are based on the existing state-centric paradigm of international relations, they are not revolutionary in nature but propounds to improve the international system. The principles of Panchsheel embodies the 'rationality' of West as well 'wisdom' of the East. On the whole, Panchsheel advocates a positive philosophy of peace.

World Federation Through the United Nations Organization (UNO)

Nehru always thought that the world government would be the ideal institution to maintain peace. However, a distant ideal it may be it would be useful to keep this ideal in mind while working, and modifying existing social and political institutions.

He, therefore, suggests to turn the UNO into the world government as it is better placed and better organized than the League of Nations. Unlike the League, the UNO has universal representation. To Nehru, what is necessary to change is not the system of Veto powers and other procedures of the UNO, but the world as a whole must change. This means all the nations must change and people all over the world must change. We must change and the attitude 'today is the same as yesterday and tomorrow will not differ greatly' - be given up. Nations like individuals, must learn to think of their freedom and independence in terms of the world and global cooperation because "the days of isolated national existence are past beyond recall."
Nehru hoped that the UNO could bring all nations together to serve as a commonwealth of nations, where every member state would give up that part of freedom which is necessary for international cooperation. Nehru wants the UN to serve as an 'umpire' to check the misbehaviour or interference with other countries. He resisted all attempts to reduce the world body into a forum to serve the interests of the power blocs. The world was so divided by different ideologies and military blocs, that he hoped that the UNO could make cooperation possible. Such cooperation among countries with "divergent political and economic systems is possible in the world body as long as each country is free to carry on the policy it chooses for itself." Thus, he wants nations to preserve their sovereignty and seek cooperation through sovereign equality of nations, and never at its cost.

The UN in Nehru's views, must be transformed into a world government. It "should be encouraged and supported in every way and should be allowed to develop into some kind of world government or world order." The ideal of "the one world" can be realized through the UN. Unlike League, the UN is based on the principle of universality because it symbolizes the longings among all peoples for the return of peace. Thus Nehru, has total faith in the UN as an instrument of world government.

World Federation, Not Through Regional Association

Nehru felt that there is a great need of international order, of coming together of states in some form of cooperation. To him, national
state alone is no longer adequate. It is too small a unit. A smaller state can not even maintain its independence alone. It would be less capable to promote welfare to any great degree. Nehru, therefore, wants India's independence, within a global federation. In 1920s, he was reported to have said that 'once India was free he would favour a world federation, even to having India give up part of her independence to a larger group of which she is an equal member.' Nehru calls for the World Republic and not an Empire based on the exploitation of one people by another. In 1930s, he wrote to his daughter, "the world is in a bad way and there seems to be no other way to get rid of its illness.

In a letter to H. N. Spalding on May 22, 1940, Nehru wrote, "It is clear enough that there can be no independent small states in the future. There may possibly be huge groups of states united together in each group and each group in a state of latent hostility, it is obviously a very undesirable possibility and it leads to no stability, but to future wars on a tremendous scale.... the political and economic organization of the world must keep pace with technique of science, which has united the whole earth. That is to say that there should be a real commonwealth of interdependent states, each state foregoing that part of its independence which is necessary for the sake of this commonwealth or federation."

Thus, Nehru seems to be against any form of regional, political or military organizations as it leads to instability and war. He, however, does not mind regional organization based on economic consideration which must aim globalization rather than confined to only regional consideration.
He never favours it as if it represents only a limited number of states. The organization with limited representation will not solve the problem. On the contrary, it may even get in the way of the desperately needed global cooperation. Nehru instead proposes an idea of a world state with demilitarized nation-state, but with a police force.

In his address to the World Federalists Conference held in New Delhi in September 1963, Nehru gave his blueprint of World Federation. He said, "The world state among other things, must have a world police force... the state must be based on more or less demilitarized humanity, that is the present approach to arms and building up huge forces armaments must go."

Nehru specifically maintains that the initiative for the World Federation must be taken by the Great Powers so that the small and medium powers can join the venture. He also suggests an idea of 'federal legislature' to regulate the matters of common concern. And "each nation having autonomy within its borders and submitting international matters to the union legislature to which it send its representatives."

No doubt, Nehru suggests to transform the entire environment within which the institution of nation-state has to function but it does not mean that he does not want any change in the functioning of the nations themselves from within.
Institutional

As elaborated above, Nehru suggests that the nation-state system should function within the United Nations organization. Thus, the entire international relations will be institutionalized. In course of time, the UNO will function as a world government and the international anarchy will come to an end. If it happens so the nation-state system will become a sub-set of the main society of man. Nehru says that it is not very difficult to do it at present when only few participators are powerful both militarily and economically. Only those few states will have to give up a perusal of narrow national interest. They have to cultivate enlightened national interests and submit themselves to the UNO or the common government of the world federation.

Strategy of Change for Individual

A new civilization calls for a new man. A new man needs to be scientific minded person. It means he must have an inquiring mind. He should not accept anything without proper questioning and testing. He should be a rational man.

Moreover, a rational man must be fearless and frank. He should be free from false pride and prejudice. He must have the quality of tolerance. The tolerance can be cultivated provided one is broad minded. He should view his problems as a part of a larger good. He should not be selfish and
narrow minded. Unless man changes his mode of thinking, his attitude and behaviour can not be changed. If man does not change, scientific and technological boon may turn into curse and lead us to our dooms day.

In the society of mankind, Nehru expects everyone to enjoy a decent standard of living. It may be a modest standard, and a luxurious one. Secondly, it will be a world in which every individual, race, a nation will be given an equal opportunity to develop a "good" life. The man race or nation will not exploit others. Man made obstacles for progress and prosperity will be ineffective. Thirdly, it will be a world in which each one will enjoy the basis right of freedom of self expression and development. Every one will, thus, live in society with enough opportunities to enjoy a good standard of living as well as a good amount of freedom. These conditions will preserve the dignity of human being.

Nehru relates the question of the dignity of human being with the issue of justice in the world order. So long as the dignity of a common man is not preserved, no order can claim to be a just order. The just world order must preserve the dignity of common human being in world society.

Nehru never wants that an individual should turn his liberty and freedom into license. On the contrary he writes, "Freedom is always accompanied with responsibility. Freedom always entails obligation whether it is a nation's freedom or an individual's freedom."

Hence, Nehru's concept of freedom implies social responsibility and, accordingly, a nation's political freedom is conditioned by international
obligations. No justice can be realized in the world order of Nehru's vision unless these conditions are met with.

Like nations, men are divided by mutual hatred, fear, intolerance and hostility. They are afraid of each other. They hate each other in the name of religion, region and race. They fight for name and fame. They are irrational and subject themselves to passions. They can not see their larger interests and act in that direction. These are negative forces. They are prisoners of their self-created cultural confinements. Side by side, there are positive forces too - the forces of science and technology - which have capacity to bring people together. The distance between the notions has decreased. According to Nehru these forces need to be encouraged, and strengthened. These forces have potentiality to remove poverty and bring prosperity for all. They are capable of creating a new civilization which can be unique. Most of the problems of the old civilization like ignorance, disease, starvation, ill health and object poverty could be abolished by this new civilization. He knew that the new civilization will have its own new problems. But he is very much certain that virtues of the new civilization will enable man to resolve these new problems himself. But in order to create a new civilization, a new man needs to be cultivated. It can be done provided his values of life is changed.
Social Environment

How can a social and cultural environment be changed? - is a relevant question. Nehru believes that all cultural and social environments are in a constant process of change resulting from normal economic, social and political developments. Constant change is a law of life. The industrial revolution was a catalyst to a process of change. The major agents of change are reform, campaigns, revolutions and wars, by which it can be instrumented.

Nehru emphasizes that environment as an agent of change play a more significant role more than an individual does. But he was not totally pessimistic about the role of an individual. Nehru urges that if attitude and behaviour of men can be changed by conscious efforts, it can give a boost to new civilization. According to Nehru, the man takes long time to change his attitude and behaviour as he is unable to control his passions, and elemental urges. Most of the time we find that man is fatalist. He fears change and looks for security. He is essentially conservative in attitude. Hence the progress of new civilization will be painfully slow.

Individuals and states are not self-conscious and realist in assessing their own selves. Mankind suffers from 'moral myopia.' Hence, they can not see the immorality of their own behaviour. On account of this 'moral myopia,' the prospects for a better civilization are deemed.

To sum up, Nehru proposes three things to build a new world order: (i) a new man; (ii) new leadership; and (iii) new culture.
To Nehru, "a new world requires a new kind of man, a man who is free from attachment, from any kind of hatred, from any kind of fear. A new world, a brave world, and a pretty generation do not go together."

### A New Leadership

According to Nehru the new leadership with a new value system is a prerequisite. The role of a statesman in this distraught world is to reduce tensions and conflicts. He feels that through application of science and technology it is possible to reconstruct the social order so as to extend the fruits of modern civilization to one and all. Every state must have a conscience of its own and the nations like the individuals should also observe certain ethical standards or else their ultimate doom is inevitable. That is what a new leadership needs to understand and rise to the occasion.

### New Culture

While accepting the honorary degree of Doctor of Law from the University of Ceylon in January 1960, Nehru elaborated his ideas on world culture. He said, "We should by all means adhere to our respective cultures, but there is something more than that national culture: it is human culture. Today it is more essential for us to develop that culture a world culture. Otherwise the world will go to pieces. We must think in terms of a world culture, one world. And if you want to prepare for that
one world, you have to think of it instead of growing in a narrow groove."

As Nehru views narrow culture and broad humanism cannot coexist. A new civilization will be a synthesis of many national cultures. We need to create a world culture which should not destroy mind and spirit of man.

Nehru accepts that the main component of international society is a system of nation-states. They are the main actors who play a significant role in maintaining an order in the society. In absence of the world government, the order in the society of states is maintained by the few powerful nations. Nehru resents to it and advocates that the international society be democratised. Moreover, a few dominant powers are not united. They are competing with each other for capturing the world market. In order to perpetuate their exploitation, the dominant powers like England, France are practising imperialism and colonialism. The other competing powers, like Germany, Italy and Japan are competing with them and are in search of colonies. Such a game of power politics is dangerous for global peace. Small powers are treated only as pawns on the chess board of world politics.

People who were living in countries, powerful or weak politically, are kept intact by a dose of narrow nationalism and by the principle of territorial sovereignty. Nehru firmly believed that the ideologies of imperialism and narrow nationalism ideologies of imperialism and narrow
nationalism can not nurture order in international society. They can not generate just order, at all, under the circumstances. Hence he resents such order.

Besides, that, the present order encourages the politics of confrontation, rather than that of cooperation. Hence, the institution of war is inbuilt into that order. Nehru had warned the world against such order before the outbreak of the Second World War. Even after the Second World War, the politics of confrontation continued. Only the main actors and ideologies changed. The eye ball to eye ball confrontation between the USA and the USSR after the Second World War gave birth to the politics of Cold War. It was the most dangerous politics as it was played under the shadow of nuclear weapons. It would have brought total annihilation of life on the earth. Such repetition of the old game of politics, even after the defeat of fascism and the victory of democratic forces, saddened Nehru.

In order to improve the functioning of the nation-state system, he suggests mainly two strategies: (1) the code of conduct in the form of Panchsheel for bilateral relations; and (2) the creation of the world federation for multi-lateral relations and for replacing the politics of confrontation by that of the politics of cooperation.

Nehru does not opt for transcending the nation-state system over night. He, however, does not mind it but knows that it will take a long time to do away with the three hundred year old system.
Nehru knows that the nation-states system too can't change unless the people (citizens) residing within it change themselves, their thinking, value-system and behaviour. Hence, he suggests that the individual within the nations need to change their culture by becoming conscious about their new environment which is totally changed by the forces of a new civilization - science and technology. The changed man through a new leadership with a new value system will ultimately change the environment within which nation-state functions. With a change in individual and his institution, i.e. a nation-state, a new global order based on justice and equality will be created and that will promise a permanent peace on the earth.

It is necessary to note that like his political guide, Gandhi, Nehru also emphasize the role of an individual in order to create an equitable world order and like him he chiefly operates on the level of intuition. It is striking to note that Gandhi's operation bears leaning towards philosophy while Nehru's concern is mainly to correlate intuition within intellect and generate a rationalist point of view. Gandhi is a severe critic of western political practices while Nehru instead of criticising the west tries to incorporate scientific mode of thinking popular in the west with intuitive mode of thinking of the east. Nehru, however, does not suggest any new political processes to initiate at national level so that ultimately they would affect the change at the global level. This task is fulfilled by Lohia as he suggests a novel processes to create an equitable world order. Hence we need to review Lohia's discourse on the global problematic of order and peace.
NOTES AND REFERENCES


3. Ibid., p. 495.

4. Ibid., p. 632.

5. Ibid., p. 632.

6. Williard Range, op.cit. no. 1, p. 47.


14. Jawaharlal Nehru, op.cit. no. 7, pp. 542-44.
16. Williard Range, op.cit no. 1, p. 121.
17. Ibid., p. 122.
18. Ibid., p. 123.
20. Williard Range, op.cit. no. 1, p. 50.
23. Ibid., pp. 490-91.
25. Ibid., p. 315.
26. Williard Range, op.cit. no. 1, p. 69.
27. Ibid., p. 65.
28. Ibid., p. 65.
29. Gopal Sarvepalli, op.cit. no. 2, p. 41.
31. Jawaharlal Nehru expressed this views in his presidential address to the Indian National Congress at Lahore session in December 1929, when the historic resolution of Poorna Swaraj was adopted.
33. Gopal Sarvepalli, op.cit. no. 2, pp. 381-82.
34. Williard Range, op.cit. no. 1, pp. 1-18 (Nehru's views on the forces of new civilizations are discussed in detail).

35. Ibid., pp. 1-18.

36. Ibid., pp. 6-7.


40. Jawaharlal Nehru, op.cit. no. 2, p. 525.

41. Ibid., pp. 552-53.

42. Gopal Sarvepalli, op.cit. no. 2, pp. 415-16.

43. Ibid., pp. 346-47.

44. Jawaharlal Nehru thought that the UN (like League) also will become a generator of a climate of hostility, if it falls under the control of a particular bloc and then be used as an instrument against other states. Nehru therefore is a staunch defender of the right of veto in the security council abused as it might be, on the grounds that it is the chief obstacle to the prevention of the security council's falling under the control of one bloc. He considers the veto desirable also because it prevents the UN so often from resorting to the undesirable method of violence, and forces the UN to rely on peaceful procedures to settle disputes.

45. Gopal Sarvepalli, op.cit. no. 2, p. 346.

46. Ibid., p. 168.

47. Ibid., p. 499.
48. Ibid., p. 169.
49. Williard Range, op.cit. no. 1, p. 54.
50. Ibid., p. 54.
51. Gopal Sarvepalli, op.cit. no. 2, p. 536.
53. Ibid., p. 347.
54. Williard Range, op.cit. no. 1, p. 124.