LOHIA'S CONCEPTION OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY

Being a contemporary of Gandhi and Nehru, Lohia like them was reacting to the prevailing international political situation. His reactions are more systematic and studied. Basically he begins his inquiry by asking fundamental questions: what is the goal of human life? why should he live in a society or a state? Lohia himself replies. The main goal of every individual in a society is to develop his personality fully. If that goal is not realized in that particular society, in Lohia's views, the order which sustains that society is inadequate. Hence we need to change that order. The same question is raised at international societal level. Lohia's views on this issue are analyzed systematically in this chapter.

Ram Manohar Lohia (1910 - 1967) divides his views into three parts. In the first part, Lohia's conception of international society is discussed. Lohia agrees with Gandhi and Nehru that the international society is basically composed of the nation-states. They are the dominant actors. They create order in international society. However, Lohia was thoroughly dissatisfied with that order as he perceives that the society is highly stratified between the hegemon (powers) and the peripheral powers. In order to rectify that order, Lohia suggests a strategy. The second part discusses that strategy. Being an idealist, Lohia wants to do away with unjust order
and suggests long term strategy to transcend that order. So that the society of states can be transformed into a society of men. This strategy elaborated by Lohia for the global order and peace.

**Nature and functioning of International Society: Organizing and Operational Principles**

In Lohia's perception, international society is composed of two elements: (1) Nation-states and (2) Mankind. Lohia's perception seems to match Kant's conception on international society. He hopes, "... sooner or later, the whole world may become a federal state and the entire mankind, a political group." Now let us examine what he has to say about the nature of the society composed of nation-states and orientation of mankind. In the later part, his strategy of transforming nation-states into federation and, mankind into a single 'political group' is discussed.

**Hegemonial Powers**

Lohia perceives international society as historically divided between the hegemonial powers and the peripheral powers. The society does not remain static as hegemonial nations keep on changing according to the cycle of history. According to him, the history moves cyclically. Once upon a time, Greeks and Romans were at the centre of power. The United Kingdom and France were hegemons of the international society during the mid-war time. But in the post-second world war era, the hegemony shifted to the United
States of America (USA) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR). Thus, the centre of power and prosperity derived from it go on shifting from one nation to another nation or one brought to another region, over a period of time. But this prosperity is unevenly distributed as majority of states was deprived of what a few powerful states could obtain by virtue of their power (military and material). A nation or a group of nations have become prosperous themselves, and, thus hegemon in world politics. Though the cyclic motion of history may bring prosperity to other states - the movement of cycle will depend upon the wishes of hegemon and therefore Lohia was of the view that it would be necessary to break this dependence on cyclic motion if the entire mankind is to seek the benefits necessary for growth and prosperity.

For Lohia, the dominant actors in international politics are nation-states. But whichever (nation) become the hegemon in the international society, never like to give up its hegemony voluntarily. They decide their priority in accordance with their interest. They imposed 'order' of their liking on the society. Historically, more and more nation-states have been emerging as independent actors in a society, but they have to accept, directly or indirectly, the domination of those few hegemon of the time. In Lohia's time, the Cold War politics had divided the international society. Since this division had ideological overtones it did not remain confined to their respective positions within their own territorial limits (Soviet Union and the United States of America) - it affected many other countries in the world. International society reflected the sharp dividing
lines through the foreign policy stance and in the formulation of domestic policies of many states. Lohia did not appreciate among the countries of the Third World as it distorted the very concept of nationalism, nationhood and thereby the distinct identity of nation. International forces in the process affected the loyalty of the citizens as they could not resist the appeal of communism and capitalism. This was going too far and therefore Lohia wrote, "But in the world of nation-states, as it is today, if the basis of politics is not one's own state and its people, it is some other state, high priest of some or the other dream of future.... the entire politics in the country is divided among devotees of the different international temples, and the very concept of nationhood is clouded."

Lohia further objects that due to Cold War, the autonomy of politics within the nation is adversely affected. Even though Lohia knew that the third world nations have become peripheral in the world politics, he does not blame the dominant nations for the gloomy state of affairs. He blames the architect of the foreign policies of the non-aligned nations for such a situation. According to him the non-aligned nations themselves are responsible for their peripheral position in the world politics.

Two Contradictory Systems

Ever since the two superpowers have extended their ideological conflict through military alliances (WARSAW Pact and NATO), they have been in search of 'power vacuums.' It would not be an exaggeration to say that
the concept of power vacuum got into reckoning with the onset of the Cold War. With the overwhelming presence of the two superpowers - other nations had hardly any option in this regard as they could not challenge the conflicting claims and strategic interest of the two warring camps.

For Lohia it was quite distressing that the two superpowers were so much involved in their own conflict that they could hardly pay any attention to other serious problems with which the international society was afflicted. Many parts of the world were reeling under poverty, over population, civil wars and with the problems of social and economic injustice and to all this the two superpowers were mute witness despite their military and economic capabilities. These tension needed priority and attention over the Cold War dominated politics.

Economic order in the existing international system perpetrates inequality and injustice which was far more disturbing for than the 'rich' and the 'poor' divide of nations. This system does not have any device to overcome this lacuna of the international society. To that extent, the existing international order is inadequate and calls for restructuring.

In order to dominate the existing structure of international politics and to seek more allies to their camp from the third world countries, the hegemon powers applied new devices to attract them to their camp. While commenting on the era of peaceful coexistence of Khruchev-Kennedy (KK) time of the late sixties, Lohia dubbed it (peaceful coexistence) as yet another device to win over new allies to their side. To him, the doctrine of
peaceful coexistence was a rhetoric to disguise their ulterior motives. They (super powers) devised to seek from respite the tension of the Cold War when it becomes unbearable and disproportionate. Unbearable in terms of the cost involved in the senseless arms race - disproportionate for the Soviet Union as it could not match the United States economic power.

The real peaceful coexistence could come about provided the two camps try to exist in such a way that a maximum capacity of every individual living on this earth could be utilized in the service of the humanity. Lohia calls it a stage of "approximation" in human development. The so-called Khruchev-Kennedy peaceful coexistence did not ensure this objective. Hence, 'coexistence' was an empty doctrine. It was propounded to buy time to outpace each other in arms race. Lohia was of the view that the doctrine of peaceful coexistence could turn out to be an adequate one provided it was combined with approximation. His own conception of nonalignment rested on a very different premise where he wanted it to be an independent force against the two warring camps because then only the process of approximation could materialise.

Lohia was convinced that the two camps can never coexist in peace. "The theory of peaceful coexistence is a 'trick' or 'trap' of the two blocs to lull the third world countries to believe in them and too their line. The super powers even go to the extent of direct intervention in the internal affairs of a weak nation."
Interventionists

The dominant powers were interventionists. They intervene in the internal affairs of another nation, either 'imperialistically' or in the name of 'liberation.' But their main aim was to pursue their national interests. They never intervene for the good of the mankind or in the larger interests of the international society. This was not a new thing. According to Lohia, every hegemon has been intervening in the affairs of a peripheral powers and, thus, keeping its domination intact. It has been a continues process and it is necessary to snap this continuity. The capability of dominant powers to intervene in the internal affairs of a nation creates a situation in which the international politics was monopolized by super powers. In order to break the monopoly of dominant powers, Lohia suggested twin strategies to improve the operation of the existing international order. These strategies will be discussed little later.

Lohia on War

Unlike Hobbes, Grotius, Kant, Gandhi and Nehru, Lohia did not blame human nature for the outbreak of war. He presumed that every human being was capable of developing his personality to the full extent provided the necessary conditions created. For outbreak of war, or the World War, he blames the system composed of nation-states and their ideologies of imperialism, colonialism, capitalism and the communism.
Lohia considers wars as products of injustice prevalent in the world. Every nation-state tries to get justice and that too only for its own nation. No one seeks justice for the entire mankind. In order to get justice for itself, the nations accumulate weapons and the different type of armaments. Lohia believed that even if "possible" equality (if not total equality) is created among the nations and within the nations, they will do away with the weapons. The equality can be created provided imperialism, colonialism and racial discrimination removed from the body politic of international relations. The phenomena of war could also be eliminated provided every individual is given an equal opportunity of self-realization.

The main problematiques of Lohia's world order was hunger, slavery and war. He calls them the "three monsters" of the present civilization. According to him, these three monsters stalk the world today as never before and their lengthening shadows were imperiling our order as appears to exist. Today's 'order' is divided into two parts: The Western World and the Eastern World. One part of the world (west) is powerless to conserve what it has created and the other finds it difficult to create what it needs. Lohia thinks that some nations are determined to hold the master's right to make war. They hold right to make war mainly because they are hegemon and the power was concentrated at few centres. The concentration of powers poses a threat of war as it gives birth to militarism and authoritarianism. Hence he suggests decentralization of powers in order to eliminate war. The East (Asia) for too long had suffered slavery which made them poor and weak. This area needs to be relieved from poverty and slavery.
and, thus, needs to reconstruct that area for the world order. The world order based on peace and justice can be created provided international society is democratized.

Lohia on Political Processes at International Level

Lohia resents the absence of political process at global level in order to address the global problems. He wanted that some political processes should be initiated at the global level and the initiative should be taken by the great powers as well as by the third world countries. These processes may be initiated within a nation-state but its impact will be felt at the global level. He suggests the following political processes for creating a global society consisting of mankind.

Novel Political Processes

Lohia opines that no genuine world order based on equality and justice could be created unless world wide political processes are generated. In order to generate those processes he suggested four novel programmes as models of political process to take care of equitable development of mankind as a whole:

1. All the political parties in all the nations should adopt a hundred or fifty year programme about what type of change they envisage in the world. Lohia wanted all the political parties to adopt the programme of international policy. He thought that the world was basically
diseased in its international relationships. Its foundations have weakened, new more solid foundations were required to be laid. Hence all the political parties all over the world need to have international policy regarding the future of the world. Lohia views the basic function of the political parties would be to change the behaviour and the minds of men, throughout the globe. Hence they are obliged to adopt positions on international societal issues.

2. The super powers of the world like, the USA and the USSR - should also hold regular summit conferences to consider the problem of poverty and disarmament and the methods of eradicating them. In Lohia's view, the disarmament and abolition of poverty are but two sides of the same coin. War will never cease to be a threat to the mankind unless poverty is eradicated from all over the world. He believed so long as inequality between the rich and the poor nations is not removed the idea of the world being a habitation for a single international family will remain a dream. He suggested a initiation of global political process by the rich nations so that an equitable global society may be created.

3. A novel institution at global level like the World Development Authority may be conceived. Its main thrust should be the economic reconstruction of the world economy. The world development authority may have objectives to improve agriculture as well as industries. This authority can organize pool of resources and skill from each nation of the world.

4. In order to make the unity of mankind a reality at global level, Lohia suggests the fourth model of political process which he evolves from
the reality of his time. In his time, many non-governmental peace movements were going on in many countries. These movements were fragmented and not coordinated. Moreover, these movements centered around the human problems and yet movements were not effective to unite the human race. Hence, Lohia pleaded for a serious effort to federate them and institutionalize them and operate them in the form of civil disobedience movement at a global level. Thus Lohia wanted these International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGO) to wake up people from slumber and inspire them to protest against the voices through the Gandhian technique of satyagraha. He had a plan to translate Gandhian ideas to suit at international societal level. Lohia maintained that hitherto we have tried to bring about unity of mankind through religious and other ideological means in which we have failed. Now this can be effectively undertaken only through international political processes.

Lohia's Concept of Justice

Lohia had a theoretical mind and he evolves a coherent theory of justice in his ideology of "New Socialism" for internal political life as well as for international relations. This project is confined to Lohia's consideration for international relation hence it tries to conceptualize only Lohia's views on justice in relation to international politics. Lohia wanted that the socialist doctrine be retold in terms of the simple truth that all men are equal, not only within the nations but also among nations.
Thus, his concept of justice concerns "equality of man" everywhere and emancipation of man from war, hunger, starvation, slavery and poverty. His conceptualization of justice emerges from his insight into the world history. In his, "Wheel of History," Lohia interprets human history as a tussle between crystallized castes and loosely cohesive classes. He writes, "castes represent conservative forces of stagnation, inertia and prescriptive right, while classes stand for a dynamic force of social mobilization." All human history, to Lohia, had been "an internal movement between castes and classes." This internal tussle of history will go on till the evil in man and society as not prevented from breeding. He expected, "the world might, through intelligent design, try to achieve a multi-coloured harmony of human race." Thus, this concept of justice embodies in it a "multi-coloured harmony." Lohia hoped that when equality of man and harmony amongst them is established, it will change its traditional forms on practically every major fronts. "In place of an increasing standard of living within national frontiers, decent and minimum living standards for all men in the world will be assured. In place of the alternatives between parliamentary and insurrectionary action, a balanced mixture of constitutional action and civil resistance, wherever necessary and possible, will be followed or practiced. In place of an international organization of unequal members, a committee of nations, equal in membership and executive and based on some sort of adult franchise, will be established and maintained. In fact, socialism must first achieve the union of mankind in the mind before it can translate that into practice."
Writing on the concept of justice, Lohia maintains that seven types of revolutions are going on in the world today to bring about justice. These revolutions are: (1) for equality between man and woman; (2) against political, economic and spiritual inequality based on skin colour; (3) against inequality of backward and high groups or castes based on long tradition, and for giving special opportunities to the backward; (4) against foreign enslavement and for freedom and world democratic rule; (5) for equality and planned production and against the existence of and attachment for private capital; (6) against unjust encroachments on private life and for democratic methods; and (7) against weapons and for satyagraha.

Lohia's concept of justice springs from the philosophy of humanism. His orientation of justice neither sacrifices the interest of the individual nor of the society, and neither of the nation nor of the international society. It seeks compromise between conflicting interests of individual, society and state.

Justice in International Society

Elaborating his ideas of international justice, Lohia points out the gray areas of injustice. Injustice prevails in international order mainly because 'injustice' is inbuilt in the order itself. International order is composed of nation-state system and ideologies of communism and capitalism. Both features divide nations and create tensions between them. Both these...
generate war, and economic inequality. In order to remove anomaly from the international order and to preserve 'peace,' the international institution like the UNO was created. But in reality, the UNO instead of removing injustice perpetuates status-quo of the high politics of international reality. This reflects the existing reality of power politics and does not help mitigating injustice from the body politics of international order.

The UNO does not offer membership to every nation of the fact that the nation has a sovereign authority. Denying of membership on grounds of character of the government leads to confused partisanship and intrigues. It leads to injustice as it discriminates nations. In order to create a sense of justice among the members of the UNO, "membership of the United nations must be obtainable to every nation that has a government able to control its affairs." According to Lohia, the principle of universalism must necessarily inhere in the United Nations.

Referring to the system of the UNO of 'one nation-one vote,' Lohia appreciated the equality in law but he criticizes that in reality this principle was not observed due to veto-system. He sought equality not only in law but also in its implementation.

Lohia believes that if justice has to prevail in international society, the UN must acquire universal membership and put a stop to the convention of the Veto and power the class of permanent members within UNO.
Lohia's concept of justice in world order was based on the twin concepts of the "Unity of Mankind" and "Equality of Man."

**Unity of Mankind**

Lohia was firmly convinced that the approximation (full development of human personality) of human race was not possible with the existing concept of international relationship. He, therefore, favoured a new idea of people to people relationship in place of government to government relationship which dominates the international affairs today. Every one has been striving for the unity of mankind. This strivings have been expressed through the need of one God, or one world or even oneness of all animal life. According to Lohia, aspiration for unity of Godhead was intimately connected with the aspiration for the political unity of mankind. Lohia himself confesses that the idea of unity of mankind was logical but can not be reality. He was hopeful that it will become reality as political process for their implementation starts. Lohia points out various world wide movements going on in the different countries: "Ban the Bomb," Ban inequality. These movements are not effective or are incapable of uniting the human race together because they don't have programme of civil disobedience. Lohia pleads for a serious efforts to federate them, to institutionalize them as humanly and to operate them through civil disobedience. He thought that while federating these movements will have an introspective outlook out of compulsion.
Equality

Justice even in world order can not be achieved without the establishment of equality of man in that society. He writes that all those who desire for world peace through the world government must aspire to achieve a world view of equality against class or caste or regional inequalities.

Lohia conceives equality not only within a nation but also among nations and that such equality must not be limited to the field of law. The concept of equality must embrace economic, political and social and other areas also. Material equality among nations appears more difficult to achieve than material equality within the nations. No nation can for long remain equal within its frontiers if it is unequal against other nations. As water finds its level, human society tends to approximate to its lowest levels, provided these levels are otherwise not raised.

For prevailing injustice, Lohia blames the existing international political and economic structure and pleads for its reshaping. Efforts should be to redesign the structure in such a way that the gap within and among nations can be bridged. Apartheid among the blacks and the whites was also a scar on humanity and to end such racial discrimination, Lohia advocated Satyagraha at international level. He however, did not elaborate the method of launching satyagraha at the international level.
For Lohia, equality and liberty are inseparable. They are not in conflict. A world order in which men are given an equal opportunity of self-realization is a world having liberty and justice. He defines injustice as lack of equality and liberty that it is due to injustice and inequality that nation needs weapons and armaments. Lohia points out, "actually weapons mean injustice. Weapons are either meant to eliminate injustice or to reduce its intensity and that is why if injustice is totally eliminated there will be no need for armaments. The weapons will not be necessary provided international society is reorganized on the basis of justice. According to him, inequality is the main element of various forms of injustice prevalent in human society. Hence 'if a society ever reaches the stage of possible equality, if not total equality, a stage might be reached for doing away with the weapons.'

Lohia views equality in four aspects, viz., inward and outward as well as spiritual and material. He pleads for an integrated approach. He advocated, "Equality must therefore, be grasped in all its four meanings. Material equality must mean the outward approximation among nations as well as the inward approximation within the nation. Spiritual equality must mean outward kinship as much as it means inward equanimity, kinship, material equality within the nation and among nations is worthy to become a supreme aim of life and its purpose."

By individual liberty in order Lohia means unfettered freedom to move to die or any part of the Lohia advocates perfect freedom to anyone to settle anywhere one liked. The present rules
and regulations for citizenship attached to the idea of one's territory are condemned by Lohia as outdated and barbarous. Lohia therefore had desired to travel throughout the world without a passport. He writes, "Man's right to travel, work and die anywhere in the world should be recognized and laws of restrictions on travel and stay on grounds of indigent or undesirability should be also lashed. Citizenship should as much be a matter of intention and cultural loyalty as of birth or residence."

Lohia's concept of justice also implies an urge to end all forms of colonialism and political rule of one nation over another. He considers colonialism as a shame to mankind and a serious impediment to the growth of an equal world. In the preface to Marx, Gandhi and socialism, Lohia writes, "National freedom is on the way to becoming men's irremovable property... No people shall now be allowed to exercise direct rule over another. Indirect control, oppressions may continue and their fate shall be part of the wider fate of the total fight against injustice. But direct political rule of one nation over another belongs to the irrevocable past."

He, however, stands for further fight against injustice in an era of neocolonialism (indirect rule). He pleads that it is not the government but the people of the world must learn to fight whenever and wherever human rights are abused. Violation of human rights, no matter where they take place should arouse warm sympathy with the victims and indignation against the tyrant.
Lohia goes beyond the areas of injustice, by also suggesting methods to fight out injustice. Before the method of Satyagraha was evolved, only two methods were popular, parliamentary and insurrectionary. But Lohia insists on Mahatma Gandhi's method of Civil-Disobedience or Satyagraha. He pleads its operationalization on a permanent basis on a world scale as it embodies direct action against any type of injustice. He writes, "for the first time in the world, the weapon of civil disobedience which had been in use by great man from Socrates to Thoreau was put into the hands of whole masses of men by Mahatma Gandhi." Gandhi's weapon of satyagrahi was used chiefly for political purposes, but now it should also be used for economic and social reformation. He further says, "a day may come later when the whole nation is summoned to organize resistance against injustice and for the achievement of a new order."

Thus, Lohia's points of departure in his concept of justice in the world order are unity of mankind and equality. The unity of mankind can come through political process. We so far have tried to achieve this unity through religious and other ideological means. It can come through by uniting (or federating) international movements undertaken separately in different countries.

The second ideal of equality also can be achieved provided the entire world must conceive it. On creating the world view of equality, we will find the reasons for the prevailing inequality. Lohia blames the economic
and political structure of the world for it. By giving an example, he points out that nation are producing weapons because there prevails inequality among them. An humble beginning is suggested by Lohia in the form of eliminating the idea of citizenship, which restricts man's movement. Man, therefore, can not develop his personality. The curtailment of liberty means curtailment of equality. it generates injustice for ever in the world.

Lohia's Twin Strategies to Reform the Functioning of the Existing Order

For Lohia, the existing international order is a victim of neo-colonialism and international imperialism practiced by the two power blocs. Hence, international order needs to be liberated from the twin grip of neo-colonialism and imperialism. Lohia suggests two strategies to liberate the international order: (1) The creation of the Third Camp; and (2) Strengthening of the international institution, i.e. the United nations Organization. Thus, Lohia opts for power approach and institutional approach to improve the functioning of the international order. These two approaches are examined in detail below.

The Creation of the Third Camp

According to Lohia the existing international order is status-quoist. It functions in the interests of the power blocs. What is needed is a
The restructuring of the international order can be done by acquisition of 'power' by the nonaligned nations if not delegated willingly. The non-aligned nations, therefore, should come together ideologically, economically and strategically. They must evolve an ideology of the Third World i.e. anti-military camps. They should not cooperate with or give in to the super powers. The non-aligned, if united, can stand apart and against the super powers. The non-aligned must learn to dictate terms to them? Lohia is against the so-called "independence of the two blocks," or a position of neutrality between them. It sounds good in principle but in reality it does not serve any purpose of national or international interest (peace). By adopting non-alignment, they sometime 'appease' one power and sometimes other. This amounts to aligning with either of the powers. In this way, non-aligned powers do not preserve their independence but surrender it to either of the powers. What is necessary to do is to compel these super powers to work for world peace and economic justice for the entire world. In fact, when they act to serve their national interest, either by neutrality of the non-aligned or sometimes by alignment with either of the super power, it does not serve the purpose of the non-aligned nation. On the contrary, it serves the purpose of the super powers.

Economically, the super powers are adopting anti-third world policy. It is being experienced by the Third World countries from time to time, and yet they do not learn lesson. They must get united and form a third camp as they have their own community of interests. The super powers are dictating terms of trade on them, instead the non-aligned should do it. The fact is
that the super powers are dependent on many 'commodities' which are available in the non-aligned nations. It does not happen. The non-aligned powers are incapable of dictating terms as they lack unity. At present the non-aligned powers are more passive in asserting their status on international scene. Lohia says, in order to be successful, "it must become creatively independent." To quote him, "the third camp must not be an empire but a participator in international events, because it will never be able to judge issues until it learns to play a part in their maturing."

Lohia wants Nehru's India to take initiative in bringing the foreground issues of economic reconstruction and, thus, help restructuring the international order.

Lohia advocates that the Third World countries should come together militarily also. The military unity will yield power against the unjust super powers. But Lohia warns against military intervention by the non-aligned nation into the other non-aligned nations, which would otherwise be imperialistic intervention. He, however, advocates non-military intervention by the third camp in the non-aligned nation. To Lohia, such intervention is preferable to the by the super powers. In order to get maturity and to obtain desired results, the third camp must learn to intervene in the affairs of the countries of the third camp whenever "democracy" and "freedom" are threatened in any of its constituent territories, it must do everything to encourage and assist the growth of democracy and socialism in all those areas." Thus, Lohia's ideas of the third camp is unique in character.
The third camp must stand for and advocate the idea of international law against the idea of naked power-play. The two camps may stand for 'power' and disregard the role of international law. They may stand for war. The third camp must stand for positive peace. To Lohia, peace is not the antithesis of war and so is not a negative concept. Lohia pleads for some assertive action by the third camp. The third camp must learn to unite the world under the rubric of international law than on a consideration of 'self-interest.' This rivalry must discontinue. The passive non-alignment can not break it. Lohia holds that, "the third camp must indeed strive to do all it can to avoid war but it must also concern itself equally with the building up of such strength as will be adequate to open a new era in world relations. This new era of world relations can be built by creating a consensus on acceptance of international law by all the nations of the system.

The third force, can, at present, coordinate international peace movements. He writes, "I should think that the third camp has its immediate work in the fields such as the various types world unity movements, which are not attached to either of these two blocs, the international socialist movement, in particular its Asian Wing, and cultural or no-war movements unaffiliated to either bloc. The United Nations is also not be completely discarded. Several of its activities and agencies are such in which the third camp can gainfully take part.... It may also seek to combine all the world on such projects as a world development cooperation, international projects of reconstruction and peace and a world food pool."
According to Lohia the present nonalignment by definition is a doctrine of subsidiary behaviour. The non-aligned nations can only affirm or deny what the principal actors of the world drama, US or USSR do or say. Thus, non-alignment is a doctrine of reaction. In other words, it stands for passive neutrality. Lohia's concept of 'third camp' is not based on passive neutrality but on active neutrality clarifying that his concept is based on active and assertive neutrality Lohia points out, "The neutral bloc is today only passively independent. It must become creatively independent. Its pretension to judge each issue on its merit will ever be hollow until it learns to put something of its own into the issues as they arise.... Neutrality that is based on national selfishness or passive waiting on events is inconsistent with the world view. To keep one's own country out of war is something wholly different from keeping war out of the world. The former is passive neutrality arising out of national selfishness while the latter is active neutrality arising out of a world view."

**Duties of the Third Camp**

Lohia assigns number of duties to the Third Camp:

a. to facilitate and complete the liberation of the colonial peoples of Africa and Asia;

b. to combat defence pacts and the peace preparations of the Atlantic and Soviet camps, which in reality are war pacts and preparations of war;

c. to annihilate the nefarious effects of the policy of armed appeasement undertaken by these camps;
d. to strive to make the UNO, through effective influence and constructive contribution, capable of realizing its role as an instrument of world peace and progress and, thus, to prevent this organization from being used by the two power blocks as an arena of disputes, a clearing house of international rivalries and a syndicate of selfish interests; and

e. to promote and to consummate regrouping and the cooperation of all peoples and nations through a world government and, thus, prevent regroupings of peoples under war banner of the two power blocs.

These duties can not be performed by the non-aligned nations as their minds are not liberated from the politics of two camps. He writes, "to liberate the human mind from the octopus grip of the two camps is to build up this new federation of the mind."

Replying to the critic of the third camp as a camp without military power, Lohia writes, "what the third camp needs today is not so much military power as the power of faith, unshakable and unbearable faith."

As a clarification he stresses the need for a constructive approach to world problems. According to Lohia, what is needed now is to set up a virile federation of the mind. To emphasize his point, he writes, "Arms are a concentrated expression at least partly of a virile attitude. What is needed now is to set up a virile federation of the mind." Lohia, thus, emphasizes the role of the political will rather than its instrument i.e. the military power.
To Lohia, the existing international order does not function in the interest of all the nations. It works in favour of the USA and USSR. They yield power not only because they are militarily powerful but they are united ideologically and economically. They think in terms of their military security only. First of all, they have faith in themselves. They have political will to get things done. The non-aligned nations do not have that will because they are not united. They have not created a united front of their own. As they are not united, they can not create a united front. They think that it can not be created unless they have military power. Lohia is very much clear that the non-aligned needs military power as much as it needs a power of faith, unshakable and unbearable faith in itself which is lacking in the non-aligned movement today. Lohia, thus, suggests to confront the bi-polar world of injustice with the will to resist them and not to toe their line. Thus Lohia understands power as coming from the will to resist and, never from the barrel of a gun.

According to Lohia, ideas rule the world and the human life is wasted if he does not try to achieve "ought" (ideal) in life. The ideal which the non-aligned nations want to achieve is always reflected in its world view. They want to liberate today's world from war and destruction. They can not prove so by just adopting so-called non-alignment policy. It can be done only by creating the third camp of the non-aligned nations. The idea of the formation of the third camp itself will prevent any non-aligned nation joining the war banner of either of the camps. Again, the formation of the third camp itself generate power. The third camp will enforce approximation
if they (two camps) themselves do not agree to approximate to each other as there will be parity amongst them: first, camp, second camp and third camp.

The two camps propagate that they believe in peaceful coexistence. But they do not experiment genuinely to coexist but they buy time for military preparation. They will learn to coexist only when they are forced to do so. it is possible provided the third camp acquires enough strength to force the two blocks to coexist.

The main aim of the third camp is to obtain peaceful and just international order. The two rival camps are striving for negative peace, which means postponement of war. Lohia thinks that creation of the third camp will help avoiding war and create a new international order based on positive peace.

Empowering the UNO: Institutional Approach

According to Lohia, the international institution like United Nations Organization (UNO) or (League of Nations) are created to bring about stable and lasting peace. Instead, an organization like the UNO is used by the two power blocks as an arena of dispute, 'a clearing house of international interests.' Lohia believes that the League of nations had failed for the same reason. By pointing out the successive failure of the League in case of Ethiopia in 1935, Spain in 1936 and China in 1937, Lohia maintains that this failure proved costly for the world. According to Lohia, along with
rising tide of armaments it destroyed the international order which was
created after the First World War. The UNO which was established after
the Second World War with so much of presumptions and high aims seems to be
walking on the same footing as its predecessor.

To Lohia the functioning of the UNO is a great disappointment. It came
into existence to serve the mankind with a concrete solution of a stable
and lasting peace. Instead the UNO itself has become an arena of struggle
between the two dominant power blocs. The member of nations are supposed to
be guided by universal interest while evaluating any international issue.
In practice they are guided by their own national interest. The guiding
principle of national interest has rocked its noble aims and high
proclamations. The member nations have forgotten the basic truth that in
order to make any institution successful for internationalism, they should
surrender some part of their sovereignty. The UNO failed to make them
realize that nations do not belong only to nation states, but from a part
and parcel of the whole human race.

Lohia suggests the three dimensional strategy for transformation of
the UNO as it can not help in obtaining the idea of world peace with its
present weaknesses. He suggests strategies for turning the United Nations
from clearing house of international intrigues into a repository of the
collective conscience of mankind.

Lohia has a great hope to achieve world peace through the UNO. Inspite
of its inherent weaknesses, he still hopes that it can achieve peace
provided the organizational and procedural defects of the UN charter be removed. He suggests the following:

1. Membership of the UNO be expanded;
2. The permanent seats in the security council be removed; and
3. The right of Veto be taken away.

Pleading for the universal membership of the UNO, he writes, "Membership of the United Nations must be obtainable to every nation that has a government able to control its affairs. Denial of membership on grounds of character of the government must inevitably lead to confused partisanship and intrigues."

Being a politician, Lohia knows that the permanent seats and the Veto are only a reflection of existing realities of power. For Lohia, it is not a just arrangement. Justice demands that equality in law as well as in fact should be sought. Judicial equality always precedes factual equality. Comparing the provision of restricted Veto power of the UNO with the caste system of India, Lohia writes, "Permanent seats and the Veto are an expression of the division of the world into great powers and small and therefore of an odious international caste system; restrictions on membership result in the nefarious black-balling of new tantrums for the sake of narrow interest." He further says that, "a judgement by the security council, four or five of whose members sit in perpetuity, is always open to doubt and challenge. The UN, therefore must acquire universal membership and end the Veto and permanent seats."
Lohia expresses his great dissatisfaction with the UNO and dubs it as the most artificial institution. To Lohia, the UNO must represent the conscience of the mankind. It will not be so unless the UNO is reorganized on the basis of the adult franchise. Lohia treats the UNO as a stepping stone to the future world government. But meanwhile he seeks revision of the charter of the UNO. According to Lohia, the UNO will not become an effective and acceptable instrument for reconstruction and defence of the world unless the charter of the UNO reflects universality and equality of membership. It should be reorganized in such a way that no nation or no people would think it worthwhile to challenge its authority. Like law courts and national parliaments, the decisions of the United Nations must also be unchallengable and binding. Such a situation can came about only if nation are equally willing to share their sovereignty in the larger interest of mankind. The UNO can be an effective instrument in identifying areas of common interest over which consensus can be arrived at. So long as it is not done, it will remain an inefficient institution to bring peace, order and justice in international society.

MANKIND AND TRANSFORMING STRATEGY

In the first part, Lohia's views on the 'system change' (Nation-State System) have been examined. Even after suggesting a strategy for the change of the system. Lohia is not satisfied with his solution. To him, it is a half-way solution. He knows it will only improve the functioning of a society of states but it will not solve the problems of civilization.
According to Lohia, we have been passing through a civilizational crisis. The main point of crisis is that this civilization has rendered itself incapable of awakening the entire human race. True civilization must help every individual to evolve a culture of outward activity and inward poise and, thus, a man can blossom his personality fully and totally. The present civilization can not address this problematique seriously mainly because the entire mankind is divided by the nation-states. The society composed of nation-states divide people in name of sovereignty, ideology and nationhood. At present, the interest of the nation-state clashes with the interest of the global society of men. Hence there has been a tension between "what is" and "what ought to be." This tension has been persisting because we live in a society composed of nation-states. Lohia writes, "Rarely have national interest and world interest coincided to this degree." Man needs to think to come out of this imprisoning system but man has ceased to think and is afraid of exploring new realms of living and thought. Nevertheless Lohia writes, "To attain a world order, therefore, is to build a new civilization to resume the onward journey of the mind and to attempt a fresh arrangement of life."

Nation-State System and Ideologies

Today's nation-state system operates through mainly two European ideologies - Capitalism and Communism. These ideologies are status-quoist and do not want any change. He believes that the liberation of mankind and world unity can be achieved neither on the basis of the communist system
nor on the ground of capitalist considerations. Both of them are irrelevant for this purpose.

According to Lohia, the existing civilization propagated by the West and the Russian (capitalism versus communism) can not be valid for the whole of mankind as it is biased and regional. These ideologies do not promise full development of personality. Hence, Lohia conceives a new ideology of socialism. (Some ideas blended with Gandhism). He dreams socialism in the form of a free from all types of exploitation - social, economic and political. Lohia's socialism is based on humanistic foundations in which the interests, the individual of the society, of the state, or of the world are never sacrificed. To him, all men are equal and they should form a single world of free association in doctrine as well as in a foreign policy.

Lohia, thus, visualizes the ideology of socialism, instead of capitalism or communism, as capable of building a world order. Secondly, he thinks that the forces of socialist ideology will break the nation-state system and the world parliament will be created out of the United Nations Organization.

Factors to Create World Community

Lohia enumerates several factors to create a global community but mainly he blames the existing ideologies (capitalism/communism) of the
nation-state system. He calls it a civilizational crisis. As for Lohia, socialism is a creed of change and justice while capitalism and communism are inextricably tied up in the meshes of an old and dying world. The twin ideologies of the present world, capitalism and communism, promise to create a world order based on human equality and justice. But in fact, they breed poverty, inequality and fear in the world. Let us therefore understand the nature of the crisis.

According to Lohia these ideologies do not unite the humanity. On the contrary they divide them in two parts - capitalist world and communist world. Both of them promise to create a world order based on equality among people by full development of human personality. But both of them have failed to develop human personality to full extent because these ideologies have divided man on the earth.

Emancipation of Humanity Through the Full Development of Human Personality

The present civilization helps developing only "maximum efficiency" and not the "total efficiency" of man. Lohia is convinced that neither communism nor capitalism is valid principles for the change over maximum to total efficiency. He writes, "Communism has indeed talked of a world order based on equality among the nations and the full development of human personality, both to arise out of the abolition of exploitation. But these general ideals are as deceptive and meaningless as the earlier ones of capitalism which has talked of a world order arising out of perfect
competition. Neither doctrine has tried to translate these general wishes into concrete ideals."

This has happened because the wheel of history moves like a cycle. It has moved because new ideas are always tried by a particular nation within the boundaries of a nation.

The civilizational crisis repeats itself in history because every society is subject to some law of change. It has its own mechanism of internal as well as external motion of law. Internally, every society (nation-state) is busy achieving maximum efficiency for its own people and not 'total efficiency' for the whole of mankind. The communist and capitalist doctrines boast about the welfare of the entire mankind, but work only for the citizens of their respective states. In practice, these doctrines produce a 'chosen people' within the humanity. Hence they divide the world between 'chosen people' (people of the nation) and the people outside the circle. It has remained plight of every civilizations produced by history and no civilization has ever taken the task of full development of personality of every human being.

**External Law of Motion**

To Lohia, the history is a narration of struggle among nations to get supremacy in international society. The class which comes to power within a nation strives to get supreme role for its nation in international society.
he maintains like Toynbee that a civilization 'disrupts' or 'stagnates' under the two pressures of internal and external struggle. Hence, the history delineates a story of an external shift of prosperity and power from one region to another. Once upon a time, the Greek and Romans were powerful, while England and France were powerful before the Second World War and in the post-Second World War era, the USSR and USA have been dominating powers. Thus, the centre of prosperity and power keep shifting from one nation or region to another in course of time. But the fact is the entire mankind has never become prosperous. A nation or a group of nations enjoy prosperity at the cost of other nations or groups of nations. Such the motion of history and history moves, according to Lohia, in a cyclic way.

Lohia further explains that internal and external laws of motion are interrelated. 'With external increase in power and prosperity, internal inequality decreases whereas with decrease in such power, internal inequality increases.

Each nation, when it thinks only from the nation's point of view, tries to rise in power in its relationship to the outside world. It strives for better living and greater equality within the state. In course of time, one nation becomes powerful than others and thus, wheel of history goes on. Thus, obviously dominant factor in the world history is the shift of power and prosperity from one region to another. No nation thinks in terms of the welfare of the entire humanity. This thinking is justified by the existing ideologies, hence the civilizational crisis.
In order to overcome this civilizational crisis, Lohia suggests that the nation-state's ideological systems should be guided by the principle of "total efficiency" of the individual instead of "maximum efficiency." Hitherto all the civilizations have been guided by the principle of 'maximum efficiency.' If this barrier is removed the nation-state system can be broken.

We need to create a new civilization which should be guided by the twin principles:
1. to achieve the 'total efficiency' for the whole of mankind; and
2. to develop total personality of an individual. Unless mankind achieves human approximation through an attempt of total efficiency instead of maximum efficiency, the wheel of history will not stop.

The existing institutions of nation-states and doctrines of Marxism and capitalism can not help us. To stop this external shift and internal oscillation, Lohia wants such a universal doctrine which will regulate this regional shift of power from one country to another or from one continent to another. To stop this cycle of history, efforts are needed. History by itself will not do so as it has no automatic motion. The present thinking that capitalism or communism will arrest the process of history be given up. They are incapable to do so.
Reasons for Capitalist Incapability

The present civilization is predominantly Euro-centric. It has its dual forms, capitalism and communism and it is incapable of bringing the entire world within its folds. On the contrary it produces poverty, fear and war.

".... these two systems have been unable to alleviate even by a small measure these three poisonous portions of mankind, poverty, war and fear."

To Lohia, the 'Atlantic' and the Soviet camps reflect only a split of the European civilization. But for Lohia split is not a new development. Even before, when a civilization had matured and when it was about to decay, it tended to split in order to regenerate itself. The entire world, however has shaken with this split but there was nothing in the split which would have been of concern to the whole of mankind. To the outside world, the capitalism and the communism seem to be fighting a deadly war for their principles, but in reality they are busy raising national output and increasing standard of living within their national territories. The capitalism does so in the name of 'perfect competition' in a democratic set-up of government, while the communism under a totalitarian regime. Neither of these doctrines, however, has concretely concerned itself with the two basic issues of total efficiency and total personal development in respect of the whole mankind as well as individual.
Science and Technology

Besides, this civilization stands for the application of science to industry and agriculture. It strives for increasing national output collectively and increasing living standard individually. It propagates social equality and peace in the world. Lohia it is a pseudo claim and it can never bring equality or world peace. According to him, the present civilization has reached its dead end. It can not be spread all over the world as its technology is incapable of repetition in Asia and Africa due to their peculiar circumstances. The Western powers could develop mainly because they had colonies to exploit. But this circumstance does not prevail in Afro-Asian countries. Lohia points out 'too little land and too many men and too few tools are a mark of Asia, so the application of the technique of mass production is utterly impossible.' It is, therefore, incapable to produce the desired world order based on economic equality.

Old Agreement and Treaties

Without specifying any international agreement and treaties, Lohia writes, "old treaties and agreements and the procedures connected with them further hamper the birth of a new order." Colonialism and Imperialism of the West perpetuated in Africa also come in the way for creating a world order. Lohia appeals to the people of world and particularly Asians to join with the Africans in their national struggle for human equality and justice 'through massive international brigades of satyagrahis or nonviolent resisters.'
Not to Judge Every Issue on Merits

Lohia appeals the non-aligned nations to pursue a policy independent of both the camps and not to judge issue as it arises, on merit. To Lohia, both the camps (USA/USSR) are imperialists and they do not stand for new world order based on justice. By judging the issue in an isolated way, it results in rendering of alternate service to the two camps. Thus the non-aligned help them to perpetuate the old order.

The world order must opt for a dynamic and positive peace. Actually in Lohia's view, "the essential function of world order is to secure peace." He says, peace is of two kinds - positive peace and negative one. Positive peace is "inherent in and the result of an appropriate manner of life." While the negative peace refers to "mere postponement of war achieved through diplomatic pressures and threats and the force of organized opinion." Lohia, however, does not want to reject negative peace outright. Being a practical man, Lohia wants the third camp to use the period of negative peace "for removing the causes of war; otherwise it is an interval during which the combatants arm themselves for a grimmer struggle." Lohia further wants the non-aligned nations "to strive for both types of peace, for a world order in which peace inheres as well as for correcting excesses of the existing semblance of order." He regrets that instead of adopting confrontationist attitude with the two power blocs, they accept from them economic or military aid. The foreign aid actually ties up an Asian people with one or the other of the conformist systems,
therefore, the foreign aid must be rejected summarily. Nevertheless Lohia is not against foreign aid totally. He welcomes economic laid in form of investment, bearing interests and reasonable profit. This aid must be used to build true socialism at home. It should not distract attention from the basic task of planning internal resources. Lohia expects that "to be useful foreign aid must be treated as a solvent to that crisis in human civilization...." Being purist in his attitude towards the ideal of world order, Lohia wishes that the foreign aid be given with a view to raising minimum decent standard of living to every person on the earth. It should be given as a duty and not as obligation, by economically powerful nations. Lohia writes, "the foreign aid must therefore be as plentiful as are the war budgets. When the immediate provision of a minimum and ultimately a decent standard of living to every person on earth becomes the duty of all citizens and states, foreign aid will in reality become an instrument of the new order."

Thus Lohia is in favour of accepting foreign aid selectively which helps building the world order based on equality and justice.

According to Lohia, all the factors which come in the way to the creation of world order can be removed provided the nations of the world have determination to do so. Lohia overemphasizes the role of will power in creation of new world order. The will power will discard the ideologies of communism and capitalism and will create the ideology of 'socialism' for the future world order. In order to create a new world order based on the ideology of socialism, Lohia suggests institutional arrangement.
New Institutions for Transformation

In order to create a new world civilization based on the principle of "total efficiency" in respect of the whole of mankind as well as the whole individual, Lohia suggests creation two new institutions - World Government and the World Development Authority.

World Government: Parliament of Man Not Nations

According to Lohia, the World Government will be consisting of a world parliament. In order to give justice to the small nations of the world in their representation to the World Parliament, Lohia puts forward two solutions:

a. The World Parliament may consist of two houses: in the upper house each nation should be accorded equal representation regardless of its population; and

b. In a single house of World Parliament, the constituencies may be so bifurcated as to achieve adult franchise along with regional weightage.

The world government will not be created unless the nations are ready to surrender their sovereignty and it is doubtful whether nations will ever be ready to surrender their sovereignty totally. Hence, Lohia suggests that nations should surrender that aspect of sovereignty which relates to peace and war. Lohia advocates to elect the world parliament on the basis of
adult franchise as it will create a direct link between individual and the world state, Lohia writes, "In order to achieve universality and equality, the only known method available is that of adult franchise."

Lohia is convinced that the method of adult franchise will help to create a world public opinion through elections. It will undermine the paradigm of nation-state. Secondly, it will call into question the reality of existing power politics based on inequality and injustice. Thirdly, it will evolve a world political process which is essential to create a world institution. Moreover, it will help creating relations based on man to man than on nation to nation.

Powers of World Parliament

Lohia wants to restrict powers of the world parliament to only two subjects, i.e. right to impose peace and to help in reconstruction.

In order to implement peace, Lohia suggests a principle of 'collective security' to be incorporated in the World Government. The system of collective security can be implemented with the establishment of international armed forces. Side by side, the world parliament must try to make nations to accept the principle of progressive disarmament of nations. The progressive disarmament will correct the excesses of the existing semblance of order.
For economic reconstruction of the world order, Lohia suggests establishment of the World Development Authority. This authority must initiate some schemes of reconstruction of world economy to improve agriculture or industries. As far as its source of income is concerned, Lohia suggests that it may "organize a pool of resources in capital and skill from each nation according to its needs." He also suggests an alternative scheme if this scheme is found to be too vague. He writes, "should this formula be found to be too vague, a fixed percentage of the war budget may go into this pool."

Lohia is hopeful that this type of parliament will come into existence. It will be not only an improvement upon the UNO but will go beyond that. He praises such a parliament, "As such an organization starts coming into being, it will inevitably tend to become a better repository for the conscience of mankind instead of being a clearing house of international intrigue and will therefore, have greater moral authority over nations and will also exercise increasing powers such as those of world force or a world development authority."

Being a realist, Lohia knows that it will be very difficult to give birth to such an organization, as nations and governments will not be ready to surrender their authority. In order to make this possible, the people will have to make sacrifices. Lohia says, "It will be achieved when it becomes a passionate need of the suffering millions."

People must be made aware of the need for the world parliament. In order to make people aware and to create the world public opinion in favour
of a world parliament, Lohia dreams of a political party within nations having long term programme to create such an institution.

Lohia thinks that mankind requires political parties which can make a hundred year or a fifty year programme of international policy. It is because, in Lohia's words, "The World is basically diseased in its international relationships. Its foundations have rotted. New foundations have to be laid." At present no political party anywhere takes up any bold policy on international relations. Lohia regrets that on the contrary, all political parties have chosen to become drum beaters of their native governments. They are afraid to think radically. They fear that the radical policy will not fetch votes to them. They also fear that they may not be able to practice in office radicalism in office that they profess. These two fears are interrelated. Insisting upon his idea Lohia writes, "A government or a foreign office may not be able to take up this position openly and aggressively. But political parties, whose function it is to change men's minds and behaviour, are obligated to take up such positions."

Lohia was thus thoroughly dissatisfied with the existing international order of his time as it was characterized by the existence of dominant powers. Dominant powers did not work for the united world (one world), but they produce an order which caused civil wars among many nations, generated poverty world wide and gave birth to the situation of war (as it is that period was characterized by (Cold) War). That order further caused inequality among nations and also gross inequality within the nations. The
Cold War politics generated an order which was status-quoist. It functioned in the interests of the super powers. In Lohia's views what was needed was restructuring of that order. In order to restructure the existing order, he suggested two pronged strategy — first the creation of the third camp consisted of the non-aligned nations and empowering of the United Nations Organizations.

Secondly, in order to do away with the existing order and to create a new order he suggested another strategy to go beyond the existing order dominated by the nation-states actors. Lohia, like Kant, opted for a new society composed of men and not sovereign states. The principle of "total efficiency" (the total development of individual's personality) should be the guiding axiom for reorganizing human society. Thus for Lohia the general good is "total efficiency" of an individual and nothing less than that. In other words, a just and permanently peaceful global society can not be created unless each individual becomes capable to develop his personality fully.

To sum up Lohia's conception (one has to understand) that he interprets the notion of the world civilization in terms of political ideologies. Unlike Gandhi, he believes that the present civilization based on science and technology is capable of producing just and equitable global order and peace, but the main stumbling bloc is the structure of the nation-states system. The nation-states are sharply divided and they subscribe to the incompatible ideologies of communism and capitalism. These ideologies are the product of the new civilization. Hence, the fragmented
nation-states prefers to use the forces of science and technology for raising standard of living of their (people) nation at the cost of other people.

Lohia believes that in the name of ideologies, they want to perpetuate the existing order composed of the nation-states. This order is based on militarism, centralization of power, rationalization in production and exploitation of all resources for the development of their own people. He is convinced that both the blocs are not interested in changing international order which works in their favour. They are least interested in creating a world order based on justice. Lohia perceives that their methods have changed, but their aims have remained the same. The methods they employ now are economic enslavement of underdeveloped countries by means of loans and military aid.

In order to combat the activities of the two blocs, Lohia works out a thesis of the Third Camp in world affairs. The third camp comprising of the newly independent states of Asia, Africa and Latin America should denounce militarism and expansionist policy of these blocs. Lohia visualizes that only the effective opinion of a third camp will influence and compel the two warring camps to pursue a policy of peace and disarmament and non-aggression in respect of weak and underdeveloped countries of the world. What Lohia seems to suggest to the third world countries is selective non-cooperation with the dominant power. It seems what Lohia has in mind is that this type of non-cooperation will weaken the nation-state system.
In the realm of ideology, Lohia propagates the ideology of socialism based on the premise of universal brotherhood. He is faithful that powerful ideology of socialism will be combating against the outdated ideologies of communism and capitalism. The ideology and capitalism. The ideology of socialism incorporates Gandhian ideals and methods of civil disobedience. It seems Lohia seeks for the application and operationalization of Gandhian model of survodaya at international level in order to create a society of mankind at world level.

What Lohia suggests is that the existing seemingly emancipative ideologies of communism and capitalism are defective. Moreover, the instruments (Nation-State System) through which ideologies are implemented is equally defective. In order to rectify these defects Lohia suggests to replicate Gandhian model at international level to server as competent alternative for achieving world peace.

Lohia's writings on international relations have historical orientation and exhibit insight into power relations in the contemporary world. He advocates socialist (New Socialism) aspirations for world order based on the principle of international brotherhood. But at the same time he views recent history as a struggle for supremacy between nations, continents and civilizations in which Europe has always been the oppressor.

In the writings of Lohia one is struck with his exposition of the synthesis of oriental thinking as well as modern conflicts between the two worlds of communism and capitalism (democratic individualism). According to
him, the basic conflict in the international society is the conflict of civilization. The modern European civilization does not help developing human personality. Hence his central thesis is regarding how to achieve total efficiency and how to relate it to development of human personality through the evolution of a new world civilization. Lohia envisages a world of total efficiency, he aims at evolving a world culture of such magnitude based on the principle of total efficiency.

The existing two blocs are struggling for the attainment of maximum efficiency for their own people by developing national output and pushing up standard of living within national boundaries in two different ways. According to Lohia, they come in the way of creating a just world order. The just world order can be created by producing a stateless society. The communism the capitalism may, however, claim to usher ultimately an era of stateless society, they have, in fact, maintained a status-quo to safeguard their status and interests.

In order to revise the unjust status-quo, Lohia suggests to replicate Gandhian model of 'satyagraha,' a struggle insisting on truth, at the international level by coordinating peace movements occurring differently in countries of the world under the leadership of the third camp mainly comprised of the non-aligned nations. Table order and just peace can be created at global level provided we create a stateless international society and classless societies at national levels composed of human beings, with the help of the ideology of socialism.
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