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LAJPAT RAI'S IDEAS ON INTERNATIONAL ORDER.

Lajpat Rai lived at a time when world had become 'Unipolar,' and Europe was the nucleus of international relationships. The international politics was European in character. The USA was guided by an isolationist impulse. Russia was far from being a major Power. The dominant pattern of international relationships was defined, and determined, to all intents and purposes, exclusively by the greed, rivalries and jealousies of the European Powers. Imperialism and aggressive nationalism had swept across the world. Empires were ruthless and oppressive and indulged in exploitation of the subject peoples. The world was effectively divided into a handful of "active," industrialised, prosperous metropolitan countries, and a majority of "passive," agrarian, raw-material producing, poor colonies. Racialism ruled the roost in as much as that alien masters, obsessed with the heady sentiments of superiority were utterly insensitive to the aspirations of the subject peoples. They were contemptuous of the native and the indigenous. In the circumstances, the birth and growth of nationalism, especially in the subjugated
regions of the world, was inevitable. So was the rise and spread of scientific Marxism and Bolshevism.

The development of communications had not yet reached the stage where the idea of 'One World' could have been realised. Science and technology, inspite of their impressive progress were still, relatively speaking, in their infancy. Wars were limited affairs both in their scope and impact. The means of warfare then available were rather primitive. As such, war was not total as it is today, and both the victor and the vanquished could survive the aftermath of war. During the times of Lajpat Rai, in the domain of world affairs, the problem of peace was peripheral and not central as it is today.

Lajpat Rai started from the premise that every individual should have the final say in matters which concerned him. Where people were deprived of their power to decide things for themselves, a state of unnatural existence developed. Imperialism and colonialism contributed to such an inequitous world order in as much that these implied the very negation of the fundamental rights of the dependent people. So rejection of imperialism and colonialism was a primary condition for bringing into existence a viable and natural society. Similarly, in a society, which was not dominated by an alien power, he
stressed that the rights of its members must be guaranteed. He, therefore, advocated the establishment of a democratic system of government in which final power would rest with the people. His criticism of the Moderates also stemmed from his democratic belief that the latter did not have the wellbeing of the people at heart, but catered to the privileged few like the holders of property; landlords, big merchants, the capitalists and the aristocrats.¹

Establishment of democracy, for Lajpat Rai was a means of bringing out the best out of the people. The best definition of democracy, he contended, had been given by Abraham Lincoln as "the government of the people by the people, for the people." Lajpat Rai extended the scope of the 'people' in the definition to embrace the people world over. That is why he criticized western political institutions and ideas because they discriminated against people on the basis of sex, creed, colour and race. A large number of people were deprived of their fundamental rights either on the basis of religion or social status. He felt, therefore, that even the western countries did not deserve

---

to be called democratic in the true sense of the word.\textsuperscript{2} In a similar way he asserted that the labouring classes must also be given their due before the world could be considered as really free.\textsuperscript{3} To evolve a democracy, to constitute a free state, to develop Swaraj was impossible unless all parts of the nation were in a position to make their contribution to the common purpose, the common will and the common work.\textsuperscript{4}

From this it follows that Lajpat Rai wanted the establishment of real democracy and not what prevailed in the West. To him democracy in the West was only a cover for exploitation and that unless it was practised in all

\textsuperscript{2}Lajpat Rai, \textit{Writings and Speeches}, Vol. I, p. 311. "Really speaking, there are no free peoples in the world. The democracies of United States, Great Britain and France are only democracies in name. The men in power, those who possess property, enjoy privileges are as tyrannical towards their own people, as they are towards us." (Ibid. p. 311).

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., p. 315. Lajpat Rai, "Untouchability and Labour," \textit{The Tribune} (Lahore) November 4, 1923. Also "we insist upon the recognition of the right of every human being to a decent living made out of land or from industries. We maintain that a body-politic which does not recognise that duty, is a lawless body existing on the exploitation of human beings." (Ibid., p. 315).

spheres of life, it could benefit the entire society. His conception of democracy may be explained in his own words:

"We want a democracy that will include all the people of India which will recognise no masters, no slaves, no capitalists, and no mere wage-earners, no landlords and no mere cultivators, no governing class and no governed."5

From the above one may deduce that Lajpat Rai envisioned the existence of a truly democratic state as a pre-condition for the establishment of a just international order. By true democracy, he meant, social, economic and political democracy. Besides, such a society must be free from rabid competition and co-operation should be the sheet-anchor on which it ought to flourish. He contended that a truly democratic state was possible only in a pluralistic society. The state coordinated the various institutions of society and laid down the foundations of moral living. In such a social order individuals would cooperate and become an ally in the venture of human progress. He expressed the hope that it was this kind of a social unit which should co-operate with others similarly placed to build a new world. The human mind, he asserted must be taught to think in terms of universal good. The security

5. Ibid., p. 168. See also Lajpat Rai, The Ideals of Non-cooperation and other Essays, (Madras, 1924).
of life and property, no doubt were important, but these were only a means to an end, the end being the uplifting of the human race and its progress towards freedom. This ideal can be achieved by a federation of sisterly states having common goals and aspirations.

Lajpat Rai had some opportunities to study the social and political systems of various countries from close quarters. Though during his travels abroad his primary concern was India's independence and creating world opinion for the achievement of that goal, yet his writings and speeches give an indication, though vague and incomplete, of an international order.

It did not require much of foreign travel to develop economic problem, it was social and political too. He was convinced that unless labour came into its own, the world could not be truly democratic, so long as those who produced wealth were poor, backward and miserable of all the human beings.

Lajpat Rai diagnosed that labour in India suffered from many drawbacks and prejudices. The interests of

workers all over the world were identical, but the capitalists everywhere were successful in driving a wedge amongst workers of different countries. To the workers of Manchester was always presented the bugbear of cheap labour in India, while Indian labour was kept in fear of competition with Manchester labour. In India a virulent revulsion for Empires and Imperialism came to him instinctively. The gospel of the Arva Samaj fostered in him an intense pride in the glorious heritage of India and he came to believe:

"Foreign Government (even when) perfectly free from religious prejudices, impartial towards all the natives and foreigners - kind, beneficent and just can never render the people perfectly happy." 7

Lajpat Rai was a personal witness to the ugly phenomena of cruel oppression, exploitation and humiliation of Indians (at home and in other colonies) by the British who had reduced India to abject straits and Indians to 'hewers of wood and drawers of water.' Lajpat Rai passionately believed that all foreign rule, whether of a democracy or a bureaucracy was immoral, unnatural and demoralising. 8

8. Lajpat Rai, Unhappy India (Calcutta, 1928), p. 425. "This Truth......is that a foreign rule, however well-intentioned it may be, can never be a blessing. Much less when it is conducted on despotic lines by autocrats invested with powers larger than even angels could be safely entrusted with." (Lajpat Rai, Writings and Speeches, Vol. I, pp. 70-71). Again "Foreign Rule is, under any circumstances, a curse; chaos, disorder, mutual slaughter, anything is preferable to that." (Ibid., Vol. II, p. 240).
Foreign travel merely provided his views on imperialism a sharp focus. He got to know at first hand of the barbaric methods of Imperialism in Africa, Asia and elsewhere and the conviction deepened in him that Imperialism was the greatest world menace known to history. Imperialism had contaminated the world order. It distorted international relationships (by fostering, for instance, myths of superiority and inferiority of peoples) and created insuperable barriers in achieving equality and liberty of nations. It encouraged militarism which impeded and thwarted the promotion and preservation of peace. As a consequence of Imperialism, the existing world order and international politics based on it, perpetuated the myth of the superior and the inferior nations. It was, therefore, to be rejected by Indians who, he said, were inferior to none. Such a world system was to be transformed, not merely by eliminating one or two Empires (Austro-Hungarian, Ottoman, etc.) or by substituting one Empire by another, but by abolishing all of them.

In his analysis of the causes and prospects of Imperialism, Lajpat Rai differed markedly with Lenin, although with regard to its ultimate demise and the desirability of exterminating it root and branch in all its

9. Lajpat Rai, Unhappy India (Calcutta, 1923), p. 141
Forms, he hardly had any difference with Lenin. In the rise of nationalism and socialism, he saw its doom and noted that the rising tide against Imperialism had been further augmented by the war, and the Russian Revolution. In the post-war world, he found the principles of Socialism pitted against those of Imperialism. The process of dissolution of Empires had set in, and Socialistic ideas were spreading fast to acquire the status of an international ideology, and thus claiming universal applicability.  

Thus in the emergence of a viable international order, chief impediment, Lajpat Rai pointed out, was imperialism which had close affinities with militarism, capitalism and other systems which were exploitative in character. He asserted that imperialism thrived on the assumption that human beings by nature were unequal. Within the state its adherents presumed the existence of classes which were at different levels of development and had antagonistic interests. Consequently, those in

authority sought to perpetuate their dominance and were not willing to concede equal rights and equal opportunities to others. In the international realm a similar struggle for power was taking place as a result of which imperialist nations tried to control the markets of the globe and establish political and economic hegemony over them. Imperialism, therefore, was inimical to the establishment of a just world order and its obliteration in all forms was a pre-condition for creating an environment congenial for its achievement of the goal. Commenting on British imperialism, he said "it was as selfish and autocratic as any imperialism in the history of the world ever was or could be."  

Lajpat Rai, therefore, came to firmly believe that in order to establish a just order, whether national or international, it would be imperative that imperialism in all its manifestations must be struck out root and branch. He felt convinced that unless ideas of inequality, exploitation, greed, power, etc. were eradicated from the minds of national communities a just world order could not be brought into existence. The two were bound to have an 

impact on each other. Besides, scientific developments made it impossible for any nation to isolate itself from the main-currents of life and thought so much so that the various countries had become quite dependent on one another for the supply of goods and other material needs. As a result of it, trade and commerce amongst nations had become inevitable.

Lajpat Rai underlined the need of building up self-governing communities which were free from social, political and economic exploitation and in which all segments of society were given equal opportunities to fend for themselves and thereby contributing towards the effective realisation of a peaceful international order. He envisaged an easy cooperation amongst such national communities for achieving common objectives. They would be meeting on terms of equality with a view to resolving their mutual differences. Commenting on the political situation of Europe during the first world war, he held that it consisted of warring classes, warring communities, and warring states. It was the natural result of the social philosophy it had been following for the last two hundred years. The existing social order of Europe was vicious and immoral. It was worm-eaten. It had the germs of

plague, of decomposition. It was based on injustice, tyranny, oppression and class rule.\textsuperscript{15} To Lajpat Rai the 1914-18 war was a major world event. He interpreted it as an Imperialist war pure and simple, born out of competing Imperialisms, and being fought for the Empire of the world; certainly not to "make the world safe" for democracy. He asserted that so long as India was denied the right to self-government, the professions of Britain and others as champions of democracy sounded hollow and hypocritical and even \textit{USA}, Britain and France which claimed to be free and democratic were not so in reality. The loud boast that the war was being fought in order to end all wars did not make any sense to Lajpat Rai. He explained that so long as the old structure of the international system persisted, so long as there prevailed the status quo and the Empires continued to exist, the motives and provocations for waging wars would remain. Lajpat Rai made it abundantly clear that seeds of future war were already being sown during the course of the war. With a prophetic prescience, he clearly foresaw that the war would leave scars on Britain: her prestige and influence in the world would dwindle; she would become unpopular and her rivals would incite and inflame her dependencies. From the Indian viewpoint, the myth of British superiority and invincibility, already shattered by

German successes, would no longer overawe the Indians, with the result that Britain would no longer be able to govern India on the old lines, "even for the next 10 years." Further, he added, Indians returning from the War would have a new confidence in their own strength, would feel equal to the Whites in every respect, and would inspire the rest of their countrymen to struggle for freedom with redoubled vigour. But, perhaps the most precious gain to India was that the War had focussed the attention of the countries like USA on the condition of the Indians and their aspirations.

In addition to bring about the Bolshevik Revolution, pulling down many monarchies and destroying four Empires, the War, said Lajpat Rai, marked a turning point in the world affairs. Communications and international intercourse, had developed as a result of which (a) It would become impossible for a nation to live in isolation, (b) An era of new internationalism had dawned, and (c) World opinion was bound to play an increasingly important role in international politics. Emphasising the importance of publicity abroad, Lajpat Rai contended that a nation could neglect, or ignore, world opinion and the need for propaganda entirely at its own peril. He, therefore, led a vigorous campaign to publicise India's case in America, Britain and other countries and in International Assemblies like the
Lajpat Rai noted the significance of the rise of Bolshevism in the Soviet Russia, but he appeared neither very sympathetic nor very clear about the objectives of Bolshevism. He was also not certain that it would spread to the countries of Europe and other parts of the world. But the significance of its creed was not lost on him in so far as it rejected the existing exploitative, predominantly Imperialist world order. It sought to lay the foundations of a new world order. He predicted the ultimate overthrow of imperialism and said in 1924:

"There cannot be any doubt that capitalism in its present form is doomed, and with it are doomed the capitalistic forms of government. Whether this change will come peaceably or after cataclysmic conflicts like those of Russia, no one can foretell."

He went on to add:

"We may or may not agree with Bolshevist ideas, but the Russian experiment was bound to influence the life of the world in a great measure, particularly, in the political and economic field in Europe and Asia."

---


The impact of the Bolshevik Revolution, according to Lajpat Rai, was due to the fact that it had come in the wake of the War, and it had led to the creation of "a new order of society, aglow with the spirit of a new and elevated kind of internationalism." 19

Here one comes across an apparent inconsistency in Lajpat Rai's attitude towards Bolshevism. On the one hand, he welcomes it as a force against Imperialism, for building a new international order. On the other, he wanted to contain its spreading to India and other parts of the world, and also to stem its tide by 'radical changes in the existing order' including the creation of a self-governing India. This ambivalence in his thinking partly emanated from his abhorrence of violence and bloodshed, the natural concomitants of the creed of Bolshevism and also from his keen awareness of India's helplessness and absence of a revolutionary situation in India. Lajpat Rai would not deny the option to adopt it as a new social order within a free India. If his love of liberty made him suspicious of all dogma, his pragmatism led him to advocate that India should retain her links with Britain as a free and equal member of the British Commonwealth.

Lajpat Rai lamented that under the obnoxious international set-up which prevailed in his time, the status of India was one of servility and insignificance. She was being held in subjection in order to subserve Britain's interests-commercial, strategic and Imperial. All their professions of 'trusteeship,' 'benevolence,' 'ruling India for her benefit,' 'security,' etc. were sheer nonsense. In fact, India formed the very basis of the British Empire and Britain would never like to renounce such a precious possession. In his "Open Letter to Edwin Montague," the then Secretary of State for India, written on 15th September 1917 from New York, Lajpat Rai had underlined this point.20

The existence of inequality, colonialism and capitalism was antithetical to a sound world order. Referring to the League of Nations which was dominated by Great Britain and France and which, therefore, compromised with Imperialism, Lajpat Rai pointed out emphatically that it was not expected to play any important part in the maintenance of international peace and security and for the


furtherance of universal principles of human dignity and progress.

The League, he clarified could be a forum for moral crusade against injustice provided it did not play into the hands of imperialistic powers and all its members were accepted on the basis of equality. He was critical of those who thought that Indian membership of the League would give them an opportunity for self-expression. India, he pointed out, was still a dependency and therefore her representatives in the League or in any other international forum toed the line of the British Government and they were not free to express their views. Besides, the mandate system was

22. To quote Lajpat Rai: "It is absolutely hypocritical to talk of a League of Nations, and the reign of internationalism so long as Imperialism continues to keep down one fifth of the human race in India alone. Of course, if you include rest of Asia and Africa, the figures will reach to almost three-fourth. With the three-fourths of humanity under the heel of militaristic imperialism starved to death physically and intellectually by a handful of the rest cursing and hating their masters, always discontented and disconsolate, how can there be peace on earth? (Lajpat Rai, Writings and Speeches, Vol. II, p. 19).

23. Lajpat Rai, Writings and Speeches, Vol. II, p. 101. Also "The fact that India is one of the original signatories to the Covenant of the League of Nations, that its 'representatives' have been admitted into the Councils of Empire on terms of equality, that an Indian was nominated as a member of the British delegation to the Washington Conference may tickle the vanity of those who see in these arrangements, means of personal glory and aggrandisement, but it does not make the slightest difference in the real status of India as subject country. It (India) will be free only when its people are in a position to make its government function in accordance with their will." (Ibid., p. 101).
colonialism in disguise and the Imperialist powers would continue to exploit these territories and even use nationals of subject countries as mercenaries in order to further their imperialist designs. He also pleaded for the improvement of the condition of the labour classes and wanted the International Labour Organisation to give it wider publicity through the League of Nations. Keeping in view the handicaps under which the League of Nations functioned, he underlined that its ideals could not exist alongside with imperialism. Moreover, as an objective, he held that the League should lead a crusade "to push the world from the world of unrighteousness into the world of righteousness and equality for every human being, be he of any continent, or any colour, or of any caste, or of any creed."

Contours of Lajpat Rai's New International Order.

Lajpat Rai emphasised that the existing state of the world was clearly intolerable and he, therefore, stood for a radical restructuring of the prevailing international setup in the interest of peace and happiness of mankind.


In the first place, Lajpat Rai insisted that Empires and Imperialism all the world over should go lock, stock and barrel. The existing Imperialistic system was to be replaced by a voluntary international organisation, fully representing all nations of the world aiming at cultivating and promoting a spirit of true internationalism. The international order must have for its foundation, Justice and self-determination for all peoples regardless of race or religion, creed or colour. In the new understanding between nations co-operation must be substituted for competition and mutual trust for distrust. The only alternative was a greater war and the spread of Bolshevism. He maintained that the struggle to abolish Imperialism should be carried on without malice or rancour even against the votaries of that system.

As a corollary to the overthrow of Imperialism an increased diversification of the world would take place. He said: "The world is good and beautiful only with its diversity." Despite of diversification which was an inevitable feature of his world order, it was not possible

for a nation to survive in isolation. He emphasised the fact of interdependence of nations and regions in the world.

Moreover, the new order was not only to be organised on democratic lines, but democracy as a system of Government and as an ideology, was to spread and inform the new order. At no stage he appeared to assign the same role or status to Socialism, or Bolshevism. Not that he was opposed to Socialism ever becoming an international phenomenon or a force of worldwide significance. He seemed to disclaim any contradiction between Socialism and democracy. But he leaned towards democracy more than Socialism or Bolshevism. Accepting Lincoln's celebrated definition of democracy Lajpat Rai found in it a lasting guarantee for world peace, for the simple reason that equality and liberty were its fundamental tenets and he wanted these to prevail in the international field, so that these causes of war might disappear for ever. Finally, Lajpat Rai looked upon the World War and the Bolshevik Revolution as events of the highest importance, heralding an international order in which lasting peace would prevail. Though the problem of peace was to be pivotal in all international relationships,

he viewed it exclusively from the point of view of India's freedom. For instance, he argued that peace in the world could be realised and was likely to be lasting provided India was free and democratic, otherwise, Britain's international enemies would always have their eye on fomenting trouble in India and making a political capital out of her discontent and unhappiness at the international plane. Moreover, an aggressive, defiant, insolent Great Britain, with India at her beck and call, was a danger to world peace. With India self-governing that danger would disappear. A subject India was a menace to world peace, as well as to the development of democracy on which the super-structure of the new order was going to be built.

Lajpat Rai insisted that India should become free, within the British Empire. Her position must be that of democratic equality, autonomy, and self-government similar to that of the other self-governing Dominions (Canada, Australia, etc.) within the Empire. In view of her self-respect and honour India within the Empire ought to enjoy full autonomy - political, fiscal, social, etc., and

above all, effective safeguards against future economic exploitation should be guaranteed, and, finally, all kinds of discrimination in her treatment should be given up. Membership of the Empire on these terms alone would ensure (a) an effective role for India in the cause of world peace, (b) the realisation of a truly democratic world order, and (c) progress of mankind. Needless to say, India's voluntary association with Britain would also strengthen the British Empire. The implication of these proposals was that he advocated the idea of transforming the British Empire into a British Commonwealth.

Lajpat Rai was convinced that a real sense of internationalism could be fostered only on the basis of equality, justice, fair play, honesty and brotherhood. He deprecated the teniency of using double standards, on the part of various nations in their dealings with one another. The European nations, he pointed out, in theory, denounced Machiavellianism, they practised it themselves. If they were serious about war-time slogan of "making the world safe for democracy," it should be made applicable to all people and should not be used to hoodwink others. If

32. Ibid., p. 283.
European civilization really stood for the lofty ideals of humanism, peace and justice, it should forbear from dominating others by force. Justice and fair play demanded a tolerant attitude towards each other and both the East and the West must come closer, borrow and assimilate whatever was best in each and thus reduce the causes of friction and misunderstanding. "It will make the world poorer and much less interesting, if it brings about a depressing monotony and a dull uniformity in the life and thought of the East the West." Further he emphasised that we should rather "join hands in building a new world, without our imposing on the other and without our dominating and exploiting the other." 34

In this connection it needs to be understood that Lajpat Rai was prepared to keep India as a member of the British Commonwealth provided she was accepted on the basis of equality and was accorded a status similar to that of Canada and South Africa. He criticised the use of the world 'Empire,' since it smacked of inequality and, thus, militated against the idea of friendship and fraternity which was the

34. Ibid., p. 386.
real meaning of the Commonwealth. He succinctly summed up India's position thus:

"If partnership of the Commonwealth means full freedom to us in India with responsibility for the burden of the Commonwealth to the extent of our interest in it, we accept that ideal of partnership, but if partnership in the Empire includes the permanence of racial or alien domination, in any shape, form or degree in the Government of India, then we do not accept that ideal."35

Lajpat Rai expressed the hope that the establishment of a British Commonwealth comprising the various parts of the Empire as completely free and equal units and consisting of people professing different religions, faiths and belonging to different racial stock, would really be a miniature experiment in Internationalism. In the event of such a common partnership taking roots on a smaller scale, its impact was bound to be felt at the global level. Painting

35. To quote Lajpat Rai: "The world movements foreshadow coming events and unless the British Empire is soon converted into a British Commonwealth it will go to the dogs as other empires have gone. The safety of the British empire lies in converting it into a British Commonwealth and we in India as constitutional workers, as Indian believing in the destiny of the whole world, we are prepared to cooperate constitutionally with the whole of our thinking forces, with the whole of our character at the back of it, to convert that Empire into a Commonwealth of equal and free nations." (Lajpat Rai: Writings and Speeches, Vol. II, p.3).
the picture of his fancied Commonwealth Lajpat Rai said:

"I can look forward with hope to the day when world will be a Commonwealth of the peoples of the earth guaranteeing liberty, equality and fraternity to all the nations of the world, without distinction of colour, creed or caste." 36

In this regard it is important to note that Lajpat Rai showed not only the perp[icacity of a genius, but a prophetic farsight into the future. He advocated the creation of a multi-racial Commonwealth, the type of which came into existence after his death. Again it was he who had insisted that India would not be coerced into accepting membership of the Commonwealth and that her decision to join the Commonwealth would be perfectly free, voluntary, and based entirely on her national interest. This was precisely what came to pass when India got her independence and she eventually chose to become a member of the British Commonwealth.

Role of India in the New Order.

Lajpat Rai envisaged a pivotal role for India for

36. Ibid., p. 395. See, 'Farewell to America' Lajpat Rai's Speech delivered at a Farewell dinner at New York, November 28, 1919.
laying the foundation of a new peaceful world order. In
the international system, her role would be that of an
active cooperative, and constructive member of the world
fraternity. She would spare no efforts for building a
peaceful world. It was not a mere happy coincidence that
the kind of role he wanted India to play in world affairs,
forms the sheet-anchor of the present day policy of
MonORIZATION. Consider, for instance the following of his
statements which embody the underlying principles at the
back of India's present day foreign policy:

(i). "We shall not be dominated, used, exploited
or dictated by anybody in the world. We bear no
ill-will against the British people. We harbour
no grudge against any country. We hate none, not
even our enemies....." 37

(ii). "We shall welcome co-operation.....advice(and)
guidance also in certain matters. But we shall
resent patronage and dictation...."38

(iii). "It would esteem German friendship as much as
British or American, or that of the Japanese
or the Chinese, I would gratefully accept any help
anybody would render...."39

(iv). "A contended India may safely keep out of all
wars between the European powers....."40

37. Ibid., p. 394.
38. Ibid., p. 2. See "Towards Freedom," Lajpat Rai's Speech
at Bombay, February 20, 1920.
Lloyd George,' June 13, 1917.
Thus Lajpat Rai laid stress in unmistakable terms on the concept of equal friendship, co-operation and mutual help on the part of all the nations, big and small. At the same time he insisted that India should resist dictation by any Power. These utterances of Lajpat Rai contain in a way, the basis of an independent, non-aligned foreign policy. Another salient feature of the foreign policy would be provided by his emphasis on developing complete self-reliance on the part of India. He also contended that India could no longer afford to be segregated. The following statement from his *Unhappy India* bears ample testimony to his firm grasp of the currents and cross-currents in world politics:

"The possibility of India being conquered by any other power also may be dismissed without much discussion. The world situation would not allow any other power taking possession of India. The European powers may not feel any danger from India if she is self-governing. But any attempt on the part of any other power to take possession will be resented and resisted by the powers of Europe in their own interest....." 42

---


On the basis of the above contentions, one may argue that Lajpat Rai does not seem to be in favour of India developing into a military power and that he nursed the idea of the Collective Security provided by the rest of the world community. Further, since there would be no inducement for India to engage herself in military and security problems, the possibility of her having to join any groups or blocs of nations was also ruled out.

Such then was the the architectonic design of Lajpat Rai's new world order and India's role in it. It was, indeed, not a perfect design. It was hedged round by certain inherent limitations. One notices in Lajpat Rai's design of a new International Order, certain gaps which he could not fill up during his life time. For instance, he had nothing to say about India's neighbours and the kind of relations a free India should cultivate with them, about the potential role of Africa, and the Latin America in the transformed international system of the future. It is again a matter of conjecture why a sensitive mind like him failed to grasp the full implications of the emergence of a Communist Russia and that in his new world order, it appeared as if Europe would continue to occupy a pivotal -- if not dominating -- position in international politics.

It is true that he was well aware of increase in international interdependence in the coming years, but without any
hesitation he seemed to accept American withdrawal into isolationism. While he advocated the cause of internationalism, he seemed little inclined to make particular adjustments in free India's stance to foster it. He could not foresee the stupendous international effort necessary for economic development of his country and economic prosperity of his people. But it may not be forgotten that Lajpat Rai was primarily a nationalist whose abiding concern was freedom of his country and that the conceptual framework for the evolution of an international order was lacking in his time.