
Chapter-V

CHAPTER - V

Peace and Humanity in International Concept : Betrayed or Went Awry!

“Man's ultimate aim,” said Gandhi in 1936, “is the realization of God, all his activities –social, political, religious –have to be guided by the ultimate aim of the vision of God. The immediate service of all human beings becomes necessary part of the endeavour, simply because the only way to find God is to seek Him in His Creation and be one with it. This can only be done by service of all. I am a part and parcel of the whole, and I cannot find Him apart from the rest of humanity.”

Though Gandhi's ultimate aim was to realize God, beyond human being he could not conceive of God's existence. His path to God realization was through man, i.e., by rendering service to His creature. He could not stand suffering among humanity. It was in his nature to be beside every needy and downtrodden. Gandhi's love for humanity knew no boundary. He stood for fundamental unity of humanity. His love for man impelled him to be both a nationalist and internationalist.¹

Gandhi said that his religion has no geographical limit. He confessed, “If I have living faith in it (religion), it will transcend my love for India.”² Gandhi has identified truth with God, though he kept his concept of truth intact, yet he changed his concept of god. He fought against deprivation, injustice, hypocrisy and untruth throughout his life and also raised his voice and extended moral support wherever and

whenever he found there was breach of one of these principles in any part of the world, leave alone India.

Though he was a deeply religious man, he identified himself with the whole of mankind. "I could not be leading a religious life unless I identified myself with the whole of mankind," Gandhi used to say. Never did he accept the frontiers made by men. To him, "God never made these frontiers."³ He felt that our first duty is towards our immediate neighbours and thus "to serve one's neighbour is to serve the world."⁴

The road to salvation, in Gandhi's opinion, lies through incessant toil in the service of India and there through of humanity. He wanted to identify himself with everything that lived. He also wanted to live at peace with both friend and foe, though he might be despised and hated by a Muslim or Christian or a Hindu.⁵ His love for country was the guide to universal brotherhood. He said, "For me, patriotism is the same as humanity, I am patriotic because I am human and humane. It is not exclusive, I will not hurt England or Germany to serve India ... A patriot is so much less a patriot if he is a lukewarm humanitarian ... It is important for one to be an internationalist without being a nationalist."⁶

Though Gandhi's contemporaries condemned the First World War, Gandhi, being an apostle of non-violence, was recruiting for the British Indian Army in Gujarat. He always looked into the greater interests of the country. He could never work within a limit, because he knew India's interests could be safeguarded only if it involves itself into the affairs outside. Long back, the Indian National Congress had realized that the problems faced by India could not be segregated from the problem of the world, and thus concluded the solutions, which were

applicable to the countries of the west, were equally applicable to India. "Gandhi is not operating at all with the problematic of nationalism. His solution too is meant to be universal, applicable as much to the countries of the West as to nations such as India."⁷ Therefore, again and again he reiterated that his concept of National movement was not meant for India alone. In the year 1921, the Indian National Congress adopted certain resolutions on the matters related to the international affairs. "As early as 1921, it passed a resolution on the foreign policy of India assuring our neighbouring countries of our friendship for them. As the war danger developed, the Congress expressed itself clearly and declared that India would be no party to imperialist war. We are interested in the fate of Ethiopia; we protest against Japanese aggression in China, we sided whole-heartedly with the Spanish Government in its heroic fight against foreign invasion and domestic rebellion. The problem of India is an essential part of the world problem."⁸

To Gandhi, the world is real but he admits it is not free from blemishes. On man he bestowed all his faith and hoped that he would be encouraged to make it flawless. There are both good and evil in this world, which is its basic nature, and cannot be altered by anybody however holy he might be. An eternal conflict between the right and wrong is always going on. Though sometimes it appears that the wrong is in the ascendant, in the end right always emerges triumphant. Right is synonymous with truth, he maintained, therefore, it never dies. "The good are never destroyed for Right –which is Truth –cannot perish." More or less similar views he expresses elsewhere also, "The world rests on the bedrock of satya or truth. Asatya, meaning untruth, also means non-existent, and satya, or truth means 'that which is'. If untruth

does not so much as exist, its victory is out of question. And truth is being 'that which is' can never be destroyed."⁹

Subjecting people to cruelty and displaying love to God, who is unseen –Gandhi could never come to terms with these contradictory behaviour. He called himself a reformer through and through. "I recognize no God except the God that is to be found in the hearts of the dumb millions. They do not recognize His presence: I do. And I worship the God that is Truth, or Truth which is God, through the service of these millions."¹⁰

Gandhi aimed at the moral regeration of human society as a whole through application of the principle of non-violence. It was not a principle only, but a religion to him. In fact, it was his 'dharma'. The word 'dharma' has wider connotation –it is in real sense of the term implies one's assigned rightful duty or it can be interpreted as a right standard of conduct, which incorporates ethics, virtue, merit etc. Gandhi used the word religion for the people who were not accustomed to the exact meaning of the word 'dharma'. His problem with the word 'religion' was semantic. As a matter of fact, the word 'religion' cannot be exact equivalent of the Sanskrit word 'dharma'. For his Indian audiences or when he wrote in Indian languages, he, of course, used the word 'dharma'. Gandhi wanted to replace selfishness, rivalry and cruelty with mutual forbearance and fraternal cooperation. "I could not be leading a religious life unless I identified myself with the whole of mankind," wrote he.¹¹

Non-violence is simply a means to realise the Truth, which stipulates identifying oneself with all that exists and universal love. The observance of the principle of non-violence in letter and spirit effaces the feeling of self from one's consciousness, which is the first criterion

towards God's realization. "... one has to learn to efface self or the ego voluntarily and as a sacrifice in order to find God... He resides in our hearts, but if we install self or ego there, we dethrone 'poor' God. I have here used the epithet 'poor' advisedly. For although He is the King of kings, most High, Almighty, yet He is at the beck and call of anyone who has reduced himself to zero and turns to Him in uttermost humility of spirit. Let us, then become poor in spirit and find Him within ourselves."¹²

A non-violent person respects all living creatures. To him all human beings belong to one family irrespective of any difference in sex, colour, race, community or nation. Gandhi tried his level best to free Indian from the narrow concept of jingoistic nationalism. He said that all activity act and react upon one another,¹³ and "the world has shrunk to a pinhead, on which the slightest movement on one spot affects the whole."¹⁴

Gandhi insisted on the perfect equality of men and also he did not support any exploitation for personal gain by anybody. His love for humanity made him "to love the meanest of creation as oneself."¹⁵

Gandhi was not ready to divide the man's activities into different watertight compartments. He considered human activities as an indivisible whole. "The whole gamut of man's activities today constitutes an indivisible whole. You cannot divide social, economic, political and purely religious work into watertight compartments. I do not know any religion apart from human activity. It provides a moral basis to all other activities which they would otherwise lack, reducing life to a maze of 'sound and fury signifying nothing.'¹⁶ Elsewhere he expressed his similar view, "I claim that human mind or human activity

is not divided into watertight compartments called social, political and religious.”¹⁷

About his own life, Gandhi held that it was an indivisible whole and all his activities emanated from his insatiable love of mankind. In his personal life, he sought no redress for any wrong done to him. He felt any problem between nation and nation could be resolved with the use of non-violent means.

Though Gandhi had deep faith in the Indian traditions of non-violence, he deviated a little and developed his own concept. He supported worldly involvement for attainment of salvation, whereas the Hinduism maintains total detachment for a ‘sanyasi’ from worldly affairs. For Gandhi ahimsa did not mean only non-injury or non-killing, he says, it should be born out of compassion. “Where there is no compassion, there is no ahimsa.”¹⁸ The term ‘non-violence’ cannot be the exact equivalent for the Sanskrit word ‘ahimsa’, for it only connotes non-injury, which is a negative term. Therefore, Gandhi preferred to use the word ‘ahimsa’ in his English writings, instead of using its English equivalent. To quote Gandhi, “In its positive form, ahimsa means the largest love, the greatest charity.”¹⁹

Gandhi tries to draw a parallel between scientific phenomenon of cohesive force and the concept of love, “Scientists tell us that without the pressure of the cohesive force amongst the atoms that comprise this globe of ours, it would crumble to pieces and we cease to exist; and even as there is cohesive force among animate beings is Love. We notice it between father and son, between brother and sister, friend and friend. But we have to learn to use that force among all that lives, and in the use of it consists our knowledge of God.”²⁰

Gandhi selected a virgin path to travel. "Our non-violence is an unworthy thing," says he. He presented to the world on a platter his concept of non-violence as a panacea for all ills afflicting human society. To Gandhi, 'ahimsa' is one of the greatest principles and invincible; and it provided him with his daily nutrient. Its applicability is universal and thus can be applied against one's wife or one's children, against rulers, against fellow citizens and even against the whole world."²¹

It is true, Gandhi did not invent the principle of 'ahimsa', it existed as a moral tenet in India for centuries, but he reaffirmed it. "Human society is a ceaseless growth, an unfolding in terms of spirituality. If we turn our eye to the time of which history has any record down to our time, we shall find that man has been steadily progressing towards 'ahimsa'.Had it been extinct by now, even as many of the lower species disappeared."²²

Ahimsa, Gandhi explains, is not non-resistance, but fearlessness and "a conscious, deliberate restraint upon one's desire for vengeance."²³ The desire for vengeance is an outcome of fear of harm, imaginary or real. "A man who fears no one on earth would consider it troublesome even to summon up anger against one who is vainly trying to injure him."²⁴ Hence, forgiveness is a main prerequisite for being non-violent. But Gandhi puts forth a pre-condition, "Forgiveness adorns a soldier. But abstinence is forgiveness only when there is a power to punish; it is meaningless when it pretends to proceed from a helpless creature."²⁵ Even he takes a step further to add that when there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, he would advise violence. "I would rather have India resort to arms in order to defend her honour than that she should in a cowardly manner become or remain a helpless victim to her dishonour. But I believe that

non-violence is infinitely superior to violence, forgiveness is more manly than punishment."²⁶

But Gandhi clarifies that physical capacity should not be misunderstood for strength. "It comes from an indomitable will."²⁷ In the same spirit he further elaborates his standpoint, "Non-violence in its dynamic condition means conscious suffering. It does not mean meek submission to the will of the evil-doer, but it means the putting one's whole soul against the will of the tyrant. Working under this law of our being, it is possible for a single individual to defy the whole might of an unjust empire to save his honour, his religion, his soul and lay the foundation for that empire's fall or regeneration."²⁸

But Nehru admits that the National Congress as a whole was not impressed by the non-violent method of Gandhi. He says that non-violence "could not be, a religion or an unchangeable creed or dogma. It could only be a policy and a method promising certain results, and by those results it would have to be finally judged. Individuals might make of it a religion or incontrovertible creed. But no political organization, so long as it remained political, could do so."²⁹

Just before the 1934 Civil Disobedience movement began, Gandhi had appealed to his supporters that the movement should not be abandoned because of the occurrence of sporadic acts of violence. On this appeal of Gandhi, Nehru comments, "If the non-violent method of struggle could not function because of such almost inevitable happenings, then it was obvious that it was not an ideal method for all occasions, and this he was not prepared to admit. For him the method, being the right method, should suit all circumstances and should be able to function, at any rate in a restricted way, even in a hostile atmosphere. Whether this interpretation, which widened the scope of

non-violent action, represented an evolution in his own mind or not I do not know.”³⁰

Gandhi tried to prove through his words and deeds that moral force is far stronger than physical force. The correctness of the statement is disputable. He maintains that anybody who sows violence cannot expect to reap peace. He modified “turning the other cheek” doctrine of Christ and added that one should also resist the evil which is being inflicted upon him ^{the application of physical force but through} not through his moral courage. He advocated love for the wrongdoer but meant no submission in his act. “But it does not mean helping the wrong-doer to continue the wrong or tolerating it by passive acquiescence. On the contrary, love, the active state of ‘ahimsa’, requires you to resist the wrongdoer...”³¹ So non-violence is an expression of love for Gandhi, and its observance is ultimately, stands for selfless service to humanity.

To put in a nutshell, non-violence or ‘ahimsa’ is a soul force to Gandhi, which is capable of eradicating all the evils in the world and simultaneously which is also a ‘conditio sine qua non’ for establishing peace, progress and prosperity. When Gandhi implemented the policy of ahimsa into action, it became ‘Satyagraha’, which was his key to thinking and action. In his ‘Autobiography’ Gandhi describes the circumstances which led him to coin the term, “Events were so shaping themselves in Johannesburg as to make this self-purification on my part as it were to ‘Satyagraha’. I can now see that all the principal events of my life, culminating in the vow of ‘brahmacharya’, were secretly preparing me for it. The principle called ‘Satyagraha’ came into being before that name was invented. Indeed when it was born, I myself could not say what it was. In Gujarati also we used the English phrase ‘passive resistance’ to describe it. When in a meeting of Europeans I found that the term ‘passive resistance’ was too narrowly

construed, that it was supposed to be a weapon of the weak, that it could be characterized by hatred, and that it could finally manifest itself as violence, I had to demur to all these statements and to explain the real nature of the Indian movement. It was clear that a new word must be coined by the Indians to designate their struggle."³²

However, it is observed that Gandhi did not use the term 'Satyagraha' until he returned to India and joined the mainstream of the Indian national movement. He identified 'Satyagraha' with direct action, though he maintained that 'Satyagraha' implies firm and fearless adherence to truth even in the face of death and not to embarrass the wrong-doer.³³ On the one hand Gandhi says, "Never has anything been done on this earth without direct action,"³⁴ then on the other he cautions his followers, "The appeal is never to his fear; it is, must be, always to his heart. The satyagrahai's object is to convert, not to coerce the wrong doers."³⁵

Gandhi emphasized on the transformation in the individual through courtesy and patience and by refusing to consider the opponents as enemies."³⁶ He gives insistence on strengthening the reason by suffering and he hopes that only can suffering open the eyes of understanding.³⁷

Gandhi's approach is in sharp contrast to those of Marx. The latter's clarion call to the workers of the world to unite and to overthrow the capitalist class smacks of violence. Even the modern capitalist system has not been fully able to do away with the class antagonisms. Here comes Gandhi with the solution. His methodology to apply the soul-force in the form of self-suffering concurrently manifesting love and respect for the opponent as a means to achieve justice rather than coercion is a classic gift left behind by Gandhi not only for the people of

India but for the world. However, he admits, although non-violence means conscious suffering, "it does not mean meek submission to the will of the evil-doer," rather "it means the pitting of one's whole soul against the will of the tyrant."³⁸

Gandhi had total commitment to the principle of non-violence and he had such a faith that he used to say that it would never fail in its endeavour to overcome all violence, "Non-violence carries within it its own sanction. It is not a mechanical thing. You do not become non-violent by merely saying 'I shall not use force.' It must be felt in the heart, there must be within you an upwelling of love and pity towards the wrong-doer. When there is that feeling, it will express itself through some action. It may be a sign, a glance, even silence. But such as it is, it will melt the heart of wrong-doer and check the wrong."³⁹

It seems Nehru has changed his stand on the concept of Gandhi's 'non-violent resistance', because in his later writings he admits 'Satyagraha' as the right policy in the backdrop of India's background and traditions. He writes, "What I admired was the moral and ethical side of our movement and of 'Satyagraha'."⁴⁰

Gandhi sought to apply 'Satyagraha' to almost all contemporary international situations. During the Czech crisis of 1937-38 Gandhi advised the Czechs against an armed resistance to invasion by the German forces, though he was against imperialistic expansionism of Germany, however he feels deeply sympathetic to the cause of Czechs, "I want to speak to the Czechs because their plight moved me to the point of physical and mental distress ..."⁴¹

Gandhi says that small nations must either come or be ready to come under the protection of the dictators, because in spite of all the goodwill in the world England and France could not save the

Czechoslovakia from being invaded and occupied by Germany. He feels, had there been armed intervention, there would have been only bloodshed and destruction. He is totally against use of arms. "The Czech could not have done anything else, when they found themselves deserted by the two powerful allies. And yet I have the hardihood to say that if they had known the use of non-violence as a weapon for the defence of national honour, they would have faced the whole might of Germany with that of Italy thrown in."⁴²

Gandhi was aware that Hitler might not relent to non-violent resistance or might remain unaffected by the suffering, but he still insisted, "But as a believer in non-violence, I may not limit its possibilities. Hitherto he and his likes have built upon the invariable experience that men yield to force."⁴³ Still he believed unarmed men, women and children offering resistance without any bitterness in them would be a novel experience for the Germans. Gandhi was not the person to accept the failure of the principle of the non-violence ever. "Who dare say that it is not in their nature to respond to the higher and finer forces? They have the same soul that I have."⁴⁴

Elsewhere on the potency of 'Satyagraha' Gandhi says; "It is such a potent force that, once set in motion, it ever spreads till at last it becomes a dominant factor, in the community in which it is brought into play, and it spreads, no government can neglect it."⁴⁵

Gandhi believed in the superiority of the non-violent method in resolving the conflicts. He was emphatic on the power of love. "Love is a rose herb that makes a friend even of a sworn enemy and this herb grows out of non-violence. What in a dormant state is non-violence becomes love in the waking state. Love destroys ill will."⁴⁶

Let us see what Nehru has to say on the issue of Czechoslovakia crisis. Though he was greatly distressed at the miserable defeat of Czechoslovakia at the hands of Germany, he did not advocate non-violent resistance against Germany as prescribed by Gandhi, rather he pleaded for taking revenge.⁴⁷ He writes, "Czechoslovakia, with all her armed might and undoubted courage, succumbed without a fight. True, she did so because her friends, betrayed her ... Poland was utterly vanquished in three weeks of struggle ... The way of violence and armed might is only feasible today, even in the narrowest interpretation of immediate success, when the armed forces are superior or equal to those opposed to them."⁴⁸ But Gandhi supported only non-violent struggle. He said that the capitulation of Czechoslovakia before the might of Germany could not be avoided even if violent resistance had been offered. He ruled out application of violent resistance by the Czechs against the Germans. Thus, he concludes non-violent resistance as "the best method under all conceivable circumstances."⁴⁹

Gandhi had seen both the World Wars. The Second World War had wide ramifications than the First, and it was more destructive. He outrightly condemned Fascism and Nazism, but he did not support imperialism either. Fascism interpreted the state as the supreme institution and glorified war condemning democracy and pacifism. Nazism, on the other, preached the supremacy of the German race and expansionism.

Taking advantage of disunity of democratic forces in Europe, Hitler captured power in Germany in January 1933. He started rearming Germany and rebuilding lost German power. In March, he simply repudiated the humiliating clauses of the Treaty of Versailles related to disarming Germany. He proclaimed conscription to enhance

military might. England and France at this juncture pursued appeasement policy, which was not desirable to the existing situation. Emboldened, Hitler remilitarized the Rhineland in 1936, sought to redraw the map of Europe by naked display of his military power. The Fascist Italy under the dictatorship of Mussolini occupied Abyssinia. Though Gandhi asserted that he could not be indifferent about the war that Italy was waging against Abyssinia, he advised them not to offer, armed resistance of any kind.⁵⁰

True, Gandhi did not subscribe to the principles preached by the Fascists, but he did not support armed opposition against them either. Unique was he, Gandhi believed that since man has not been given the power to create, he does not possess the right to destroy the meanest of living creatures. "The prerogative of destruction belongs solely to the creator of all that lives." He was insistent that modern international gangsterdom, howsoever dangerous that might be, should be dealt with applying the method of non-violence. Eventually force, however justifiably used, will lead into the same morass as the force of Hitler and Mussolini.

Therefore, Gandhi had all praise for the French surrender in 1940. He applauded it as a mark of brave statesmanship. "I think French statesmen have shown rare courage in bowing to the inevitable and refusing to be party to senseless mutual slaughter." Though he acknowledged the bravery of the French soldier, he maintained that the greater bravery of the French statesmen lie in suing for peace.

Since war is contrary to the principle of non-violence, it was unjustified in the eyes of Gandhi. When he arrived in South Africa and observed racial discrimination, he was put into a dilemma in respect of adoption of a right course of action –he had to choose either violence

or to find out an alternative modus operandi. There he developed a firm conviction that "suffering is the fundamental conclusion ... suffering is the badge of human race, not the sword."⁵¹ Gandhi had experimented non-violent way of protest at first in South Africa with a commendable success. This was the beginning of the use of the principle of non-violence in politics by Gandhi and he did not look back after that.

Though Gandhi stood for complete peace, he expressed his support to the Allies in the Second World War against Fascism and Nazism. But in order to remove misconception lest his support might be interpreted wrongly, he clarified, "My sympathy does not mean endorsement in any shape or form of the doctrine of the sword."⁵² Even during the First World War Gandhi said that the Indians were duty-bound to support the British in their war-effort. However, on being questioned, he gave a categorical statement that he hated violence in every form and his association with the war was from different angle, "I myself could not shoot, but could nurse the wounded. I might even get German to nurse. I could nurse them without any partisan spirit. That would be no violation of the spirit of compassion then."⁵³

Undoubtedly, Gandhi condemned aggressive nationalism pursued by Nazi and Fascist powers, but simultaneously he was no less disfavoured to imperialism of the Allies. If he decried aggression on the one hand, then on the other he censured exploitation of small nations by big powers. "I see no difference between the Fascist and the Nazi powers and the Allies. All are exploiters, all resort to ruthlessness to the extent required to compass their end. America and Britain are very great nations, but their greatness will count as dust before the bar of dumb humanity, whether African or Asiatic ... They have no right to talk of human liberty and all else, unless they have washed their hands

clean of the pollution... Then, but not till then will they be fighting for a new order."⁵⁴

Gandhi, in his writings and speeches, always re-asserted his faith in non-violence again and again. 'Hate the evil not the evil-doer' was what he insisted upon all along. Even the Indian National Congress had resolved then, "We have no quarrel with the German people, or the Japanese people or any other people, but with the system which deny freedom and are based on violence and aggression."⁵⁵ Gandhi knew Germany had to face injustice and humiliation at the hands of the victorious powers after the First World War, although the professed aim during the course of the War was to restore democracy and assure the freedom of small nations. But after the War, all these tall objectives were simply shelved and realization of colonial interests was given prominence. Therefore, Gandhi wrote, "... the Nazi power had arisen as a nemesis to punish Britain for her sins of exploitation and enslavement of the Asiatic and African races."⁵⁶

Persecution of the Jews under the Nazi regime is the culmination of invulnerability of totalitarianism to any kind of moral pressure. Gandhi was not unaware of the violence let loose upon the Jews by Adolph Hitler in the name of purging the German nation of impurities by expelling the Jews, but he was not in favour of restoring Palestine to the Jews. He felt that cry for a national home provides a plea to Germany to expel the Jews. Though he was highly sympathetic to the Jews, he tried to provide a solution to their problem from a broader angle, "The nobler course would be to insist on a just treatment of the Jews, wherever they are born and bred. The Jews born in France are French in precisely the same sense that the Christians born in France are French. If the Jews have no home but Palestine, will they relish the idea of being forced to leave the other

parts of the world in which they are settled? Or do they want double home where they can remain at will? This cry for the national home affords a colourable justification for the German expulsion of the Jews."⁵⁷

Gandhi condemned Nazism and Fascism because they professed the theory of force and were against the principles of international brotherhood, equality and the dignity of man. To quote him, "Germany is showing to the world how efficiently violence can be worked, when it is not hampered by any hypocrisy of weakness masquerading as humanitarianism. It is also showing how hideous, terrible and terrifying it looks in its nakedness."⁵⁸

Seeing the extreme inhuman persecution of the Jews, Gandhi one time begins to dream of a war against Germany in the name of restoration of humanity, but he immediately retracts his words and says that he does not believe in war himself. "But the German persecution of the Jews seems to have no parallel in history. The tyrants of old never went so mad as Hitler seems to have gone ... The crime of an obviously mad but intrepid youth is being visited upon his whole race with unbelievable ferocity. If there could be a justifiable war in the name of and humanity, a war against Germany, to prevent the wanton persecution of the whole race, would be completely justified. But I do not believe in any war."⁵⁹

Therefore, in 1938, Gandhi advised the Jews to take shelter of 'Satyagraha' against the Nazi's persecution. "Can the Jews resist this organized and shameless persecution? Is there a way to preserve their respect and not to feel helpless, neglected and forlorn? I submit there is. No person who has faith in a living God need feel helpless or forlorn." Now, he elaborates his prescription, "If I were a Jew and born

in Germany and earned my livelihood there, I would claim Germany as my home, even as the tallest gentile German might, and challenge him to shoot me or cast me in the dungeon; I would refuse to be expelled or to submit to discriminating treatment ... If one Jew or all the Jews were to accept the prescription here offered, he or they cannot be worse off than now. And suffering voluntarily undergone will bring them an inner strength and joy, which no number of resolutions of sympathy passed in the world outside Germany can." Even he stresses that "... even if Britain, France and America were to declare hostilities against Germany, they can bring no inner joy, no inner strength. The calculated violence of Hitler may even result in a general massacre of the Jews by way of his first answer to the declaration of such hostilities. But if the Jewish mind could be prepared for voluntary suffering, even the massacre I have imagined could be turned into a day of thanksgiving and joy that Jehovah had wrought deliverance of the race even at the hands of the tyrant. For the god-fearing, death has no terror. It is a joyful sleep to be followed by a waking that would be all the more refreshing for the long sleep."⁶⁰ Perhaps here Gandhi went wrong. It seems, he tries to look at the situation in Germany from the Indian point of view. Even he endeavours to draw a parallel between the Indians in South Africa with the Jews in Germany. Here also perhaps he missed out the actual situation. True, there were unjustified racial laws in South Africa, but there was independent judiciary and freedom of expression. These two things were absent in Hitler's Germany and over and above there was no constitutional government. In such a hostile situation the Jews could never expect fair treatment or sympathy.

But Gandhi was not the type to stop at anything. He knows how to drive home his argument. He says, "There too the Indians were

consigned to ghettos, described as locations. The other disabilities were almost of the same type as those of the Jews in Germany. The Indians, a mere handful, resorted to satyagraha without any backing from the world outside or the Indian Government."⁶¹ About the Jews of Germany, he writes that they "can offer satyagraha under infinitely better auspices than Indian of South Africa. The Jews are a compact and homogeneous community in Germany. They are far more gifted than the Indians of South Africa ... I am convinced that if someone with courage and vision can arise among them in non-violent action, the winter of their despair can in the twinkling of an eye be turned into summer of hope. And what has today become a degrading man-hunt, can be turned into a calm and determined stand offered by the unarmed men and women, possessing the strength of suffering given to them by Jehovah. It will be then a truly religious resistance offered against the godless fury of dehumanized man. The German Jews will score a lasting victory over the German gentiles in the sense that they will have converted the latter to an appreciation of human dignity."⁶²

Here again, it seems, Gandhi is expecting some miracle; in fact, it was never going to happen, because the political situation in Europe then was totally different from the Indian political situation. Though he admits his ignorance of European politics, he argues that to commend his prescription to the Jews for removal of their many ills, he does not need to have an accurate knowledge of European politics.⁶³

It will not be out of place here to quote from the rejoinder of a famous Jewish intellectual Martin Buber written in response to Gandhi's appeal to the German Jews to adopt the policy of non-violent satyagraha in his article in *Hariajn* on 26 November 1938, "Do you not know what has gone up in flames of the sacred and in part ancient community property. (in Germany) ... But do you or don't you know,

Mahatma what a concentration camp is and what happens there, what the tortures of the concentration camp is and what its methods of slow and quick killing?"⁶⁴

In the same letter Buber wrote, "In the five years which I myself spent under the present regime, I observed many instances of genuine satyagraha among the Jews, instances showing a strength of spirit wherein there was no question of bartering their rights or of being bowed down, and where neither force nor cunning was used to escape the consequences of their behaviour. Such actions, however, exerted apparently not the slightest influence on their opponents .. An effective stand may be taken in the form of non-violence against unfeeling human beings in the hope of gradually bringing them thereby to their senses; but a diabolic universal steamroller cannot thus be withstood. There is a certain situation in which from the 'Satyagraha' of the strength of the spirit no 'Satyagraha' of the power of truth can result."

Admittedly, a single prescription could not fit into all the situations. A new prescription is required to be written for every new illness. No doubt 'non-violent resistance' is a great and noble step to fight injustice, but its modus operandi is required to be changed with the occurrence of every new situation. What is good from an Indian point of view may not be appropriate elsewhere and in a different condition. Moreover, there cannot be a second Gandhi. True, Gandhi can bring about miracle single handed, but to expect the same qualification in every ordinary mortal is like searching a needle in a haystack. Therefore, Gandhi's statement that if a single Jew performs true 'satyagraha' could be the saviour of the other Jews can be construed as a gross exaggeration and extremely distant from reality. In spite of the fact that the Jews remained non-violent all the while, but still they were massacred in thousands by Hitler's Gestapo in different

concentration camps. In favour of Gandhi this much can be said that perhaps the then existing situation might have helped Hitler to continue his persecution against the Jews. The nations which were at war with Germany hardly had time to give serious thought to the Jew's problems, for all of them were busy to devise their defence strategies against the Axis Powers.

On September 1, 1939, The Nazi Germany attacked Poland ignoring all the international objections. Gandhi spoke forcibly against the Nazi's aggression. He expressed his deep sympathy for the Polish people and gave a message to the Polish President, "Their cause is just and their victory certain. For God is always the upholder of justice."⁶⁵ Never could it have been possible for the Polish people to be restored to their normal self so easily, had the Germans not lost the Second World War. Similarly when Hitler occupied Norway and Denmark, Gandhi communicated that there was hardly any Indian who did not feel the same sympathy for Norway and Denmark for loosing their freedom overnight.⁶⁶

If Gandhi's sense of morality and justice made him to speak that the Second World War was due to the betrayal of the cause of Germans on the one hand, then on the other his unselfish love for mankind impelled him to write to Hitler to prevent war, "It is clear that you are today the one person in the world who can prevent a war which may reduce humanity to the savage state. Must you pay the price for an object, however worthy it may appear to be? Will you listen to the appeal of one who has deliberately shunned the method of war not without considerable success? Anyway, I anticipate your forgiveness, if I have erred in writing to you."⁶⁷

As was obvious, Gandhi received no reply from Hitler. Gandhi was extremely critical of Hitler's ways, he remarked that no tyrants of age gone by went so mad to the extent Hitler had gone and was doing it with religious zeal. "For he is propounding a new religion of exclusive and militant nationalism in the name of which any inhumanity becomes an act of humanity to be rewarded here and hereafter. The crime of an obviously mad but intrepid youth is being visited upon his whole race with unbelievable ferocity."⁶⁸

When the Munich Pact was signed, Gandhi became apprehensive of its future consequences. He writes, "One must feel that the danger of war has been averted for the time being. Is the price paid likely to be too great? Is it likely that honour has been sold? Is it a triumph of organized violence? Has Herr Hitler discovered a new technique of organizing violence which enables him to gain his end without shedding blood?" He draws his own conclusion of the event, "Europe has sold her soul for the sake of a seven days existence. The peace that Europe gained at Munich is a triumph of violence; it is also its defeat."⁶⁹

For this 'peace without honour', Gandhi does not want to blame either Mr. Chamberlain or Mr. Daladier, because these two leaders had no other option to avoid war. Moreover, they were not independent like Hitler or Mussolini; they had to keep their parliaments and chambers in good humour.

"Democracy dreads to spill blood.", however, with the dictators nobody could dare either to question their word or deed. Similarly in Germany or Italy, there was none to cross the path of either Hitler or Mussolini. Their word was law. Therefore, they were ever ready for war, Gandhi concludes, "The science of war leads to one dictatorship

pure and simple. The science of non-violence can alone lead one to pure democracy. England, France and America have to make their choices. That is the challenge of the two dictators."⁷⁰

True, Gandhi condemned Nazism and Fascism, yet his absolute faith in morality pegged him to assume that Hitler and Mussolini could not be beyond redemption. "Hitler is not a bad man," Gandhi wrote to Lord Linlithgow in 1940. Even in 1934, he had certified that the Italians are not unhappy under Fascism. Leave alone Hitler, Italy was certainly better off than before under Mussolini. Standard of living improved. Some of the public works undertaken deserved commendation.

Gandhi never lost faith in the power of the people. "Unarmed men, women and children offering non-violent resistance without any bitterness in them will be a novel experience for them. Who can dare to say that it is not in their nature to respond to the higher and finer forces? They have the same soul that I have."⁷¹ He hopes the people of Germany would be instrumental in leading the peace movement as well as in bringing about the progress of the world through the application of their marvelous energy. He writes, "Germans are a great and brave people, their industry, their scholarship and their bravery command the admiration of the world ... Hitler is one man, enjoying no more than average span of life. He would be a spent force if he had not the backing of the people ... I refuse to believe Germans as a nation have no heart or markedly less than the other nations of the world."⁷²

Gandhi had reservation about the Russian Government on two counts: if on the one hand it was a dictatorial form of government, then on the other, it was based on violence. "Russia has a dictator who dreams of peace and thinks he will wade to it through a sea of blood. No one can say what Russian dictatorship means to the world," said

Gandhi.⁷³ The life in Russia did not appeal Gandhi, because it did not fit into his conception of an ideal state. "I want every individual to become a full-blooded, fully developed member of society."⁷⁴ He did not like any citizen of a country to lose his individuality and become a mere clog in the machine, though he hoped the sacrifice of Lenin and others during the Russian Revolution might purify the system of Government in Russia in future.

Gandhi abhorred violence and forcible appropriation of private property. He doubted on the implementation of the ideal of equality in Russia. Writes Gandhi, "But from what I know of Bolshevism, it not only does not preclude the use of force, but freely sanctions it for the appropriation of private property and maintaining the collective state ownership of the same. And that if that is so, I have no hesitation in saying that the Boshevik Government in its present form cannot last long. For it is my firm conviction that nothing enduring can be built on violence."⁷⁵ To Gandhi, under dictatorship no economic justice could be expected for the poor. He maintains, "Some say that there is ruthlessness in Russia. ... For me it has very little good in it. Some day this ruthlessness will create an anarchy, worse than we have ever seen."⁷⁶

Gandhi could never come to terms with the Soviet system of government because of his strict adherence to the ideal of non-violence. "I do not know whether it is for the good of Russia in the long run. But I do know that in so far as it is based on violence and denial of God, it repels me. I do not believe in short violent cuts to success ... I am uncompromising opponent of violent methods even to serve the noblest of causes. There is, therefore, really no meeting ground between the school of violence and myself."⁷⁷

When Gandhi comments, "that the Bolshevik Government in its present form cannot last for long"⁷⁸ he has kept in view the mass non-violent resistance. It was his conviction that nothing enduring could be built on violence. In fact, the subsequent history of Russia proved his prediction true.

Gandhi's sense of justice and fair play did not allow him to outrightly condemn Hitler and Mussolini. It was his impression that these two people were not so indifferent to the appeal of the world opinion, but it was difficult for them to come to terms for certain past injustice inflicted upon their people. "Today these dictators feel satisfaction in defying the world opinion because none of the so-called Great Powers can come to them with clean hands, and they have a ranking sense of injustice done to their people by the Great Powers in the past."

Therefore, Gandhi opined, "Peace will never come until the Great Powers courageously decide to disarm themselves. It seems to me that the recent events must force that belief on the Great Powers. I have an implicit faith –a faith today burns brighter than ever, after half a century's experience of unbroken practice of non-violence –that mankind can only be saved through non-violence."⁷⁹

All this shows Gandhi's great dislike for war, rather he hated war like anything. In 1940 he appealed to the British people, "I appeal to every Briton, wherever he may be now, to accept the method of non-violence instead of that of war for the adjustment of relations between nations and other matters ... I appeal for the cessation of hostilities, not because you are too exhausted to fight, but because war is bad in essence ... I want you to fight Nazism without arms, or, if I am to retain the military terminology, with non-violent arms. I would like you to lay

down the arms you have as being useless for saving you or humanity. You will invite Her Hitler and Signor Mussolini to take what they want of the countries you call your possessions. Let them take possession of your beautiful island, with your many beautiful buildings. You will give all these, but neither your souls, nor your ^{minds. If these gentlemen choose to occupy your} homes, you will vacate them. If they do not give you a free passage out, you will allow yourself, man, woman and child to be slaughtered, but you will refuse to owe allegiance to them."⁸⁰

It was the pious desire of a saint obviously, never was it acceptable to the British Government. They were firmly resolved to prosecute the war to a victorious conclusion.⁸¹ It was sheer greatness of Gandhi that even he did not want to annoy his adversary when the latter was in trouble. He felt highly sympathetic to Britain when it was constantly being bombed by German air force, "We must remove hatred for the British from our hearts. At least in my heart there is no such hatred. As a matter of fact, I am a greater friend of the British now than ever I was."⁸² He urged Indians not to get provoked and resort to any violence when Britain was passing through crisis. Even he declared publicly, "We do not seek our independence out of Britain's ruin."⁸³

Even as late as 1944, feeling extremely hurt at the rampant man-slaughter in the name of fighting for the dignity of one's own country, Gandhi commented, "I cannot look at this butchery going on in the world with the indifference. I have the unchangeable faith that it is beneath the dignity of men to resort to mutual slaughter."⁸⁴

When China was attacked by Japan, Gandhi condemned this and advised the Chinese people to resist the Japanese taking recourse to the principle of non-violence. He expected that this attitude of China

would bring Japan on its knee and the latter would become China's slave. But it was not to be so, China tried to repel the Japanese aggression by using Japan's own violent method. "Her putting up a valiant defence against Japan is proof enough that China was never intentionally non-violent ... According to the accepted standards, China's behaviour is correct. But when the position is examined in terms of non-violence, I must say it is unbecoming for a nation of 400 millions, a nation as cultured as Japan to repel Japanese aggression by resorting to Japan's own methods. If the Chinese had non-violence of my conception, there would be no use left for the latest machinery for destruction, which Japan possesses. The Chinese would say to Japan, 'Bring all your machinery. We present half of our population to you. But the remaining two hundred millions will not bend their knee to you.' If the Chinese did that, Japan would become China's slave."⁸⁵

On being questioned, how could non-violence combat aerial warfare since in such a case there would be no personal contacts, Gandhi's reply is very simple, "... behind that steel is the human heart that sets the hand in motion."⁸⁶ But against the Japanese, he bears no ill will, yet he confesses that he intensely disliked their attack upon China. He expresses his strong displeasure, "It was a worthy ambition of yours to take equal rank with great powers of the world. Your aggression against China and your alliance with the Axis powers was surely an unwarranted excess of that ambition. And we are in the unique position of having to resist an imperialism that we detest no less than yours and Nazism."⁸⁷

Gandhi's assessment of the Soviet Union took a U-turn, when Hitler invaded the latter in June 1941. The unique display of courage and heroism by Russia and China in extremely adverse situation to repulse the invaders earned high appreciation from Gandhi. "My

sympathies are undoubtedly in favour of China and Russia, “ declared Gandhi in May 1942.⁸⁸

When Rangoon had fallen in early 1942, the spectre of the sudden Japanese invasion loomed large in the Indian horizon. Gandhi fixed up his strategy of non-violent resistance in the event of the Japanese invasion. He said, “...Non-violent resisters would refuse them any help, even water, for it is no part of their duty to help anyone to steal their country. But if a Japanese had missed his way and was dying of thirst and sought help as a human being, a non-violent resister, who may not regard anyone his enemy, would give water to the thirsty one. Suppose the Japanese compel resisters to give them water, the resisters must die in the act of resistance. It is conceivable that they will exterminate all resisters. The underlying belief in such non-violent resistance is that the aggressor will in time be mentally and even physically tired of killing non-violent resisters. He will begin to search what this new (for him) force is which refuses co-operation without seeking to hurt, and will probably desist from further slaughter. But the resisters may find that the Japanese utterly heartless and that they do not care how many they kill. The non-violent resisters will have won the day, inasmuch as they will have preferred extermination to submission.”⁸⁹

Gandhi's outlook was always international, though he was intensely attached to India. He used to say quite often that his nationalism was intense internationalism. He never entertained any difference between man and man. Gandhi had close affinity with the people of the world; his commitment to mankind knew no boundary. His mission was not merely freedom of India but through its realization he hoped to realise and carry on the mission of brotherhood of man. India was his medium, the world was his goal. He wished for “not

absolutely independent states warring one against another, but a federation of independent states expecting our readiness for universal independence."⁹⁰ His outlook was so broad that he could not even think of duping an invader. He insisted, "There is no bravery in my poisoning my well or filling it in so that my brother who is at war with me may not use the water ... Nor is there sacrifice in it, for it does not purify me, and sacrifice as its root meaning implies presupposes purity."⁹¹ In the same tone he asserts, "In its positive form ahimsa means the largest love, the greatest charity. If I am a follower of ahimsa, I must love my enemy ... Ahimsa truly understood, is in my humble opinion, a panacea for all evils mundane and extra-mundane."⁹² Stanley Jones points out, "the concept of Satyagraha is one of the greatest contributions of Gandhi to the world."⁹³ Even Gandhi had expressed his deep anguish when the U.S.A. had jumped into the war after sudden attack of the Japanese on the Pearl Harbour and had declared that the U.S.A. could have served the cause of peace in actuality by "offering a non-violent contribution to the world."

True, 'Satyagraha' is one of the greatest contributions, yet it cannot be a panacea for all evils. Man is a complex machine, his thoughts too are complex. Similarly the causes of war are too many –it is too a complex phenomenon like man. Therefore, the applicability of 'Satyagraha' differs from situation to situation; it's success, as a matter of fact, depends, in actuality, on the human power of endurance and complete fearlessness. Little bit of fickle mindedness and the concept of 'Satyagraha' is blown away with the wind. There are umpteen instances in world history when frustration has turned a man violent, though in the beginning he was a votary of non-violence.

The first criterion for the success of the principle of non-violence is the development of the power of endurance and the second is

vigorous training. Only could total dedication to its cause make one a true 'Satyagrahi'. Though discipline and fortitude are two primary requirements, Hart apprehends, "human instincts such as fear, anger and selfishness could all too easily wreck its prospects."⁹⁴

But whatever the human frailties are, Gandhi demonstrated to the world effectively the power of non-violence as a practical political tactic. Though he was a nationalist in essence, he called upon the people to enter with him into the suffering of the whole world.⁹⁵ Gandhi wanted his dream of one world was realized in his lifetime. He did not hesitate to say, " I would not like to live in this world if it is not to be one world."⁹⁶ His creed was service of God and therefore humanity and service meant pure love to him. His love for mankind made him to speak, in his 'Autobiography', "We are all tarred with the same brush, and the children of one and the same Creator." The relevance of Gandhi will never die so long this world remains and he is more relevant today as never before in this terrorism-infected world. To quote Ronald Regan, "All problems could be peacefully resolved if adversaries talked to each other on the basis of love and truth. All through history, the way of truth and love has always won. This was the belief and vision of Mahatma Gandhi and his vision remains good and true even today."⁹⁷

II

Jawaharlal Nehru, an outstanding personality of twentieth century India and an eminent leader of India's independence movement, had outlined his foreign policy principles as early as 1920s. He spelled out that India would seek to combine idealism with national interest while pursuing her foreign policy.⁹⁸ Safeguarding the national interests was his primary goal, therefore, he tried to view internationalism through the magic eye of nationalism. Gandhi rightly pointed out that Nehru's nationalism was equal to his internationalism.⁹⁹

Nehru viewed India's future development on democratic lines, having direct representation of the collectives and cooperatives in the land and in industry, would be in tune with political and economic internationalism. Breeding no conflicts with other nations, Nehru thought, would be a powerful factor for peace in Asia and the world. "it would help in the realization of that one world towards which we are inevitably being driven ... The Indian people, freed from the terrible sense of oppression and frustration, will grow in stature again and lose their narrow nationalism and exclusiveness. Proud of their Indian heritage, they will open their minds and hearts to other peoples and other nations, and become citizens of this wide and fascinating world."¹⁰⁰

Nehru regarded the world as one integrated entity having close link of one region with another. Therefore, Nehru advocated for the world peace, and he wanted to develop India's foreign policy in that line. Seen in this light, Nehru's attitude during Nehru-Liaquat Pact of 1950 looks to be a strange mixture of complexities. At one time he declares that India cannot remain calm when there is great danger to

minorities in Pakistan, then at next moment he advocates in favour of Pakistan, "Ultimate protection in Pakistan can be given by Pakistan."¹⁰¹ It seems Nehru did not want to complicate the matter or to put it in another way perhaps he was fearful of "world complications". Nehru clearly indicated his stand in the Parliament when he assumed government, "There had been a talk of war in the country. Possibly the people who indulged in such talk did not realise what it meant."¹⁰²

Nehru's point of view vis-à-vis Nehru-Liaquat Pact was in sharp contrast to his outlook on the Munich Pact. He writes, "Before Munich I met some of the members of the British Cabinet and other prominent politicians of England, and ventured to express my anti-fascist and anti-Nazi views before them. I found that my views were not welcomed and I was told that there were many other considerations to be borne in mind."¹⁰³

Nehru's dissatisfaction and frustration with the attitude of the Allied powers during the Czechoslovak crisis become further distinct, "During the Czechoslovak crisis, what I saw of Franco-British statesmanship in Prague and in the Sudetenland, in London and Paris, and in Geneva where the League Assembly was then sitting, amazed and disgusted me. Appeasement seemed to be a feeble word for it. There was behind it not only a fear of Hitler, but a sneaking admiration for him."¹⁰⁴

It is indeed very difficult to assess Nehru's fluctuating wave of thought concerning war and peace. A person who vindicated world peace throughout after assuming the post of Prime Ministership of India could be found to be justifying war in 1930s. "For long years before the war my mind was full of the war that was coming. I thought

of it, and spoke of it, and wrote about it, and prepared myself mentally for it," wrote he.¹⁰⁵

Be that as it may, India's foreign policy under Nehru is definitely built on the foundation of peace and "preserved by the methods of peace."¹⁰⁶ Nehru's development of foreign policy concept was gradual. As early as 1885, with its constitution, the Congress Party began to show interest in foreign affairs. In the beginning, its interest was limited, but gradually it acquired wider dimensions with the broadening of its field of operations in domestic politics. In 1927, the Congress first declared its policy in regard to international relation and it was Nehru, who was instrumental in making the Congress to think that Indian struggle for freedom, in actuality, was, a part of global struggle.¹⁰⁷ After Nehru's participation in the Congress of oppressed Nationalities at Brussels in the same year, hardly was there any problem of international importance for which the Congress did not offer a solution. Nehru played a key role in drafting such resolution on behalf of the Congress on international events and problems. In fact, he wanted that Congress should be associated with the global affairs. After his becoming Prime Minister of India, it was quite natural for Nehru to be guided by the trend of thinking developed by the Congress prior to independence to condition his stand on foreign policy. Therefore, on being questioned he persistently asserted that India's foreign policy has nothing to do with his personal opinions or obsessions, but it has its origin in the mind and heart of India.¹⁰⁸

True, Nehru took inspiration from the past, yet a man of his personality could not be expected to follow any trend blindly, wherever or whenever it became imperative he charted his own path, though he never ignored the traditions developed in course of the nationalist movement. Rather he adapted them, as a master craftsman, in such a

way so that they could fulfill the timely needs of the nation. Therefore, he did not like that his mind should be probed to ascertain what is there in India's mind, but still some people mistakenly believed that "Nehru is India ... his prejudices, biases and pre-disposition are mirrored in India's attitude to national and world affairs."¹⁰⁹

With the mounting tempo of the nationalist movement in India, the people began to think in terms of freedom from the British rule. Even a vague structure of the nature of future relationship with the nations of the world began to take shape. In the event of India becoming independent it was assumed India would pursue its own independent course without aligning itself with any big power, though definitely it would seek international co-operation. To quote Nehru, "We thought of close relation with our neighbours, countries in the East and the West, with China, Afghanistan, Iran and the Soviet Union. Even with distant America we wanted close relation, for we could learn much from the United States as also from ^{the} Soviet Union. There was a feeling that we had exhausted our capacity for learning anything more from England, and in any event we could only profit by contact with each other after breaking the unhealthy bond that tied us and by meeting on equal terms."¹¹⁰ Even a conception began to emerge: if it should happen that India achieved independence then it would sever all the bonds that tied her to England and her empire. The emergence of this feeling was due to pressure of the racial discrimination and treatment of Indians in some of the British dominions and colonies. Though the independent India would act at its own discretion, it would not act in isolation, but with full world cooperation. However, Nehru made it loud and clear that India would agree to limit its independence, "in common with other nations, within some international framework. That framework should preferably cover the world or as large a part of it as

possible, or be regional.”¹¹¹ In this configuration, Nehru opined, the British Commonwealth would not fit in any of these conceptions, “though it could be a part of the larger framework.”¹¹²

Nehru admits that though India grew internationally minded, it maintained its intense nationalism all along. He feels proud that no other nationalist movement of a subject country came anywhere near India on this aspect, rather “the general tendency in such other countries was to keep clear of international commitments.”¹¹³ This fusion of nationalism with internationalism was a great contribution of Nehru to India’s cause.

As early as 1928, in a letter to Indira, his daughter, Nehru had written “as Indians we have to live in India and work for India.” But Indians should not forget that they belong to the larger family of the world and the people living in other countries are after all their cousins. “It would be such an excellent thing if all the people in the world were happy and contented.” India should, therefore, try to make the whole world a happier place to live in.¹¹⁴

But he winds up with a forecast that in the event of a contest between nationalism and internationalism nationalism would win for internationalism could only develop in a free country. This is because all the thought and energy of a subject country are directed towards the achievement of its own freedom.¹¹⁵

Nehru was a champion of world peace, because for him it was an indispensable precondition for solving domestic problems.

After the Second World War, the world was divided into two warring camps posing a threat of global catastrophe. Another major world war seemed imminent. Nehru became extremely concerned. He

prioritised foreign policy over domestic policy. He declared, "How can we solve our problems if peace itself is in danger? So our primary consideration is peace."¹¹⁶ He did not know how to ward off this impending danger of nuclear holocaust. but he knew restraint would come on its own amongst those who possess the nuclear weapons, for it will sound death-knell for them also who dare to unleash it. "That itself is a restraining factor. Whether aggression takes place in a small country or a big one, it tends to upset the unstable balance in the world and is therefore likely to lead to war."¹¹⁷ Only through the application of the principles of cooperation and mutual understanding, Nehru opined, could the target of a really lasting and reliable peace be achieved.

A protagonist of peace, Nehru always demonstrated that the war is futile for mankind. "Two tragic wars have demonstrated the futility of warfare. Victory without the will to peace achieves no lasting result and victor and vanquished alike suffer from deep and grievous wounds and a common fear of the future."¹¹⁸ Being a lover of mankind, he always asserted in his speech that the way to serve or protect mankind is not to destroy the house in which it lives and all it contains.¹¹⁹ In fact, the way_^^{of} peace is always the better and, in the long run, the shorter way, the way of war is no way at all, for it solves nothing.¹²⁰

It is said that a good negotiator will never rely for success of his mission either on bad faith or on promises that he cannot execute.¹²¹ Nehru was always sanguine what he has to do and what he has to achieve regardless of what others have to say about his mission. He longed for peace at nobody's price. It was his faith that what is good for all would be equally good in the context of India as well. To quote him, "We cannot take the world on our shoulders and remodel it according to our heart's desire; but we can help in creating a climate of peace which is so essential for the realization of our objectives."¹²² While

pursuing his 'mission peace' Nehru never forgot his country's interest for a moment, "Peace is not only an absolute necessity for us in India in order to progress and develop but is also of paramount importance to the world. How can that peace be preserved? Not by surrendering to aggression, not by compromising with evil or injustice but also not by talking and preparing for war."¹²³

Nehru acknowledged quite often that he was guided by Gandhi's guidance and tried to follow the methods of peace pursued by Gandhi. Gandhi used to say that he was a man of peace believed in peace but he did want the peace which one finds embedded in human breast, "which is exposed to the arrows of a whole world, but which is protected from all harm by the power of the Almighty God." Nehru maintains more or less this similar attitude, "Under Gandhi's guidance, we tried to follow the methods of peace and were friendly even to those who tried to crush us."¹²⁴

Nehru cautioned the people of the world that no good would come either to them or to their country through war. It would simply convulse the whole world, bringing not only infinite destruction in its train but also corrupting the souls of those who survive. "We are thus facing a great challenge to our civilization and to such culture as we possess."¹²⁵

In order to fight out this great challenge, Nehru placed before the world Gandhi's doctrine of non-violence as a befitting solution. Nehru says that Gandhi "taught us the doctrine of non-violence, not as a passive submission to evil, but as an active and positive instrument for the peaceful solution of international differences. He showed us that the human spirit is more powerful; than the mightiest of armaments." He admits that Gandhi's doctrine of non-violence is an outstanding

contribution not only to the freedom of India but to that of world peace.¹²⁶

According to Nehru, defeat of the enemy is not by itself an objective but rather the removal of an obstruction towards the attainment of the objective. If that objective is not attained by the victorious power, then that victory over the enemy brings only negative relief and indeed is not a real victory. Therefore, he says that if lasting peace is sought for then the root causes of war must be attacked and not merely the symptoms. He outlines three underlying causes of war in the modern world:

- a) Domination of one country by another or an attempt to dominate.
- b) The problem of racial relations.
- c) The misery and want of millions of people in many countries and, in particular, in Asia and Africa.¹²⁷

Though Nehru was a protagonist of Gandhian principle of non-violence, he did not ignore the necessity for maintenance of armed forces in view of existing world order then. In this context, his reply to debate on Goa in Parliament is worthy of noting, "As far as I can conceive, under the existing circumstances, no Government can be pledged to non-violence. If we were pledged to non-violence, surely we would not keep any Army, Navy or Air Force –and possibly not even a police force."¹²⁸

After the Second World War, the world was divided into two power blocs. Though Nehru was an internationalist, he was aware of the danger of joining any power bloc. Joining of any such bloc was tantamount to lose an independent position in world affairs. He said,

“By aligning ourselves with any one Power, you surrender your opinion, give up the policy you would normally pursue because somebody else wants you to pursue another policy. I do not think that it would be a right policy for us to adopt. If we did align ourselves we would only fall between two stools.”¹²⁹

However, Nehru admits that the world has become internationalized, production is international, markets are international and transport is international. Industrialization has broken down national boundaries and it has made each nation, howsoever powerful it may be, dependent on other countries. Under this new dispensation “no nation is really independent, they are all interdependent.”¹³⁰

There is no real defence against nuclear weapons since in the event of a nuclear conflagration it will destroy both the belligerents and the non-belligerents. “Then the only way out is to prevent war, to avoid it. There is no other way.”¹³¹ Thus a peaceful world order is indispensable and indisputable. “We wish for peace. We do not want to fight any nation if we can help it. The real objective that we, in common with other nations, can have is the objective of cooperating in building up some kind of world structure, call it one world, call it what you like ... Now, if we think of that structure and our co-operation with other countries in achieving it, where does the question come of our being tied up with this group of nations or that group?”¹³²

On the issue governing inter-state relations Nehru's stress was on freedom, equality and justice. When Albania was captured Nehru became extremely apprehensive of impending danger of Second World War and commented, “Who dare says that the thin thread that holds back these forces will not snap and un^elash destruction and doom on hapless mankind? Peace, so-called peace, holds today; what of

tomorrow or the day after?"¹³³ Within months of this forecast, the Second World War broke out. Peace was Nehru's objective from the very beginning and enlargement of human freedom was his goal.¹³⁴

Nehru was against Fascism and Nazism in principle, and exhibited his dislike to these anti-democratic forces openly whenever he found an opportunity. It was not merely the physical acts of aggression which Fascism and Nazism indulged in, but their vulgarity and brutality which they imposed on mankind and the principles on which they stood along with the theories of life on which they tried to fashion themselves, had badly shaken Nehru. His displeasure against them was so intense that he refused to meet Mussolini and Hitler despite invitations. To quote Nehru, "I remember how I refused a pressing invitation from Signor Mussolini to see him in early days of March, 1936. Many of Britain's leading statesmen, who spoke harshly of Fascist Duce in later years when Italy became belligerent, referred to him tenderly and admiringly in those days, and praised his regime and methods.

"^wTo years later, in the summer before Munich, I was invited on behalf of the Nazi government, to visit Germany, an invitation to which was added the remark that they knew my opposition to Nazism and yet they wanted me to see Germany for myself. I could go as their guest or privately, in my own name or incognito, as I desired, and I would have perfect freedom to go where I liked. Again I declined with thanks, instead I went to Czechoslovakia, that 'faraway country' about which England's then Prime Minister knew so little."¹³⁵

Nehru was also critical of Japan's aggression on China. The rape of Abyssinia, the betrayal of Czechoslovakia and the fall of Republican Spain had been a tragedy and a personal sorrow for

Nehru.¹³⁶ He had to side with so-called democratic forces, though they were also engaged in war, since he could not think of any other better option. Being a subject citizen of a colony, Nehru's prime target was to achieve independence for his country.

Nehru had always felt a necessity of complete disarmament through the removal of social, political and economic inequalities both in national and international society. "The question of complete disarmament thus becomes tied up with fundamental political and economic changes in the world. It could not be tackled, much less solved, by itself," said he.¹³⁷

He was a pioneer of non-alignment movement, but non-alignment, as a matter of fact, had become a historical necessity for survival for those countries that were erstwhile colonies. Most of these countries on principle declined to join any power bloc and formed their own group and tried to maintain their own separate identity, coining a term 'non-aligned'.

Non-alignment had its genesis in Nehru's conviction that the division of the world into two warring power-blocs would sure lead to a Third World War if nothing substantial done to ease the tension. His ideal of non-alignment aimed at peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations and engaging in military alliance with none, but making an effort to bring closer the two opposite camps of power blocks, representing one by the U. S .A. and the other by the Soviet Russia, by way of mediation. Thus his policy of non-alignment pursued dual objectives: one to keep India aloof from the cold war of the power blocs and second to keep abreast of all the happenings in the world around him and to keep India engaged in the role of a mediator to settle problems of the world. He thought joining any power bloc would

amount to curtail India's capability to function as a mediator in restoring peace in the world.

Nehru's sense of pride could never allow him to make India a follower of any one of the two power blocs. Long before independence he "had spoken about a free India working for world peace and the end of imperialism and the need for a new Asian unity including China."¹³⁸ To quote Nehru, "The twin policies which have guided us since independence are, broadly democratic planning for development at home and externally a policy which has come to be named, rather inadequately, 'non-alignment'. Like the basic policies of most countries, these are not the product of any inspiration or arbitrary choice, but have their roots in our past history and way of thinking as well as in fundamental national exigencies."¹³⁹

To overcome India's economic weakness was Nehru's one of the priorities. Being non-aligned mean India could receive aid from any donor nation irrespective of the power blocs. This was an added advantage for a developing country like India. Moreover, peace was since qua non at the international level for the economic development and progress of the countries newly acquired independence.

Nehru's abhorrence to join any power blocs is reflected on one of his speeches as early as 1943, "I do not think anything could be more injurious to us from any point of views –certainly from an idealistic high moral point of view, but equally so from the point of view of opportunism and national interest in the narrowest sense of the word – than for us to give upon politics that we have pursued, namely, those of standing up for certain ideals in ourselves with this great power or that and becoming its camp followers in the hope that some crumbs might fall from their table."¹⁴⁰

After the Second World War a new phenomenon has emerged in the international situation, one country after another became independent. Their priority was economic development, but it was independent of the patterns followed by the power blocs. Most of these countries were erstwhile colonies. Therefore there is a vague correlation between decolonisation and the emergence of non-alignment. Post-independence reconstruction of these countries was not possible without prioritizing the peace effort. Apart from pursuing peace, these nations also made an effort to fetch freedom for those Asian and African countries, which were still under foreign yoke. Similarly from Nehru's point of view also non-alignment movement stood for peace and against colonialism.

Peace Nehru did try to restore in the world, but not through condemnation of the power blocs but through display of tolerance and forbearance. "It is not by condemnation or mutual recrimination that we shall achieve this goal. We must forget past conflicts and past grievances and decide to make a new approach to each other in a spirit of tolerance and forbearance ..."¹⁴¹ Being a closest follower of Gandhi, Nehru does not seem to deviate an inch from Gandhian principle of non-violence in pursuance of his foreign policy. "Friendship toward all nations" was Nehru's policy in international arena. In leading non-aligned movement in the world Nehru's role was that of a leader. Nehru admits that India has influenced the thinking of a large number of countries to some extent in the cause of world peace.¹⁴²

Though Nehru mediated in international affairs of his own volition whenever and wherever he felt that the peace in the world was in danger, it is wrong to call him a "professional mediator". This is absolutely unfair to Nehru. He himself clarifies his position; "Well I have no desire, nor my Government, to sit on a perch and to moralise

anybody because we are conscious of our own failings in our own country.”¹⁴³ But at the same time elsewhere he confesses that India cannot shed her responsibilities that go with a great country if a situation arises in the world, which might require some kind of initiative or association in any particular decision.¹⁴⁴

India being friendly to China since time immemorial, having no legacy of conflict with Russia, easily befriended the West. Notwithstanding its military and economic weakness, it could deftly play its role as a balancer between two conflicting power blocs. Nehru was acceptable to both the east and the west because of his neutral stand. He sided with neither but he had the confidence of both. It was only possible to a personality like Nehru.

Nehru was proud that India's history and geography had compelled it to play a crucial role in Asia. He says, "India's pivotal position between Western Asia, South East Asia and Far East made it the crossroads of that part of the world. India is the central point of the Asian picture." But he admits that India's role of leadership might not be palatable to others, yet it cannot escape that responsibility.¹⁴⁵ This sense of superiority in Nehru was in actuality acceptable to others or not is a matter for discussion and also for the later events to judge. If it is conjectured whether Nehru meant to say India had to show a big brother attitude to smaller nations then on this and similar other questions, he has only one answer, "We have to approach every problem in a spirit of sweet reasonableness and co-operation."¹⁴⁶ His role was always that of a conciliator, Nehru's neutralism was motivated by India's national interest. Non-alignment was the best policy pursued by him in the changing concept of international relations vis-à-vis the diplomatic clash between the super powers. Nehru was a matured politician, he knew which course of action is suitable in India's context.

“Whatever policy you may lay down, the art of conducting the foreign affairs of a country lies in finding out what is most advantageous to the country. We may talk about international goodwill and mean what to say. We may talk about peace and freedom and earnestly mean what to say. But in the ultimate analysis, a government functions for the good of the country it governs and no government dare do anything, which in the short or long run is manifestly to the disadvantage of that country.

“We propose to keep on the closest terms of friendship with other countries unless they themselves create difficulties. We intend co-operating with the United States of America and we intend co-operating fully with the Soviet Union.”

“At the present moment no country, including the big Powers with their long traditions in foreign affairs, has anything which could be called a precise and definite foreign policy because the world itself is in a fluid condition”,¹⁴⁷ Nehru opens his mind thus.

We do get a smell of sheer opportunism in the above speech of Nehru, yet he could never be expected to compromise at the cost of India's self respect.¹⁴⁸ He also knew in order to make India's foreign policy effective a national consensus is a prerequisite. Since in a country like India there always exist some divisive elements amongst the elite groups who could be sympathizers of either this or the other block of powers, Nehru had therefore followed a middle course in his foreign policy aligning with none. He did not want to create any difficulty for himself within India. As a true democrat, he had a respect for every dissenting view. Non-alignment was the best course open before him to obtain consensus. Only through peace at home and abroad could Nehru think of marching India towards the goal of

economic development and self-reliance. It is true, non-violence is a great principle but only a politician of Nehru's quality could think of moulding that principle to one's own country's advantage.

The Bandung Conference (April 1955) of Afro-Asian countries was a landmark in the history of non-aligned movement. It was in the previous year at Bogor meeting the Prime Ministers of Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia and Pakistan had settled for Bandung Conference under their joint sponsorship. Invitations were sent to almost thirty independent countries of Asia and Africa, comprising about two thirds of the then population of the world. This conference took place at a time when the war was at its peak. It demonstrated the solidarity of the Afro-Asian and Latin American countries, which were previous colonies and had faced frontal exploitation at the hands of the imperialist powers. The Bandung Conference made a declaration on maintaining world peace and cooperation between nations based on the ten principles of peaceful co-existence. In fact, it was an elaboration of the Panchashila or the five principles of peaceful co-existence. These five principles were:

- (i) Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty;
- (ii) Non-aggression;
- (iii) No-interference in one another's internal affairs;
- (iv) Equality and mutual advantage; and
- (v) Peaceful co-operation and economic co-operation.

To Nehru the Bandung Conference had been a historic event. He states, "If it only met, the meeting itself would have been a great

achievement, as it would have represented the emergence of a new Asia and Africa, of new nations who are on the march towards the fulfillment of their independence and of their sense of their role in the world. Bandung proclaimed the political emergence in world affairs of over half the world's population. It presented no unfriendly challenge or hostility to any one but proclaimed a new and rich contribution.

"The Bandung conference attracted world attention. In the beginning it invited ridicule and perhaps hostility. This turned to curiosity, expectation and, I am happy to say, later to a measure of goodwill and friendship."¹⁴⁹

From the above statement, it appears that Nehru had high hopes with the outcome of Bandung Conference, but in reality he could not achieve what he had hoped for. On many counts he had to sacrifice his views "in order to secure the maximum harmony" and he could assert himself only "when the proceedings threatened to get out of hand."¹⁵⁰

Even B.K. Nehru, who has accompanied Nehru and Indira Gandhi to Bandung did not mince words to comment that the importance of the Bandung Conference "did not lie in what it did; what was important was that it was held at all"¹⁵¹ In spite of its failure to achieve anything substantial, the Bandung Conference marked the birth of non-aligned movement (NAM) in world politics. It was an unprecedented impression left behind by this conference for the posterity to take note of. Indeed from this angle, it was an achievement of sorts.

To remove misconception about India that it had any desire for aggrandizement, Nehru always repeated in his speeches whether in India or abroad that India had no ambitions against any other country

or people. He said that India wished well for all and was anxious that freedom and social and economic progress should come to all countries. Wherever this freedom was denied the evil tree of conflict and war originated.¹⁵²

Nehru always ruled out war as a means of redress. He said "The only alternative we are left with is the diplomatic method and we are pursuing it."¹⁵³ In November 1957 he urged the U.S.A. and the Soviet Russia to stop nuclear weapon testing forthwith and take recourse to disarmament. Therefore, the treaty amongst the USA, the Soviet Russia and Great Britain in 1963 on the partial prohibition of nuclear testing was welcome to Nehru. He was against proliferation of all kinds of nuclear weapons for he felt that could create further mistrust between the two power blocs and drag the world at the doorway of another war. Long back in Parliament he had spelled out India's standpoint on making of nuclear weapons in unambiguous terms, "We have declared quite clearly that we are not interested in making atom bombs, even if we have the capacity to do so, and that in no event will we use atomic energy for destructive purposes."¹⁵⁴

Nehru had always given stress on the principle of co-existence. In order to resolve the cold-war crisis war was no solution. In the event of war, none would be able to dismiss the other, he knew, for the two were equally powerful. Therefore, he appealed to both the USA and the Soviet Russia, "... Then you have to co-exist, you have to understand, you have to be restrained and you have to deal with each other. If you reject co-existence, the alternative is war and mutual destruction."¹⁵⁵

India, under Nehru's initiative, played key role in easing international tension during the period following the Second World War. Had India not taken initiative hardly had it been possible for the other

non-aligned countries to impose their desire for peace in the world, though it is also true their moral support to India imparted further momentum to international peace process. Wherever Nehru achieved success to relax tension in the international arena, it was no doubt the triumph of the objective of non-aligned movement.

During the Korean crisis, India played a key role to pull back the world from the drop-step of another major conflagration. It was after much persuasion of Nehru channels of communication opened between the adversaries and they agreed to sort out their differences across the table. Though it was an achievement of some consequence for India, Nehru did not want to accept this honour. He said, "Why did we go to Korea? Was it to gain honour, glory and prestige? We went to Korea because, if we had not gone, there would have been no truce and no cease-fire and the war would have gone on with a danger of its expansion. I cannot speak with a prophet's certainty of what would have happened if we had not gone there. But as we saw the problem at the time – and subsequent events have justified it – the only way first of all to get the United Nations to adopt that resolution and subsequently to see that there was agreement between the two Commands was for India to fill a gap that no other country could fill. I am not claiming any virtue for India. But it is a factual statement that no other country was willing to fill that particular gap. Without that gap being filled, there would have been no agreement. If there had been no agreement, then the cease-fire would not have taken place and the terrible war would have gone on. We had to face the problem with utmost reluctance"¹⁵⁶ While taking initiative to resolve any world crisis, Nehru's primary concern was always India's interest.

Again during the Indo-China crisis in 1954, Nehru played a significant role to ease further development of conflict through initiating

the process of negotiated settlement. On India's role, he comments; "whether in Indo-China or elsewhere, peace can only come if we endeavor to establish a climate of peace."¹⁵⁷

In order to find a solution on Indo-China deadlock, Nehru presented a six-point formula to be discussed at the conference of the foreign ministers. His priority on the list was to limit the conflict and to have a cease-fire. Also on the agenda was to agree on non-intervention in Indo-China. Nehru's proposals received concurrence at the conference of the South-East Asian Prime Ministers' meet in *on May 2, 1954 on behalf of the powers met at Colombo* Colombo. Nehru appealed for a cease-fire in Indo-China in order to find a solution.

When unrest and disorder erupted in Congo in 1961, India sent a detachment of troops there in compliance with the request of Hammarskjöld, the U.N. Secretary General, not to fight but to restore peace and normalcy.

Nehru justified all his actions in terms of his commitment to the cause of world peace. India responded to the call of the U.N.O., for Nehru the latter was an important instrument of peace. He was well aware of the limitations of the non-aligned countries and he believed without their participating in international forums, such as the United Nations, they would not be in a position to resolve any major world issues on their own. Despite its weakness and failures, Nehru displayed his absolute faith on the U.N.O. for he had the impression that it was the only world body whose very existence represented peace in the world, therefore to think of its abolition any time would be tantamount to jeopardize the very cause of peace. To quote Nehru, "I have believed and I do believe that the United Nations, in spite of its many faults, in spite of its having deviated from its aims somewhat, is,

nevertheless, a basic and fundamental thing in the structure of the world today. Not to have it or to do away with it would be a tragedy for the world.¹⁵⁸

Though he professed non-alignment and kept India away from aligning with any of the two power blocks, Nehru could not think of remaining out of the United Nations anytime. "The fact is that isolation in the past has weakened us very greatly and left us rather in the lurch when the world has advanced in terms of science or other developments. We cannot be isolated; in fact, no country can be. Therefore, to talk of getting out of the United Nations or of otherwise, keeping apart from all these problems is not to take cognizance of the realities of the situation... if a country does that, I have no doubt that it is that country which will suffer more than the organization."¹⁵⁹

True, India has a glorious past of pulling along individually because it was strong enough to thwart any threat to its sovereignty, but the existing scenario was different. India was beset with a lot of internal problems which were sapping its energy all along, yet Nehru always asserted that India's foreign policy was always a policy of fearlessness.¹⁶⁰ "We are not citizens of a weak or mean country and I think it is foolish for us to get frightened, even from a military point of view, of the greatest of the powers today."¹⁶¹ In fact, he was resting on his laurels. In diplomacy, true fearlessness comes with military might. It gives encouragement to his countrymen, "Therefore, let us not be frightened too much of the military might of this or that group. I am not frightened and I want to tell the world on behalf of this country that we are not frightened of the military might of this Power or that... our general policy has been to avoid entering into anybody's quarrels."¹⁶² But Nehru had no solution if India was dragged into quarrels forcibly by some power militarily stronger than India. Nehru says. "From the very

outset our policy, both at home and abroad, has been to solve our problems peacefully. If we ourselves act against that policy we would be regarded as deceitful hypocrite."¹⁶³ Hostility cannot be conquered by humility always: when this reality dawned upon Nehru, it was too late as subsequent history of India unfolds. He always quoted Gandhi whenever he has to drive home some of his specific point of views before the public such as India's foreign policy, "We can never forget the teaching of our Master that the ends do not justify the means. Perhaps most of the trouble in the world today is due to the fact that people have forgotten this basic doctrine and are prepared to justify any means in order to attain their objectives. And so, in the defence of democracy or in the name of liberation, an atmosphere is created which suffocates democracy and stifles freedom and may ultimately kill both."¹⁶⁴ Even as early as 1949, Nehru had admitted that he grew up under Mahatma Gandhi's inspiration and sheltering care who always laid stress on moral values and warned never to subordinate means to ends.¹⁶⁵

Perhaps Nehru's concept of non-alignment received its inspiration from the Gandhian concept of balancing ends and means, and the principle of co-existence was simply one of the offshoots of non-alignment. Major objective of Nehru behind professing the principle of co-existence in the world was his concern for India's security. He wrote, "Therefore, we propose to look after India's interests in the context of world co-operation and world peace, in so far as world peace can be preserved."¹⁶⁶ On the issue of maintenance of an army by a country for its security Nehru has his own observation, "Security can be obtained in many ways. The normal idea is that armies protect security. That is only partly true; it is equally true that security is protected by policies."¹⁶⁷

Admittedly, policies do play their role in providing some security to a country, but they are not enough if not backed by a strong army. One of the glaring examples of the effectiveness of this security related formula is India's debacle at the hands of the Chinese in 1962. Nehru readily admits that due to his other preoccupations related to eradication of poverty of his countrymen and other similar issues he could not give much attention to defence needs. He writes "In the past our preoccupation with the human problems of poverty and illiteracy was such that we were content to assign a relatively low priority to defence requirements in the conventional sense. We will have to clearly give considerably more attention to strengthening our armed forces and to the production within the country, to the extent possible, of all weapons and equipment needed by them."¹⁶⁸

'Peaceful co-existence' could be a noble objective, but for restoration of peace everything cannot and should not be surrendered. Peace could be an end but means has to be and must be varied including making oneself strong enough to counter if some one or other tries to disturb peace. Though as early as 1954 Nehru had stated that "In international affairs one never be dead certain, and the friends of today might be enemies of tomorrow. This may be so. Are we then to begin with enmity and suspicion and not give any other approach a chance? Surely, it is better with nations as with individuals to hope and expect for the best, but at the same time be prepared for any eventuality."¹⁶⁹ It is not understood how he failed to read in between the lines and did not prepare India "for any eventuality" before 1962.

Nehru's belief that China would never be any security threat to India was also absolutely wrong. When China occupied Tibet, Nehru did not consider it a danger. He simply went on to insist that India and China are friends and the future of Asia and to some extent of the

world depends on this friendship.¹⁷⁰ India befriended China through a Sino-Indian agreement on the five principles of international diplomacy in 1954. Sarvepalli Gopal comments that Nehru's assessment of China's attitude to India was naïve.¹⁷¹

China continued to build road in all parts of Tibet. By 1958 China completed its link with Tibet through arterial highways from northeast, east and west. The Himalayas for centuries, which had remained a natural boundary for India, was infiltrated, but Nehru had never anticipated that the Chinese would ever mount an offensive from those remote mountains.¹⁷²

True, war as an instrument of foreign policy was repugnant to Nehru all along, but he explained that the word neutrality was not a correct word to describe India's policy. He wrote. "We wish to judge every issue on its merits and circumstances then prevailing then decide what we consider best in terms of world peace or our other objectives."¹⁷³ It was, therefore, no wrong on the part of Nehru to make an appeal to all heads of state on October 27, 1962, to extend immediate diplomatic and material support to India. Though it was an expected move on the part of Nehru when India's sovereignty was put in jeopardy, it was a late realization. He regrets, "It is a matter of deep regret that the Chinese in their relations with India have paid back evil for good. Friendly and peaceful relations with China have been our basic policy ever since India became independent. We have consistently followed this policy and gone out of our way to support China's case in the council of the world. We regret that in their relations with India, China has not merely shown a hostile attitude, but has also resorted to dissimulation. Even the pre-meditated and massive attack on our defence forces on October 20 has been represented by China as an attack by Indian forces on China's border guards. That this

assertion is completely false is clear from the weight and intensity of the Chinese attack, which is not confined to the Eastern Sector but includes other sectors of the India – China border. No self-respecting country, and certainly not India with her care of freedom, can submit to such aggression, whatever may be the consequences. Nor can India allow China's occupation of Indian Territory to be used as a bargaining counter for dictating to India a settlement of the differences regarding boundary on China's terms."¹⁷⁴

India did not have the requisite strength to dictate its terms. A nation's survival depends on its ability to defend its frontiers. World peace could be an ideal, but one's country's defence should be equally kept strong. Since independence days India championed the cause of peace and non-violence in the world but its showing little defence awareness in home front simultaneously could not be justified. The concept of co-existence is indeed a great ideal for a country to live with, but it only suits that country which has a backing of strong defence. For the powerless nothing is attainable, this is the truth, and India failed to imbibe this truth in time, hence the defeat on the Nyamkachu front at the hands of the Chinese. India's defence budget was only 15 percent of its national revenue in 1961-62, though in 1950-51 it was 30 percent. It was again raised to 31 percent only in 1963,¹⁷⁵ when it dawned that India's defence could no longer be neglected.

Though defeat at Nyamkachu is not of much significance from the military point of view, Nehru felt highly distressed because he was betrayed and his policy of friendship and goodwill with China was shattered to smithereens at one stroke. This marked a turning point in Nehru's foreign policy outlook. He woke up and realized that defence and development were parts of the same process.¹⁷⁶ India should always be ready to face the evil with the application of force in future if

required; once betrayed Nehru did not want to take any chance in defence related matters. To quote him, "Our preparations will continue even if the war stops. We have been deceived once; we are not going to be taken in again. The Chinese invasion had served one purpose. It has united the Indian people. We must get over this crisis and profit by it. You rest assured that the aggressors will be thrown out of India. I do not think the Chinese will again come back but if they dare do so, they will be met stoutly. We shall defend our country to the last."¹⁷⁷ Even Nehru declared at Tezpur at a Press Conference on December 6, 1962 that if the Chinese did not withdraw completely from Indian territory then India would force them out.¹⁷⁸

The Chinese invasion had made a deep impact on Nehru. To some extent he felt demoralized since what he stood for so long and professed crumbled like a house of cards in no time and was forced by the sudden development of events "to adopt a militaristic outlook which he did not like."¹⁷⁹ At the change of events, there was a call from some circle to end the policy of non-alignment and to align with the West but Nehru remained firm to his commitment. "It is true that because of the Chinese aggression we have developed closer bonds with some countries which helped us. That was natural, but that does not mean that we have weakened in our desire to adhere to non-alignment," he said in the Lok Sabha on September 3, 1963.¹⁸⁰ But Nehru accepted long back to Brecher that in a democracy no policy could go very far if it was quite divorced from the people's thinking. "However, in the final analysis all foreign policy concerns itself chiefly with the national interest of the country concerned."¹⁸¹ Therefore, he admitted, "Although our foreign policy is a continuation of the stand we took during our struggle for independence, we are, some times, constrained to vary it according to circumstances."¹⁸²

Though Jawaharlal Nehru is a history today, his message of one world is still relevant rather it is the only solution to all the evils besetting the world. No one can claim he is safe today either at home or abroad. It there is no immediate fear of nuclear warfare, the fear of sudden terrorist strike is always there in the vicinity. Though he loved his country, he was an internationalist from inside. Nehru was essentially a world citizen. To quote his own observation:

“We talk of World Government and one world and millions yearn for it. Earnest efforts continue to be made to realize this ideal of the human race, which has become so imperative today. And yet those efforts have thus far proved ineffective, even though it becomes ever clearer that if there is to be no world order then there might be no order at all left in the world. Wars are fought and won or lost, and the victors suffer almost as much as the vanquished. Surely, there must be something wrong about our approach to this vital problem of the age, something essential lacking... I have no doubt in my mind that the World Government must and will come, for there is no other remedy for the world's sickness.¹⁸³

Notes and References :

1. The Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi.
2. Young India, 11.6.1920.
3. Young India, 31.12.1931.
4. Gandhian Holistic Economics, Sashi Prabha Sharma, pp. 105-06.
5. Young India, 3.4.1924.
6. Ibid., 16.3.1931.
7. Nationalist Thought And the Colonial World, Partha Chatterjee, p. 93.
8. Indian Foreign Policy, Dr. Rammohan Lohia –the portion quoted is from the foreword by Jawaharlal Nehru.
9. Mahatma Gandhi –His Own Story, p. 225.
10. Harijan, 11.3.1939.
11. Mahatma, D. G. Tendulkar, 1960, vol. IV, p. 318.
12. Harijan, 13.10.1946.
13. Young India, 2.3.1922.
14. Non-Violence, M. K. Gandhi, Navajivan, Ahmedabad, 1945, vol.I, p. 127.
15. An Autobiography, M. K. Gandhi, p. 370.
16. Mahatma, D. G. Tendulkar, 1960, vol. IV, p. 318-19.
17. Young India, 2.3.1922.
18. The Moral and Political Writings of mahatma Gandhi, Raghavan Iyer, Oxford, 1987, vol. II, p. 225.
19. Selections from Gandhi, N. K. Bose, p. 156.
20. Young India, 5.5.1920.
21. Satyagraha, M. K. Gandhi, (Navajivan, Ahmedabad), 1958, p.78.
22. Harijan, 11.8.1940.
23. Young India, 12.8.1926.
24. Ibid.
25. Occurs in Nehru's 'Autobiography', p. 83.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid., p. 84.
29. Ibid., p.84.
30. Ibid., p. 85.
31. Selections from Gandhi, N. K. Bose, p. 33.
32. An Autobiography, M. K. Gandhi, Navajivan, 1991, p. 226.

33. Harijan, 25.3.1939.
34. Selections from Gandhi, N. K. Bose, p. 159.
35. Harijan, 25.3.1939, Complete Works of Mahatma Gandhi, vol. 69, 1977, p. 69.
36. Young India, 29.9.1921.
37. Young India, 19.3.1925.
38. Hindu Dharma, M. K. Gandhi, p. 183.
39. The Moral and Political Writings of Mahatma Gandhi, Oxford, 1987, vol. II, p. 432.
40. Toward Freedom, Jawaharlal Nehru, p. 72.
41. Mahatma, D. G. Tendulkar, vol. IV, p. 312.
42. Harijan, 8.10.1938.
43. Mahatma, D. G. Tendulkar, vol. IV, p. 320.
44. Ibid., p. 321.
45. Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, vol. 15, p. 139.
46. Ibid., vol. 14, p. 299.
47. The Unity of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, New York, 1941, p. 312.
48. Ibid., p. 355.
49. Tendulkar: op. cit., vol. IV, p. 321.
50. Non-violence, M. K. Gandhi, vol. II, p. 118.
51. Young India, 5.11.1931.
52. Harijan, 14.10.1939.
53. From Gandhi Papers, 15.11.1914.
54. Tendulkar, op. cit. vol. VI, p. 103.
55. Non-Violence, M. K. Gandhi, op. cit., vol. I, p. 236.
56. Mahatma, Tendulkar, op. cit., vol. VI, p. 76.
57. Tendulkar, op. cit., vol. IV, p. 312.
58. Ibid.
59. Ibid.
60. Ibid., p. 313.
61. Ibid., p. 315.
62. Ibid., p. 316.
63. Ibid., p. 315.
64. A Bunch of Old letters, J. Nehru, Bombay, 1958, p. 286.
65. India and the Germans, Walter Leifer, 1977, p. 255.
66. Harijan, 30.4.1940.

67. This is an extract from a letter written to Hitler by Gandhi from Allahabad on 23.7.1939.
68. Tendulkar, op. cit., vol. IV, p. 312.
69. Ibid., p. 278.
70. Ibid., p. 280.
71. Ibid., p. 281.
72. Harijan, 9.9.1939.
73. Tendulkar, op.cit., vol. IV, p. 280.
74. Tendulkar, op.cit., Vol. V, p. 9.
75. Tendulkar, op.cit., vol. II, p. 439.
76. Tendulkar, op.cit., vol. VI, p. 120.
77. Communism and Communists, M. K. Gandhi, Navajivan, Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1959, p. 4.
78. Tendulkar, op.cit., vol. II, p. 333.
79. Tendulkar, op.cit., vol. IV, p. 321.
80. Harijan, 3.7.1940.
81. Tendulkar, op.cit., vol. VI, p. 295.
82. Rabindranath Tagore: A Biopgraphy, Krishna Kripalani, 1980.
83. Tendulkar, op.cit., Vol. V, p. 347, Harijan, 1.6.1940.
84. Harijan, 20.7.1944.
85. Tendulkar, op.cit., vol. IV, p. 319-20.
86. Ibid., p. 320
87. Harijan, 26.7.1942.
88. Harijan, 24.5.1942.
89. Harijan, 16.3.1942.
90. Young India, 26.12.1924.
91. Harijan, 22.3.1942.
92. Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, vol. XIII, pp. 294-97.
93. Mahatma Gandhi, Stanely Jones, p. 108.
94. Deterrent Or Defence, B. H. Liddell Hart, Steven and Sons, London, 1960, Chapter – 20.
95. Harijan, 20.7.1944.
96. Asian Relations Conference, New Delhi, March 1947.
97. Ronald Regan, Speech at United Nations Assembly, 1984.
98. Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches, vol. II, p. 394.
99. M. K. Gandhi in P. D. Tandon's 'Nehru Your Neighbour', Signet Press, Calcutta, 1946, p IX.

100. The Discovery of India, op.cit., p. 523.
101. Debates in Parliament on the eve of Nehru-Liaquat Pact.
102. Nehru's Speech In Delhi, 13.4.1950.
103. Discovery of India, op.cit., p. 19.
104. Ibid.
105. Ibid.
106. Congress Bulletin, No. 5, June-July, 1954.
107. Jawaharlal Nehru's World View, Willard Range, University of Georgia Press, Athens, 1961, p. 68.
108. Amritsar Congress, 1956.
109. Sulzberger in 'New York Times'. February 10, 1955.
110. Discovery of India, op.cit., p. 421.
111. Ibid.
112. Ibid.
113. Ibid.
114. Letters to Indira, (1928).
115. Discovery of India, op.cit., p. 419.
116. Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches, vol. III, p. 288.
117. Ibid., p. 282.
118. Speech in New York (19th Oct, 1949).
119. Speech in the Canadian Parliament, Ottawa, 24.10.1949.
120. Nehru's Speech in Parliament, 12.2.1952.
121. It was written by Francois de Calliers in 1716 at a time when Richelieu had set a standard of diplomacy.
122. Speech in Parliament, 18.2.1953.
123. From his address at the Columbia university, New York, 17.10.1949.
124. Broadcast from New Delhi, 31.12.1950.
125. Broadcast from New Delhi, 24.1.1951.
126. Broadcast to the U. S. A. from New Delhi, 3.4.1948.
127. Address at the Columbia University, New York, 17.10.1949.
128. Reply to Debate on Goa in Parliament, 26.7.1955.
129. Speech in Parliament, 28.3.1951.
130. Important Speeches of Jawaharlal Nehru, p. 75.
131. From Speech in Parliament, 25.2.1955.
132. India's Foreign Policy, Jawaharlal Nehru, New Delhi, 1961, p. 11.
133. Anthology, Jawaharlal Nehru, (OUP), 1983, p. 385.

134. Speech delivered in New York, 19.10.1949.
135. Discovery of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, OUP, 1991, pp. 18-19.
136. Ibid., p. 18.
137. Anthology, op.cit., p. 388.
138. Nehru: A Political Life, Judith M. Brown, Oxford University Press, 2004, p. 245.
139. Quoted in Nehru: The First Sixty Years', Dorothy Norman, The Bodley Head, London, 1965, vol. II, p. 540.
140. Independence and after, Jawaharlal Nehru, the Publications Division, Govt. of India, New Delhi, 1949, p. 214.
141. Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches, vol. III, p. 252.
142. Nehru: 'The First Sixty Years', Dorothy Norman, The Bodley Head, London, vol. II, p. 541.
143. His Speech in August 27, 1954.
144. Nehru's Speech at House of People in May, 1954.
145. Speech delivered in New York, 19 October 1949.
146. 16 January 1956.
147. Speech in Constituent Assembly, December 4, 1947.
148. India's Foreign Policy, Jawaharlal Nehru, Delhi, 1961, p. 35.
149. Statement in Parliament, 30.04.1955.
150. Jawaharlal Nehru : A Biography, Sarvepalli Gopal, vol. II, 1979, p. 241.
151. ... Nice Guys Finish Second, B.K. Nehru, Viking Penguin, Delhi, 1997, p. 262.
152. Speech at Banquet in honour of Mr. Bulganin, 20.11.1955.
153. Speech in Parliament, 28.03.1951.
154. Speech in Parliament, 24.07.1957.
155. Speech in Parliament, 29.09.1954.
156. Speech in Parliament, 24.12.1953.
157. Nehru's Speeches 1953-57, vol.III p. 252.
158. Speech in Parliament, 07.08.1952.
159. Speech in Parliament, 17.04.1953.
160. Speech delivered at Kalyani Congress, 1956.
161. Speech in Constituent Assembly, 08.03.1949.
162. Ibid.
163. Speech in Parliament, 17.09.1955.
164. Nehru's Speech on 23.01.1954.
165. Nehru's address at Columbia University, New York, 17.10.1949.

166. India's Foreign Policy, New Delhi, 1961, p. 28.
167. Ibid., p. 79.
168. "Changing India", Foreign Affairs, Jawaharlal Nehru, New York, April, 1963.
169. Congress Bulletin, 1954.
170. Letter to Panikkar, 02.09.1950.
171. Nehru : A Biography, Sarvepalli Gopal, vol-II, 1979, p. 106.
172. Indira : The Life of Indira Nehru Gandhi, Katherine Frank, Harper Collins, 2002, p. 264.
173. From Nehru's talks with Norman Cousins, 1951.
174. Statement made in the Lok Sabha, Oct. 25, 1962.
175. Of Matters Military, Lt. General S.K. Sinha, PVSM, Vision Books, New Delhi, 1987, p. 102.
176. Nehru's Speech at the A.I.C.C., New Delhi, 06.04.1963.
177. With West Bengal Chief Ministers (Memoirs 1962 to 1977), Saroj Chakraborty, Orient Longman Limited, 1978, p. 36.
178. Ibid.
179. It was Krishna Menon's dialogue with M. Brecher, occurs in 'India and World Politics.' Krishna Menon's view of the World', by Michael Brecher, OUP, London, 1968, p. 157.
180. Jawaharlal's Speeches, vol. V. New Delhi, 1968, pp. 199-200.
181. It is from an interview with Brecher in 1956.
182. Speech in Parliament, 17.02.1953.
183. Broadcast from New Delhi, 03.04.1948.