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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The world today is in a state of continuing crisis. Like the sword of Damacles, the nuclear weapons in the hands of the major powers pose a threat of destruction of the human race as a whole. In this world context India follows a foreign policy based upon the principles of non-alignment. In the cold war, India has not taken sides with any of the power blocs of the East or the West. India is not alone in this. Many of the Afro-Asian countries which attained freedom after the Second World War have joined hands with India in adopting the policy of non-alignment in their respective countries. These countries constitute the Third World. There is both support for and opposition to this in the West.

An attempt is made in this thesis to explicate India's foreign policy of non-alignment and the influence of Gandhian ideology of non-violence. In all the annals of human history, it was Mahatma Gandhi who used the principle of non-violence for a political purpose - to win freedom from an alien rule for his country. This was his greatest contribution to the world as a whole. If he was alive today he would strive with all the resources at his command to substitute moral warfare in the place of nuclear warfare.

Critics of India repeat the slogan, "If you are not with us, You are against us." This is wrong. Those who have read and understood the history of different nations will not subscribe to this view. The history of the United States itself is an instance in point. Under the Monroe Doctrine the United
States followed a foreign policy of non-alignment for well over a century and a half. It is a matter of common knowledge to the student of U.S. history that this policy was one of the most essential elements, among others, which enabled her to build up her strength as a powerful nation.

When India annexed the Portuguese possession of Goa in India by military means after all attempts at persuasion had failed, the question was asked, "How could a non-violent India invade Goa?" Similarly, when India had resorted to military means to safeguard Kashmir from Pakistan and her North-Eastern boundary from Red China, disillusionment in Indian non-violence began to trouble the minds of some critics who accused her for adopting double standards. As I will attempt to show, this again is wrong. Those who have correctly understood the Gandhian ideology will hesitate to criticise India has not swerved from the Gandhian ideal of non-violence at any time.

This thesis on "Gandhian Ideology and India's Foreign Policy," is an altogether novel thesis. It comprises the following propositions:

a) India's foreign policy of non-alignment is based on Gandhian creed of non-violence,

b) Notwithstanding the fact that India used force to deal with her neighbors in defense of her territory, she did not deviate from Gandhian principles, and

c) the Gandhian ideology of non-violence is by far the best method to settle international disputes.

As this thesis is primarily a study in India's foreign policy the method of historical narration with detailed chronological survey of events was not followed in dealing with the exposition of Gandhian ideology for the simple reason that this study is in the context of his philosophy of life.
The history of the movements of non-violent resistance led by Gandhi and others is outside the scope of this thesis.

My claims to write this thesis are twofold - personal experience and research. I have seen Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru in person, heard their speeches on many occasions and read their writings both before and after Independence. Besides, I also took part in the Indian politics at the State level from 1952 to 1962 as an elected Member of the State Legislature for Madras and practised as a lawyer until 1964. As regards my study and research, I have taken sufficient care to see that the limited access to Indian sources here does not affect this thesis from being interesting and instructive.
CHAPTER II
GANDHIAN IDEOLOGY - WHAT IT IS?

Men of good will in the past have raised their voice against violence and senseless destruction. Jesus Christ advised the turning of the other cheek. Lao Tze preached to meet the good with goodness, the bad also with goodness. Buddha taught that man must overcome anger by love, evil by good, lie by truth. Thoreau declared that in an unjust state, the proper place for a just man was the prison.

Mahatma Gandhi was the first man who used nonviolence for a specifically political purpose. He consistently preached nonviolence as an instrument for shaping the destinies of nations. This nonviolence was not mere submission to violence, the passive nonresistance to evil, but a patient and persistent challenge to violence, until the latter should exhaust itself and be overcome. This is the greatest contribution of Mahatma Gandhi to the modern age.

What, then, is this creed of nonviolence? Ahimsa (nonviolence) was for Mahatma Gandhi the basic law of our human conduct. That is why it can be used as the most effective principle for social action, since it is in deep accord with the truth of man's nature and corresponds to his innate desire for peace, justice, order, freedom and personal dignity. Since himsa (violence) degrades and corrupts man, to meet force with force and hatred with hatred only increases man's progressive degeneration. Nonviolence, on the contrary, heals and restores man's nature, while giving him a means to restore social order and justice. Ahimsa is only incidentally a policy for
the seizure of power. It is in essence and in its political aspect a way of transforming relationships so as to bring about a peaceful transfer of power, effected freely and without compulsion by all concerned, because all have come to recognize it as right. Mahatma Gandhi believed that when the practice of ahimsa becomes universal, God will reign on earth as He does in Heaven.

Mahatma Gandhi called his nonviolent resistance Satyagraha. Literally translated, the word "Satyagraha" means insistence on truth. The content of the word, however, includes an elaborate program. The concept has come to be applied to all the organized and concerted activities which were coordinated in a particular pattern of a successful Satyagraha - that of the nationalists in India pledged to Gandhi's doctrine of nonviolence. In most cases, these mass actions were extra-legal and extra-constitutional; they outgrew parliamentary procedure and become revolutionary. Thus Satyagrah becomes a form of direct action in so far as the people take the law in their own hands. In contrast to war or violent revolution, however, Satyagrah is nonviolent direct action.

Gandhi's own views on Satyagrah are expressed in the following quotations from his work:

1. In Satyagraha the cause has to be just and clear as well as the means. \( ^{1} \)

2. The ideal of Satyagraha is not meant for the select few - the saint and the seer only; it is meant for all. \( ^{2} \)

\( ^{1} \) Thomas Merton, ed., *Gandhi on Nonviolence*, (New Directions, 1965), p. 28.

\( ^{2} \) Ibid.
To lay down one's life for what one considers to be right is the very core of Satyagraha.  III-59

The sword of the Satyagrahi is love, and the unshakable firmness that comes from it.  IV-59

The training of Satyagraha is meant for all, irrespective of age or sex. The more important part of the training here is mental, not physical. There can be no compulsion in mental training.  V-59

Satyagraha is always superior to armed resistance. This can only be effectively proved by demonstration, not by argument...Satyagraha can never be used to defend a wrong cause.  VI-60

The conditions necessary for the success of Satyagraha are:
1) The Satyagrahi should not have any hatred in his heart against the opponent.
2) The issue must be true and substantial.
3) The Satyagrahi must be prepared to suffer till the end.  VII-61

The root of Satyagraha is in prayer. A Satyagrahi relies upon God for protection against the tyranny of brute force.  VIII-60

The art of dying for a Satyagrahi consists in facing death cheerfully in the performances of one's duty.  IX-60

The millions of unassuming and most part illiterate Indian villagers understood Satyagraha to mean that it was 'Gandhi's way of fighting the

---

3 Ibid., p. 29.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid., p. 30.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
British Raj." But to more sophisticated Indians, Satyagraha was a new type of war of which Gandhi was the fountainhead. Viewed as a technique for solving conflict, Gandhi's ideology becomes a form of struggle to achieve social ends.

Mahatma Gandhi believed that Truth was God. In the general sense of the word, Satyagraha means the way of life one holds steadfastly to God and dedicates his life to Him. The true Satyagrahi, therefore, is a man of God. As an individual he finds himself against evil which he cannot but resist. He finds in the society in which he lives in particular and the world in general, injustice, cruelty, exploitation and oppression. In his struggle his reliance is on Truth or God, and since the greatest truth is the unity of all life, truth can be attained only by loving service of all - by nonviolence. The weapon of the Satyagrahi is therefore nonviolence. Satyagraha, in the narrower sense in which it is ordinarily understood, accordingly means resisting evil through soul-force or nonviolence. C.F. Andrews writes:

Among Mahatma Gandhi's practical religious ideals the emphasis seems always placed upon Ahimsa, or Non-Violence. It is difficult in the West to realize how this had become to him the heart of all religion. It is bound up absolutely in his mind with Truth. He holds that the truth of all life on this planet and of God Himself is to be found in this principle of the sacredness of life and refusal to use violence. This principle he calls Ahimsa, which means literally Non-Violence. There is an early Christian saying in the Epistle to Diogenetus: 'Violence is not the attribute of God.' This would have won his wholehearted adherence. 10

As a resister of the evil, the Satyagrahi has to discipline himself in

self-control, simplicity of life, suffering without fear or hatred. Mahatma Gandhi emphasized that his followers should take vows to train themselves in Satyagraha. They were: truth, nonviolence, brahmacharya (celibacy), fearlessness, control of the palate, non-possession, non-stealing, bread-labor, equality of religions, anti-untouchability and swadeshi (the principle of using goods made in one's own country).

Mahatma Gandhi had clearly enunciated the moral requirements for satyagraha. Once a question was put to him. "Was it true that passive resistance (satyagraha) was the weapon of the weak?" He replied:

This is gross ignorance. Passive resistance, that is soul-force, is matchless. It is superior to the force of arms. How then, can it be considered only a weapon of the weak? Physical-force men are strangers to the courage that is requisite in a passive resister. Do you believe that a coward can ever disobey a law that he dislikes?11

To add strength to his point that nonviolence is superior to brute force Mahatma Gandhi posed the counter question:

Wherein is courage required - in blowing others to pieces from behind a cannon, or with a smiling face to approach a cannon and be blown to pieces? Who is the true warrior - he who keeps death always as a bosom-friend, or he who controls the death of others? Believe me that a man devoid of courage and manhood can never be a passive resister.12

He pointed out that passive resistance is an all-sided sword, it can be used anyhow; it blesses him who uses it and him against whom it is used. Without drawing a drop of blood it produces far-reaching results.

12 Ibid., p. 52.
Satyagraha, in the narrower sense, takes many forms. Primarily it is a case of appealing to the reason and conscience of the opponent by inviting suffering on oneself. The motive is to convert the opponent and make him one's willing ally and companion. It is based on the idea that the moral appeal to the heart and conscience is, in the case of human beings, more effective than an appeal based on threat of bodily pain or violence. Indeed violence, according to Mahatma Gandhi, does not overcome evil; it suppresses it for the time being to rise later with redoubled vigor. Nonviolence, on the other hand, puts an end to evil, for it converts the evil-doer. "The aim of individual as well as group satyagraha is not to crush, defeat or punish the tyrant or break his will. It is not even to harm or embarass him, though the resistance and suffering may, as a matter of fact, cause the wrong-doer embarrassment. The satyagrahi loves the opponent as the human being and aims at rousing him to a sense of equity by an appeal to the best in him, i.e., at converting him. Conversion implies that the opponent realizes his mistake, repents and there takes place a peaceful adjustment of differences. 13 As Gandhiji once remarked to Miss Agatha Harrison, "The essence of non-violent technique is that it seeks to liquidate antagonisms but not the antagonists." Satyagraha may take the form of non-cooperation. When it does, it is not non-cooperation with the evil-doer but with his evil deed. This is an important distinction. The satyagrahi cooperates with the evil-doer in what is good, for he has no hatred for him. On the contrary he has nothing but friendship for him. Through cooperating with him in what is not evil, the

14Harijan, April 29, 1939, p. 101, quoted in Dhavan pp. 133-134.
Satyagraha may at times take the form of fasting. When it does, there is to be no trace of self in the motive. The fast should be prompted by the highest devotion to duty and love for the opponent. It should aim at purifying oneself, for lack of capacity to convince the opponent shows defect in oneself. It should seek to influence the opponent by converting him, not by coercing him to do something against his conviction. Mahatma Gandhi was against personal gains. He held that it was nothing short of intimidation and the result of ignorance. According to him, suffering even unto death, and therefore, even through a perpetual fast is the last weapon of a satyagrahi. This is the last duty which is open to him to perform. It should be in the nature of prayer for purity and strength and power from God.

Mahatma Gandhi had undertaken several fasts for public causes. The most important of all was the one which he took in connection with the Harijan\textsuperscript{15} cause in May 1933. This fast is called the "Epic Fast." Under the leadership of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, the untouchables of India demanded separate electorates to elect their own representatives to fight for their rights in the Indian legislatures. This, they believed would put an end to their social, economic and political ills under which they were suffering for centuries. The then British Prime Minister, Ramsay Macdonald had conceded their demand. But Mahatma Gandhi, who was in jail at that time opposed it, saying that that communal award was injurious to the untouchables for it would keep them forever in backwardness and disrupt the strength of the Hindus. Since the British Government was unconvinced and adamant in their stand, Mahatma Gandhi declared that he would resist the British communal award even with

\textsuperscript{15} People of God
his life and went on a fast unto death. He fasted for twenty one days and was literally knocking at death’s door. To save his life, a compromise formula based on increased representation to the untouchables was substituted in the place of the communal ward. Thus Mahatma Gandhi had demonstrated the efficacy of fasting for common good. He declared: "The fast was an uninterrupted twenty one days prayer whose effect I can feel even now. I know now more fully than ever that there is no prayer without fasting, be the latter ever so little." 16

Satyagraha in the political sphere assumes the form of civil disobedience. It is for this form of satyagraha that Mahatma Gandhi became most reputed. Civil Disobedience means mass resistance on a non-violent basis against the government when negotiations and constitutional methods have failed. It is called "civil" because it is non-violent resistance by people who are ordinarily law-abiding citizens; also because the laws which they choose to disobey are not moral laws but only such as are harmful to the people. It is civil also in the sense that those who break the law are to observe the greatest courtesy and gentleness in regard to those who enforce the law. They are even to seek not to embarrass the opponent.

Complete civil disobedience is a state of peaceful rebellion - a refusal to obey every single State-made law. It is certainly more dangerous than an armed rebellion. For it can never be put down if the civil resisters are prepared to face extreme hardships. It is based upon an implicit belief in the absolute efficiency of innocent suffering. By noiselessly going to prison a civil resister ensures a calm atmosphere. The wrong-doer wearies of wrong-doing in the absence of resistance. All pleasure is lost when the victim betrays no resistance. 17

16Gandhi, Non-violent Resistance, p. 315.
17Ibid., p. 172.
When a government is corrupt and demoralizes the people, resistance to such government can also be shown on a nation-wide scale. It may then take the form of non-cooperation with the government. Mahatma Gandhi launched series of civil disobedience movements against the British Indian government during 1920-22, 1930-34, and 1940-44. Non-cooperation may express itself in giving up titles and honors bestowed by the government, resignation from government service, withdrawal from the police and military, non-payment of taxes, boycott of courts, schools and legislatures, and running parallel institutions to perform these functions.

Civil Disobedience demands on the part of the people disciplined group action, infinite capacity for suffering without retaliation, and strict obedience to leaders. They have to be taught, for example, cooperation, communal unity, fearlessness, consideration for the social good, self-help and resourcefulness, and have to have physical, mental and moral strength. These things could be achieved, Mahatma Gandhi pointed out, only through various forms of constructive endeavor, such as working for economic self-sufficiency in villages, education, abolition of drink and untouchability, communal concord, uplift of women, sanitation, hygiene, improved diet, child welfare, and so on. In the political field, therefore, satyagraha is not undertaken on a temporary basis. It presupposes day to day non-political constructive work aiming at the all-round development of the individual from the cradle to the grave.

No doubt, Mahatma Gandhi, based on the experience he gained in South Africa in fighting against that government through non-violence was able to launch the Civil Disobedience movements in India from time to time against the British government and succeeded in achieving tangible results. But it
should not be forgotten how he prepared his followers to adhere to the creed of non-violence with a religious fervor. This required Herculean efforts. He was able to appeal to the hearts and minds of Indians, men, women and children alike and they all looked upon him as a saint rather than a politician, and followed him with implicit faith and utmost confidence which enabled them to realize their long cherished dream of independence from the British. There can be no doubt that in developing satyagraha in its various forms as a practical means of overcoming violence, more especially in group life, Gandhiji established a new milestone in the history of the human race in its march towards peace on earth and goodwill among men.

The foregoing pages in this chapter have dealt with the main characteristics of Gandhian ideology. The creed of non-violence, the meaning of satyagraha as expounded by Gandhiji, his quest after the Truth which was God himself, the discipline required of a true satyagrahi, the moral requirements for satyagraha, the various forms of satyagraha such as non-cooperation, fasting, civil disobedience and its prerequisites both in political and non-political fields etc., were explained briefly but clearly with due regard to limitations of space.

Now it is important to direct our attention to the many sources from which Mahatma Gandhi derived his doctrine of satyagraha.

In the first place, the birth place of Mohandas Gandhi provides an ideal atmosphere and background for his creed of non-violence. He was born on October 2, 1869, in Porbandar, one of Kathiawar principalities. Gandhi's father was Diwan, or Prime Minister, of Porbandar, later of nearby Rajkot, and later still of Wankaner. The Gandhis were of the Modh Bania subdivision
of the Vaishya, or merchant caste.\textsuperscript{18}

The Modh Bania,

like other merchant castes, held to a nonviolent ethic suited to commerce, and to ascetic standards which often supplied the moral equivalent of a Protestant ethic for Indian merchant castes. Kathiawar was strongly influenced by the Vaishnavites, with additional influences from Jainism - the most nonviolent of Indian sects.\textsuperscript{19}

His mother, Putlibai, had profound influence over Mohandas Gandhi. Unlike his father, Karamchand, Gandhi's picture of his mother is of unrelieved holiness and purity. In his autobiography he writes that she left an outstanding impression of saintliness upon his memory. She was deeply religious. Gandhiji admitted the fact that whatever purity was found in him was derived from his mother and not his father.

Likewise, his first teacher of non-violence was his wife, Kasturbai. J. S. Holyland, in Mahatma Gandhi, edited by Radhakrishnan, quotes the following passage:

I learnt the lesson of non-violence from my wife, when I tried to bend her to my will. Her determined resistance to my will on the one hand, and her quiet submission to my stupidity involved on the other hand, ultimately made me ashamed of myself and cured me of my stupidity in thinking I was born to rule over her; and in the end she became my teacher in non-violence.\textsuperscript{20}

The non-violent ideal imbibed by Gandhiji was derived essentially from the Baghvat Gita and from Jesus' Sermon on the Mount. It could also be

\begin{flushright}


\textsuperscript{20}Quoted in Dhawan, Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi, p. 131.
\end{flushright}
traced to the writings of Thoreau, Ruskin, and more especially Tolstoy. But his practical application of it in the social and political spheres was entirely his own.
CHAPTER III

INDIA'S NON-VIOLENT STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE

WHY DID IT SUCCEED?

The flag of the Indian Union was raised to join those of fifty-four other member nations at the headquarters of the United Nations at Lake Success, New York, when India finally became independent on August 15, 1947. Meeting in an exultant yet solemn mood, the Constituent Assembly of India paid tribute to Gandhiji, sent friendly greetings to the new sister state of Pakistan, and observed two minutes of silence for patriots who had died for India's freedom. Lord Mountbatten became Governor-general of the new dominion of the Union of India and Jawaharlal Nehru the first Prime Minister. The Indian communities in the West Indies and South Africa celebrated the Independence Day with parades and displays of the two new dominions. Participating in the flag-hoisting ceremony for free India in London, A. V. Alexander, who had been a member of the Cabinet Mission to India declared, "The Indian Empire dissolves - the British Commonwealth of free nations welcomes two free peoples into their association." 21

In more ways than one, the story of the Indian Independence is unique both for India and the world. The contributions to the freedom of India were many and manifold. In this chapter an attempt is made to deal with some

of those contributions and their sources.

Richard B. Gregg wrote:

In 1947, after twenty six years of nonviolent struggle under Gandhi's leadership, India won her political freedom from Britain. Not a single Briton, so far as I know, was killed by Indians as part of this struggle. It was the Indians who voluntarily endured the necessary deaths and suffering. This was the first time in the history of the world that a great empire had been persuaded by nonviolent resistance to grant freedom to one of its subject countries. Of course, as in all great and complex events, there were many reasons for the result, but the nonviolent method is what eventually unified all Indians and gave them the necessary self-respect, self-reliance, courage and persistence, and also resulted in mutual respect and good feeling between Great Britain and India at the end.22

There is no doubt whatsoever that it was the non-violent character of the struggle that did the miracle. It is therefore interesting to know the working of the mass nonviolent resistance as such.

There is a close resemblance between war and non-violent mass struggle. It is said by great authorities on the science and art of war that the object of war is the mind of the enemy command and government, not the bodies of their troops. The balance between victory and defeat turns on mental impressions, and only indirectly on physical blows. Napoleon stated that "in war, the moral is to the physical as three is to one."23 War seeks to demoralize the opponent, to break his will, to destroy his confidence, enthusiasm and hope. Nonviolent resistance demoralizes the opponent only to reestablish in him a new morale that is finer because it is based on sounder values. Non-violent resistance does not break the opponent's will but alters it. It does not

22 The Power of Nonviolence, p. 28.

destroy his confidence, enthusiasm and hope but transfers them to a finer purpose.

Violence always leads to counter-violence and cannot be a lasting solution of conflict. The defeated nurses the grudge and waits for a suitable opportunity to wreak vengeance. Violence thus creates greater evils than it seeks to cure. It arouses the beastliest passions of man and leads on from injustice to injustice. Non-violence seeks to redirect these divisive opposites into creative channels. It raises the conflict from the destructive physical to the constructive moral level. Suffering love paralyzes more physical force, conciliates the opponent and leads to a settlement satisfactory to both the sides and in keeping with their self-respect, it is available to either side in the conflict and will vindicate truth and justice on whichever side they are in a preponderating measure. It thus carries its own automatic check against misuse. On the whole, the destructive method of violence is no substitute for satyagraha. The latter may work slow, but it does settle the conflict and establish the right even as the former perpetuates and, often enough, establishes the wrong.

Mahatma Gandhi had realized the relative merits and demerits of both violence and non-violence as means for effecting social and political changes and decided in adopting the non-violent means as the best under the circumstances. The practice of satyagraha could result in a new form of war - a non-violent, non-retaliatory war. But before this stage was reached, Gandhi maintained, all avenues for peaceful resolution of the conflict had to be explored, for there was no room in the spirit of non-violent movements for stubborn pride or refusal to confer. One ought to respect one's opponent and avoid open breaks if possible. The program as Gandhi saw it, had five
stages, and groups carrying on non-violent campaigns should exhaust all the possibilities of each before proceeding to the next. The first stage called for a utilization of all the regular constitutional machinery available, including legislative debates, arbitration by third parties, and direct negotiations. If after a reasonable period, this seemed fruitless, the movement was to pass into a stage of agitation, taking the cause to the people with pamphlets and speeches to develop a heightened awareness of what the conflict was about. Gandhi was aware that in totalitarian societies methods of agitation would have to be different from those possible under a more liberal government, probably performed through a network of communications built up outside the normal channels.

If agitation failed to open the opponent's mind, Gandhiji recommended an ultimatum, a document drawn up by the leaders with the consent of the movement's representatives, listing the people's needs and stating that continued opposition would produce some sort of direct action. This phase, Gandhiji called self-purification. Its purpose was to develop ahimsa, or the spirit of harmlessness, the pre-requisite to action untainted with self-interest. Satyagrahis were to pray and fast, seeking to discover whether perhaps their own deficiencies were in part responsible for the evils they wish to abolish. They were to ask themselves whether they were not too lacking in self-respect to command the respect of the opposition and ponder how they could avoid the pitfall of reducing both sides to mere things instead of human beings.

The last stage of the campaign was some form of direct action: economic boycott, sit-down strikes, non-payment of taxes, mass resignation from public office, deliberate and organized disobedience to certain laws, etc. Some
combination of these measures would, it was hoped, so cripple the society that Gandhiji counted heavily on his opponents' lack of preparation for non-violent methods and bewilderment about how to meet them, coupled with the sympathy such tactics could arouse in servants of authority like the police. The ultimate result, if the opponent held out until the bitter end, would be a complete collapse of all order, and power would pass to the satyagrahis who would constitute a new government.

Krishnalal Shridhareni, an Indian journalist and sociologist who knew the independence movement at first hand, writes:

Violent overthrow of the government has been the only method popular with the revolutionists irrespective of their creed, nationality or race. Almost to a single instance, all revolutions have resulted in carnage. What is even more significant, violence has never stopped at the conclusion of a revolution. It has had to be employed even during the aftermath, that is, when the replacement of the established order by the people's government has taken place. Born in a welter of blood, revolution has also to be consummated in blood.

In this carefully plotted and well established pattern of revolution, the Gandhi struggle is perhaps the first and only variation... 24

Shridhareni points out that there were two well marked periods in the history of swaraj (self-government) movement when satyagraha has served as the instrument of the entire Indian community in its struggle against the state. The All-India Non-violent Non-cooperation Movement began in 1920 and continued up to the middle of 1922. The period that followed was, he says, one of demoralization and despondency. When it subsided, various groups engaged in sporadic outbursts of satyagraha fought for local or secondary

issues. It was not until 1930 that a call for general "mobilization" was sent to the four corners of India. This was successful and brought beneficial results to the Indians.

The Non-cooperation Movement of 1920-1922 deserves mention, in the moral warfare waged by Mahatma Gandhi to dislodge the British rule from India.

During World War I Great Britain promised Indians a share in the war reparations and the grant of Dominion status to Indians if India supported the British in their war effort by supplying men and materials. Mahatma Gandhi believed it and at his instance, India made liberal contributions to the war. When the war ended, neither the promised Dominion Status nor the share in the war reparations was given to the Indians. On the other hand stories of ill-treatment and discrimination of the Indian soldiers by the British merely because they were Indians reached India in ever increasing number. Mahatma Gandhi was thoroughly disappointed. To add to all this, the Rowlatt Committee, appointed by the British government, recommended drastic measures to curtail the freedom movement in India. Driven to desperation, Gandhiji called upon the people to offer a satyagraha.

A day was appointed for complete Hartal as a sign of mourning. Each village and every city in the country was to stop all normal activity for twenty-four hours and every adult was to observe a fast. Streets were deserted and shop windows abrouded. Mass meetings were held in the evening to denounce the act. Individuals were asked at these meetings to sign a satyagraha pledge which bound them to disobey the act and such other laws as would be recommended by the nationalist high command. Finally huge processions marched through the main streets of the cities shouting revolutionary slogans. 25

25 Shridharani, War Without Violence, p. 125. The act here refers to the Rowlatt Act which provided arbitrary powers of arrest of a suspected person without warrant and of imprisonment without trial.
How did the British government react? Police and military were used to shoot at the unarmed crowds. At Delhi, Calcutta and Amritsar large crowds of people were fired on. On hearing of a disturbance at Punjab, Gandhiji was going there to restore peace. He was arrested and thrown into prison. The people of Amritsar, disappointed by the news of Gandhiji's arrest, held a protest meeting on the 18th of April, 1919. Some 20,000 people, unarmed and peaceful gathered together in the Jallianwalla Bag, a walled-in garden with only one exit. A gruesome massacre took place at the instance of the British. Shridharani gives a graphic description of this massacre:

Suddenly, General Dyer, a British military officer, arrived on the scene with fifty picked soldiers armed with machine guns. He posted his troops at the only exit of the walled-in garden so that no one could escape. Without a word of warning, he gave orders to fire. About 1,650 rounds of ammunition were leveled at the peaceful gathering of men, women, and children at close range. The holocaust was over in a few minutes. When Dyer withdrew, some 1,200 dead and 3,600 wounded were lying in the garden.

The whole country was shocked and stunned at this blood bath. Mahatma Gandhi, horrified at this heartless carnage, suggested various steps to protest against the government. They were: huge processions, mass meetings to protest government action and picketing of government buildings by women. The government tried to suppress the growing tension by coercive measures as arrests of the satyagrahis, lathi charges (cracking heads open with bamboo sticks), firing on crowds, and wholesale massacres.

Richard B. Gregg, discussing the consequences of firing on unarmed non-violent resisters, gives the Jallianwallabag incident as an example.

26 Shridharani, War Without Violence, pp. 126-127.
Suppose one of the officers loses his head or believes in "making an example" and teaching by terror and orders the soldiers to fire on the unarmed nonviolent resisters, and many are wounded and killed. The effect is indeed electrical. The immediate beholders may be terror-stricken for a short time. But the news inevitably spreads, and the public indignation against the officer and the soldiers will be overpowering. This was the case with the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy in India. By the manner of their death, the hundreds who died there did more to further the cause of Indian political freedom than could the deaths of three times that number in violent rioting or attack upon the army. News of the massacre was a blow to British prestige throughout the world, as well as to British self-respect.  

After the massacre of Jallianwala Bagh, Mahatma Gandhi launched the non-cooperation movement on a national scale. This was the first experiment with non-violent direct action on a national scale which came very close to a complete success when the government was brought to a standstill. But, due to the occurrence of violence which the untrained mobs showed here and there, Gandhiji was accused of inciting the people to violence, tried and sentenced for eight years imprisonment by an English judge. 

While it is outside the purview of this study to give a detailed account of the Civil Disobedience Movement of Mahatma Gandhi in his fight for freedom, some important landmarks, besides the Rowlatt Act satyagraha may be mentioned. They were: Non-violent non-cooperation, August 1, 1920, Salt satyagraha (or Dandi March), March 12, 1930, Non-violent cooperation, Dec. 31, 1931-34, Individual satyagraha, Oct. 1940, and "Quit India" Movement, Aug. 9, 1942.

27. The Power of Nonviolence, pp. 76-77.

28. For a detailed account of Civil Disobedience Movement, see India's Struggle for Freedom, by Jagadish S. Sarma, pp. 78-142. (Delhi: S. Chand & Co. 1962)
Mahatma Gandhi spiritualized politics. "Gandhi once said: You and I have to act on the political platform from a spiritual side and if this is done, we should then conquer the conqueror". According to him the non-violent struggle was a struggle of good against evil and the force behind it was soul force.

It should be remembered that the success of the moral warfare of Mahatma Gandhi was due to his personality. He caught the imagination of the people not only by his teachings but also by his activities. To the millions of the masses of India he was a saint and a Mahatma (great soul). He was regarded as an incarnation of God. He wore a loin cloth. He controlled his palate; led a strictly celibate life after his thirty-sixth year. He prayed and fasted frequently. He walked on foot from village to village. Above all, though he was fighting for a noble cause unarmed, he bade his followers not to raise even a finger against the opponent. Hence he was ranked with Buddha, Mahavira, and Jesus Christ and he acquired a halo of sacredness around him. His emergence as a prophet of the Indian people or as a charismatic leader, out of a politician pure and simple has been nurtured by the peculiar faiths, traditions, and beliefs of the multitudes. Gandhi, the Mahatma, the result of mass psychology, is as significant as Gandhi, the statesman, the result of his individual nature and nurture. People's hearts enshrined him under a halo and his consequent prophetic role in turn endowed the straight-forward political struggle of the Indians with the richness and profundity of a great social


30 Gandhi's desire to identify himself with the poor was the reason for this meagre dress. It gave him the image of an ascetic and a saint to the people of India. But his critics called him an half naked fakir (beggar).
Haridas T. Muzumdar describes Gandhiji in these words:

Mahatma Gandhi belongs not to India alone but to the whole world. He belongs not to our generation alone, not to the twentieth century alone, but to posterity as well. In life as in death Gandhi has been revered by millions of his compatriots in India and millions abroad. Most of us the present generation look upon him as a great political leader. As such Gandhi would no doubt be classified with the great makers and moulders of nations - Cromwell, Napoleon, Mazzini, Washington and Lincoln. Future generations, however, will, I believe, recognize in Gandhi one of the greatest spiritual forces of all times. Whether we knew much or little about him, this man in a loin-cloth somehow reminded the men of the present generation, and will continue to remind future generations, of the great heights which the spirit of man can scale. In him we see an image of our higher self, of that nobler self, of that nobler self which recognizes non-violence and truth as the law of our species.

Thus it was Gandhiji's technique of non-violence and his own dynamic personality which to a large extent, contributed to the resounding success of the India's struggle for freedom.

The world's largest colonial empire was dissolved peacefully, changing the history of the world. Whatever may be the various factors that could be cited for this epoch making event, the final question remains: Was it the moral superiority of the British nation that impelled her to grant independence to India ultimately or was it her weakness and pusillanimity?

Faced as they repeatedly have been with ever-growing nationalist movements of revolt, all other imperialists have, on the contrary, resorted to

---

ever-increasing force and violence, have held in check or suppressed such movements for a long time, and in the end have often perished with them in a common ruin. But the British imperialists acted differently. What they did was slowly and reluctantly gave way before the mounting agitation of Mahatma Gandhi's various campaigns. But that was enough: It was enough to enable the Indian nationalist movement to be conducted along predominantly non-revolutionary lines, even to some extent along parliamentary lines, while achieving a sufficient minimum of progress to avoid discrediting those methods.

Chester Bowles writes:

No country profited more than England, whose empire, on which "the sun never set," stretched from the Atlantic seaboard of America to the island continent of Australia. Its "brightest jewel," in Winston Churchill's words, was India. Without India's enormous annual "contribution" to the British economy, Churchill believed as late as 1935 that "one third" of the British population "would have to go down, out or under." "India," he said, "was England's daily bread, that's all." Yet by the middle of the twentieth century India was free, and the British Empire had been largely converted into a Commonwealth of entirely independent nations. 33

Certainly it was not Great Britain's weakness or her pusillanimity that compelled her to grant independence to India. The real reason lies elsewhere. It was the conscience of the British more than anything else that explains the uniqueness of British transfer of power to the Indian hands. The British people have often achieved greatness, but never were they greater than in the time and manner of their leaving India. Chester Bowles recalls in his book

what one of Gandhi's followers told him regarding the grant of freedom to India by the British.

One night I heard one of them say, "British terror was never relentless enough to succeed. At the crucial moments it always found itself troubled with a bad conscience, and suddenly, when least expected, even with respect for the individual Indian as a human being. A terror that never relented, that never compromised, that was always free of doubts, might have crushed us." 34
INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY. WHY INDIA IS NON-ALIGNED?

Mahatma Gandhi dominated the politics of India, internal and international, both during and after his lifetime. His gospel of non-violence pervaded all aspects of life. It was not a tactical non-violence confined to only one area of life. It embraced all of life in a consistent and logical network of obligations.

During his lifetime, Gandhiji was the heart and soul of the Indian National Congress, the political party which fought for the achievement of freedom on non-violent basis under the guidance and leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. The principles on which the Foreign Policy of the Indian National Congress was based during the course of the India's struggle for Independence were:

1) strong opposition to imperialism;
2) active sympathy with and support to subject-peoples fighting for freedom and independence
3) hatred of war and abiding desire for peace in the world;
4) avoiding foreign entanglements as far as possible; and
5) working against racial discrimination.

It takes no effort to see how logical and consistent these principles are with the Gandhian ideology of non-violence. These principles were

---

India had to use force to settle its problems of integration and border disputes with its neighbors which conforms to Gandhian principles. See Chapter V.
Gandhian. They were enunciated by the Mahatma. They were adopted by his political party as guidelines for action in areas both domestic and foreign.

It is important at this point to recall some of Gandhi's pertinent pronouncements on politics, government and democracy. This will illuminate India's foreign policy and permit its being viewed in proper perspective.

To quote Gandhiji:

There is no escape for any of us save through truth and non-violence. I know that war is wrong, is an unmitigated evil. I know too that it has got to go. I firmly believe that freedom won through bloodshed or fraud is no freedom.

In this statement, Gandhiji expressed the fact that the salvation of mankind itself lies in truth and non-violence. He condemned war as a great evil and passionately pleaded for its abolition. To him real freedom was and could be achieved by non-violence only, and not by fraud and bloodshed. These thoughts of the Mahatma, no doubt, did influence the struggle for India's freedom and the nation's outlook on the world.

At another occasion, Gandhiji reiterated the all-pervasive character of non-violence. He said:

Non-violence to be a creed has to be all-pervasive. I cannot be non-violent about one activity of mine and violent about others. That would be a policy, not a life force.

This clearly explains Gandhiji's stand even in the realm of politics. Non-violence should embrace politics as well. No wonder Gandhiji literally spiritualized politics. He lifted it from the quagmire of deceit, craftiness, and chicanery to a higher and a nobler plane of morality and sanity.

36Thomas Merton, ed., Gandhi on Non-violence, p. 52.
37Ibid.
Gandhiji even talked about non-violence in great nations. He exhorted nations as well as individuals to imbibe the principles of non-violence and practice them.

If they can shed the fear of destruction, if they disarm themselves, they will automatically help the rest to regain their sanity. But then these great powers will have to give up their imperialistic ambitions and their exploitations of the so-called uncivilized or semi-civilized nations of the earth and revise their mode of life. It means a complete revolution. 38

How did Gandhiji relate non-violence with democracy? Here is what he said:

Without the recognition of non-violence on a national scale there is no such thing as a constitutional or democratic government. 39

Democratic government is a distant dream so long as non-violence is not recognized as a living force, an inviolable creed, not a mere policy. 40

In both his prolific writings and his speeches, Mahatma Gandhi carried his message of non-violence across the masses of India and the nations of the world.

After India became an independent nation on the 15th August, 1947, free to follow her own policy and exercise her influence over world affairs, she lost no time in putting into practice the ideals she had cherished so long. The five principles of foreign policy adumbrated by the Indian National Congress under Gandhiji's leadership were implemented without any

38 Ibid.
39 Ibid., p. 53.
40 Ibid.
material change. Thus, there could be no two opinions on Gandhiji’s influence on India’s foreign policy.

Arne Naess describes the influence of Gandhiji in Indian politics in a chapter entitled “Gandhi after India’s political freedom” as follows:

In an India which in 1947 had gained its political freedom, there was no place for Gandhi to act as a politician; yet his prevailing influence became even greater than it had been before. He exerted a powerful influence on Nehru and the other Congress Party leaders, and his religious influence in Indian culture was immeasurable. \(^1\)

In the glowing tribute that Nehru paid to Gandhiji after his death, one can see his own admission of the impact of Gandhiji’s influence on the sub-continent of India.

A glory has departed,” wrote Jawaharl Nehru, “and the sun that warmed and brightened our lives has set and we shiver in the cold and dark. Yet he would not have us feel this way after all that glory that we saw, for all these years that man with divine fire changed us also, and, such as we are, we have been moulded by him during these years and out of that divine fire many of us also took a small spark which strengthened and made us work to some extent on the lines that he fashioned; and so if we praise him our words seem rather small and if we praise him to some extent we praise ourselves. Great men and eminent men have monuments in bronze and marble set up for them, but this man of divine fire managed in his lifetime to become enmeshed in millions and millions of hearts so that all of us have become somewhat of the stuff that he was made of, though to an infinitely lesser degree. He spread out over India, not in palaces only or in select places or in assemblies, but in every hamlet

---


\(^2\) Mahatma Gandhi was assassinated on January 30, 1948. (see Wallbank’s History of India and Pakistan, p. 246, and Louis Fischer’s The Life of Mahatma Gandhi, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950, Chapter 1, Death Before Prayers, pp. 3-11)
and but of the lowly and of those who suffer.
He lives in the hearts of millions and he will
live for immemorial ages. 43

A close study of the independent principles of the Congress policy be-
fore and after the attainment of Independence indicates no remarkable differ-
ence in the basic approach. The main reason of this steady and firm growth
of the Foreign policy, perhaps, is that the man after 1925 who gave the Con-
gress and India a definite line of action to follow with regard to interna-
tional issues is Jawaharlal Nehru. It was he who instilled into the Indian
National Congress an international bias. It is true that the Congress gladly accepted his stand on practically all international issues; for example
on the Sino-Japanese War, the Spanish question, Italian invasion of Ethiopia,
World War II, and the issues of Palestine-Israel issue, Goa, Indonesia,
Ghana and Hungary. From 1925 until his death, he has primary responsibility
for drafting the resolutions on India's Foreign Policy for the Congress.

After India became independent, he became both Foreign Minister and Prime
Minister. Naturally, therefore, the Foreign Policy of the Indian Government
was greatly influenced by Pandit Nehru. Thus, while the spirit and philo-
sophy of India's foreign policy was provided by Mahatma Gandhi, the content
and direction came from panditji.

Who was Nehru? What qualifications and training did he have to shape
India's foreign policy?

Vincent Sheean gives the answer:

43 Jawaharlal Nehru, Mahatma Gandhi, (Bombay: Asia Publishing House,

44 The annexation of Goa by force was according to Gandhian principles.
See Ch. V. p. 49.

45 Jawaharlal Nehru died on May 27, 1964.
Declared purposes are one thing, inherited predispositions another; but Nehru's ideas in foreign policy are also personal, resulting from his total experience, including travel, reading and reflection. He has been intellectually concerned with foreign affairs for forty years and more. This could not be said of any other Indian leader - not even of Gandhi - and constitutes a high degree of preparation for his task.

Born on November 14, 1889, Jawaharlal Nehru was the only son of the late Motilal Nehru, a renowned lawyer and at one time leader of the Opposition in the Central Legislative Assembly. At the age of 13 he became a member of the Theosophical Society, but his interest in this subject soon ebbed out. At 15 he was taken to England and admitted to the public school at Harrow. From Harrow he went to Cambridge where he took his tripos in natural sciences. During his stay in Cambridge he took part in the activities of the Cambridge Majlis (an organization of Indian students). He then studied law and was called to the Bar from the Inner Temple. On his return to India in 1912, he enrolled himself as an advocate of the Allahabad High Court.

On his return to India, "writes Sheen, "he had almost forgotten his native Urdu tongue and took his place in the national movement, at the Bankipore Congress, Christmas, 1912, as a writer and speaker of English. English was then, and was to remain for a long time, the real language of the national movement."

According to Sheen Nehru's ideas in foreign affairs were developed during the long years of study and reflection which preceded his advent to

---


47 Ibid., p. 131.
power. He reveals the fact that Nehru's ideas in foreign policy were evolved in jail, where, all told, he spent some nine years of his maturity. Nehru was, it should be admitted, treated with leniency by the British during his incarceration. Nehru read incessantly while in jail. He could receive books, periodicals and -- most of the time -- even letters. While he was in solitary confinement both his mind and body were active. He developed the yoga principles from a book and stuck to their practice till the end of his life. In the company of other leaders of the Indian National Movement, he gave and received food for thought in the course of unending conversations which served also to sharpen the wits of the participants.

Nehru's rich experience and fund of knowledge came not only from his study and reflection. They came from his wide foreign travel as well. He was a great globe-trotter. In 1926 he sailed for Europe to recuperate his health. He travelled in Italy, Switzerland, Brussels, Germany and Russia. He attended the Brussels Conference of Oppressed Nationalists as the official delegate of the Indian National Congress. In February 1935, he was released from jail. He took his sick wife to Badenweiler, the German health resort. 48 Nehru represented India at the Commonwealth Conference in London in 1949. He went to America on a goodwill mission in October - November 1949. He attended the Commonwealth Foreign Ministers' Conference at Colombo in January 1950. He visited Indonesia in June 1950 and attended the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in January 1951. Nehru visited Africa,

48 Nehru's wife was Kamala. He married her in 1916 and was deeply devoted to her. She died there in Feb. 25, 1936. Mrs. Indira Gandhi, India's Prime Minister today, was their only daughter.
Egypt, China and many other Asian countries on different dates, too numerous to mention. These travels brought him rich experiences, knowledge and mastery over international problems. In consequence Nehru became the chief architect of India's foreign policy, after many years of conscious preparation in deep study, wide travel and serious reflection.

What is India's foreign policy? In a speech delivered at the Constituent Assembly (Legislative), New Delhi, December 4, 1947, Nehru said:

To come to grips with the subject, in its economic, political and various other aspects, to try to understand it, is what ultimately matters. 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 we say. We may talk about peace and freedom and earnestly mean what we 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. 49

So India's foreign policy was, from the very beginning, directed to what is most advantageous to the country, or in other terms, to its material interests. Fundamentally this meant preservation of her newly won freedom on the one hand and achievement of unity and economic development on the other. India is a developing nation. Her policies must therefore be different from those of a well-developed nation. This is true of the policies of the underdeveloped nations in general. To quote J.B. Kripalani:

The underdeveloped Asian-African countries which have recently achieved freedom have so many political, economic and social problems of their own that they feel they must confine their attention to the solution of these rather than dabble in partisan international politics. They do not want to annoy any of

of the big powers. Furthermore, nations which have recently cast off the Western yoke are not quite sure that the colonialists have altogether abandoned the idea of regaining their old dominant position, given the opportunity. They therefore utilize the anti-imperialist assertions of Russia to keep in check fresh ambitions of the West. At the same time they are not enamored of the political and economic set up in communist Russia or China. They therefore remain neutral. Further, they do not believe in the apostolic mission of reforming the world that both sides claim for themselves, one more fanatically and more aggressively than the other. No nation has been commissioned by God or His substitute, Historical Necessity, to reform the world.

These are good reasons for neutrality as between the two blocs, and they appeal to India. Therefore, the policy of the Indian Government in this respect is generally accepted by the nation. 50

India's foreign policy is based on the phrase "Panch Sheela," which was first mentioned in the Joint Statement issued by the Prime Ministers of India and China on June 28, 1954. The five principles as stated in it were:

1. Mutual respect for each other’s territorial integrity and sovereignty;
2. Non-aggression;
3. Non-interference in each other’s internal affairs;
4. Equality and mutual benefit; and
5. Peaceful existence.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the first President of India, in a radio broadcast, had noted that the Panch Sheela was based on the message of Buddha and called upon the people to dedicate themselves to Buddha's teaching.

50 "For Principled Neutrality" - Foreign Affairs, October, 1959, pp. 56-57.
Speaking on the Indian way in International Affairs, Mr. Nehru in December 1956 stressed that the Indian people seemed to have developed a tradition to do things peacefully.... If there was any message which India offered to other countries, it was this message of doing things by peaceful methods to solve any problem. 51

When other nations, especially those of the West, indulge in power politics and use of force for solving their problems arising out of international relations, India follows the principles of non-violence, of Ahimsa, and the dictates of peace and love expounded by Buddha, some twenty five hundred years ago. Wallbank points out that well-informed observers in the West have been impressed by the spiritual motivation of Indian foreign policy. "Professor Norman Brown has commented that "it is in the light of India's moral idealism" that her approach to world affairs must be viewed." 52

Vincent Sheean prefers the word "uncommitted" to describe the foreign policy of India. To him this word is more precise than any other word for this purpose. He writes:

A considerable number of words have been either coined or turned from their original uses to characterize Nehru's foreign policy. The commonest journalistic description of it is "neutralism" referring to the position of friendliness which India assumes with regard to both sides in the "cold war" between Russia and America. It is not a good word because it states an untruth: India is not neutral, and has in fact deployed an incessant activity for twelve years, besides constantly voting on the questions in dispute when they reach the


United Nations. What this deplorable word really means is that Nehru has steadfastly refused to commit himself in advance — by means of treaties, alliances, blind pledges of this or that kind — toward the activities of other nations.

Hence we get another word in current use for the past four or five years: "uncommitted." It was Adlai Stevenson's word originally, I believe, but has been absorbed into contemporary journalese with avidity, as being less negative and therefore less offensive than "neutralism." This word does contain the truth India and a considerable number of other free countries in Asia and Africa stand for, but it has always the danger of suggesting that older negative, "noncommittal" than it is "neutral," and it is only "uncommitted" up to the time when commits itself, as it does on each question when it arises.

In other words, India's central and consistent claim in foreign affairs is the right to make up its own mind on every case, both in accordance with the merits of the case and of India's national interest, without regard to what other nations or combinations of nations may say or do.53

Nehru's own conception of Indian foreign policy, according to Sheean, was that it must adhere to three main parallel lines, governed by three purposes. These were: nonalignment, the pursuit of peace when possible, and the national interest of India itself.

It is interesting to note the variety of roles played by India on the international scene under these purposes. Under nonalignment, India has avoided all "entangling alliances," and military pacts. The celebrated Panch Sheela or five principles of mutual respect and noninterference formed the basis of agreements with Communist China and other countries. Under the second purpose — the pursuit of peace when possible — India has played a

53 Vincent Sheean, Nehru: The Years of Power, pp. 122-123.
considerable role on the world stage.

One of the reasons that Nehru attributed to the non-alignment policy of India was that any attempt on India's part to influence international relations would be ineffective at this stage of the country's development. In a speech delivered at the Constituent Assembly (Legislative), New Delhi, March 8, 1948, Nehru declared:

Now, surely the responsibility for the deterioration of the international situation might lie with some Powers. In India, our responsibility is very little. We may have acted well or badly on the international stage, but we are not, frankly speaking, influential enough to affect international events very much. Therefore, if a great deterioration has taken place in the international sphere it is not due to our policy. 54

Notwithstanding Nehru's admission of India's comparative lack of influence in conventional power terms, on the world's diplomatic stage, India has played effectively the role of a mediator and emissary for peace. Historians like T. Walter Wallbank accept this fact as beyond dispute:

In addition to her anti-colonialism and her concern for security and for Asian peace and solidarity, India has been eager to use her influence and leadership in reducing areas of friction in the world. She has been active as a mediator in disputes, encouraging disarmament - especially in nuclear weapons - and has stood before the nations as a disinterested party working for the common good of humanity. While there has not been complete agreement in Western nations about the overall balance sheet of this role, it is indisputable that India has exerted tremendous weight in the affairs of the world. Her hand was active in the Korean armistice, in the admission of new members, especially in 1955, to the United Nations, in the truce secured in 1954 in Indochina, and in reducing some of the tensions stemming from differences dividing Communist China and the United States. 55

55 A Short History of India and Pakistan, p. 308.
Under the third declared purpose of the Indian foreign policy, to wit, the national interest of the country itself,

there came a variety of considerations ranging from internal development under the Five Year Plans to unity, independence, defense and integration, in which what happens inside and nearby must inevitably have some influence on the actions taken far afield. 56

India's action in the annexation of Goa, her fight against Pakistan over Kashmir and the border dispute with Red China fall under this category of India's foreign policy.57

Now the question may be asked, is India justified in following such a policy of non-alignment in her international relations? Yes. India's foreign policy of non-alignment could be justified from many points of view. For example, Dr. Frank C. Chookoling says:

'This policy can best be understood in the light of the country's past history, its geographical location, its cultural foundations, its present problems, and its future goals. 58

India is an ancient country. "As a way of life, as an Empire, as a political confederacy, the country of India has been in existence since about 4000 B.C."59 Even from the period of recorded history, great emperors, with

56Sheean, pp. 126-127.

57The author of this thesis explains this purpose in terms of Gandhian ideology. According to him the foreign policy of India never swerved from Gandhian principles, even though India was constrained to use force to defend her national interests. See infra.


59Ibid., p. 156.
codes of conduct for national and international purposes existed. Emperor Asoka is an outstanding example. He renounced war as an instrument of national policy and sought to extend the teaching of the Buddha throughout the Empire in 325 B.C. This is India's past. This is India's tradition. The present refusal to join the power blocs constantly engaged in cold war and the preparations for a hot war at any moment should be looked at, among other things, from the standpoint of India's past history and tradition.

A study of the geographical position of India will also help to understand its foreign policy. This may be done from two points of view. First of all, India's juxtaposition with the two most powerful communist countries - Russia and China, and second of all, India's position in the Indian Ocean area.

If India joins the Western bloc, for instance, in the event of a war, she is very vulnerable. Both Russia and China can easily attack India, taking advantage of her geographical proximity. India's northern province of Kashmir is just a few miles away from the southern boundaries of the Soviet Union. Her eastern province of Assam is contiguous with Chinese territory. This, then, is an important consideration which has militated against an Indian desire to join the West in the cold war.

Next, how does Indian Ocean influence India's foreign policy?

"The destinies of the Indian Ocean and India are so closely interwoven that it has appropriately been said whichever power controls one controls the other." Dr. Chookolingo points out that at the time of the Roman empire, both Pax Romana and the maritime strength of the Indian kings maintained peaceful conditions in the Indian Ocean. Later, the Arabs acted as inter-

\[60\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 158.\]
mediaries for the trade between Europe and the Orient. In 1453, when the Turks captured the Constantinople, the Western nations were forced to disc alternative sea routes to continue their trade with India and the Far East. Columbus discovered America in 1492 in an attempt to reach India by sailing Westward, since the Italian merchants refused the use of the Mediterranean sea for the Spanish merchant ships to go to the Orient. For the same reason, Vasco da Gama discovered another sea route to India by sailing West from Portugal along the African coast and the Cape of Good Hope. Since that time the control of the Indian Ocean has been in the hands of nations of Western Europe, Portugal, Holland, France and England. England alone, it must be admitted, by virtue of her superior naval strength, controlled the Indian Ocean for almost two hundred years. But, after the second World War, British sea power declined due to various reasons. A power vacuum has been created in the area of the Indian Ocean, since Britain has left it without a strong naval force. This is an invitation to any other strong nation to covet the possession of India and to attempt to widen its area of influence. By adhering to the policy of non-alignment, India, besides building up her own strength, manages to keep herself out of the colonial ambitions of any power.

How can India's foreign policy be justified on the basis of its present conditions? India has such countless problems at home that she can hardly afford dabbling in the preparations for international wars - hot or cold. To mention only a few of the many problems - very low per capita income, a diehard caste system which divides rather than unites the Indian people, and the illiteracy of the masses - these are urgent and serious problems which deserve the attention of its leaders. Could there be more valid justification than this for India to decline to join the cold war
blocs? Werner Levi correctly points out this fact as follows: "...internal problems are overwhelming. Their solution demands such a concentration of effort that occupation with foreign policy looks to many Indians like a luxury."

Criticisms of India's foreign policy are many. Some say India should get off the fence. She exploits both sides and gets all sorts of aid from them and gives nothing in return. Some others would say, "If India is not with us, she is against us." A third category of critics might point out that India is overambitious. She wants to become a big power in a very short period and so she is shirking her responsibilities in international participation to preserve the democratic way of life as against the totalitarian.

Plausible as these criticisms may sound, it should be noted that they are criticisms which arise from failure to look at the question from India's point of view. If the critics of India could examine her foreign policy from India's point of view and not from that of their own countries', most of their criticisms would undergo considerable modification. But it should be noted that some well informed and well-placed individuals have always understood and sympathised with India's position. Chester Bowles, for instance, justifies India's foreign policy thus:

Americans should understand India's new foreign policy better than any other people because with its oratorical wrappings removed it is practically indistinguishable from the foreign policy of the United States from 1787 to 1937.  

---


He further points out:

For 150 years we more or less faithfully tried to follow George Washington's farewell advice to avoid "permanent alliances" and to remain aloof from the "age-old struggle for power in Europe." Like India we were very busy with our own affairs and inclined to place our faith in moral judgments rather than in positive international action. Walter Lippman says that the present Indian foreign policy, like the historic program of neutrality and isolation laid down by America's founding fathers, is 'the natural expression of the vital interests of a new state.'

Some critics hold that India is "more non-aligned towards the West and less towards the Soviet Union." This criticism again is not well founded. It is true that India follows a program of planned economy, like Russia. India approves the latter's denunciation of colonialism. But this by itself does not constitute a pro-Russian attitude on India's part. India is in fact more closely attached to the West. ".....the concrete step that Nehru took of retaining relationship with the Commonwealth even after India became a sovereign democratic republic is a step full of great import. It reinforces India's relationship with the West and keeps her in the main stream of the world struggle for human freedom and social advance."64

In fine, India's foreign policy of non-alignment simply boils down to this: Refusal to sign any pact of alliance and to receive any military aid. "After Independence what India needed most was peace and friendship with all nations so that she could devote herself to the task of building up her strength."65
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CHAPTER V

INDIA'S RELATIONS WITH ITS NEIGHBORS: HAS THE CREED
OF NON-VIOLENCE FAILED?

The antithesis of non-violence is violence. But Mahatma Gandhi, the
apostle of non-violence, preached that the practice of non-violence does not
preclude violence under certain circumstances. He wrote:

I do not say 'eschew violence in your dealing with
robbers or thieves or with nations that may invade
India.' But in order that we are better able to do
so, we must learn to restrain ourselves; it is a
sign not of strength but of weakness to take up the
pistol on the slightest pretext. Mutual fisticuffs
are a training not in violence but in emasculation.
My method of non-violence can never lead to loss of
strength, but it alone will make it possible, if the
nation wills it, to offer disciplined and concerted
violence in time of danger.66

For yet another reason, Gandhiji permitted the use of violence without
any qualms of conscience.

I do not believe that where there is only a choice
between cowardice and violence I would advise vio-
ence. Thus when my eldest son asked me what he
should have done, had he been present when I was
almost fatally assaulted in 1908, whether he should
have run away and seen me killed or whether he should
have used his physical force which he could and
wanted to use, and defended me, I told him that it
was his duty to defend me even by using violence.
I would rather have India resort to arms in order

to defend her honor than that she should in a cowardly manner become or remain a helpless witness to her own dishonour.67

These were the exceptions that Gandhiji allowed to his dogma of non-violence. But the curious may ask, did Gandhiji at any time, practise violence in his own life? He participated in the Boer War which was waged in South Africa from 1899 to 1902 between Dutch settlers and the British. Louis Fischer tells that in this war, "Gandhiji led his men on to the battlefield. For days they worked under the fire of enemy guns and carried moaning soldiers back to base hospital. The Indians sometimes walked as much as twenty-five miles a day."68

He also participated in the First World War. In this war he raised an ambulance corps of volunteers, about eighty Indians, most of them university students in the United Kingdom. This could not be deemed an act of violence. But Gandhiji held, "those who confine themselves to attending to the wounded in battle can not be absolved from the guilt of war."69

Was Gandhiji inconsistent? How could he permit the use of violence while he preached non-violence? Gandhiji himself was aware of this question.

.... in his reply to an open letter from Rev. B. de Light, he said: There is no defense for my conduct (participation in the British-Boer war, the Zulu rebellion, World War I) weighed only in the scales of Ahimsa... But even after indoctrination during all these years, I feel that in the circumstances in which I found myself I was bound to

69 Ibid., p. 123.
adopt the course I did during the Boer war and the Great European War and for that matter, the so-called Zulu 'Rebellion' of Natal in 1906. 70

Gandhiji's inner integrity would not permit him to dodge the issue of the demands of Ahimsa versus the demands of the state. Explaining his cooperation in the wars, he wrote:

But as long as I lived under a system of government based on force and voluntarily partook of the many facilities and privileges it created for me, I was bound to help that government to the extent of my ability when it was engaged in a war, unless I non-cooperated with that government and renounced to the utmost of my capacity the privileges it offered me. 71

Another instance where Gandhiji made a departure from the dogma of pure non-violence deserves mention here. "He who believed in the sacredness of all life would not and did not hesitate to instigate and direct an attack on the monkeys in order to save the crops." Since he could not abstract himself from society and since agriculture was an essential human pursuit, "in fear and trembling, in humility and penance, I therefore participate in the injury inflicted on the monkeys, hoping some day to find a way out." 72

Since life is governed by a multitude of forces, one must choose between possible alternative courses of behavior. This choice must contribute to the furtherance of the ultimate value or values one holds dear. But Gandhiji claimed for his conduct that "it was, in the instances cited, actuated in the interests of non-violence." 73
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It is the purport of this thesis to prove that:

a) India's foreign policy of non-alignment is based on Gandhian creed of non-violence,

b) Notwithstanding the fact that India used force to deal with her neighbors in defense of her territory, she did not deviate from Gandhian principles, and

c) the Gandhian creed of non-violence is by far the best method to solve international disputes.

From the foregoing passages from Gandhiji's writings it is clear that the use of violence for the defense of national honor was perfectly justified. Therefore, it is important to review India's conduct of her foreign relations with her neighbors and see how far it conformed to this Gandhian ideal.

When India fought against Pakistan was it in defense of her national honor? The Kashmir issue, among others, was the most vital of all which drove these two sister nations to take up arms against each other. Both claimed Kashmir, advancing reasons that suited their convenience. Speaking before the Security Council the Indian Representative, Sir Benegal Rau declared:

The Maharaja of Kashmir executed an instrument of accession in favor of India on October 26, 1947, and Lord Mountbatten accepted it in the next day. This completed all legal and constitutional requirements for accession to the Indian dominion. Nothing more was required. Therefore, it is elementary that Kashmir now is legally a part of India; that Indian troops are legally in Kashmir going there to restore law and order.74

Pakistan did not accept these arguments. On the basis of the facts of geography and the wishes of the people, Sir Mohammed Zafarullah Khan said, Kashmir belonged to Pakistan. He even pointed out that India played the game with two different sets of rules, one for Junagadh and Hyderabad and the other for Kashmir. He asked, how could India dismiss all arguments of legality for the annexation of these two states and take her stand on the wishes of the people and the facts of geography but in the case of Kashmir make legalism sacrosanct and disregard traditions, the wishes of the people, and the facts of geography?

The instinct of self-preservation is vital for individuals; it is even more so in the case of nations. Whatever may be India's explicit reasons for claiming Kashmir, there is one implicit reason which should be brought to light: this is self-preservation. Most of the invasions of India have taken place from the north and northwest where geography provides convenient passage into the country. For this reason, should Kashmir fall into the hands of Pakistan - an enemy of India - the flood gates of aggression against India would be opened and the security of India seriously jeopardized. At one time Indian spokesmen may use arguments of legalism to protect the integrity of the Union, and for the same reason they may reject legalism at other times. This does not mean that India is inconsistent. The only logic that appeals to India is the logic of self-preservation. It is this reason, more than anything else, that lies behind India's stand on Kashmir. Even Ross N. Berkes agrees with this point of view. He says, "Although it could hardly be argued publicly, it is clear that Indians believe that the self-preservation of India depends in part on holding firmly to the proposition that
"Kashmir and Jammu is an integral part of India." But he does not see the validity of this view. He characterizes it as "irrational." But he does not explain how.

Whatever others may say, as far as India is concerned Kashmir is an integral part of India, and it is vital for India's own self-preservation. When Pakistan resorted to force to take over this part of Indian territory the national honor of India was at stake and hence India was justified, according to Gandhian ideology, in using force to counter the enemy attack on her soil. "...When India sent troops into Kashmir to repel the aggression of tribesmen and Pakistan "volunteer" troops, Gandhi said the Government of India had done so with his concurrence if not with his blessing." 77

India also used its military to take over Junagadh, Hyderabad and Goa. Was this also in the national interests as defined by Gandhiji? If so, the use of force in these instances was within the limits of Gandhian ideology.

It is important to know how and why India used force to annex Junagadh. It was a very small princely state on the Kathiawar coast of India. Although more than eighty per cent of its population were Hindus, and though Junagadh was entirely surrounded by the Indian Union territory, in September 1947 the Muslim ruler acceded to Pakistan. India strongly protested against this accession and pointed out that the ruler had acted in disregard of the facts of geography stressed by Lord Mountbatten in his speech to the Chamber of...
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of Princes on the eve of Partition. India also criticized the Nawab for
flouting the wishes of the inhabitants of the state. The ruler maintained
that what he had done was legal, but India contended that an important issue
like this could not be decided on the basis of legality alone, riots breaking
out, and the ruler fled to Pakistan. On November 11, 1947 Indian troops
entered the state and took over the administration. When a plebiscite was
held, the majority of the people voted in favor of the Indian Union.

It is not difficult to see the anomaly of the situation if India had
allowed the ruler to retain his state or allowed his state to merge with the
territory of Pakistan. It was not only incongruous with the sovereignty of
the Indian Union, but was also a potential source of danger to the nation.
Hence, when all persuasion failed, India used force to take over this state
for its own self-preservation. This action was justified on the basis of
the plebiscite held subsequently.

It was for the same consideration of self-preservation that India
used force to take over Hyderabad, the most important princely state and lo-
cated well within the center of the Indian Union. Here again the Nizam was
a muslim, supported by a small minority of a muslim elite. But the vast
majority of the people were Hindus. When India became independent, the
Nizam insisted that Hyderabad should become an independent state within the
British Commonwealth of Nations and refused to join the Indian Union. But
India was determined to see that this state was merged with the Indian Union.
Disturbances took place and Congress workers were arrested by the thousands.
The Nizam argued that his stand was perfectly legal, stressing that once
British paramountcy had been withdrawn Hyderabad was automatically an inde-
pendent sovereign state. As in the Junagadh imbroglio, the Indian Government
disagreed with Hyderabad and contended:

The future of political communities and states is not governed by such declarations. An issue like this involving the defence of India, the integrity of her territory, the peace and security of the country...could not be allowed to be solved by mere legalistic claims of doubtful validity. 78

All negotiations between the Nizam and the Indian Government broke down in June 1948. In order to bring the state within the Indian Union, the Government of India initiated an economic blockade against Hyderabad. Then the Nizam appealed to the United Nations to settle this dispute. But the Indian Government protested that Hyderabad had no right to do so, since it was not an independent state. Finally, on September 13, the Indian Army took over the state. 79

The advice that Gandhiji gave, viz, "I would rather have India resort to arms in order to defend her honor than that she should in a cowardly manner become or remain a helpless witness to her own dishonour," 80 was followed by India, both in letter and spirit, in the case of Goa. The military action India took to annex Goa to the Indian Union should be seen in the light of this Gandhian principle before any valid criticism could be levelled against. Therefore, it is but proper to see whether there was any national honor at stake in the Goan issue that justified India in taking over that foreign enclave by force.


79 India maintained that it was not a military invasion but just a police action.

80 See footnote 65 supra, p. 43.
Portugal had three possessions in Bombay state, the most important of which was Goa. After India became independent, the presence of Goa in India as an integral part of Portugal was not in keeping with the sovereignty of India. It was regarded as a symbol of imperialism and an irritating reminder of Western exploitation. In spite of repeated requests to Lisbon to open negotiations, Portugal had turned down those requests, maintaining that Goa belonged to Portugal and could not accede to India under any circumstances. Disturbances took place after a liberation movement within Goa was initiated. Finally, in December 1960, Indian Army units took over this foreign pocket. Thus, the integration of Portuguese Goa with the Indian Union was accomplished. The basic aim of unifying India was fulfilled.

In the case of Red China, the use of force by India of her national interest was even more obviously justified. In this instance, India had to fight back a Chinese invasion to save her own territory.

The Chinese attack on India came as a bolt from the blue. India was shocked beyond all description. Walter C. Neale points out that,

Through the three thousand years of history India and China had never had a conflict. During the days of friendship following communist seizure of power, only a few Indians pointed out that the long history of peace was due to the thousand miles of Tibet between the countries. At first, independent India looked upon the Chinese communist revolution as another example of a colonial people throwing off foreign domination, and with any such national movement Indians were sympathetic. Then the Chinese joined the Indians in praising neutralism and noninterference in the affairs of others. The peak of friendship was reached in 1954 with the joint enunciation of the Panch Shila, or Five Principles of Peace.\(^{81}\)

India was scrupulously following these principles in its relation with China. But China was not. India firmly believed in the slogan हिंदू चीनी भाई भाई ("Indians and Chinese are brothers.") But China did not. This attitude of China came fully to light when China began to violate the 2000 mile long Sino-Indian frontier. It was even apparent at the time of Chinese invasion of Tibet which was a buffer state between these two countries and when the Dalai Lama, the spiritual and temporal head of Tibet and some 13000 Tibetans asked for and were given political asylum, the Chinese intentions against India became more and more clear. Soon after the attack, "Panch shila's use as the guiding force in India's China policy is, as the Indian Express put it, "dead as the dodo." Prime minister Nehru's claim to a special neutralist magic in his dealings with Communism was now put in "not dead, but it was severely damaged." Particularly toward Red China Nehru had followed see-no-evil policies. He has also gone too far in recognizing the superior position of China, to which he had given expression on many occasions. He had admitted that Red China was the No. 1 power in Asia. "...he listed China as the world's third power - behind the U.S. and Soviet Russia - with India in the fourth spot, ahead of Britain and France." He deplored the exclusion of Communist China from the United Nations and had been much involved in pleading for a seat to Red China in that body. Nehru pointed out that if China was not in the United Nations, from the point of view of population and from the point of view of world importance, nearly a quarter of the world was not there.

Now Red China repaid for all this good will by stabbing India in the back. It violated the Sino-Indian border and occupied Indian territories by killing the Indian soldiers stationed in the area on the pretext that India was the aggressor and was expansionist.

How did the Sino-Indian border dispute arise? K. M. Panikkar says,

In history, India and China have, politically speaking, constituted two different worlds, which, though touching on each other, have not influenced each other greatly. The only problem which existed between them, which India inherited from the British, related to Tibet. India, however, recognized Chinese authority over Tibet and the outstanding issues between the two countries in this area were settled by negotiations in 1954.

K. M. Panikkar goes on to point out that the Himalayan range forms the natural boundary between India and Tibet. It has never been a live boundary, requiring elaborate arrangements for defence. Extending from the Pamirs to the Burmese border, over most of the area, it is settled by long custom and tradition, but at the North-Eastern end it was defined by negotiations between the British Indian authorities and Tibet. This is what is known as the MacMahon line. Neither Red China nor any other past regimes recognized this line. Red China claims that the actual frontier runs 100 miles south of the present line on the south slope of the Himalayas. John Rowland puts it thus:

"The genesis of the MacMahon Line," India's Assam boundary, is a story of Great Britain's efforts to limit Chinese authority in Tibet and to commit the Chinese to accept the Himalayan crest - India's vital rampart of defense - rather than the Himalayan

---

southern base as the northeast boundary between India and Tibet. The drawing of this line represents a vital phase in Chinese-Indian relations. China's Communist dynasty fifty years later would reap the benefit of its predecessor's stubbornness and sense of greater Chinese destiny in refusing to accept Britain's formula. Independent India, inheritor of Britain's Indian Empire, would suffer the consequences.  

In 1959 Red China occupied 12,000 sq. mi. of Indian territory in Kashmir, and has laid claim to an additional 39,000 sq. mi. along India's northern frontier. In the summer of 1962 several armed clashes occurred in Ladakh and the North East Frontier Agency. Late in October, Chinese Communist forces launched a major offensive at points all along the border. Nehru broadcast sadly to the nation, asking for unity in India's hour of peril. A national emergency was declared. He had already dispatched an urgent request for military aid from Britain and the U.S.A. The badly needed equipment was quickly flown in to the war zone. India also asked the Soviet Union for help. The Russians helped, though reluctantly, for Russia declared that India was only a friend, but China was a brother.  

(It may be pointed out here that one of the main ingredients of India's policy of non-alignment, to wit, refusal to receive military aid, was abandoned, when it asked for and received military aid from other nations. But this was done, it should not be forgotten, in an hour of national peril. Further, even though there is an apparent deviation from the creed of pure non-violence when India resorted to armed resistance against Red China, yet it was strictly within the purview of the principles of Gandhism.

according to which violence may be used to defend one's national honor.)

While the fighting was going on, China declared a unilateral truce and withdrew after the initial successful breakthrough into Assam. What was Red China up to? As the Time Magazine observes:

Red China seemed spoiling for a fight - almost as if determined to convict Nehru's India as pliable and easily frightened, or else compel it to abandon its prestigious posture as the great uncommitted neutralist power in Asia.\(^{86}\)

Now it is possible to turn to the critics of Indian foreign policy who ask in what way India differs from the nations of the West, when India has also used force to settle the disputes arising out of its international relations with its neighbors. How could India take over Goa by military action, fight against Pakistan and Red China and yet maintain that it is wedded to non-violence and Gandhian ethics in solving her international problems?

It must be admitted that India has failed to practise pure non-violence in all these situations, even though non-violence is its avowed policy. The Indian leaders do not believe in violence, much less would wish to use it to settle any problems, domestic or foreign. Because they know too well that violence begets violence, and in the ultimate analysis, it does not help to settle any problems. Even in the face of Chinese invasion of India, look what Nehru had said:

We are friendly with every country in the world. But we will fight with China. My desire is to avoid it but not to submit as well. If we have to take such a step, we will take it. But, he added, I am free to confess to this House (Parliament) that my soul reacts against war anywhere.

\(^{86}\)India: The Dragon's Breath, p. 23.
That is the training I received throughout my life, and I cannot easily get rid of it at the age of 72. In typical phraseology, he added: We will be able to get this aggression vacated, through pressure and other things without getting the whole world involved in war. 87

But it should be borne in mind that the use of force to defend India's national interests and honor was very much in tune with the Gandhian ethics. 88

The practice of non-violence would work only when the opponent is also a respecter of non-violence. If India had followed non-violence to solve her problems of integration and the Chinese invasion it would have lost not only its national honor but also its freedom. This does not mean that the ideal of non-violence has failed, though it is possible to argue that India may on occasion have failed in following it. For non-violent policy to succeed the condition precedent, viz, the opponent also being a believer in non-violence, should exist. Otherwise it may be necessary to resort to violence on occasion. This was the advice Mahatma gave the nation to defend itself in its hour of danger. This was Gandhian wisdom. Was he a down-to-earth pragmatist or was he just a starry-eyed visionary? The answer to this question is for posterity to give. As a scientist, Mahatma Gandhi had postulated certain theories for social experiment. He even demonstrated to all the world the success of his experiment using it against the then mightiest British Empire. If it could work in the case of one nation, it may be presumed, it could work in the case of other nations as well, provided all the required conditions exist. No doubt, the creation of such favorable


88 See foot note 65, p. 43 supra.
conditions is difficult, if not impossible. The non-violent way is vastly superior to any other means of solving problems, domestic or foreign, national or international, simple or complicated. Humanity will be richer, Gandhiji firmly believed, for using it to eradicate the many and manifold ills that plague the world today. Hence, the non-violent ideal is worth striving for. As the Rev. P. Regansey points out:

...it is a delusion to disregard prophets because they are not able to give precise predictions about the future. Even a politically competent prophet like Gandhiji, though could indicate objectives, was not able to fully reach them. 'What forms can non-violence take, and to what extent can it succeed? Practising it is the only way of discovering what it can achieve.'

CHAPTER VI

INDIA AND THE THIRD WORLD

WHAT IS ITS IMPORTANCE IN THE WORLD SITUATION TODAY?

What is the third world? To know the third world, it is important to know the other two worlds preceding the third. Mario Rossi describes it thus:

The third world comprises the developing nations of Asia and Africa. It took a place, after World War II, alongside the Western World and the Communist World. It is “Third” not only because the other two preceded it, dominating the scene of history, but also in so far as it possesses a personality of its own, just as the others do. It is not a world waiting to choose which side to join because it has already chosen to be itself. Its vision of the future, its needs, its perspectives are different, and these are all incompatible with the idea that the world can be either democratic in the Western sense or Socialist in the Soviet or Chinese sense. To the old alternatives it has added one of its own.90

It must be noted that Latin America does not belong to this Third World. If economic underdevelopment was the only criterion, Latin America would fall into this category. But it does not share with Asia and Africa a number of traits which make of them a world apart. Its traditions, language, and religion belong to the West. It remains an autonomous entity within the Western community of nations.

The Second World War set several revolutions in motion. It shook long established traditions, ways of life, and approaches to world problems; it produced social phenomena and transformations. When compared to our revolution all the other revolutions which preceded it shade into insignificance. For instance, the agricultural revolution changed man into a deliberate cultivator of his own food supply. No doubt the Industrial Revolution had brought about far more changes in a few decades than Europe had known during the preceding two thousand years. But the Revolution of our time is bound to prove even more far-reaching in its consequences. The peaceful applications of nuclear and other forms of energy, the desalting of ocean water that may make deserts bloom, the population explosion (which affects certain continents more than others), the new explorations and discoveries in outer space that will add a cosmic dimension to man's life - all this and much more will affect radically our view of the world and our relationship to it.

How is the present revolution more remarkable than the previous revolutions? The speed of communications has erased distances; the emergence of the Third World has caused every continent to become a participant in the process of history; nuclear energy has endowed certain nations with the capacity to destroy not only this or that city or region but the whole human race; technology has produced an unparalleled equalization within and among countries; for the first time an organization, the United Nations represents most of the world. Above all, this revolution is unique in that it forces a universal approach--however reluctant--to human problems.
Another important characteristic of the present revolution is that it has introduced ideology as a dominant factor in international relations. The idea that a country uses ideologies in the pursuit of its foreign affairs, or employs its power to promote an ideology, is comparatively new. This could be seen in the emergence of the United States and the Soviet Union to world prominence after the Second World war. This is an Age of Ideology. There is a constant rivalry going on between the ideology of Western democracy and the Communist ideology winning the allegiance of individuals and nations. The so-called 'cold war' or the international tensions of to-day is the consequence of this conflict between the ideologies. The behavior of the Third World in such a context is very important.

How did the Third World come into existence? The countries of the Third World, except Algeria and Vietnam, have not known the protracted bloody struggles, the battles and revolutions, that many of the nations of Europe had to fight in order to secure their independence. They became free primarily because they were caught and carried along in the whirlwind of the revolution of our time. But there was also a certain degree of inevitability of independence to these countries due to the fact that the administering countries carried with them the civilization that was the product of their own industrial revolution. A good many of the nationalist leaders of the Third World, like Gandhi, Nehru, Soekarno, and Nkurumah, had studied in Europe or the United States and had absorbed Western civilization and the principles of democracy and egalitarianism. To fight the West they adopted the principles and the methods of the West. The adoption by Asian and African intellectuals of principles springing from European traditions caused an anti-European reaction for which Europe was indirectly responsible.
The revolution of our time, having originated in Europe, could not but engulf the countries dominated by Europe.

The shift in the balance of power caused by World War II was largely responsible for accelerating the emergence of the Third world countries as independent nations. No doubt, the process by which Europe undermined its own colonial power through the spread of its institutions was going on slowly but steadily even before the outbreak of the Second World War. But this process alone, it would have taken many more generations for the Third World countries to gain their independence from their masters. In the Second World War, Germany defeated France, Belgium and the Netherlands. Britain was saved by the intervention of the United States and the Soviet Union. These two countries emerged as the dominant factor in international politics, and both were traditionally anti-colonialist. This had its own impact on the end of the era of colonialism. Further, wartime promises and declarations such as the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms had also greatly helped in creating a conducive climate for the birth of the Third World.

Intense nationalism and insatiable desire to catch up as speedily as possible with the more progressed peoples of the West activated the countries of the Third World beyond description. A semi-colonial China emerged from the war as one of the Big Five. The Philippines, hitherto a colony of the United States, was granted independence on July 4, 1946. India had been ruled over by Great Britain for more than a century and a half. During the Second World War, India had participated in the allied war effort. It played an important — perhaps decisive — role in Africa and the Middle East, especially after Japan had occupied Burma and India's own security was in danger. Finally, on August 15, 1946, Great Britain
relinquished its Indian empire and created two independent states, India and Pakistan. After the war, Ceylon, Burma and Nepal also became independent countries. Thus most of Asia became free.

The story of the process by which African countries won independence is even more striking. With the exception of Algeria, Africans did not have to fight for their freedom. Freedom came to them because it was inevitable. The global revolution had spread to Africa also. The European powers abandoned one territory after another, not because they lacked the strength to hold them, but because they recognized the relentlessness of the revolutionary process. This is how Asia and Africa became free after the Second World war. This, in brief, is the story of the genesis of the Third World which did not exist as a separate entity before the Second World war.

In today's world situation, the Third World plays an important part. No doubt there is a wide gap between the nations of the other two worlds and those of the Third World in many respects. Nevertheless, in the context of the modern world caught in the throes of rising international tensions threatening to precipitate a third world war, the Third world does play a vital role. Rossi points out:

The gap in historical evolution and internal structures between the Third World and the other two worlds is perhaps the most significant element that the rise of Asia and Africa to freedom has added to the pattern of inter-state relations. The Third World has introduced diversity - diversity not only within itself but also in respect to the Western and the Communist countries. This new element gives the Third World its independent existence, and the fact that it has one must be taken into account. For continents with different structures, to accommodate this new reality is a difficult task, rendered even more difficult by the gap in social and economic
conditions that tend to drive the developed
and the developing nations further apart.91

Perhaps the countries of the Third World are underdeveloped. Maybe
till recently they were only colonies of the Western powers. But still they
merit attention for their potential for making a valuable contribution to
the cause of world peace. After the Second World War the United States and
the Soviet Union emerged as two super powers - not as friends as they were
during the war, but as rivals locked in an eternal conflict of ideologies.
They have deep mutual fears and suspicions. The Americans accuse the Russians
of "aggressive communism," and the Russians accuse the Americans of
"capitalist imperialism." George F. Kennan makes a lucid analysis of the
causes that lie behind the tensions between these two countries. He sees
in the present military strength of Russia an immediate threat to the secu-
ritv of central and western Europe. This, he attributes to the fact that the
Soviets have come into control of the physical and technical and manpower
resources of the Baltic states, of eastern Germany, and of the satellite
countries of eastern Europe. Kennan points out another cause for the Soviet -
American friction as follows:

The next fact we must note is the congenital
and deep-seated hostility of the Soviet regime
to the older and larger countries of the west-
ern world, and particularly of the United
States. There has been much argument as to what
caused this hostility: whether it was a preconcep-
tion of the communist movement or whether it was
something provoked by western policies toward
the Soviet regime in the years of its infancy.
Actually, both factors enter in, but the more
important of the two has been by far the ideol-
ogical prejudice entertained by the Soviet

91Ibid., p. 29.
leaders long before they seized power in Petrograd in 1917.92

According to Kennan, the Soviet leaders were always on the lookout for an external enemy to explain and justify their own excesses and cruelties when they were faced with the responsibilities of power. In the thirties they actually had two such genuine enemies - the Germans and the Japanese. World War II had eliminated these real enemies. Thereafter the Russians looked for a fictitious enemy, and found one in the United States. Kennan says:

We had every qualification for being cast in such a role. By our insistence on remaining in Germany and Austria and controlling Japan, by stiffening Europe with Marshall Plan aid, and by defending the political integrity of South Korea, we prevented that complete sweep of dominant Soviet influence over Europe and Asia which was Stalin's initial postwar hope. By keeping freedom alive in the immediate proximity of Soviet-occupied areas, we complicated the consolidation of communist control there and maintained, in effect, a constant threat to the security of Soviet power. ...For all these reasons we must recognize Soviet hostility as something reflecting a deep historical and political logic.93

Red China now causes a greater headache to the West than the Russians. Even J. William Fulbright, the Chairman of the U. S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee has given expression to this. He writes:

There is an unacknowledged presence in all that we think and say and do in connection with Vietnam: the presence of China. We wage
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war against the Vietcong and North Vietnam but we regard them as instruments of China, and it is China and Chinese Communism that we regard as the real threat to the security of Southeast Asia.94

Is there a real Chinese threat to world peace? Or is it only imaginary? In the opinion of Fulbright there is no real Chinese threat. Most of the fear of Red China stems from the doctrine enunciated in September 1965 by the Chinese Minister of Defense, Lin Piao. He divided the world into two parts, the "cities" and "rural areas." The former includes the United States, Western Europe, and the Soviet Union. The latter includes Asia, Africa and Latin America. The rural areas will surround and conquer the cities in the same way the Chinese Communists starting from the countryside gradually took over all of continental China. It is this statement of Lin Piao that has disturbed and scared the United States. The United States thinks that China is as aggressive as Germany was in the thirties. But Fulbright thinks it is not true. It does not exist as a fact. At best it is only a doctrine. He points out that some distinction must be made between what China's leaders say and what they do. He gives figures to prove his point. In Vietnam itself, Fulbright says, the United States had some three hundred thousand troops as of mid-1966 while the Chinese had only a few thousand men in work teams assisting the North Vietnamese. Furthermore, he asserts China is really tolerant and not aggressive. It has allowed and respected the independence of its neighbors like Burma, North Vietnam and North Korea. Even George Kennan agrees with the view that Red China could

not be a threat for the reason that it lacks military-industrial strength and is distinctly a resources-poor country. 95

Whether the mutual threats are real or not, the power blocs are acting and reacting constantly, each hoping to beat the other in various ways. Even before World War II the rivalry between the two blocs to widen the area of their influence was going on at a slow pace. But after the war, the competition and rivalry increased by leaps and bounds resulting in a tension that threatens the outbreak of a Third World War involving weapons that could annihilate the human race from the face of the earth. Frederick H. Hartman describes this rivalry - the so-called cold war - in these terms:

Even without ideological dissensions, trouble between the victors would not have been abnormal; with it the Cold War became a tense struggle between East and West, waged on a number of levels - economic, psychological, political - and over a number of basically distinct issues whose exact outlines were frequently blurred in the ideological exchange. 96

He pinpoints four main issues involved in this Cold War. They are, first, the enormous growth in power of Russia and the increasing influence of communism in the post-World-War-II world. This issue includes a number of questions raised by the Russian establishment of pre-1904 boundaries and position in Asia and its pre-1914 boundaries in Europe. Second, the

---

95 For a detailed analysis of this fact refer to the chapter on "The Problem of Soviet Power," in Kennan's book, Realities of American Foreign Policy, especially pp. 63-67. No doubt, the emergence of China as a nuclear power calls for a modification of Kennan's views today.

extension of communist form of government to China and the events that flow from it; third, the Russian domination of the Balkans and Poland, and fourth, dominant Russian influence in Eastern Germany. Since these issues individually and collectively constituted a threat to the Western security, they gave rise to problems of policy formulation and implementation by the West.

To understand the grave situation of the world today it is necessary to know what makes it so grave and dangerous and who is responsible for it. Because of conflict of ideologies and the mutual threat to each other's security, the power blocs have resorted to various measures to protect themselves and to undermine the relative strength of the opposite side. In other words, they erected military alliances and engaged themselves feverishly in arms race. These military alliances split the world into rival camps (excluding the Third World countries) and made it bipolar.

In Asia, however, the balance of power after World War II was unstable. After the collapse of the Chinese Nationalist power in 1949 a further elaboration of alignment system took place. In 1951-52, the United States concluded a series of treaties with Japan, the Philippines, Australia and New Zealand. After preventing Red China and North Korea from making further inroads into South Korea, the United States concluded a treaty with South Korea against an armed attack in the Pacific area against either of the parties. A treaty of alliance was also concluded between the United States and Nationalist China by which Formosa and the Pescadores were guaranteed against mainland attack. By the formation of the SEATO (South East Asia Treaty Organization) in 1954 with Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, the United States and the United Kingdom, the balance of power attained a precarious stability in Asia.
The Baghdad Pact came into being in 1955 in the Middle East. Iraq withdrew from this Pact after a revolution. Thereafter it was renamed as CENTO (Central Treaty Organization) with Britain, Turkey, Pakistan, and Iran as members.

The competition between the power blocs to widen the area of their influence in the world and to match the might of each other has not produced any beneficial results to mankind except to worsen international tensions. The arms race represents a dog-eat-dog competition in the field of manufacturing and stock-piling more and more deadly and destructive weapons all in the name of self-defense. A chronological survey of the development of weapons over the ages, strictly speaking, is outside the scope of this work, even though it might be helpful to understand the magnitude of power of destruction that mankind has achieved. Dr. David R. Inglis, a senior physicist at the Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois who participated in the production of the first atomic bomb writes as follows about the unprecedented destructive nature of the nuclear weapons:

Our concepts of civilisation, of political institutions, of religion and morality, and of war have all grown up together, gradually, throughout history and before. Suddenly in the middle twentieth century, one of them, the concept of war, has radically changed. Nuclear sources of devastating energy, the A-bomb and the H-bomb, have suddenly multiplied by a million the power of the weapons which can be used by man. The word "war" to which we have become accustomed in the past, is no longer adequate to describe.

97 A brief but exhaustive survey of weapons development is given by Hartman, pp. 168-175 in Chapter 8.
what we can expect, but we have no better word. We can call it "nuclear war," and we must learn to feel how very different nuclear war is likely to be from the wars with chemical explosives which mankind has survived in the past. 98

Dr. Inglis describes the power of one bomb thus:

For anyone who has read some description of the devastation which took place in Rotterdam or Hamburg or London or Cologne or Coventry or Tokyo or any of the dozens of cities which suffered enormous and tragic and irreparable losses from chemical explosives in World War II, perhaps the best way to try to imagine the power of one big H-bomb is to think of all this destructive power dumped on one city in the flash of one single explosion. That is just part of what one H-bomb can do. One single twenty-megaton H-bomb delivers more explosive power than that of all the weapons used by all nations for all purposes during all the years of World War II, or for that matter, during all the wars of history. 99

Both the United States and the Soviet Union are now in possession of H-bombs whose destructive megaton capacity is many times twenty. As early as 1963 Premier Khrushchev announced that Russia had developed a hundred megaton bomb. Many believed then - many believe now - that that marked a turning point in the Cold War between the power blocks. A nuclear deadlock was created. But the super powers continue through research and development to look for possible technological breakthroughs even though both have come to acknowledge the existence of a balance of terror. Out of this horrible
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situation, a strange theory was developed according to which the two power blocs, with almost equal nuclear weapons could be relied upon to refrain from attacking each other for fear of retaliation. The idea of a utopia of permanent peace was developed out of a situation of utmost peril. Churchill, at that time, believed it possible that "we would by a process of sublime irony have reached a stage in this story where safety will be the sturdy child of terror, and survival the twin brother of annihilation." 100

In a world context, such as this, the Third World countries do play an important role which serves the cause of world peace. How? The countries of the Third World are wedded to the policy of nonalignment in the deadly power struggle of the blocs. This again calls for a definition of 'nonalignment.' To quote J. W. Burton, Senior lecturer in International Relations, University College, London:

The term 'nonalignment' as commonly used to describe the foreign policies of nations which are not in an alliance with either the Communist or the Western bloc, despite the feeling of the political leaders of the nonaligned nations that it does not convey satisfactorily a description of their policies. 'Nonalignment has no positive value which they wish most to express. In Belgrade, Cairo, Delhi, and other centres of nonalignment, other and even less satisfactory terms are frequently used: 'non-bloc,' 'uncommitted,' 'actively neutral,' are some of those. Long phrases and speeches are sometimes the only means of overcoming frustrations experienced as a result of the absence of any term which is as yet sufficiently meaningful. For want of a better term 'nonalignment' has now been adopted very generally.... 101


What is the content of nonalignment? How to define a nonaligned country?
The representatives of twenty governments claiming to pursue nonalignment
met at Cairo in June 1961 in a Preparatory Meeting for the Belgrade Conference
and attempted to define a nonaligned country. The Conference adopted five
broad criteria to distinguish a nonaligned country. A nonaligned country
should
(1) Follow an independent policy based on nonalignment and peaceful coexis-
tence;
(2) Support liberation movements;
(3) Not be a member of a multilateral military pact in the context of the
East-west struggle;
(4) Not be a member of a bilateral military pact with a Big Power in the
East-West struggle;
(5) Not grant military bases to foreign powers.

From the foregoing definition of a nonaligned country it is clear what
the nonaligned countries of the Third World stand for. At this point it is
necessary to distinguish between nonalignment and neutrality. N. Parames-
waren Nayar, a lecturer in Politics at the University of Kerala in Trivandrum,
India, points out that the nonaligned countries had made a definite and
clear distinction between the two terms. He says: "Though these countries
spoke of nonalignment, it was made clear as early as 1947 that it had
nothing to do with neutrality, passivity or anything else." India was non-
aligned but not neutral; Indonesian policy was "independent and active;"
Egypt sought to pursue "positive neutrality." There have been repeated
expressions of this distinction between nonalignment and neutrality over
all these years by the leaders of these nations.... On questions of
colonialism, racism, and peace there has not been any tendency for neutrality among these nations." 102

Charles G. Fenwick not only discusses the concept of neutralism but also points out the part played by the nonaligned countries in the cause of world peace through collective security.

Not a little confusion has been created by the use of the term "neutralism" to describe the position of states which, while still loyal to the United Nations, are holding aloof from the political controversies and conflicting policies of the "cold war" between the United States and the Soviet Union. They are supporting the basic principles of collective security, but they realize that in certain situations they might be risking their very existence in taking sides against a state in possession of the atomic bomb. But in thus standing aloof from participation in possible military action in support of a decision of the Security Council they are still ready to affirm the principles of the Charter. 103

The Third World gives to what serves the cause of peace a different interpretation from that generally advanced by the industrialized countries. There was a time when people in the West believed that peace could be secured only through the defeat of communism, while the Communists preached the coming of the millennium following the violent elimination of capitalism. Today it is assumed that because of the nuclear menace Western democracy and Soviet communism will have to coexist, but not necessarily peacefully. Each side entrusts the preservation of its territory and way of life to the balance of power, viewed as the only guarantee of peace or rather of non-war. This theory implies that only the countries capable of establishing


the balance are primarily responsible for keeping the peace. The Third World does not deny this premise in present international conditions. It does deny, however, that there is no alternative to the balance of power. The alternative as the Third World sees it, is a world disarmed, working toward objectives beneficial to the whole human race.

It is now understood in some quarters that the real, though indirect, threat to the world peace lies in the disparity between the industrialized and the proletarian countries.

Each year the rich countries distribute about eight billion dollars to those which are poor. The military budgets of these countries total 140 billion dollars. The relationship between these two figures is in itself the heaviest possible condemnation of the policy of the great powers. It is generally agreed that the industrialized countries should contribute one per cent of their gross national product. We are far from reaching this goal. And France, which is making the greatest effort of all, each year reduces the percentage of its contribution. All the other countries are also decreasing their aid, either in absolute terms or as a percentage of their total GNP. This trend is alarming; it shows the dangerous lack of concern for the third world among the great powers. 104

Economic assistance, the Third World feels, is not only a partial restitution of the riches the Western countries took from their colonies - something to which the new countries believe they are fully entitled - but is also a benefit to the givers. Within some nations the indifference of the wealthy classes to the poverty of the majority has led to revolution and violent change. On a similar basis, the wealthy countries cannot feel

secure amid intolerable poverty. Money spent on war preparations is considered not only an investment in mass annihilation, hence a folly, but also an injustice because it could mean the salvation of hundreds of millions of people.

Miss Barbara Ward makes her following observation:

Another reason for our relative indifference is that owing to the relative under-population of our part of the world and owing to the scale of latent resources waiting to be developed in the Atlantic world, we in the West had not too much (sic) difficult a passage to modernity; certainly nothing compared with the really appalling dilemmas that are faced by the under-developed world today. So, although we are perhaps beginning to see that they face almost insurmountable problems, I do not think we have worked out our response or even perhaps fully measured our responsibility. Yet there is no human failure greater than to launch a profoundly important endeavour and then leave it half done. This is what the West has done with its colonial system. It shook all the societies in the world loose from their old moorings. But it seems indifferent whether or not they reach safe harbour in the end.105

Strangely enough, the West - particularly the United States - does not take kindly to the demands of the Third World countries, even though it extends economic aid to these countries, one presumes without any strings attached. Reporting from Belgrade, Time-Life London Bureau Chief, Robert Elson, takes a look at "nonalignment" as follows:

At the Belgrade Conference of nonaligned countries some very oddly assorted nations produced some strange judgments which have disturbing implications for the West. Even though the Conference was punctuated by the ominous obli-gatto of Soviet nuclear explosions, it produced

no formal condemnation of Nikita Khruschev's violation of the world's conscience or even a proof. 106

What irritated Mr. Elson was,

...the most ambitious demand...that the nonaligned countries should not only be represented at future disarmament conferences but that they should actually be included in the inspection and control system. Here, putting forth its claim to be recognized as equal with the great powers, the Conference showed an arrogant assumption of moral superiority which the conference attach to 'nonalignment' itself. 107

But there are others, it is gratifying to note, who take a different and more realistic attitude towards the Third World countries. Here is the observation of another expert - Frederick Kuh - who covered the Belgrade Conference of Neutrals for the Chicago Sun-Times:

The United States and Soviet Union would throw themselves for a calamitous loss if either fails to take the nonaligned group into account, even though on balance the Conference was more favorable to the Sino-Soviet bloc than to the American-led camp. After all, the nonaligned represented one fourth of the earth's inhabitants and a quarter of the total U.N. membership. And, despite its ugliness, the conflict over Berlin is a minor episode, while the struggle between the two blocs for the allegiance of the uncommitted world is a pivotal and long-term manifestation of our Age. 108

He further points out that the uncommitted world is growing and is exerting magnetism, and "...even if today it is merely a glint: the birth of a Third Force...does create a cushion between the two giants." 109 John B.

---
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Oakes tolerates the nonalignment policy of the Third World countries thus:

The perfectly clear refusal of the new countries to side automatically with the democratic world against the Communist world may be shocking to our sensibilities, but it ought not to be viewed as a disaster. Quite the contrary. The very fact that the new countries vote as they please is proof that - even in this earliest stage of their freedom - they are acting as independent states, which precisely the role that we had hoped they would assume once they emerged from their colonial status. 110

Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Oakes points out, Dean Rusk, the former Secretary of State gave testimony in which he said:

I do not believe that we, ourselves should be unduly concerned about what might be called the genuine neutralism because if a new nation is internally vigorous, visible, strong, progressive, its orientation in foreign policy is not so important as its health and strength... I do not believe that we should insist that any one who is not with us is against us. 111

Is the world better off for all these military alliances, coalitions and pacts to maintain the so-called balance of power? They have on the contrary led the world to become a victim of arms race and placed it in a situation wherein the concept of 'balance of power' has been replaced by a new concept - the balance of terror. This is what the conflict of ideologies - democracy and communism - has led the world into.

How is the modern world in a balance of terror situation today? The answer to this question lies in the history of the arms race in which the two power blocs have been vying with each other. Furthermore, from the behavior of China in the Communist bloc and that of France in the democratic
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world the concept of bipolarity of the cold war loses its meaning. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. makes this observation:

...nothing exhibits more arrestingly the decline of Superpowership than the spectacle in recent years of Super powers pushed around by their satellites - the Soviet Union by East Germany, Cuba, and North Vietnam; the United States by South Korea, South Vietnam and Taiwan. Tocqueville's old forecast - America and Russia, each 'marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half of the globe' - has had in the end, an exceedingly short run.112

Did India, as a member of the Third World, play any significant part so as to deserve a special mention at this point? India was the first country to proclaim the policy of nonalignment in international relations. In September 1946, Nehru as the Member in charge of External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations in the Government of India, declared that India would keep away from power politics of groups aligned against one another, which have led in the past to world wars and which may again lead to disasters on an even vaster scale. He also elaborated all the basic premises of the policy, like anti-colonialism, nonalignment with power blocs and faith in the United Nations. For a few years India was the only country in the world to pursue the policy of nonalignment as its basis of approach to contemporary international relations. For the last twenty three years the popularity of this policy has been growing at a phenomenal rate and a large number of countries of Asia, Africa and Europe also followed suit. (See Table 1, page 82). Today nonalignment has come to occupy an indispensable place in

the theory and practice of world politics. "No theory of international relations is complete," writes J. W. Burton, "without an explanation of the development of, and a theory of, nonalignment." He gives four reasons. First, nonalignment is a special feature of the current world system to which the communications, rather than the power, model is suited. This means that an alliance is a symptom of a break-down in communication: it also contributes to a further deterioration in perception, feedback and other parts of a flexible international system. Only through power can a state afford to maintain inefficient communications system, and the nonaligned States have limited power. Easy contact with East and West is essential to the pursuit of their national interests. Unlike 'neutrals,' which are content to stand aloof, the nonaligned States are, for pressing economic, strategic and political reasons, obliged to maintain open communications with all leading nations. Nonalignment as a foreign policy is in any event dictated by the need to maintain uncommitted to those economic and political institutions inherited from the West, which may or may not prove suited to the needs of new nations as they develop. It may be neither capitalism nor communism which is required and which ultimately emerges, and commitment to either would introduce rigidities which could prejudice development. Second, nonalignment reflects some of the features of a developing world community and in this sense is itself a corrective to the communications model. Third, nonalignment has inherent within it certain features which are developing amongst aligned States and throws some light upon the relations between the aligned
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States. Fourth, nonalignment offers an alternative game and set of rules which is likely to be important once nuclear deterrence is no longer credible. Such is the importance of nonalignment today. It certainly redounds to the credit of India to have adopted it as the basis of its foreign policy for the first time twenty three years ago among the nations of the Third World.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEUTRALIST</th>
<th>COMMUNIST</th>
<th>WESTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonaligned (Belgrade Conference, 1961)</td>
<td>African States not formally nonaligned</td>
<td>NATO SEATO CENTO Alliances OAS Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Bulgaria (China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Bulg. (E. German) (N.Kor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon (Switzerland)</td>
<td>Chad*</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo-Brazzaville</td>
<td>Congo-Leopold</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Dahomey</td>
<td>Rumania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Ivory C.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Madagascar*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meli</td>
<td>Niger*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Senegal*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1 (Continued)
MEMBERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS AS AT DECEMBER 1963, SHOWING ALIGNMENT STATUS
(Bracketed countries are not members of the U.N.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEUTRALIST</th>
<th>COMMUNIST</th>
<th>WESTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonaligned (Belgrade Conference, 1961) Neutrals</td>
<td>African States not formally nonaligned Warsaw Other</td>
<td>NATO SEATO CENTO Alliances OAS Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Arab R.</td>
<td>Upper Volta*</td>
<td>** Observer at Belgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Zanzibar</td>
<td>*** Observer at Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since declared nonaligned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanganyika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 27</td>
<td>4(1)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Members of the Brazzaville group of French-speaking countries

---

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

By following the policy of nonalignment, India was not a passive spectator but an active participant in international events and developments. This justifies Nehru's terminology of dynamic neutralism to describe India's foreign policy. He further clarified this policy in his reply to the debate on March 17, 1959 in the Lok Sabha (House of the People) on the demands for grants for the Ministry of External Affairs as follows:

It is not a question of 'purer than thou' attitude or high morality. We know our faults very well, and we know the virtues of others, sometimes even those whom we criticise. But gradually in the course of the years people came to realize that we were not posing, that we were not moralizing, but that we were following a certain policy in all good faith and that policy while being one deliberately of friendship to other countries was yet one not only of non-alignment as such but something deeper than that, of doing something that we thought right in the circumstances. 115

Thus India acted according to what it thought right in the circumstances of world affairs. By and large her approach to every problem in the arena of international politics did meet with a measure of success. T. Walter Wallbank says:

Since 1947 India and Pakistan have played important roles in world affairs. The former, particularly has been astonishingly active in exercising a decisive influence in international relations. India wielded important weight in the affairs of the United Nations; She had an important part in the

---
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Korean truce; assisted materially in securing the end of hostilities in Indochina; acted as mediator in Chinese - United States relations: and in general worked with considerable success for the preservation of world peace. 116

India is the biggest country in the Third World. India's pioneer effort against colonial rule, coupled with the world prominence attained by Gandhiji and Nehru gave her a position of leadership among the nations which achieved freedom after World War II. For following moral principles, especially the principles of non-violence as taught by Gandhiji in the conduct of its foreign policy, India gained world support and recognition. As was pointed out earlier, the very policy of non-alignment - the refusal to join the power blocs in the Cold War - stems from the Gandhian ideology of nonviolence. "Idealists, pacifists, and seekers of peace everywhere have been moved by India's advocacy of non-violence, disarmament, and peaceful coexistence - in short, adherence without equivocation to the teachings of Christ and Buddha." 117

Even in dreams, India could not have hoped to dislodge the British rule by resorting to violent means. The British Empire was the mightiest at that time. The situation was hopeless and the whole country was in despair. It was at this critical moment that Gandhiji came forward to lead the nation with his Satyagraha (passive resistance) and nonviolence.

Nehru describes in these words:

...there seemed to be no way out of the intolerable conditions of a degrading servitude. People who were at all sensitive felt terribly depressed and

116 History, p. 294-295.
117 Ibid., p. 295.
helpless. This was the moment when Gandhi put forward his programme of non-cooperation. Like Sinn Fein in Ireland, it taught us to rely on ourselves and build up our own strength, and it was obviously a very effective method of bringing pressure on the government. It was to be perfectly peaceful, and yet it was not mere non-resistance. Satyagraha was a definite, though non-violent, form of resistance to what was considered wrong. It was, in effect, a peaceful rebellion, a most civilized form of warfare, and yet dangerous to the stability of the State. It was an effective way of getting the masses to function, and it seemed to fit in with the peculiar genius of the Indian people.\(^{118}\)

Thus India was able to emerge from centuries of bondage and take her place among the galaxy of nations with self-respect and honor, thanks to the Gandhian creed of non-violence. As far as India was concerned, he made a fear-ridden people fearless. The prison-houses and the gallows which used to awe the people were transformed into holy shrines. He endowed non-violence with power. He taught the virtue of self-discipline and self-purification to the individual, and disciplined, organized action to the masses for overcoming social, economic, and political ills. He brought religion— not credal religion but essential religion— into politics and set about the task of spiritualizing politics with measurable success. Not only did he uplift a degraded people into great nation but he ennobled the tone of public life.

This does not mean that the people of India in general and the Indian National Congress in particular followed Gandhiji's teachings in every letter and spirit. His teachings were violated many times not due to any defect

in them but due to weakness in the people themselves.

The fact is that like other great prophets - Buddha, Christ or Mohammad - Gandhi also was too great, his ideals too high to be completely followed by his disciples. Naturally they often seem to drift away from their masters. But the master's teachings always remained as an inspiring ideal which is never achieved but whose imprint always remains ineffaceable. 119

Notwithstanding some minor lapses from the Gandhian path of non-violence, India was able to make spectacular progress both domestically and internationally. Starting from her own achievement of freedom from the British through non-violent means and acting as the honest broker to ease international tensions wherever and whenever the Cold War became hot threatening to undermine the foundations of world peace. India has increased her strength at home and her prestige abroad. This is, in a nutshell, the quantum of benefit that India was able to reap from the Gandhian ideology of non-violence.

Though India might have gained by adhering to the creed of nonviolence, the question may be asked, will the world stand to gain also, if it were to practice non-violent methods for the settlement of international disputes? Undoubtedly the answer is yes. Instead of resorting to war and violence to settle disputes among nations, the world will be much better off should non-violence become the guiding star of the leaders of nations and the statesmen of the world. A clear understanding of the world situation today will convince anyone, of the need and necessity of non-violence.

To quote David R. Inglis: "World politics is dominated by "two atomic colossi eyeing each other (more or less) malevolently across a divided world," to adopt President Eisenhower's phrase.""^120 He lists some four important reasons for the existence of a very serious danger of a nuclear war breaking out at any time. They are: war by accident, by miscalculation, by escalation, or by catalysis (the setting off of a big reaction by a small agent which may itself escape harm). The undoing of the human race, Dr. Inglis points out, may be that its technical advances have been so rapid that its statecraft can never catch up. Against nuclear attack no technical defense is expected to be adequate. In such a context nobody, in his right senses, wants a war. The Dean of American Catholic biblical Scholars, Father John L. McKenzie S.J. condemns war.

I think that war is essentially irrational. And immoral. It's essentially irrational because violence, by definition, is not a solution of human questions. It might defend me against a wild animal, but unless I reduce the human being to a wild animal, I'm not settling any issue that exists between us. The human way to solve human problems is rational discourse. Violence is used on the assumption that rational discourse won't solve the problem..."^121

This does not mean that one should submit to evil. The evil should be resisted, no doubt. But the means should be human and not beastly. It is here Gandhian nonviolence and satyagraha come into the picture. They are both human and superior to war. R. R. Diwakar enumerates the points of difference between war and Satyagraha thus:

^120 Nuclear Weapons and the Conflict of Conscience, p. 56.

War uses physical force. Satyagraha uses moral force. War stands for violence, for destruction of person and property, for annihilation of the opponent or his humiliating submission. Satyagraha stands for nonviolence, noninjury to person and property, supports the principle of live and let live, does not wish to humiliate the opponent but would treat him as an equal. War inflicts the highest suffering. Satyagraha invites the utmost suffering. War appeals to might. Satyagraha appeals to reason. War results in heavy losses. The losses involved in Satyagraha campaigns are light. War as an institution does not stand for compromise. Satyagraha always admits compromise on nonessentials. War engenders hatred, anger and the spirit of revenge. Satyagraha promotes love, compassion, and pity....War is a barbarous method. Satyagraha is a civilized and Christian method...

On an impartial analysis, it must be admitted that both nonviolence and nonalignment are concepts which are too well known to the West. Christianity is a primarily Western religion. Jesus Christ was the very embodiment of nonviolence. Mahatma Gandhi did no more than emulate Jesus Christ. He deserves credit for dramatising nonviolence by applying it to India's struggle for independence. As to non-alignment, George Washington advised Americans not to be involved in any entangling alliances soon after they became free, which advice they scrupulously followed until the First World War and profited enormously to the point of becoming the richest and strongest nation in the world. Jawaharlal Nehru did no more than just follow Washington and advised his country not to entangle itself with the power blocs and to be nonaligned in the Cold War. Jesus and Gandhi practised nonviolence and proved its success and superiority. Washington and Nehru

---

followed nonalignment for their respective countries and proved its merit and efficacy in solving problems, domestic and foreign. These are great saints and statesmen who had left "foot prints on the sands of time." The world will be richer, stronger and nobler by following their foot prints. Joan V. Bondurant concludes her thought-provoking book with the observation: "The Gandhian experiments suggest that if man is to free himself from fear and threat alike, he pause in his flight from violence to set himself the task of its conquest." Unless men conquers violence, he will perish by violence. In this day and age when Sputniks, Explorers and guided missiles threaten the total annihilation of mankind, the choice between nations is non-violence and non-existence.
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