
UNIT 1 EVOLUTION OF INDIA'S WORLD-VIEW

Structure

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Sources of Traditional Values
- 1.3 Nature of Traditional Values and Themes in the Evolution of World-view
 - 1.3.1 Preference for the Middle Way
 - 1.3.2 Tolerance
 - 1.3.3 Idealist and Realist Traditions
 - 1.3.4 Absence of Imperialist Tradition and Ideals of Freedom Struggle
 - 1.3.5 Approach to International Law
 - 1.3.6 Expressing Positive Ideas through Negative Terms
- 1.4 British Rule in India
- 1.5 The Indian National Congress on India's World-view
- 1.6 Summary
- 1.7 Exercises

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The prime objective of this unit is to explain how India's history, cultural and philosophical tradition and ideals of freedom struggle helped the evolution of its world-view in the post-Independence era. For, after all world-view of any country being a form of social action and its makers being part of the socio-cultural *milieu* in which they operate, the significance of those values and traditions, especially those transmitted through successive generations, cannot be gainsaid. This is especially true in the case of countries like India, which has been the seat of an ancient civilisation and meeting-place of great cultures.

According to India's first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, who tailored its world-view during the initial phase, two aspects of India's world-view, namely, the 'positive aspect of peace' and the desire to promote 'a larger degree of co-operation among nations,' were based on India's past thinking on the formulation of foreign policy. It is therefore necessary to discuss those socially accepted traditional values, which are expressed either in writings of thinkers or embodied in ancient institutions and customs that inculcate peaceful attitudes and practices notwithstanding imperfections or shortcomings in these ideals and objectives native to India.

1.2 SOURCES OF TRADITIONAL VALUES

The chief sources of India's ancient values are the scriptural texts like the *Vedas*; the law books by sages such as Manu, Yajnyavalkya, and Parashar; the *Dharmasastras*; text of Buddhists and Jains; the great epics, the *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata*; the *puranas*, legends, and chronicles of great national events; and theological treatises and manuals of worship. As a means of popular education in social values, these epics are even more important than the scriptural texts and law books, knowledge of which is generally confined to a very few.

It is relevant to remember in this context that the above-mentioned traditional sources of values covered various aspects of human life such as spiritual, social, economic, and political, as ancient Indians did not divide human activities in watertight compartments. Secondly, though these traditional values underwent certain changes due to the impact of the Islamic and Western culture, the works of modern Indian thinkers like Vivekananda, Tagore, Tilak, Aurobindo, Gandhi, and Nehru show that they were very much influenced by ancient Indian thought, which in turn influenced their ideas about shaping the destiny of independent India.

1.3 NATURE OF TRADITIONAL VALUES AND THEMES IN THE EVOLUTION OF WORLD-VIEW

Five aspects of India's traditional values have a bearing on the evolution of its world-view, namely, preference for a middle way, tolerance, idealist and realist traditions, absence of imperialist tradition, and a habit of expressing positive ideas through negative terms.

1.3.1 Preference for the Middle Way

A preference for the middle way has been one of the cardinal features of Indian tradition and culture as seen in the Sanskrit saying, *ati sarvatra varjayet* meaning "Let us eschew excess at all times". This saying underlines India's philosophical abhorrence of absolute, of extremes, of the tendency to see things strictly in terms of black and white. It runs like an unbroken thread through Indian culture. The Indian preference for the middle path is reflected in their attempt to synthesise the goals of *dharma*, ("duties—whether social, moral, spiritual, or ritual"), *artha* ("capital accumulation"), *Kama* ("sensual pleasure"), and *moksha* ("liberation"). Though *dharma* and *moksha* are given prime importance, *artha* and *kama* are not ignored. This is evident, for instance, from works like *Vatsyayana's Kamasutra*, from sculptures like those of Khajuraho, and from sayings like *sarve gunah kanchanamasyanti* ("all virtues lie in gold"). The *Bhagavad-Gita* therefore speaks of the divine sanction for all desires, which are not against the moral order and moral law.

While there may be disagreement as to how far the Indians have been able to translate their ideals into practice and to arrive at a position in the socio-economic and politico-religious ordering of life that could secure the solace of both the worlds—the here and hereafter, one cannot gainsay the significance of the underlying synergetic impulsions of Indian culture. Michael Brecher, therefore, observes: "The central message of India's philosophical traditions dating from the Buddha has revolved round the rejection of absolutes, and extreme positions. On the contrary, it has stressed philosophical relativity, intellectual Catholicism and co-existence of good and evil, in short the golden middle path of compromises and tolerance of opposites." Nehru echoes the same sentiment, when he says: "India has absorbed and harmonised different religions; and even the conflict between science and religion in the past; and maybe it is our destiny to help reconcile the conflicting ideologies of today."

In view of such a cultural-philosophical tradition, it was not surprising that India should prefer the golden mean of the middle way between the two competing international ideologies during the Cold War years—Western liberal democracy and Soviet egalitarianism. With the West, India shared such values as dignity of individual and sanctity of civil liberties, democratic political

institutions, the rule of law, and modern technology. At the same time, it appreciated the Soviet emphasis on distributive justice and its stand against colonialism and racialism, as also its Asia-mindedness. India, therefore, refused to align with any power bloc and resolved to cooperate with both of them in furtherance of its own ideals and interests. Nehru proclaimed this in a language reminiscent of the great Ashoka thus: “We propose, as far as possible, to keep away from politics of groups aligned against one another. The world, in spite of its rivalries and hatred and inner conflicts, moves inevitably towards closer cooperation and the building up of a world commonwealth.”

This was the message of friendship that India issued in 1946. This policy of friendship gave India freedom of manoeuvre in a world, which was getting frozen in its divisions. Even the Great Powers, their reservations notwithstanding, found India’s detached stance useful in the Korean, Indochinese, Suez, and other crises. Thus, by becoming a bridge between the two power blocs and by blunting the edges of the ideological conflict between them, India acquired a prominence in the comity of nations far in excess of military strength and economic capabilities.

1.3.2 Tolerance

The aforesaid account of the ancient Indian philosophic attitude of avoiding extremes shows the traditional faith in reason and abhorrence of dogma. As the old Indian saying goes, *vade, vade jayate tattvasiddhih*: “Enlightenment is achieved through debate.” Ancient Indian tradition believes in the paramountcy of reason. *Prajna* (“reason”) is an important concept that indicates how one may pursue the three objectives of life—*dharma*, *artha* and *kama*. In the *Mahabharata*, for instance, there is a clear attempt to relativise *dharma* by saying that it has to be judged on the basis of experience and reason.

This undogmatic approach to duty and rational tradition that does not claim monopoly of truth constitutes the core of Indian culture; from it flows tolerance. This tolerant approach rests on the belief that the human mind, being limited in its range and power, cannot comprehend the nature of reality in its totality. The *Rigveda*, therefore proclaims, *ekam sadviprah bahudha vadanti* meaning, “The one truth is described variously by learned”. The *Upanishads* declare that just as cows of varied colours yield the same white milk, all the different paths lead to the same goal.

Tolerance is not just an ideal mentioned in the scriptures: it is a social reality. That is why, when the first Christians came to Kerala in 47 AD, they were not repulsed or hounded but welcomed; and when the first Jews came to Kerala in 70 AD, they too were welcomed and allowed to practise and propagate their faith. Similarly, when the Parsis fled their own country in the face of the advent of Islam and came to India in the 7th Century AD, they were also to practise and propagate their faith. The Ashokan edicts speak highly of tolerance of all the views then obtaining. Though there were religious persecutions during the time of some Muslim rulers, tolerance was conspicuous during the reign of the Emperor Akbar, who adopted a policy of universal harmony (*sulh-i-kul*). The Muslim poet, Rahim, and the Hindu poet, Tulsidas, were close friends. The eldest son of the Emperor Shah Jahan—Dara Shikoh—translated the *Upanishads* into Persian. The recurring caste and communal violence in India shows that there is much less tolerance today than there was in the past; we cannot deny that the tradition of tolerance is fundamental to the life of the masses in India. This explains why secularism has been adopted and has survived in India inspite of its aberrations.

In the sphere of foreign relations, tradition of tolerance made it impossible for India to join any particular bloc and conduct its international relations from the black-and-white perspective of that bloc. The tolerant and pluralistic outlook of the Indian mind made it to react instinctively against the politics of the Cold War characterised by intolerance and against the claims of the two blocs that they alone had the monopoly of truth and virtue. Instead, India chose to pursue a policy of peaceful co-existence and friendship towards all countries.

This is why, when in the 1950s, the then US secretary of state, John Foster Dulles, and the then US vice-president, Richard M. Nixon, used almost abusive language with reference to the non-aligned countries, Nehru urged them neither to suppress discussion nor to give up tolerance in discussing the external relations of the new countries. He said: "I submit for consideration that Mr. Nixon and Mr. Dulles are saying something opposed to the democratic way of life.... The very basis of democracy is tolerance for differing points of view."

The tradition of tolerance in fact has been the basis of India's emphasis on the peaceful settlement of disputes through negotiations. The essence of India's approach has been that, to achieve a lasting result, an attempt should be made to see that neither of the parties engaged in a conflict suffers significant loss. This is how Gandhi tried to resolve India's domestic tension as well as to secure freedom for India—a modern application of the principle of negotiation so forcefully adumbrated in the *Mahabharata*. Nehru clarified the essence of this approach on several occasions. For instance, in a speech broadcast from London on 12 January 1951, he said: "If we desire peace we must develop the temper of peace, and try to win over those who may be suspicious of us or who think that they are against us."

The aforesaid approach to negotiation was illustrated in India's *Panchaseela* agreement with China in 1954, the premium it put on diplomatic negotiations for a settlement of the border dispute with China even after the situation worsened in 1959, and, its acceptance of the Colombo proposals formulated by certain friendly countries after the Sino-Indian conflict of 1962 as the basis for a resolution of the India-China border dispute. Prime minister, Atal Behari Vajpayee's visit to Beijing in June 2003 and the sincere attempts made thereafter to move India-China relations forward is in line with India's traditional approach to negotiation. This approach to conciliation is also reflected in India's offer of a no-war pact to Pakistan in 1949 and its repeated renewal of the offer in the subsequent years, its willingness to accept a division of Kashmir on the basis of the ceasefire line in the interest of Indo-Pakistani peace. New Delhi's current peace initiative with Pakistan is the latest manifestation of this negotiating method.

1.3.3 Realist and Idealist Traditions

Two important approaches to inter-state relations have existed in India since the beginning. The positivist approach is advocated, for example, in the *Arthashastra* of Kautilya, as well as of Bharadvaja, in *Manusmriti*, in some portions dealing with the teaching of *Panchatantra*. While these realist thinkers differ over the means to be employed, they generally believe that both defence of a kingdom and aggressive war, if used to conquer the whole country, are just. They hold that war should be undertaken only as the last resort, not because war is immoral, but because it is expensive and troublesome and victory is not certain. *Panchatantra*, for instance, says that royal policy has peace for its beginning and war for its end.

On the other hand, from the times immemorial, a school of philosophy has existed in India, which

maintains that penance, self-abnegation and non-injury are the means to get rid of sin and secure salvation. The *Upanishads* give us the basis of the theory of non-violence. There is one undivided and indivisible spirit, which may be called God or truth. The universe is expression of it, and all beings form part of it. Since perfection consists in realising this truth, any kind of violence would be a repudiation of the truth.

The Buddhists and the Jains are most fervent advocates of non-violence although non-violence is expected to be practised rigorously only by monks. On the whole, they discourage Machiavellian politics and deglamourise war. A *Mahayana Sutra*, the *Suvarnaprabhasottama*, condemns all warfare as sinful. When Ashoka became a Buddhist and renounced war as an instrument of his foreign policy, he uncovered a new dimension of inter-state relations. He maintained friendly and diplomatic relations with his immediate neighbours and other countries of Europe and Asia and pursued a peaceful, non-aggressive policy throughout his reign.

In the modern era, Mahatma Gandhi revolutionised the idea of non-violence by demonstrating first in South Africa and later in India, that it could be employed as a weapon to achieve socio-political ends. He wished to use this ideal of non-violence in international relations as well, as according to him, this was the only way to ensure security in the atomic age. Needless to add, the stress on disarmament in India's world-view derives from this ideal of non-violence.

The application of non-violence to India's world-view meant a deliberate acceptance of a method or approach to foreign policy problems, which emphasised the temper of peace. This was clearly reflected in India's decision to remain a member of the Commonwealth of Nations after independence although Britain had subjected India to injustice and cruelty. Echoing this spirit of reconciliation, Nehru stated in the *Rajya Sabha*: "Our approach is not to stress the differences but to stress the similarities."

This idealist method had its limitations as India discovered to its cost during the action in Goa in 1961, the Chinese invasion in 1962, and the Pakistani aggressions of 1965, 1971 and 1999. India attempted the peaceful method of negotiation in each case. From the failure to prevent war it learnt that the reality of power should be taken into account along with the non-violent approach to difficult international problems if the security of the country was to be ensured. In summing up the application of the ideal of non-violence to India's world-view, Nehru therefore publicly stated: "He drew his inspiration from Gandhi." He, however, followed the Master only as far as was practicable.

The realist component in India's world-view got strengthened after the Chinese aggression of 1962. As Nehru himself admitted: "In the past our preoccupation with the human problems of poverty and illiteracy was such that we were content to assign a relatively low priority to defence requirements in the conventional sense." Not surprisingly, India's world-view after the Chinese aggression has been less doctrinaire and more realistic despite the continuance of its broad ideological moorings.

1.3.4 Absence of Imperialist Tradition

Another distinguishing feature of Indian tradition is the absence of imperialist tradition, including what is called cultural imperialism. No prominent Indian thinker, not even a realist like Kautilya or

Manu or Bodhayana, advocated the extension of Indian empire beyond the geographical boundaries of *Bharat* (India), which though varied from time to time, ultimately it came to mean the country stretching from the Himalayas to southern sea and from the western sea to the eastern. Kautilaya's *Arthashastra*, or Samudragupta's inscriptions, for instance, never envisage an Indian emperor's rule beyond the Indian sub-continent. The *Mahabharata* too lays down that an Indian empire should not extend beyond the geographical limits of the country.

Likewise, the concept of *chakravartin* ("supreme ruler dispensing justice and maintaining peace") was envisaged only for the geographically and culturally defined parts of the country. Similarly, though Buddhist literature speaks of a world state "ruled" by one person, such rule should be established by love and not by force. Lord Buddha conceived of himself as *chakravartin* of this sort. There is, therefore, no evidence of any aggressive war waged by the Hindus and the Buddhists. The Hindus and Buddhists went to Southeast Asia and Sri Lanka as traders and missionaries, not as invaders and conquerors. They did not go there to drain off their wealth. On the contrary, the Indians who ruled in Southeast Asia underwent a process of indigenisation. They did not owe any allegiance to, and were not controlled by, any power based in India. Kanishka's aggressive war against China and *Chola*'s conquest of and rule over Indonesia and Sri Lanka were repugnant to the Hindu and Buddhist cultures. They were in fact aberrations, which should not be used to negate the overall anti-imperialistic tradition of India. In fact the *Cholas* were engaged, not in opposing an alien culture, but in striving for supremacy over dynasties, which belonged to their own culture.

Ancient Indian history is, on the other hand, replete with examples of kings who voluntarily relinquished conquered territories. Kalidasa's *Raghuvansam*, for instance, mentions kings who won righteous victories but gave up the territories conquered by them. A Gupta conqueror named Baladitya defeated Mihiragula, a Hun, but in deference to his mother's advice, he not only reinstated Mihiragula but also gave him a royal princess in marriage. Kalhan, in his *Rajatarangini*, speaks of many more such kings. Hindu kings apart, Ashoka denounced warfare everywhere in accordance with the Buddhist ideology.

The desire of the best Muslim and Mughal rulers was also to establish a lasting all-India state and to ignore the world outside India. Rulers like Akbar tried to achieve the unification of India through tolerance, conciliation, and diplomacy. The attention of the Muslim rulers was confined to India: India was their whole world. They fought among themselves and with whoever came as invaders from beyond the Himalayas or from across the sea.

There has thus been no deliberate attempt at imperialism at any time in the history of India. This anti-imperialist tradition and sentiments got a boost during the British rule, because of the suffering caused to the people by British imperialism. The leaders of India's freedom struggle therefore viewed their movement as a part of the overall fight against imperialism and colonialism in the world.

With this anti-imperialist tradition and culture, it was not surprising that when India achieved its independence it vigorously pursued the cause of emancipation of colonial and dependent territories and of promotion of racial equality through the policies of non-alignment and *panchasheel*. The support India gave to the freedom struggles of dependent peoples is now a part of history. To cite only a few examples: Nehru convened a conference in Delhi in 1949 to consider the question

of securing Indonesia's freedom from the Dutch; India extended support in the United Nations to the struggle for freedom in Algeria and Tunisia from the French and in Namibia from South Africa. India's action in returning to Pakistan in 1972 the territories it had wrested from it in the Indo-Pakistan war of 1971 and in enabling Bangladesh to emerge as an independent nation is in line with the Indian tradition that prohibits an aggressive design by India and emphasises that it should allow other cultures and states to work out their destinies in their own way. Nehru, therefore, declared: "India's world-view is grounded in ancient tradition and culture of this country."

1.3.5 Approach to International Law

It was established in theory and practice in ancient India that it is the moral responsibility of a king to safeguard the person of an envoy accredited to his court by other kings. One who kills an envoy is supposed to overstep the limits of *dharma* and is condemned to hell. Kautilya's *Arthashastra* endorses this view. The *Ramayana* shows that even Ravana, the ruler of Lanka, has respected the idea of diplomatic immunity by agreeing to his brother's advice not to kill Hanuman, who had gone to Lanka as an ambassador of Shri Rama.

Modern international law too allows certain privileges and immunities to foreign emissaries. However, some countries have violated this well-established law. Pakistan burnt down the US embassy in 1980; Iran held American embassy personnel as hostages for a long period. On the other hand, the Government of India has observed all diplomatic immunities.

More remarkable is India's dealing with the refugees. India granted political asylum to the leaders of the Nepali Congress when they came in the wake of the crackdown ordered by the king of Nepal. It extended hospitality to the Dalai Lama of Tibet although it realised the price it might have to pay both politically and militarily. It accepted the heavy burden of looking after a million and more refugees who came over in 1971 from the former East Pakistan. While quite a number of them have still not returned to their country, the inflow of refugees has also never really stopped. India treated respectfully the prisoners of war who had been captured during the Indo-Pakistani War of 1971. They were later returned to Pakistan without any conditions. It accepted the responsibility of affording protection to the Tamil refugees from Sri Lanka in the mid-1980s. This modern Indian approach towards refugees in consonance with the dictum of the *Mahabharata* that says an enemy seeking protection from fear, destitution, or defeat should be cared for as if he were one's own son. Similarly, the *Hitopadesh* declares that even if an enemy comes to our house, we should receive him with hospitality. One should be like a tree, which does not hold back its shade from a man even though he may have come to cut it down. It was this ideal that inspired Prithvi Raj Chauhan to always forgive Muhammad of Ghor, despite his repeated invasions. When, however, Chauhan was defeated, Muhammad of Ghor had him immediately killed!

1.3.6 Expressing Positive Ideas through Negative Terms

Indian history, tradition and culture have not only influenced the substance of independent India's world-view, but also to name the main instrument of Indian world-view, non-alignment. As K P Misra explains: "Even a cursory look at the philosophical and civilisational tradition indicates that the Indians have been fond of noun with negative. It is through negative terms that the Indians have expressed positive and affirmative ideas of profound significance in their social evolution." Thus, for example, instead of saying "peace," the Indians say "non-violence" (*ahimsa*). Instead of saying "defeat", they use the word "non-victory" (*parajaya*). Likewise, we are familiar with

the use of “non-one” (*aneka*) as against “many;” “non-idleness” (*apramada*) as against “exertion;” and “non-grudge” (*avaira*) as against “tolerance.” We can cite many more words and expressions of this kind, particularly from the literature of Buddhism and Jainism. These negative words have a positive meaning of great significance. Nakamura, therefore, rightly points out: “To other nations, showing the moral precepts in the negative form seemed somewhat powerless and unsatisfactory, but to the Indians, who lay stress on the negative phase and pursue the non-determinant, the negative form of expression has a more positive and powerful meaning.”

The formulation of the concept in a negative way reminds us of the fact that one of India’s most far-reaching contributions to world civilisation is the concept of zero and its mathematical use in positive value. Seen from a wider angle, the expression as well as content of non-alignment may similarly suggest a deeper connection with the Indian cultural tradition. For, the word, non-alignment is though negative in expression, it has very positive connotations that include pursuit of an independent world-view, and efforts towards development, disarmament, decolonialisation and democratisation of international relations.

1.4 BRITISH RULE IN INDIA

The British rule in India helped evolve India’s world-view in three ways. Firstly, it gave stimulus to the national movement for freedom, which in turn led to India’s support for the freedom of dependent peoples all over the world. Both merits and demerits of the British rule contributed to the growth of national movement in India. As regards merits, facilitating of communication through setting of communication network, introduction of the English language, laying of railways and encouraging social reforms, and above all, bringing entire India under one administrative umbrella, the British rule contributed to the rise of nationalism in India. On the other hand, their racial arrogance, economic exploitation of Indians and excluding them from the power structure contributed to the rise of national consciousness even among the wealthy class of people, who earlier supported the British rule. This growing political consciousness was translated into mass movement when beginning with the widespread protest against the Partition of Bengal (1905) leaders like Aurobindo Ghosh, Bal Gangadhar Tilak and later on Mahatma Gandhi, began to develop mass contact with their fingers on the pulse of the people. Freedom movement thus became a national movement for freedom and ultimately found its fulfillment in 1947.

Under the circumstances, independent India’s support to the freedom movement of dependent peoples all over the world was therefore not at all surprising. “We are particularly interested,” proclaimed Jawaharlal Nehru on 7 September 1946, outlining India’s world-view, “in the emancipation of colonial and dependent countries and peoples.”

Secondly, the humiliation and suffering experienced by Indians due to the British racialism made the leaders of independent India to strongly oppose racialism. Jawaharlal Nehru in his statement on India’s world-view on 7 September 1946, cited above, declared: “We repudiate utterly the Nazi doctrine of racialism, wheresoever and in whatever form it may be practised.” He reiterated this in the Constituent Assembly of India on 16 May 1949 thus: “One of the pillars of our foreign policy is to fight against racial discrimination.”

Thirdly, India’s historic association with the British rule obliged independent India not to snap all of its ties with Britain to avoid practical difficulties. Explaining the imperatives of India’s continued association with the Commonwealth of Nations headed by Britain, Jawaharlal Nehru observed

in the Constituent Assembly: “The House knows that inevitably during the past century and more all kinds of contacts have arisen between England and this country. . . . Any marked change in this without something to follow created a hiatus, which may be harmful. Largely our educational apparatus has been influenced. Largely our military apparatus has been influenced by these considerations and we have grown up naturally as something rather like the British Army. . . . If we break away completely, the result is that without making sufficient provision for carrying on in a different way, we have a period of gap. . . . If we don’t want to pay the price we should not pay it and face the consequences.”

1.5 THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS ON INDIA’S WORLD-VIEW

Our discussion on the evolution of India’s world-view would not be complete without a reference to the ideas on nationalism and internationalism championed by the Congress during the struggle for freedom. In fact, the leading members of the Congress, as early as 1921, intended the Congress resolution on international developments to be a guide to independent India’s world-view. Mahatma Gandhi, for instance, declared: “Indeed, while we are maturing our plans for *Swaraj*, we are bound to consider and define our foreign policy. Surely, we are bound authoritatively to tell the world what relations we wish to cultivate with it.”

The Jaipur Resolution of the Congress listed the promotion of world peace, the freedom of all nations, racial equality and the ending of imperialism and colonialism as guiding principles of this organisation. To this may be added one more—the duty of people of Indian origin settled abroad to identify themselves with the people of the country in which they had settled and not exploit them. Resolution after resolution passed by the Congress in its successive sessions clearly outlined India’s world-view after independence on these lines.

The Haripur Congress resolution (1935), for instance, outlined India’s world-view thus: “The people of India desire to live in peace and friendship with their neighbours and with all other countries, and for this purpose wish to remove all causes of conflict between them. . . . A free India will gladly associate itself with such an order and stand for disarmament and collective security. But world cooperation is impossible of achievement as long as the roots of international conflict remained and one nation dominates over another and imperialism hold away. In order, therefore, to establish world peace on an enduring basis, imperialism and exploitation of one people by another must end.”

1.6 SUMMARY

The above-account of the evolution of India’s world-view dating back to the ancient period shows that though both idealist and realist approaches to inter-state relations existed in India, the idealist approach advocated by Buddha and Gandhi dominated India’s world-view during the Nehru era notwithstanding the recourse to violence in extreme cases such as India’s military action for liberation of Goa. One may of course argue that Nehru’s policy of non-alignment was as idealist as it appears to be. For, an alternative policy on aligning with any super power would have brought the Cold War to India’s doorsteps and thereby jeopardised India’s pursuit of autonomy and economic development. The policy of non-alignment, for instance, served India’s

national interest by enabling it to ensure Anglo-American assistance during the India-China war of 1962 and Soviet neutrality. At the same time this enabled India to contribute towards world peace and decolonisation. It is in this sense that the policy of non-alignment reflected both idealist and realist traditions of India.

It cannot however be denied that a doctrinaire approach to non-alignment made Nehru to neglect India's defence preparedness leading to its debacle by the Chinese, which Nehru himself admitted after that traumatic experience in India's Parliament. India's world-view turned to be more realistic after 1962. Yet changes in India's world-view continued to take place only within the overall framework of continuity.

1.7 EXERCISES

- 1) What are the sources of India's traditional values? How have these values guided India's world-view after its independence? Explain.
- 2) Evaluate the idealist and realist thinking in ancient India. How, and to what extent could Nehru combine both the approaches in his world-view? Discuss.
- 3) "India's policy of secularism and non-alignment are two aspects of the same coin, namely, tradition of tolerance." Comment.
- 4) Discuss the traditional sources of India's world-view.