CHAPTER III
GANDHI’S APPROACH TO WORLD PEACE

History has proved that Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi and the World Peace are inseparable. Gandhi first employed his idea of peaceful civil disobedience in the Indian community’s struggle for civil rights in South Africa. Assuming leadership of the Indian National Movement, Gandhi led a national campaign for the alleviation of poverty, for the liberation of women, for brotherhood amongst differing religious and ethnicities, for the end of untouchability and caste discrimination, and for the economic self-sufficiency of the nation, but above all for Swaraj, the independence of India from foreign domination. It was during his peaceful agitation for the cause of the people, Gandhi was addressed by the people fondly as Bapu (Father of the Nation) and Mahatma (Great Soul)

Non-violence and Truth were his time tested weapons throughout his life and he had applied them meticulously even in the extreme situations. He lived on a simple vegetarian diet and kept rigorous fasts for long periods, for both self-purification and protest in support of his justified demands. By means of a hunger strike, Gandhi had helped bringing about India's Independence from British rule, inspiring colonial people to work for their own independence and ultimately dismantle the British Empire. Gandhi’s principle of Satyagraha (truth force) has inspired generation of democratic and antiracists activists including Martin Luther King (Junior) and Nelson Mandela.

G. Ramachandran, a close associate and interpreter of Gandhi, once said about Gandhi’s non violence: “In Gandhi’s mind, truth incarnates as love, and love translates itself into action and incarnates as non-violence. It was strong as steel, heritable but unbreakable”. As could be seen, Gandhi’s thoughts and actions were indivisible and as he himself said in his auto biography, “ What I
want to achieve—what I have been striving and pinning to achieve these thirty years— is self realization, to see God face to face.”

Admitting that what he was trying to propagate was not anything new and that truth and non-violence were as old as the hills, he averred: “My non-violence does not admit of running away from danger and leaving dear ones unprotected. Between violence and cowardly fight, I can only prefer violence to cowardice. I can no more preach non-violence to a coward than I can attempt a blind man to enjoy healthy scenes. Non-Violence is the summit of bravery. And in my own experience, I have had no difficulty in demonstrating to men trained in the school of violence and superiority of non-violence. As a coward, which I was for years, I harbored violence. I began to prize non-violence only when I began to shed cowardice.” Many may not admit openly that the real problem is this, our lack of courage to face challenges which would definitely demand facing difficulties of that sort. We become votaries of violence, for it is easy there for every one to hide his or her real self while non-violence requires infinite courage, suffering for which many may not be ready.

Gandhi’s approach to life itself needs to be understood if one wants to realize how he perceived human problems and solutions. He began to realize as he perceived human problems and solutions. He began with the assertion that ‘God is Truth’, but after several years he changed it to ‘Truth is God’, signifying the importance he attached to man’s relation to infinite. Gandhi asserted that humanity has to progress towards non-violence if it has to survive and he was convinced that humanity is gradually moving towards non-violence.

Gandhi through his numerous campaigns in South Africa and India (21 years in South Africa and 33 years in India) demonstrated that Satya, Ahimsa and Satyagraha could become the base of a new concerted effort on the part of humanity to discover its roots and more steadfastly to an era of amity and goodwill which will promise continuation of life in harmony with nature. He said, “We have to make truth and non-violence not matters for more individual practice but for practice by groups and communities and nations. Ahimsa is the
attribute of the soul, and therefore, to be practiced by everybody in all the affairs of life. It cannot be practiced in all departments, it has no practical values. The one refrain of most of his arguments has always been that society is largely regulated by expressions of non-violence in its mutual dealings and that non-violence is not merely personal virtue, it is social virtue to be cultivated like other virtues.

He pointed out, "If one does not practice non-violence in one's personal relations with others and hopes to use it in large affairs, one is vastly mistaken. Also, one cannot be non-violent in one's own circle and violent outside it. Or else one is not truly non-violent in one's circle. Often the non-violence is only in appearance". Gandhi believed that "the world of tomorrow will be, must be a society based on non-violence". He reminded his countrymen and others that non-violence cannot be preached, it has to be practiced.

Admitting that what he was trying to propagate was not anything new and that truth and non-violence were as old as the hills, he said, "My non-violence does not admit of running away from danger and leaving dear one unprotected. Between nonviolence and cowardly flight, I can only prefer violence to cowardice. I can no more preach non-violence to a coward than I can tempt a blind man to enjoy healthy scenes.

However, humanity's urge for peace is innate and insatiable. Today, as never before, the urgency of securing it on a lasting basis is at once desperate and attainable. Gandhi's thought and action flowed from this deep rooted conviction. "Not to believe in the possibility of permanent peace," he held, was to "disbelieve in the Godliness of human nature. Methods hereto adopted- have failed because rock bottom sincerity on the part of those who have striven has been lacking. Not that they have realized this lack.

In unconditional acceptance of non-violence and its methods Gandhi saw the possibility of raising foundation pure and strong for an enduring peace in the world-through the concept of nonviolence. The philosophy of non-
violence was rooted in and permeated by truth. The difference between nations arose over the perception of their interests. The moral force of Satyagraha would oblige a nation to ascertain its true interests and in a spirit of cooperation rather than selfishness or malice. Once this is done, interstate relations could come to be founded upon mutuality and accommodation rather than competition, aggrandizement and domination. The choice of Satyagraha would transform the very character of the state and thus of interstate relations and the consequent state of the world. It is hoped that Non-violence and Satyagraha together can usher in a lasting peace.

Gandhi fervently hoped for a world federation of free and "independent state." His concept of World Government transcended the traditional thinking, the pattern of conventional international organisations could not satisfy the conditions for bringing genuine peace. He held that peace could not be established through mere conferences. He was not optimistic about the League of Nations and the U.N. Since they lacked the spirit of non-violence and failed to serve as vehicles of peace in the absence of a force to enforce their decisions.

Gandhi believed that the doctrine of non-violence held good in the matter of relationship between states and states also. This conviction impelled him to unequivocally recommend total disarmament. He was optimistic enough to advocate unilateral disarmament. "If even one great nation were unconditionally to perform the supreme act of renunciation many of us unconditionally to perform the supreme act of renunciation many of us would see in our life-time visible peace established on earth. His call for unilateral disarmament betrayed his idealism, while the realist Gandhi appreciated that with the establishment of a democratic world federation disarmament would be practicable in all countries.

Gandhi believed that disarmament was possible only through "the matchless weapon of non-violence," and it was his hope that "India will ... prove herself worthy of being the first nation in the world to give lead to other nations for the delivery of earth from the burden of war. He wanted the great
powers lead the rest by disarming themselves: they should give up ambitions and exploitation and revise their mode of life. Thus, according to Gandhi disarmament cannot crystallise, unless the nations of the world cease to exploit one another. Exploitation must go ... that is the essential pre-condition for the establishment of a world free from blood-spilling and destruction.

Accordingly, he advocated Satyagraha as the sure and potent weapon of combating Inter-state aggression. Satyagraha is universally acceptable. Non-violence, according to him, excludes war and ushers in peace. Gandhi's ideas about peace suggest that the solution he offered for effecting world peace transcended the frontiers of international diplomacy. The chief limitation of international diplomacy is that it is based up on recognition of the power-system. The Gandhian way claims to stand for non-violent and non-exploitative Social order which alone can ensure just and enduring peace. It may be argued that the Gandhian declarations on peace bristle with some practical difficulties. But Gandhi would ask that- if an individual could practice nonviolence why whole nations could not do so. He believed that one must make a beginning and the rest would follow. The Gandhian concept of world peace should be viewed within the general frame work of his philosophy of ahimsa. A proper appreciation of his doctrine of ahimsa would facilitate comprehension of the logical application of that doctrine.

Sceptics consider Gandhian plea for disarmament Utopian. In fact, it is not so. Its success depends on the nature of human beings. Gandhi has great faith in the godliness of human nature. Human nature is essentially peace loving. Even when man fights violently, he does so out of a desire to live in peace. The way of world peace lies in cultivating the spirit of non-violence and peace in the hearts of men. As the individuals are built, so the nations are also built. And as the nations are built, so the world is built. Gandhi says: "there is not one law for the atom and another for the universe."

The life-style of Mahatma Gandhi is quite enough to prove that he was able to reduce himself virtually to "the level of the poorest of the poor." As for
an ordinary human being, it would be too much to expect what would have been possible for a great man like Gandhi. We must however have to learn a lesson from Gandhi's style of living, for as an effective means to achieve Socialism. There is no alternative to simple living and noble thinking and this is more so for a developing country like ours.

It goes without saying that a world of peace and prosperity can never be achieved by the use of force- It was Mahatma Gandhi who invented a new weapon that alone could save mankind from a war of total annihilation. Gandhi and the atom bomb were intact "the two originalities of our time and one would defeat the other before it ended".

Jayaprakash Narayan has very aptly said about Mahatma Gandhi that "He was specifically a prophet of the atomic age in which the engines of violence which man has invented for the first time in history threaten to destroy the whole of mankind. Gandhiji not only preached non-violence as a Philosophy and an ideal but practiced it on a very colossal scale and did it if not with complete success, with very great success. As long as there is violence which threatens the very future of the human race, the relevance of Gandhiji would continue. Gandhiji will remain relevant till the changes of total annihilation of the human race are removed."

Peace is a relationship between people and people. Peace begins with a harmony between individuals. Gandhi lived and worked for the establishment of such relationship among individuals and groups. His is a unique contribution to peace in the modern context. Gandhi's style of life and the techniques he propounded deserved to be studied and applied so that the world may be a safe place to live.

Gautama Buddha preached the message of Ahimsa and Compassion-Asoka one of the greatest emperors had followed the Buddha's teachings in giving up wars and to tread the path of peace though only after being vexed with the carnage which the Kalinga was had brought about. Jesus Christ whom
the Christians worship as the Saviour and Lord is described as the prince of peace. He had lived and preached the message of love, forgiveness and peace. In contemporary times Gandhi has relentlessly voiced the efficacy of non-violence as against violence.

H.G. Wells in one of his last writings had predicted that man is unfit to live in this world as he knows what is good but does not know how to do good. Man wants peace but does not know how to achieve it. Hence he being incapable of doing what he knows to be the right would destroy himself. The future would show whether H.G. Wells is right or wrong. However, a survey of the contemporary world is ominous. Since man has perfected the weapons of war and nations have manufactured and stored them in enough numbers to such an extent that an outbreak of war would not only destroy the living and the products of civilization, but also would make the surface and atmosphere of the earth uninhabitable for hundreds of years if not for ever. Leaders of nations and man in general are aware of this fact and they dread another war. War is an international nightmare. Man would like to avoid or escape wars if possible.

It is known that Gandhi is opposed to violence and wars. Gandhi has been an advocate of non-violence and peace. Though nonviolence is "as old as the hills", Gandhi's exposition, clarification and forceful advocacy of non-violence is unique. The Gandhian way of peace springs from the basic concept of non-violence.

Though for many war is said to be a way of ending wars. As a matter of fact the Second World War was fought by the allies with a view to end all wars. Gandhi is of the firm opinion that war can never end wars. Violence breeds only violence but can never end violence. War is destructive whereas peace is constructive. They are two opposite processes. Further, violence, being destructive, is a negative process, whereas peace, being constructive is a positive process. Peace is a positive force of cementing people. War which is a destroying and divisive force can never contribute to the establishment of peace. Hence the search for peace should be in the way of non-violence alone.
What Napoleon had said to the emperor of Austria in a personal appeal after a fierce battle is worthy of note:

"Thousands of Frenchmen and Austrians have been killed. The prospect of continuance of such horrors distresses me so greatly that I make a personal appeal to you. Amid grief and surrounded by 15,000 corpses, I implore your Majesty, I feel bound to give you an urgent warning. Let us give our generation peace and tranquility. If the men of later days are such fools as to come to blows, they will learn wisdom after a few years of fighting and will then live at peace with one another".

Napoleon had sent this appeal for peace at the height of his glory and success. He saw the futility of war to end hostilities and appealed for peace. Napoleon subscribed to the Gandhian view when he said, "There are only two powers in the world, those powers are the spirit and the sword. In the long run the Sword will always be conquered by the Spirit."

Gandhi writes, "There will be international league only when all the nations big or small, composing it are fully independent". An International league based on non-violence leads to the establishment of world peace. Such a league implies and it is possible only when it consists of independent nations.

As long as any nation is not independent, there would not be world peace. It is necessary that all nations should be independent to be equal partners in the League of Nations in order to have peace.

Gandhi in adopting non-violent means to get Swaraj for India aimed at achieving international peace by doing so. Gandhi said, I suggest to the friends of peace for the world, that the congress in 1920 took a tremendous step towards peace when it declared that it would attain her own, namely Swaraj, by non-violent and truthful means. And I am positive that if we unflinchingly adhere to these means in the prosecution of our goal, we shall have made the largest contribution to the world peace."
According to Gandhi there are certain conditions which are conducive for international peace. They are:

(i) All nations should be independent;
(ii) The equality of all nations should be recognized;
(iii) Disarmament should be accepted by the nations both in principle and their practice.

Wars are the result of lust for power. In some way or other some nations want to establish supremacy over at least some of the other nations. They derive to create and perpetuate inequalities so as to maintain their superiority. Self aggrandizement gives rise to inequality and inequality in return affords scope for self-aggrandizement. It is a vicious circle which can be broken only by an international law by which all nations are treated as equal. The spirit of self-aggrandizement is killed to some extent, though it requires to be more nullified by education, by the proclamation of equality of all nations by an international law. Such a law in the course of time would become a convention and de-facto accomplishment. Equality of nations would go a long way to establish peace in this world.

However, his philosophy of peace is to be sharply distinguished from the conservative plea for "Peace at any cost" which is in essence a plea for the maintenance of status quo. Peace as Gandhi advocated is integrally related to justice. As he wrote: "Peace must be just." Peace is not mere cessation of hostilities. Gandhi did not share the diplomatic view of peace. Peace for him connoted a positive state of affairs, the pre-condition being freedom from exploitation. What he advocated was non-violence and just peace which alone in his opinion, could ensure lasting peace. Accordingly his ideas about peace suggest that the solution he offered for effecting world peace transcended the frontiers of international diplomacy. The chief limitation of international diplomacy is that it is based upon recognition of the power-system.
Further, the Gandhian way claims to stand for non-violent and non-exploitative social order which alone can ensure just and enduring peace. Non-violence, according to Gandhi, excludes war and ushers in peace.

As a result, Gandhi's concept of peace on earth and goodwill among mankind leads to the development of Sarvodaya Social order which is India's distinctive contribution to the world of thought. The application of moral truth to the facts of social life is the essence of Gandhian and Valluvar's way of life. Their dynamic Philosophy can make possible the advent of a radically transformed society. They serve as a system of norms and moral values that can guide our conduct and action in society and state. The truth or a few will count, the untruth of millions will vanish even like a chaff before a whiff of wind. The message of Gandhi and Tiruvalluvar will remain permanent in the hearts of one and all. Tiruvalluvar really transcends Jesus who only wants to forgive them. In advising to forget the trespasses Valluvar is only in the positive degree, Mahatma Gandhi and Tiruvalluvar have become the symbols of peace, truth, non-violence and dharma. If an individual can practice non-violence, why not whole groups of individuals and whole nations? Gandhi believed that one must make a beginning and the rest would follow. Gandhian concept of world peace should be viewed as an integral part of his philosophy of life and one should try to appreciate his attitude within the general framework of his philosophy of ahimsa.

TRUE INTERNATIONALISM

Nations, according to Gandhi, must learn to live for each other, and they are quite capable of doing so—even the defeated Germans: "all that is needed is a transmutation of their marvellous energy for the promotion of the progress of the world as a whole, rather than its application for their own against that of the whole world." He asserted that the great powers assembled at San

---

Francisco for the founding of the United Nations ought to work for "parity among all nations— the strongest and the weakest—the strong should be the servants of the weak not their masters or exploiters."2 Brotherhhood of all peoples in the world, which is the ultimate goal of humanity or at any rate should be, could only be based on the plinth of their national freedoms, according to Gandhi: "Hinduism insists on the brotherhood not only of all mankind but of all that lives. . . . The moment we have restored real living equality between man and man, we shall be able to establish equality between man and the whole creation. When that day comes we shall have peace on earth. . . ."3

Evidently, then, Gandhi had no doubt whatsoever that nationalism, instead of being narrow or exclusive, is a vital prerequisite for internationalism. The passion with which he made India's independence the linchpin of world peace exemplifies this belief. According to Gandhi, one could not be an internationalist without being a nationalist. Internationalism would come only if nationalism became a reality, that is, only when peoples of different countries and cultures were organized in such a way that they were capable of acting as one being.

Nationalism was not bad in itself, of course. It was the selfishness, the spirit of exploitation that inhered in those with power that, in Gandhi's view, impelled them to fight others and grow bigger at the tatter's expense and ruin. He was emphatic that India's nationalism had broken new ground insofar as it was "seeking full self-expression for the benefit and service of humanity at large. I cannot possibly go wrong so long as I do not harm other nations in the act of serving my country."4

---

Even in the mid-1920s, Gandhi wanted "to think in terms of the whole world," for his patriotism include[d] the good of mankind in general." He proclaimed, "My nationalism is intense internationalism." That is how, in his logic, hatred need not be an attribute of nationalism. Those who believed it was were to be pitied, for they were laboring under the grossest of delusions:

So long as they retain that attitude the progress of this country [India], the progress of the world is retarded. . . .

The world is weary of it. We see the fatigue overcoming the Western nations. We see that this song of hate has not benefited humanity. Let it be the privilege of India to turn a new leaf and set a lesson to the world.

Gandhi's views of nationalism are expressed thus:

Internationalism pre-supposes nationalism—not the narrow, selfish, greedy spirit that often passes under the name of nationalism that, whilst it insists upon its own freedom and growth, will disdain to attain them at the expense of other nations.6

Apparently, in Gandhi's version of nationalism, there is a strong undercurrent of cooperation born of and necessitated by the understanding of one people by the others in a spirit of humility and sympathy rather than arrogance. He wants insolence and ignorance to be banished forever in the concerns and calculations of nations when it came to interacting with one another. Gandhi's nationalism was as broad as the universe. It includes in its sweep even the lower animals . . . all the nations of the earth. He said: "If I possibly could convince the whole of India of the truth of the message, then India would be something to the whole world for which the world-is longing. My nationalism includes the well being of the whole world. I do not want my India to rise on the ashes of other nations. I do not want India to exploit a single human being. I

---

want India to become strong in order that she can infect the other nations also with her strength. Not so with other nations of the world, not so with a single nation in Europe today."

Gandhi was certain that internationalism did not mean the loss of national identity: "we do not want to follow the frog-in-the-well policy, nor, in seeming to be international, lose our roots. We cannot be international, if we lose our individuality, i.e., nationality." Nations must promote nationalism, of course, but such promotion should always be in the spirit of universal brotherhood and should always "depend on the rule [that the] stronger should help the poor."8

Such a spirit, Gandhi had no doubt, could really and quite easily be developed by means of positive nationalism: unless people could serve their family and their village, they could not serve the world. Nationalism had no malice, no ill-will or contempt—it had only goodwill and peace in it. Unless one learned to love one's neighbors, one could not possibly cultivate the spirit of love for the rest of the world.

Gandhi described himself as a cosmopolitan. He could not possibly be anything else, if he wanted his credo and gospel to have universal relevance. And his mission was to unite the world by "grouping unities": Unless I group unities I shall never be able to unite the whole world. Tolstoy once said that if we would but get off the backs of our neighbours the world would be quite all right without any further help from us. And if we can only serve our immediate neighbour by ceasing to prey upon them, the circle of unities thus grouped in the right fashion will ever grow in circumference till at last it is co-terminus with that of the whole world. More than that it is not given to any man to try or achieve.9

---

8 Young India, 18-6-1925, p. 211.
It is not surprising, therefore, to find Gandhi expressing his revulsion against the idea of "Asia for Asians" as an anti-European combine. Brimming with the vision of world unity, he could not bear the thought of being a "frog in the well." Takaoka, a member of the Japanese Parliament, sought a message from Gandhi at Sevagram for his party, which was just founded with the motto "Asia for Asians." Gandhi's response was blunt and firm: I do not subscribe to the doctrine Asia for the Asiatics, if it is meant as an anti-European combination. How can we have Asia for the Asiatics unless we are content to let Asia remain a frog in the well? But Asia cannot afford to remain a frog in the well. I have a message for the whole world, if it will only live up to it. There is the imprint of Buddhistic influence on the whole of Asia, which includes India, China, Japan, Burma, Ceylon and the Malaya States. I said to the Burmese and the Ceylonese that they were Buddhist in name; India was Buddhist in reality. I would say the same thing to China and Japan. But for Asia to be not for Asia but for the whole world, it has to learn the message of Buddha and deliver it to the world. Today it is being denied everywhere.10

In Gandhi's view "for a non-violent person the whole world is one family." If Gandhi had his way, the post-war policy of the free National Government of India would be to promote commonwealth of all world states including, if possible belligerent states also, so as to reduce to the minimum the possibility of an armed conflict between different states.11

The League of Nations, he thought accordingly, could not further the ideal of one world, for it was not universal. A truly international League could exist only when all its members, big or small, were independent, with the nature of that independence corresponding to the extent of nonviolence assimilated by the nations concerned. Gandhi is absolutely clear about one

---

10 Harijan, Vol. 6, p. 404.
thing: "In a society based on non-violence the smallest nation will feel as tall as the tallest. The idea of superiority and inferiority will be wholly obliterated." 12

THE IMPERATIVE OF SWADESHI

In a literal sense swadeshi means "home manufacture." But the main thrust of Gandhi's advocacy and insistence of swadeshi was on the need for self-reliance, which in turn contributed to world peace. Seething poverty in India naturally moved Gandhi to conclude that independence did not mean mere political emancipation from foreign rule. He believed that in order to be meaningful independence must have a substantive economic content and criterion. Indeed, fiscal autonomy and health were very vital for the life of a nation. And that, he was confident, could be attained through swadeshi, particularly in the case of India.

The history of nations, Gandhi said, bore testimony to the fact that nations unable to preserve their economic independence for want of a policy of swadeshi had fallen, whereas those that could had always enjoyed swaraj. Citing the example of the smaller European states of his time, he pointed out that they survived as independent economic entities because they practiced swadeshi. Indeed, every nation that was independent followed swadeshi in its own way. Switzerland and Denmark, for instance, achieved this by maintaining manufactures and trades that were suited to their own needs and were free from outside interference. Swadeshi and swaraj, in Gandhi's opinion, were thus inexhorably interdependent-if not actually synonymous. The reign of foreign domination would easily come to an end once the country ceased to be dependent for its material requirements on others and became instead capable of meeting its needs from its own resources.

The sword will be sheathed as soon as Manchester calico ceases to be saleable in India. It is much more economical, expeditious and possible to give up the use of Manchester and, therefore, foreign calico than to blunt the edge of Sir William's sword. The process will multiply the number of swords and, therefore, also miseries in the world.

Like opium production, the world manufacture of swords needs to be restricted. The sword is probably responsible for more misery in the world than opium.

Hence do I say that, if India takes to the spinning-wheel, she will contribute to the restriction of armament and peace of the world as no other country and nothing else can.13

A fuller appreciation of Gandhi's position here calls for some explanation. Clothing is one of our basic necessities. Before the advent of colonialism in India, the economy of the country was flourishing enough to meet the basic needs of the people, leaving enough surpluses for export. That is what had drawn the foreigner to India in the first place. The village at that time was virtually a self-contained economic unit that satisfied all the basic needs, and more, of its inhabitants. Handicrafts and cottage industry flourished, and agriculture supported a satisfying quality of life of the people in India.

Colonialism destroyed all that by policies coercively enforced to pursue its own interests. The compulsions and requirements of industrialization at home obliged the colonial rulers to supplant the prevailing economic system by a pattern that not only met their own needs but also aimed at strengthening the shackles of the subject people by making them dependent upon the metropolitan country, in this case, England. As industrialization there grew, so did the dependence of India and its people on England.

13 The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, op. cit. vol.28, p. 454
The spinning jenny revolutionized weaving and cloth making. Soon the textile mills of Manchester and Lancashire were producing huge quantities of cloth that duly swamped India, impoverishing in the process the craftworkers and weavers in the villages along with the others. In reviving and rejuvenating these sources, basic to the life and economy of the village, Gandhi saw the only hope for the salvation of the people of India. Hence his insistence on swadeshi, which included not only cloth but all those items that could be—and not long ago were—produced in the small, self-reliant Indian village.

Gandhi thus argued that India's independence would be hollow as long as it remained dependent for its basic needs upon England. The industrial and corresponding technological development of over a century in that country had increased the gap tremendously with regard to India. Only an India relying upon its own resources and strength could possibly reduce or bridge that gap. Promoting and using swadeshi was the obvious first step India must take for its independence and giving meaning and substance to that independence.

This explains his call for stopping all imports from England so that India could regenerate its economy by its own efforts. In his opinion, this would improve international relations, for India's relations then "will no longer be based on consideration of self-interest but will be inspired by concern for general welfare."

Gandhi's argument may not make much sense to many modern economists, also because trade and commerce are major contributory factors to international interdependence and seeming unification of the world. But due recognition of its merit is reflected in the growing clamor for a new international economic order, as also in many an aspect of the North-South dialogue, a discussion of which need not detain us here.

In any case, given the context of Gandhi's times, his economic philosophy, and, most important, his priorities, his argument for swadeshi and its integral component, self-reliance, are perfectly consistent and very relevant. For instance, often he declared:
Under this scheme... men in charge of machinery will think not of themselves or even of the nation to which they belong but of the whole human race. The Lancashire men will cease to use their machinery for exploiting India and other countries, but on the contrary they will devise means of enabling India to convert in her own villages her cotton into cloth. Nor will Americans, under my scheme, seek to enrich themselves by exploiting other races of the earth through their inventive skill. 

The spinning wheel (charkha), which he held to be a "sign of peace," was crucial to Gandhi's concept of swadeshi, for it was through revival and resort to it that the rural economy in the country could be oriented toward self-reliance and finally to world peace. It was this belief that made him claim that the spinning-wheel was the most appropriate and effective answer to the atomic bomb. Andrew Freeman of the New York Post asked him if the spinning wheel had a cultural and therapeutic value for the malaise infecting the West, which had culminated in the atomic bomb, and if the wheel could serve as a counterweapon to the bomb. Gandhi responded that he did not have the "slightest doubt that the saving of India and of the world [lay] in the wheel." He further argued that, in order to save the world from destruction, life had to be simplified; human dignity could be sustained only by serving everyone—even the last, the smallest, or seemingly most insignificant—on the earth: "We must do even unto this last [creature] as we would have the world do by us. All must have equal opportunity. Given the opportunity, every human being has the same possibility for spiritual growth. This is what the spinning-wheel symbolises."

Apparently, Gandhi's seminal ideas in this regard have much more than meets the eye, and it would not be productive to interpret his statements literally. The charkha for him has both literal and symbolic significance.
Literally, it meets the immediate basic needs of the individual by producing the cloth through a fruitful use of one's time, which in any case is plentiful in the rural milieu; it precludes dependence upon the mercy or charity of others and enables one to meet a basic need in the dignity of one's own labor. On a symbolical level, the wheel signifies the spirit of self-reliance that sustains life. A complete discussion of his views on the value of the charkha, which he spelled out in his writings, is beyond the scope of this work, however.

The essential point to bear in mind here is that, by stressing the role of the charkha in the life of the individual, Gandhi is drawing attention to an honorable, dignified means of resisting exploitation and preventing alienation inherent in the entire system of industrial production. Industrialization in the world has occurred unevenly and at the cost of so much misery for the majority who feed the phenomenon by being merely suppliers of raw material and cheap or free labor. More often than not the industrial relations are marked by exploitation and consequent strife instead of equality and cooperation. Yet the charkha, Gandhi is absolutely certain, facilitates cooperation among millions in various ways. Through such cooperation "on the largest scale known to the world," he wants to teach "the uselessness, nay, the sinfulness of exploitation of those weaker than ourselves." 17

Thus, he insists, a self-supporting, self-reliant India—chiefly through swadeshi, of course—would be a proof against the temptation to exploitation. This, in turn, will make India least attractive to the greed or caprice of any power, Western or Eastern, and would automatically make India secure without its having to carry the burden of expensive, wasteful armaments. "Her internal economy [of swadeshi] will be India's strongest bulwark against aggression." 18 In this way, a sturdy contribution to a durable peace would naturally have been made, for self-support and self-reliance were the very essence of a peaceful world order.

18 Pyarelal, Last Phase, op. cit., vol.1, p. 120.
Gandhi's belief in universal brotherhood, and his view of internationalism, quite logically led him to think in terms of and advocate a world government preceded, as a compromise, by a world federation based on nonviolence:

Yes I claim to be a practical idealist. I believe in compromise so long as it does not involve the sacrifice of principles. I may not get a World Government that I want just now but if it is a government that would just touch my ideal I would accept it as a compromise.

Therefore, although I am not enamoured of a world federation I shall be prepared to accept it if it is built on essentially non-violent basis. 

Nations must eventually unite. Gandhi abhored "isolated independence," least of all of India; rather, he espoused "voluntary interdependence." Whereas isolated independence could easily menace the world, a federation of friendly interdependent states the world over—for which India was always ready—would unite the world in lasting peace. And if by India's efforts such a world federation of independent states comes into being, the hope of the kingdom of God, otherwise described as ramarajya, assured Gandhi, may legitimately be entertained.

Gandhi saw neither a contradiction between the freedom of India and a world federation brought about on a voluntary basis, nor a matter of choosing one to the rejection of the other. Shortly before his arrest in August 1942, Gandhi was asked, "Instead of striving for India's freedom why would you not strive for a far greater and nobler end—world federation? Surely that will automatically include India's freedom as the greater includes the less."

Conceding that federation was "undoubtedly a greater and nobler end" than to

---

19 Ibid, p. 126
be merely "self-centred, seeking only to preserve their own freedom," Gandhi pointed to the obvious fallacy implied in the question; namely, how could the subject nations be federated with the free as equals? So, clearly,

The very first step to a world federation is to recognise the freedom of conquered and exploited nations. Thus, India and Africa have to be freed.

The second step would be to announce to and assure the aggressor powers, in the present instance the Axis powers, that immediately [after] the war ends, they will be recognized as members of the world federation in the same sense as the Allies. This presupposes an agreement among the members of the world federation as to the irreducible fundamentals.\(^\text{21}\)

The agreement on irreducible fundamentals was a necessity—otherwise, the federation would fall to pieces under the slightest strain—and it must come voluntarily; nonviolence is the basis of voluntariness. Since, of all the nations of the world, India was the only one with the message of nonviolence, it must first have its immediate freedom to be able to play a constructive part in the creation of a world federation later on. According to Gandhi, India's freedom as a first step toward a world federation was necessary also because,

If I can get freedom for India through non-violent means, power of non-violence is firmly established, empire idea dissolves and the World State takes its place in which all the states of the world are free and equal, no state has its military.\(^\text{22}\)

And, asserted Gandhi,

A free democratic India will gladly associate herself with other free nations for mutual defence against aggression and for economic co-operation. She will work for the establishment of a

\(^{21}\) Harijan, vol.9, p. 265

\(^{22}\) Pyarelal, Last Phase, op. cit., vol.1, p. 120
real world order based on freedom and democracy, utilising the world's knowledge and resources for the progress and advancement of humanity.  

More than "a world federation of free and independent states," Gandhi considered it to be vitally necessary for these states to unite under one central governing body composed of their representatives. Indeed, "that is the only condition on which the world can live," as he told the correspondent of the United Press of America in June 1947. He viewed the world as an organic whole: "God has so ordered this world that no one can keep his goodness or badness exclusively to himself. The whole world is like the human body with its various members. Pain in one part must inevitably poison the whole system." But this one world, as he told George Catlin, had to be founded upon respect for truth. There was too much deception and hypocrisy about contemporary international relations. People declared themselves to be righteous, even in the face of utterly unjustified facts of murder and sudden death in the world; one must not compromise or come to terms with these ugly facts. The brightest prospect of world unity, Gandhi assured Catlin, rested upon respect for truth and ahimsa; nonviolence was the most appropriate and right course always, for nonviolence had never done any harm to anybody.

True to his faith of a lifetime, Gandhi, accordingly, pleaded for the adoption of nonviolence as a way of life by the nations of the world as "it will promote their happiness and peace," while, at the same time, being "their biggest contribution to the attainment of world peace after which we are all hankering." As early as 1919, he had written in Young India,

> It is [the] law of love which, silently but surely, governs the family for the most part throughout the civilised world.

---

23 Harijan, Vol.7, p. 278
25 Catlin George, In the Path of the Mahatma (London : MacDonald), 1998, p. 281
I feel that nations cannot be one in reality, nor can there be activities conducive to the common good of the whole humanity, unless there is this definition and acceptance of the law of the family in national and international affairs, in other words, on the political platform. Nations can be called civilised only to the extent they obey this law.

Thus a world state based on and permeated with nonviolence constitutes a prominent feature in Gandhi's blueprint for permanent peace. But he was realistic enough not to anticipate "a time in India or the world when all will be followers of ahimsa," though he did "contemplate a time when in India we shall rely less on brute force and more on soul force." 27

A state without police was very much in his scheme of things, of course, and its attainment quite feasible too, but Gandhi also conceded that it requires a higher degree of courage and unity than is ordinarily available. Therefore, "whilst I can invite all states to do without police or army," he candidly admitted, "I have not yet been able to bring myself to believe that you can preserve a society without police. ... You can thus say that my toleration of police is a limitation of non-violence." 28 And "police there will be even in satyayuga [the age of truth and perfection]," he felt.

Accordingly, Gandhi envisaged that as a transitory measure there "may be a world police to keep order in the absence of universal belief in non-violence." 29 He would allow "an armed police to enforce the lightest terms of peace. Even this retention of an international police," said Gandhi ruefully, "will be a concession of human weakness not by any means an emblem of peace." 30

27 Ibid, vol.48, p. 158
28 Ibid, vol.2, p. 130
29 Pyarelal, Last Phase, op. cit., vol.1, p. 120
But never for a moment did Gandhi see any need for an army for, in his opinion, an army was "opposed to non-violence." Whatever tolerance or sympathy he might have had for it in his early days in South Africa for its virtues of discipline and devotion to duty had dwindled drastically, if not completely evaporated. He is frank, however, in acknowledging.

If is my inability to convince my people to do

without army. I have not mustered sufficient strength to pit non-violence against thieves and scoundrels and cut-throats but I can ask people to pit non-violence against hordes of the army.

If perchance India wins her deliverance through non-violence we may perhaps show to the world that it is not necessary to have an army state.

I do not regard it utopian to think of a state without army, but it requires a higher degree of courage and purity.31

He might well have added that, until humanity regenerates the high moral fiber appropriate to such a transformation, an army would be necessary.

The nearest Gandhi gets to the idea of an army is that of a nonviolent "army," which differed fundamentally from the usual violence-oriented organization. The difference lay in the nature of the discipline his nonviolent army would observe and emulate: the discipline would come from within the "soldier' rather than from without. The soldier of the usual army "yields obedience whilst at war, but will yield to wild licence when free from it. But a non-violent soldier carries discipline in his heart and will carry an atmosphere of restraint in every walk of life."32

It appears that for establishing peace Gandhi had far greater hope in the British Commonwealth of Nations than in the United Nations. But the

---

31 The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, op. cit., vol.48, p. 158
32 Ibid, vol.19, p. 444
Commonwealth must first be transformed into "a fellowship of free nations joined together by the 'silver cords of love'. ... I would have India enter freely into such a fellowship and with the same rights of equality for Indians as for other members of the Commonwealth." He explained that

my ambition is much higher than independence. Through the deliverance of India I seek to deliver the so-called [weak and backward] races of the earth from the crushing heels of western exploitation in which England can have the privilege of becoming a partner if she chooses.\(^{33}\)

He elaborated the thought by reiterating what he had always maintained:

Puma Swaraj [complete independence] does not exclude association with any nation—much less with England. But it can only mean association for mutual benefit and at will. Thus, there are countries which are said to be independent but which have no Purna Swaraj, for example Nepal.\(^{34}\)

To that example he could have added the countries of central and southern America, where the type of independence Gandhi visualized was far from being a reality or even an aspiration. Anyway, when eventually India became a full-fledged and equal member of the transformed Commonwealth of its own volition, Gandhi considered it to be an event of great importance, for the members had willingly launched a multi-racial Commonwealth. This, in his opinion, augured well for the forces of peace in the world, for justice had at last been done to a people who had long clamored and struggled for it.

THE DECEPTION OF DISARMAMENT

For years, Gandhi campaigned for the view that peace was a matter of justice rather than of strength: "all the world over a true peace depends not upon gun powder but upon pure justice." Unless nations learned to be just by

\(^{33}\) Ibid, vol.35, p. 457
\(^{34}\) Ibid, vol.45, p. 264
renouncing exploitation and their total reliance on force, there could never be peace on the earth. Armaments were both a symptom of force and a temptation to use force. Thus, instead of talking of a mere restriction of armaments, their quantity and quality, Gandhi pleaded passionately for complete, universal disarmament.

Apparently in thorough approval, he published in the columns of Young India, which he edited, an excerpt from a monthly called International Sunbeam:

Total world disarmament, the only material safeguard for peace, should be the outward and visible sign of that inward mental disarmament on which alone outward peace can secure. So long, however, as one people is actually subjecting another to itself by superior military might even the very first step toward this inward mental disarmament has not been taken. 35

Europe should take this first step, held Gandhi, "unless Europe is to commit suicide." The tendency to outdo one another in building up armaments would subside once that step were taken.

By the same token, it would be equally disastrous if India, after attaining its freedom, were to join the arms race: "For India to enter into the arms race is to court suicide. With the loss of India to non-violence the last hope of the world will be gone. ..." Gandhi hoped "that India will make non-violence her creed, preserve man's dignity, and prevent him from reverting to the type from which he is supposed to have raised himself." 36

The bloodshed of the Hindus and Muslims in the wake of partition and independence of India greatly distressed Gandhi, of course, but what exasperated him even more was the country

36 Harijan, vol.7, p. 305
swearing by the military and all that naked physical force implies. Our statesmen have for over two generations declaimed against the heavy expenditure on armaments under the British regime, but now that freedom from political servitude has come, our military expenditure has increased and still threatens to increase and of this we are proud!

However . . . the hope lingers in me and many others that India shall survive this death dance and occupy the moral height that should belong to her after the training, however imperfect, in non-violence for an unbroken period of thirty two years since 1915 [the year Congress accepted the method of nonviolent struggle for the country's freedom].

Gandhi never reconciled himself to the partition of India. Its aftermath of communal massacres in the Panjab and Bengal saddened him further. Talk of strengthening and relying upon the military as a means of meeting the situation, which was surcharged with suspicion, anger, and frustration, grieved him greatly.

He saw little sense in India after attaining its freedom incurring a heavy defense budget and felt that the country was groaning under this unnecessary and unsupportable burden: "We are convinced that we do not need the arms that India is carrying." He stuck to his oft-repeated position that nothing could be more disastrous than India trying to imitate or rival the Western powers, including the United States, in their defense strategy based on military capability.

Gandhi unequivocally advocated that India—even Asia—take a lead with regard to disarmament. At the concluding session of the Asian Relations Conference at Delhi on April 2, 1947, he declared that the West is despairing of

37 Ibid, vol.11, p. 453
38 The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, op. cit., vol.48, pp. 200-201
a multiplication of the atom bomb, because atom bombs mean utter destruction not merely of the West but of the whole world, as if the prophesy of the bible is going to be fulfilled and there is to be a perfect deluge.

It is up to you to tell the world of its wickedness and sin that is the heritage your teachers and my teachers have taught Asia,\textsuperscript{39}

His anguish at the talk in India of continuing with the military, in fact strengthening it, is therefore in character.

Gandhi was certainly opposed, however, to the forced disarmament of a nation. For instance, referring to the disarming of India during World War I, Gandhi declared with vehemence:

Much as I abhor the possession or the use of arms, I cannot reconcile myself to forcible prohibition.

As I said three years ago, this forcible disarmament of a people will be regarded by history as one of the blackest sins committed by the British Government against India. If people want to possess arms they ought to have them without ado. . . . We cannot learn discipline by compulsion. We must learn not to use arms or to use them with responsibility and self-restraint, notwithstanding the right to possess them.\textsuperscript{40}

In the same spirit, he condemned the disarming of the vanquished as a punitive measure. This was not merely due to compassion; Gandhi believed that guilt of war was so pervasive that it was virtually impossible, and wrong, to apportion all the blame for it to just one of the parties at the expense of the other.\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{39} Harijan, vol.11, p. 117
\textsuperscript{40} The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, op. cit., vol.20, p. 406
\textsuperscript{41} Pyarelal, Last Phase, vol.1, p. 114
If the great powers disarmed themselves, felt Gandhi, they would not only escape the ravages of war but also cover themselves in glory, restore sanity to the world, and earn the eternal gratitude of posterity. These powers would, at the same time, have to give up their imperialistic designs and exploitation of the weak and hapless, while revising their own way of life. All this, evidently, amounts virtually to a total revolution, the only alternative to which, in Gandhi's opinion, was absolute disaster. The great powers could not be expected to move in the direction of total revolution—contrary to what lifestyle they had thus far been used to—spontaneously, of course.42

Nor could disarmament be worked out overnight; it would take time. The one thing Gandhi was absolutely certain of was that it would come only through the adoption of nonviolence by a nation—indeed, by all the nations of the world. The evils of armaments can be cured, held Gandhi, by non-violence, which will eventually be the weapon of all nations. I say 'eventually' deliberately, because we shall have war and armaments for a very long time. It is two thousand years since Christ preached his "Sermon on the Mount" and the world has adopted only a fragment of the imperishable lofty precepts therein enunciated for the conduct of man toward man. Until we take all Christ's principles to our hearts, war, hatred and violence will continue.43

It was wrong to think that armaments implied or imparted strength, for real strength, according to Gandhi, came by self-sacrifice, from within and not through physical force. He pointed out that the rishis (sages) of yore, themselves great warriors, realized the utter uselessness of force and "taught a weary world that its salvation lay not through violence but through non-violence."

---

42 Harijan, vol.6, p. 328
43 The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, op. cit., vol.45, p. 319
Gandhi was emphatic that nations should strengthen themselves spiritually, for "Internal spiritual forces are stronger and induce a more certain and lasting life. It is not by arming yourself that you will guarantee peace to the world. External arms, guns, cannons and gas have only evil and passing results." To say that one is arming oneself for self-defense was, he said, "a wretched plea ... a bad thing," for, in effect, the result invariably was that you organized yourself to "prey upon ill organized communities and nations." The crux of the matter was that real disarmament could come only when "the nations of world cease to exploit one another."45

Gandhi would not accept the proposition that, since disarmament chiefly depended upon the great powers, small, neutral and nonaggressive countries like Switzerland, for instance, should be forced to disarm. Gandhi asserted that the very fact of neutrality and nonaggressiveness of Switzerland rendered the army there completely redundant. Indeed, it would be a far superior thing for Switzerland to give the world a lesson in disarmament and establish that the Swiss are brave enough to live without an army. Nor was he willing to accept the proposition that the mere presence of the Swiss army had saved that country from being overrun by foreign armies. Rejecting both the deterrent role of the Swiss military forces as well as the value of military development, Gandhi astutely pointed out the fallacies involved:

Will the questioner forgive me if I say that a double ignorance underlies this question?

He deplores the fact that, if you give up the profession of soldiering, you will miss the education you receive in service and sacrifice.

None need run away with the idea that because you avoid military conscription you are not in for a conscription of a

44 Ibid, vol. 46, pp. 402-403
45 Ibid, p. 441
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severer and nobler type. When I spoke to you about labour, I told you that labour ought to assimilate all the noble qualities of soldiering: endurance and defiance of death and sacrifice. When you disarm yourself, it does not mean that you will have a merry time. It is not that you are absolved from the duty of serving your homes when you give up soldiering; on the contrary, your women and children would be taking part in defending your homes.

Again I am not talking to you without experience. In the little institution [sic] that we are conducting, we are teaching our women and children also how to save that institution --as we are living among thieves and robbers.

Everything becomes simple and easy the moment you learn to give up your own life in order to save the life of others.

And lastly, it is really forgotten that safety which an individual derives from innocence is safety which no amount of arms will give you.

The second part of the ignorance lies in the second part of the question.

I must respectfully deny the truth of the statement that the presence of the Swiss army prevented the War from affecting Switzerland. Although Belgium had its own army, it was not saved and if the rival armies had wanted a passage through Switzerland, believe me, they would have fought you also. You might have fought in turn, but you would have fought much better non-violently.46

---

46 The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, op. cit., pp. 419-420
Gandhi was also not deluded by the description of an arms race among the powers of Europe, and elsewhere, as a manifestation of their desire to eliminate war. 48 This was a misconception at best and plain hypocrisy at worst for the noble ideal of peace could not possibly be achieved by the disastrous means of war. And where was even the slightest indication that in acquiring more and more weapons the concerned nation had abjured the motive of being dominant and jockeying for the position of strength? In his message editor of a U.S. magazine. The Cosmopolitan, Gandhi wrote:

If recognised leaders of mankind who have control over engines of destruction were wholly to renounce their use with full knowledge of implications, permanent peace can be obtained.

This is clearly impossible without the great powers of the earth renouncing their imperialistic designs. This again seems impossible without these great nations ceasing to believe in soul destroying competition and the desire to multiply wants and therefore increase their material possessions.47

With regard to nuclear weapons, Gandhi thought it quite futile merely to restrict them; he seriously doubted that the nations possessing them would remain content merely with their possession. Dismissing the efficacy or permanence of "balance of terror" or "balance of nonuse" and the supposition that their "overkill" capacity by itself would induce and enforce nonviolence in the world, he emphasized that so long as the thinking in these quarters remained rooted in violence we will continue heading toward disaster and self-destruction. Indeed, "the violent man's eyes would [be] lit up with the prospect of much greater amount of destruction and death which he could now wreak," Gandhi said. At best the destructive capability of these weapons may temporarily postpone the outbreak of war. "Like a man gutting himself with dainties to the point of nausea and turning away from them only to return with

47 Harijan, vol.4, p. 109
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redoubled zeal after the effect of nausea is well over. Precisely in the same manner will the world return to violence with renewed zeal after the effect of disgust is worn out." Gandhi quite frankly considered the "balance of terror" to be nothing more than the "preparations for a third World War." He was willing to concede that atomic energy "may be utilised . . . for humanitarian purposes" but was sure that it would not be confined to that alone.

According to Gandhi, nations armed themselves out of fear of each other and to guard their imperialist possessions. Quite early in his life, echoing the philosophy of the Gita, Gandhi in his Hind Swaraj asserted that nations armed themselves because they were filled with the fear that others may take away their possessions; force was used when people were under the spell of fear, and "what is gained through fear is retained only for as long as fear is present." At the same time, fear breeds hatred. Apparently then, the very first step that nations must take toward ensuring peace was to dispel fear and, along with it, mistrust. Gandhi said his instincts told him that if you do not intend violence to anyone, no one will use it against you either: "It is only when we are afraid of our opponent, we employ unclean strength like his that we learn unclean ways and so become weak. . . . If we meet uncleanliness with cleanliness, the total result would be less of uncleanliness and the people, the world, would be happier for this." Gandhi put it succinctly and without any equivocation when he declared:

Peace will never come until the Great Powers courageously decide to disarm themselves.

I have an implicit faith—a faith that today burns brighter than ever, after half a century's experience of unbroken practice.

---

48 Ibid, vol. 10, pp. 212-217
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of non-violence—that mankind can only be saved through non-violence.\footnote{Harijan, vol.6, p. 395}

Speaking about Britain, before World War II broke out, Gandhi stated:

Someone has to rise in England, with the living faith to say that England, whatever happens, shall not use arms. They are a nation fully armed, and if they having the power fully deliberately refuse to use arms, theirs will be the first example of Christianity in active practice on a mass scale. That will be a real miracle.\footnote{The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, op. cit., vol.67, p. 76}

He thus called upon the greatest nation of its times to make the noble beginning.

A realist and ever a man of action, Gandhi fully realized that, before general disarmament prevailed, a beginning had to be made somewhere.

Some nation will have to dare disarm herself and take large risks. The level of nonviolence in that nation, if that event happily comes to pass, will naturally have risen so high as to command universal respect. Her judgment will be unerring, her decisions will be firm, her capacity for heroic self-sacrifice will be great, and she will want to live as much for other nations as for herself.\footnote{Ib d, vol.48, p. 85}

In calling upon Britain to take the initiative in unilaterally disarming itself, Gandhi seemed to be saying that a voluntary renunciation of its formidable military capability would make a tremendous and multifaceted impact on the nations of the world. His invitation also implied in a way the great faith he had in the people of that country—once they decided to do something, they could and did it well. And would it not be some atonement for their past sins?
All good things, Gandhi believed, began always with one single person. Thus, he urged that an initiative toward disarmament be taken soon by some country. To one of his biographers, Frederick B. Fisher (author of The Strange Little Brown Man Gandhi), Gandhi sent a message on September 31, 1931, for American Christians on World Peace and Disarmament in which he unambiguously stressed that

Peace and disarmament are not a matter of reciprocity.

When real Peace and Disarmament come, they will be initiated by a strong nation like America irrespective of the consent and co-operation of other nations. . . .

As Thoreau has said so well, "all reform all the world over always began with one person taking it up" . . . 54

Here is the very kernel of Gandhi's entire thinking and campaign with regard to disarmament. Having concluded that disarmament was moral, eminently desirable, and urgent in a world quickly moving toward self-annihilation, the karmayogi in Gandhi was moved to seek courses of action. In unilateral disarmament he saw a bold but perfectly feasible course of action in concrete terms. And he pressed for it whenever he could relax the focus of his campaign for nonviolence and rampant international exploitation, particularly in the colonial world.

For much of his later life, Gandhi was preoccupied with the particular issues raised by India's freedom struggle. Since he had been thoroughly disillusioned about the intentions of the British Empire, he could now more easily explore the implications of a total rejection of war. World War II reinforced this position both because of the urgent need to consider what action to take if the Japanese invaded and because of the awareness that war was now something that involved a new level of destructiveness. As a result, what

54 Ibid, vol.54, p. 335
emerges is a crystallized conviction of war as an evil that must be prevented by eliminating its root causes and resorting to moral means in preference to arms or their regulated use.

Asserting that "physical possession of arms is the least necessity of the brave," Gandhi stated that nonviolence requires the strength and courage to suffer without retaliation, to receive blows without returning any. Nonviolence, the surest means of ushering in permanent peace, becomes futile "unless the root cause is dealt with, and the root cause is the greed of nations. If there were no greed, there would be no occasion for armaments: the principle of nonviolence necessitates complete abstention from exploitation in any form. Immediately the spirit of exploitation is gone, armaments will be felt as an unbearable burden." He declared, "I have no doubt that unless big nations shed their desire of exploitation and the spirit of which war is the natural expression and atom bomb the inevitable consequence, there is no hope for peace in the world." In sum, an eternally peaceful world federation could be raised only on the sturdy and deep foundations of nonviolence; violence will have to be given up in all shape and form in world affairs; and disarmament—a contributory condition of such peace—will come only when nations shed their exploitation and the fetish for arms.

Certain that maneuvers like those of President Wilson would not bear the fruit of peace expected of them since they were rooted in deep hypocrisy, Gandhi ceaselessly endeavoured to break a new path. Wilson had remarked, "After a.l, if this endeavour of ours to arrive at peace fails, we have got our armaments to fall back upon." Gandhi's rejoinder to such an attitude was: "I want to reverse that position and say our armaments have failed already. Let us now be in search of something new, and let us try the force of love and God which is Truth." He wanted to show that physical force "is nothing compared

---
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to the moral force and that moral force never fails."\(^{57}\) Moreover, not for a moment did he think that peace could ever be attained in a piecemeal manner: "Peace is unattainable by part performances of conditions even as chemical combination is impossible without complete fulfillment of conditions of attainment thereof."\(^{58}\)

Real, effective, lasting peace, Gandhi reiterated, could only be attained through the rule of the "law of love" saturating the life and style of nations the world over. Love for one's own nation is not enough, for "such love is an armed peace." War will only be eliminated when the conscience of humanity becomes elevated enough to recognize the undisputed supremacy of the law of love in all walks of life.\(^{59}\) This was not all that Utopian, or beyond the reach humanity, as might be imagined; Gandhi was absolutely confident that all this will come to pass here and perhaps in not too distant a future. So the columns of Young India articulated: Till a new energy is harnessed and put on wheels, the captains of older energies will treat the innovation as theoretical, impractical, idealistic and so on. It may take long to lay the wires of international love, but the sanction of international non-co-operation in preference to continued physical compulsion ... is a distinct progress towards the ultimate and real solution.\(^{60}\)

Gandhi maintains, "perfect peace comes when mind and heart are pure."\(^{61}\) All his life, he bent the entire energies of his being in purifying the heart and elevating the mind of his countrymen with the contagion of his tireless pursuit of truth—concretized in nonviolence, fearlessness, sense of responsibility and duty, and a loving concern for his fellow beings. Congenital optimist perhaps, but certainly one who had implicit, unbounded, and a proud faith in his country and countrymen, Gandhi seemed to expect unilateral disarmament in India. Perception by a newly independent India may be blunted

\(^{57}\) Ibid, vol.15, p. 142  
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for a time with the euphoria of emancipation. But Gandhi was confident that "even in my absence my influence for peace will last; though I may be far away, my spirit will remain behind."\(^{62}\)

Mahatma Gandhi stood for a simple and, more or less, self-sufficient living in the rural surroundings mainly because he could foresee that a highly sophisticated and centralised life in the cities would inescapably lead to the organisation of inhuman violences and aggressive nationalism resulting in international tensions and wars of unprecedented devastation. Gandhiji therefore advocated the establishment of ideal villages where the people could pursue the ideal of "simple living and high thinking." But this ideal has been criticised, ridiculed and even denounced as an opiate to keep the poor quiet and help the present social order to go on.

Dennish Meadow's is of the opinion that human environment is a shocking way and there is limit to the world material growth and the world economy faces a very gloomy picture in the new millennium if we do not change radically our present policies. The indiscriminate use of technology and the pursuance of industrialisation on competitive basis have led to serve economic and social consequences of new and different nature. The ever widening gap between rich and poor, worsening economic and political relations, economic imperialism, multinationals and techno structure are among the more important problems at both the internal and international levels, the solution of which is not becoming possible through the traditional and conventional methods of modern world. With reference to these problems the relevance of Gandhian ideas are very much emphasised by Tinbergen in the following words—"the rich of the earth should prepare themselves for the simpler life in future. The leading philosophy of the present day society which always asks for more material goods and does not attach much value at simplicity of life or modesty in claims has to be replaced by alternative

\(^{62}\) Ibid, vol. 48, p. 353
philosophies and surely much could be learned from Mahatma Gandhi's words and example. The real values of life do contain a sufficient quantity of goods and shelter, but it is not necessary to have the luxuries now aimed at. Cultural values will have to be upgraded again.  

According to Gandhiji advancement, is not only economic or industrial it is the ethical and spiritual progress of man's nobler pursuits for a higher and sublimer goal of life. Gandhiji Says, "Civilisation in the real sense of the term consists not in the multiplication, but in the deliberate and voluntary restriction of wants." Even the Laws of diminishing utility and the law of Insatiable wants clearly indicate that the more a man has the less he is able to derive pleasure from the articles of consumption.... The end consists in the total elimination of all the wants, existing at the moment". Just a few months before his death Gandhiji wrote to Mr. Nehru: "The New Social Order that we envisage should not be judged by the quantity of material comforts and luxuries that we are able to accumulate, by the high standard of moral and ethical values that govern the life of a nation." He advised simplification of the standards of living and that one should place voluntary limits on his property and practice self renunciation. Gandhiji held that "many of the so called comforts of life are not only indispensable but positive hinderances to the elevation of mankind." Having correctly diagnosed the disease, he called for the revival of village economy with indigenous industries so that the people could have enough to eat and keep the wolf off their doors.

Chesterton's article was an attack on the so called Indian awakening- His objection was not against Indians asking for independence or preserving their cultural heritage. His objection was against Indians asking for Western political system, education, philosophy etc. He wrote "The right of the people to express
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itself to be itself in action, was a genuine right. Indians have a right to be and live as Indians. But Herbert Spencer is not an Indian, his philosophy is not Indian philosophy; all his clatter about the science of education and other things is not Indian .... But this is our first difficulty that Indian nationalist is not national. As Bell rang an alarm on an earlier occasion, Chesterton's words acted as red signal. These words told Gandhiji where to stop and how to proceed. These words were ringing in his mind when he embarked the Kildonan castle on November 13, 1909. Though cool winds were cooling his body, the five of patriotism was smouldering within. There was the clash of ideas and ideals within. There was also the clash between the biting cold, literally and figuratively, outside and the burning five inside. This dialectical conflict brought about an awakening. Indian Home Rule or Hind Swaraj was Gandhi's answer to Chesterton. Dr. Chandran Devanesan calls it the "Manifesto of Gandhian Revolution." No one could now say that Indian nationalist were not national enough.

Indian Home Rule or Hind Swaraj was the product of Gandhiji's profound concern for the welfare of all. It was this concerned that prompted him to wage a relentless non-violent war in South Africa against racial discrimination and resultant injustice. Though Gandhiji's immediate aim was the attainment of true Swaraj for India his ultimate goal was the Swaraj of all mankind. Through the service of India, Gandhiji wanted to serve the whole mankind. By the establishment of Swaraj Gandhiji envisaged the possibility of a new world order, where Truth, Non-violence and Love would be the guiding principles in the relation between man and man and between State and State. Gandhiji wanted India to the lead to the world in this matter.

According to Gandhiji the root meaning of Swaraj being self-mode, it may be rendered as disciplined rule from within, and purna swaraj means...
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completely disciplined Self-rule. He makes a fine distinction between Swaraj and independence. Independence may mean Licence to do as you like. Swaraj is positive, independence is negative. The word Swaraj is a sacred word, a vedic word, meaning self-rule and self-restraint and not freedom from all, restraint which independence often means.

Gandhiji often interchanges the words Swaraj and Ramarajya. Of course Swaraj is the basis of Ramarajya. Ramarajya is the harmonious co-existence of persons who have attained self-control or Swaraj. Ramarajya is not possible without Swaraj. If true Swaraj or Puma Swaraj is attained by all, then Ramarajya will be its natural consequence. Gandhiji says Self-Government entirely depends upon our internal strength, upon our ability to fight against the heaviest odds. Indeed Self-Government which does not require that continuous striving to attain it and to sustain it, is not worth the name. I have therefore, endeavoured to show both in words and indeed that political Self-Government—that is Self-Government for a large number of men and women—is no better than individual Self-Government and therefore, it is to be attained by precisely the same means that are required for individual self-Government or Self-rule. Again Gandhiji says that "real Swaraj will come out by the acquisition of authority by a few but by the acquisition of the capacity by all to resist authority when abused. In other words Swaraj is to be attained by educating the masses to a sense of their capacity to regulate and control authority." The Swaraj of Gandhiji's dream recognised no racial or religious distinction. It was to be for all. A state where non-violence and love reign supreme, where everyone works according to one's capacity and consumes according to one's needs keeping in mind the welfare of all, would have attained Swaraj for the individuals and Ramarajya for all. This is what the
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Westerners call the Kingdom of God on earth. Gandhiji preferred to use the words Ramarajya probably because his "Swadeshism" or because the words of Chesterton were still ringing in his mind.

Ramarajya in the narrow Hindu context could mean the rule of Rama, the divine King. But it was not in this sense that Ramarajya was significant. For Gandhiji Rama was not merely a king. He is simply God. Ramarajya then means the Kingdom of God. Ramarajya is significant in another sense also. Rama's rule was an enlightened one. It was true Swaraj when true democracy prevailed, though it was in the form of a monarchy. Gandhiji calls Ramarajya as the charmarajya, the rule of dharma. It is also called People's Raj or democracy. As all are children of God/ it is only natural that everyone should receive a fair deal.

Gandhiji knew that the welfare of all, which was the ideal of Ramarajya/ depended on the moral conviction of the members of Ramarajya, depended on the moral conviction of the members of Ramarajya. This is why he insisted that moral values should guide all our actions. Gandhiji never wanted economics, or politics of religion or morality or any other worthwhile human concern to be kept apart from the other. All have to be mutually supporting and enhancing the value of life. For him politics bereft of religion is absolute dirt, ever to be shunned.\(^\text{76}\) That economics is untrue which ignores or disregards moral values.\(^\text{77}\) True economics never militates against the highest ethical standard, just all true ethics to be worth the name/ must at the same time be also good economics.\(^\text{78}\) His Ramarajya is a moral Kingdom where truth, love and respect for everything being are of supreme importance.

Eventhough Gandhiji insisted on the importance of moral principles in his Ramarajya, he was not unaware of the importance other factors in the
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attainment of human welfare. He also knew at man being physical, spiritual and social being all his needs responding to these natures should be satisfied at least in reasonable measure before he could be asked to be happy and contented. Ignoring any one in favour of the others not only does not lead to human welfare and social harmony but leads to political disharmony and distrust. He realised that a "Starving man thinks first of satisfying his hunger than anything else. We will sell his liberty and all for the sake of getting a morsel of food. For them liberty, God and all such words are merely letters but ether without the slightest meaning. They jar upon them. If want to give these people a sense of freedom, we shall have provide them with work which they can easily do in their desolate homes and which would give them a bare living.\textsuperscript{79} "Gandhiji understood that economic equality is the master key to non-violent independence\textsuperscript{80} and hence a very important aspect of his Ramarajya. He thought that by a few simple principles some kind of practicable economic equality would be achieved.

Gandhiji favoured "production by the masses" opposed to "mass production". But it is significant that he never opposed machinery as such; What he opposed was craze for machinery. Gandhiji was realist; he knew that every country needs certain large-scale industries to cater to vital needs-steel, cement and so on. He knew that even millions of blacksmiths cannot replace a steel plant. But according to him, such industries should be controlled and managed by the State and should occupy the least part of the vast national activities which will mainly be in the villages.\textsuperscript{81}

Gandhiji's plan of production by the masses also has other distinct advantages over mass production. As Dr. Schumacher wrote, "The system of mass production, based on sophisticated, highly capital intensive, high energy-input dependent, and human labour-saving technology presupposes that you are

\textsuperscript{79} The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, op. cit., XXX, p. 133
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already rich, for a great deal of capital investment, is needed to establish one single work place. The system of production by the masses mobilises the priceless resources which are possessed by all human beings, their clever brains and skilful hands, and supports them with first-class tools. The technology of mass production is inherently violent, ecologically damaging, self defeating in terms of non-renewable resources, and stultifying for the human person. The technology of mass production by the masses, making use of the best of modern knowledge and experience is conducive to decentralisation, compatible with the laws of ecology, gentle in its use of scarce resources, and designed to serve the human person instead of making him the servant of machines.82

For a moment, let us take it for granted that the total output under mass production is larger than that under the system of production by the masses; even the latter should be preferred over the former from the view point of distributional aspect. Gandhiji remarked, "Granting for the moment that machinery may supply all needs of humanity, still it would concentrate production in particular areas, so that you have to go in a round-about way to regulate distribution both in the respective areas where things are required, it is automatically regulated and there is less chance for fraud and none for speculation." It is worth nothing that vast organisations like the General Motors Corporation of the United States and the British National Coal Board have been decentralised to improve efficiency and promote employee's welfare and job satisfaction. Gandhiji's view on the social responsibility of business and his trusteeship theory constitute a revolutionary step in the field of socio-economic reform.

Absence of peace is both the cause and effect of tension in the social, national and international spheres. It frustrates all attempts at economic development/ social progress and human solidarity. Inspite of several efforts made by League of Nations and U.N.O. for co-operation and goodwill in the
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world, the battles have still been going on and a wave of cold war has swept
over the world which has created a suffocating atmosphere.

Recently, on 24th December 1999 at Kandahar, Indian Airlines Air Bus
was hijacked and 187 passengers were made as hostages. After the information,
the U.N.O. officials rushed to Kandahar, Afghanistan and they had a talk with
hijackers and at last the U.N.O. talk was failed. The hijackers never accepted
the demand made by the U.N.O. officials.

No where peace is found. The race for armament is still going on. The
U.N.O. recognises that the Government of almost all the countries of the world
are not prepared to renounce war for one reason or the other. War cannot
produce peace. It produces only war. One cannot expect peace from the balance
of power since it nourishes mutual hatred, struggle for widening the sphere of
influence, fear and suspicion, which may be the elements of generating wars.
Hence some new and basic thought will have to be adopted for permanent and
long lasting world peace.

Gandhiji an apostal of non-violent action never approved war—a violent
action. He rejected outright and condemned war as a means of resolving a
conflict. According to Gandhi the problem of peace was not just a political
problem involving the adjustment or rectification of relations between armed
nations. It was the problem of mankind, posing a challenge not only to states
but also to every individual human being and human group. He, therefore,
endeavoured to established peace between man and man, group and group and
nation and nation.

It was a life long conviction with Gandhiji that mankind and its
civilisation can be saved from destruction only through non violence. The
individual as well as his environment — local, national and international have
to be purged of violence. If the individual regenerates himself—through strict
self-discipline, and if the nations of the world reconstruct themselves along
non-violent lines, the emerging international order will naturally be peaceful
and co-operative. The great fear of a war and destruction could at once disappear. Indeed the adoption and practice of such an idea at global level is an urgent need of the day. Such a condition could avert the modern wars which have the potentiality to cause unimaginable horrors and destruction not once to the present generation but also to the coming generations. At the very outset one finds that his approach to the problem of world peace was overloaded with moral philosophy of life. It is for this reason that the Mahatma had been scoffed at by many of his critics as an Utopian, blind to the facts of the grim world of real politics. At the same time one has to be cautious while challenging Gandhian philosophy of life and his techniques of action. Gandhiji’s main aim was the "moral regeneration of human society" in which peace can be obtained. One has to take into account that moral philosophy does play an important role in the relation of human behaviour. In the same way the application of moral values in regulating the behaviour of nations is also possible. George Caltin, one of the important political scientists, is of the opinion that "the mission of Mahatma Gandhi was to be our educator, and to call the world's attention on the need for an education in the beauties of Ahimsa."\(^{83}\)

Gandhiji advised us to mobilise millions of people for non-violent resolution of conflicts and for the proper achievement and establishment of world peace. This would mean the adoption of the following ways:

a) "Starting a non-violent movement on the international level. Peace worker all over the world must unite."

b) Through peace education workers should bring a change in mentality of the masses and infuse the feeling of unity."

Peace workers of each nation should press their government for total disarmament which requires a strong public opinion. So long as total disarmament is not accepted at least nations should not join military pacts.

\(^{83}\) Ibid, p. 105
It would not be out of place to mention that apart from his own philosophy of peace, Gandhiji also advocated certain other measures such as disarmament, world peace organisation and world police to secure peace. Gandhiji suggested disarmament. In his own words Gandhiji says that "real disarmament cannot come unless the nations of the world cease to exploit one another. If the mad race for armaments continues, it is bound to result in a slaughter such as has never occurred in the history."

Gandhiji further said that, "absence of fundamental sincerity makes all talk about the limitation of armament meaningless. Not disarmament—whether partial or total in respect of nuclear weapons, but renunciation of all force is the answer to the problem of international peace."84

Gandhiji suggested that only a world organisation backed by a moral or non-violent sanction can guarantee international peace. He had given his own view regarding the nature of this world organisation different from the nature of the present day U.N.O.

According to Gandhiji this world peace organisation must have the following characteristics:

1. The individuals and the nations composing the world should be predominantly non-violent.
2. All the nations of the world should be fully independent. There can be no place in such a world for colonialism, imperialism and race hatred.
3. The distinction of big and small should be obliterated and every nation should feel as tall as the tallest. Each and every nation must be represented in the International organisation.
4. It should be based on general disarmament. Failing that some one nation, at least, should take the initiative and give a lead to the rest of the
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world. Its example may become infectious in course of time, even as the
example of the non-violent individual become infectious.

5. The International Society should be a voluntary organisation of States
for the common good, in which every nation should be willing to
sacrifice itself for all.

6. All disputes between nations should be settled peacefully and amicably
by such methods as negotiation, mediation and arbitration.

As a realist Gandhiji was prepared to concede that "there might be a
world police in the absence of universal belief in nonviolence." But this force
would be, "a concession to human weakness, not...an emblem of peace." This
would function more as a SHANTI SENA or a PEACE BRIGADE than a
modern fighting force. The successful implementation of the Gandhian
technique depends on the willingness of the individual to commit himself for
the chosen ideal with the attitude of "one step is enough to me." His manner of
living will indicate his commitment. What he is and does is not without
significance. The way to peace lies through peace.

Gandhiji's passion for Truth, found in every person a divine fire, with a
diamond-sharp sincerity, opposed every force which enslaved man, woman or
child. The central conviction of man's dignity and divinity flamed forth in
many revolutionary articles of faith and spread over the whole spectrum of
celestial and terrestrial being in the advaitic spirit. This became his God, that is
Truth, his human divine conception, his spiritual orientation, secular toleration
and belief in the moral order of mankind his conviction that higher values are
basic to politics, economics and other material pursuits, his fascination for
Sarvodaya and abjuration of violence his communism without cruelty and
government without coercion and his creed that there is innate goodness in
every man. And this is the secret of his merger with the hungry, the poor, the
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sick and the downtrodden. He was a Mahatma because he realised that regardless of station, colour, creed or skin, everyone was at man and any system that diminished or denied this truth was unjust, asuric and ultra vires.

The social philosophy that sustained his life-work and life style was a eclectic and open-minded as Gandhi himself. An open-minded system of social philosophy has one essential characteristic unity of thought and practice. The primacy of this unity was recognised by Gandhi.

Gandhi who did not claim adherence to any set ideology, described his continuing quest in the realms of thought and action as "Experiment with Truth". The thought and practice of Gandhi provides a fruitful area for rethinking, Gandhian ideas present a complete, even if not fully articulated, basis of an entire socio-ethical system. The dynamics of the relationship between Maxim and Truth and the "Welfare of all" and the operational role of non-violence will progressively bring into realisation the commodities of Gandhi's utility function. In short, Gandhi achieved a great change in history, through the application of the principle of Satyagraha. He turned the historic process into a supra-personal fact. Gandhiji presents ethical significance in terms of man's social responsibilities.

Gandhiji's speculative wisdom includes an enquiry into power structure, institutional frameworks, balance between technical skills and spiritual culture, ends and means to deal, with human and historical situation, moral facts in new economic order and a synthesis of individual and Social attitudes. Thus Gandhi drew all human activities into the widening not of philosophy. By asserting its centrality in all levels of thought and action, Gandhi stirs philosophy from its apathy of irrelevance.

Gandhiji was a revolutionary thinker. He revolted wherever the status quo offered a challenge to his conscience. His acceptance of spiritual determinism gave him supreme faith in the inevitable emergence of the non-violent society in the future. The emphasis on spontaneity, faith and devotion,
the acceptance of love as the supreme value, the demand for service and sacrifice, the insistence on the dignity of Truth—all these find full manifestation in the life and teachings of Gandhi. He was sanguine that political action would be made to conform to the ultimate values of the spirit.

Gandhij showed to the whole world the efficacy of the principle of live and peace as instrument of social change. His undying faith in the goodness of man and the efficacy of nonviolence is beyond doubt. Since the individual is the basis of all social progress, one should place greater reliance on the development of the individual than of any intellectual device. Man is not a "lost" creature. He is ever capable of self-development. The fundamental Gandhian means for bringing about social change rests on the reformation of the individual "internally, morally and spiritually". If all individuals practised self-control, a control over all senses, followed the principles of truth and non-violence in their daily dealings and tried to incorporate these principles in their thoughts and attitudes, society would gradually gravitate towards the ideal he cherished. Essentially, all the teachings of Gandhi, were entirely based on the concept of individual perfection by a strict adherence to Truth and Non-violence.

Gandhiji's devotion to individual rights made him a fighter for democratic freedom. He stressed communal unity and the absolute elimination of untouchability among the foundations of political freedom. Only a community constituted by persons imbued with a sense of deep social cohesiveness can attain the benefit of Swaraj. Hence it is essential to combine the quest for political individuality with the voluntary acceptance of social and political discipline which is the basis of social solidarity and cohesiveness.

According to Gandhiji, moral and spiritual freedom depend on the effective cultivation of the two ancient virtues of truth and non-violence. He
never accepted the view of freedom as arbitrariness or licence. Genuine Swaraj is a function of the development of inner sources of power.\textsuperscript{87}

Ideally, Gandhiji visualised a stateless society and repudiated the authority of the state at every level and in every form. Gandhiji as convinced that mere constitutional structures will not suffice for the concrete realisation of rights and hence he postulated the ideal of "Rama Rajya" which means the kingdom of love, justice and righteousness. This amounts to the synthesis of the Augustian conception of the kingdom of God on earth with the democratic ideal of the sovereignty of the people. Gandhiji believed in "Sovereignty of the people based on pure moral authority."

Traditional deprivation of the backward sanctions based on ascription was shifted to relative deprivation based on the new values of freedom and equality- Exploitation, suppression, illiteracy, poverty and host of other malpractices prevalent in the structure were opposed by Gandhiji. Gandhiji championed the concept of equality on metaphysical grounds. Everyman is equal in the eyes of God as the Bhagavad Gita points out. Hence every man should be legally, politically and socially equal. This presupposes his faith in justice. Gandhiji observes: the first condition of non-violence is justice in every department of life.\textsuperscript{88} The chief evils against which Gandhiji fought were racialism, imperialism, communalism and untouchability. His crusade for the liberation of the suppressed lower classes in India shows his deep attachment to the concept of Social and economic justice.\textsuperscript{89}

**THE DECEPTION OF DISARMAMENT**

For years, Gandhi campaigned for the view that peace was a matter of justice rather than of strength: "all the world over a true peace depends not
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upon gun powder but upon pure justice." Unless nations learned to be just by renouncing exploitation and their total reliance on force, there could never be peace on the earth. Armaments were both a symptom of force and a temptation to use force. Thus, instead of talking of a mere restriction of armaments, their quantity and quality, Gandhi pleaded passionately for complete, universal disarmament.

Apparently in thorough approval, he published in the columns of Young India, which he edited, an excerpt from a monthly called International Sunbeam: Total world disarmament, the only material safeguard for peace, should be the outward and visible sign of that inward mental disarmament on which alone outward peace can secure. So long, however, as one people is actually subjecting another to itself by superior military might even the very first step toward this inward mental disarmament has not been taken.90

Europe should take this first step, held Gandhi, "unless Europe is to commit suicide." The tendency to outdo one another in building up armaments would subside once that step were taken.

By the same token, it would be equally disastrous if India, after attaining its freedom, were to join the arms race: "For India to enter into the arms race is to court suicide. With the loss of India to non-violence the last hope of the world will be gone. ..." Gandhi hoped "that India will make non-violence her creed, preserve man's dignity, and prevent him from reverting to the type from which he is supposed to have raised himself. n91

The bloodshed of the Hindus and Muslims in the wake of partition and independence of India greatly distressed Gandhi, of course, but what exasperated him even more was the country swearing by the military and all that naked physical force implies. He said: our statesmen have for over two generations declaimed against the heavy expenditure on armaments under the
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British regime, but now that freedom from political serfdom has come, our military expenditure has increased and still threatens to increase and of this we are proud! However . . . the hope lingers in me and many others that India shall survive this death dance and occupy the moral height that should belong to her after the training, however imperfect, in non-violence for an unbroken period of thirty two years since 1915 [the year Congress accepted the method of nonviolent struggle for the country's freedom].

He saw little sense in India after attaining its freedom incurring a heavy defense budget and felt that the country was groaning under this unnecessary and unsupportable burden: "We are convinced that we do not need the arms that India is carrying." He stuck to his oft-repeated position that nothing could be more disastrous than India trying to imitate or rival the Western powers, including the United States, in their defense strategy based on military capability.

Gandhi unequivocally advocated that India—even Asia—take a lead with regard to disarmament. At the concluding session of the Asian Relations Conference at Delhi on April 2, 1947, he declared that the West is despairing of a multiplication of the atom bomb, because atom bombs mean utter destruction not merely of the West but of the whole world, as if the prophesy of the bible is going to be fulfilled and there is to be a perfect deluge. It is up to you to tell the world of its wickedness and sin that is the heritage your teachers and my teachers have taught Asia.

Gandhi was certainly opposed, however, to the forced disarmament of a nation. For instance, referring to the disarming of India during World War I, Gandhi declared with vehemence: Much as I abhor the possession or the use of arms, I cannot reconcile myself to forcible prohibition. As I said three years ago, this forcible disarmament of a people will be regarded by history as one of
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the blackest sins committed by the British Government against India. If people want to possess arms they ought to have them without ado. . . . We cannot learn discipline by compulsion. We must learn not to use arms or to use them with responsibility and self-restraint, notwithstanding the right to possess them.95

In the same spirit, he condemned the disarming of the vanquished as a punitive measure. This was not merely due to compassion; Gandhi believed that guilt of war was so pervasive that it was virtually impossible, and wrong, to apportion all the blame for it to just one of the parties at the expense of the other.96

If the great powers disarmed themselves, felt Gandhi, they would not only escape the ravages of war but also cover themselves in glory, restore sanity to the world, and earn the eternal gratitude of posterity. These powers would, at the same time, have to give up their imperialistic designs and exploitation of the weak and hapless, while revising their own way of life. All this, evidently, amounts virtually to a total revolution, the only alternative to which, in Gandhi's opinion, was absolute disaster. The great powers could not be expected to move in the direction of total revolution—contrary to what lifestyle they had thus far been used to—spontaneously, of course.97

Nor could disarmament be worked out overnight; it would take time. The one thing Gandhi was absolutely certain of was that it would come only through the adoption of nonviolence by a nation—indeed, by all the nations of the world. The evils of armaments can be cured, held Gandhi, by non-violence, which will eventually be the weapon of all nations. I say 'eventually' deliberately, because we shall have war and armaments for a very long time. It is two thousand years since Christ preached his "Sermon on the Mount" and the world has adopted only a fragment of the imperishable lofty precepts therein
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enunciated for the conduct of man toward man. Until we take all Christ's principles to our hearts, war, hatred and violence will continue.\(^{98}\)

It was wrong to think that armaments implied or imparted strength, for real strength, according to Gandhi, came by self-sacrifice, from within and not through physical force. He pointed out that the rishis (sages) of yore, themselves great warriors, realized the utter uselessness of force and "taught a weary world that its salvation lay not through violence but through non-violence."

Gandhi was emphatic that nations should strengthen themselves spiritually, for "Internal spiritual forces are stronger and induce a more certain and lasting life. It is not by arming yourself that you will guarantee peace to the world. External arms, guns, cannons and gas have only evil and passing results."\(^{99}\) To say that one is arming oneself for self-defense was, he said, "a wretched plea ... a bad thing," for, in effect, the result invariably was that you organized yourself to "prey upon ill organized communities and nations." The crux of the matter was that real disarmament could come only when "the nations of world cease to exploit one another."\(^{100}\)

Gandhi would not accept the proposition that, since disarmament chiefly depended upon the great powers, small, neutral and nonaggressive countries like Switzerland, for instance, should be forced to disarm. Gandhi asserted that the very fact of neutrality and non-aggressiveness of Switzerland rendered the army there completely redundant. Indeed, it would be a far superior thing for Switzerland to give the world a lesson in disarmament and establish that the Swiss are brave enough to live without an army. Nor was he willing to accept the proposition that the mere presence of the Swiss army had saved that country from being overrun by foreign armies. Rejecting both the deterrent role of the Swiss military forces as well as the value of military development,
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Gandhi astutely pointed out the fallacies involved: Will the questioner forgive me if I say that a double ignorance underlies this question? He deplores the fact that, if you give up the profession of soldiering, you will miss the education you receive in service and sacrifice. None need run away with the idea that because you avoid military conscription you are not in for a conscription of a severer and nobler type. When I spoke to you about labour, I told you that labour ought to assimilate all the noble qualities of soldiering: endurance and defiance of death and sacrifice. When you disarm yourself, it does not mean that you will have a merry time. It is not that you are absolved from the duty of serving your homes when you give up soldiering; on the contrary, your women and children would be taking part in defending your homes.

He wrote: Again I am not talking to you without experience. In the little institution [sic] that we are conducting, we are teaching our women and children also how to save that institution —as we are living among thieves and robbers. Everything becomes simple and easy the moment you learn to give up your own life in order to save the life of others. And lastly, it is really forgotten that safety which an individual derives from innocence is safety which no amount of arms will give you. The second part of the ignorance lies in the second part of the question. I must respectfully deny the truth of the statement that the presence of the Swiss army prevented the War from affecting Switzerland. Although Belgium had its own army, it was not saved and if the rival armies had wanted a passage through Switzerland, believe me, they would have fought you also. You might have fought in turn, but you would have fought much better non-violently.101

With regard to nuclear weapons, Gandhi thought it quite futile merely to restrict them; he seriously doubted that the nations possessing them would remain content merely with their possession. Dismissing the efficacy or permanence of "balance of terror" or "balance of nonuse" and the supposition
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that their "overkill" capacity by itself would induce and enforce nonviolence in
the world, he emphasized that so long as the thinking in these quarters
remained rooted in violence we will continue heading toward disaster and self-
destruction. Indeed, "the violent man's eyes would [be] lit up with the prospect
of much greater amount of destruction and death which he could now wreak,"
Gandhi said. At best the destructive capability of these weapons may
temporarily postpone the outbreak of war. "Like a man gutting himself with
dainties to the point of nausea and turning away from them only to return with
redoubled zeal after the effect of nausea is well over. Precisely in the same
manner will the world return to violence with renewed zeal after the effect of
disgust is worn out. "102 Gandhi quite frankly considered the "balance of terror"
to be nothing more than the "preparations for a third World War." He was
willing to concede that atomic energy "may be utilised . . . for humanitarian
purposes" but was sure that it would not be confined to that alone.

According to Gandhi, nations armed themselves out of fear of each other
and to guard their imperialist possessions. Quite early in his life, echoing the
philosophy of the Gita, Gandhi in his Hind Swaraj asserted that nations armed
themselves because they were filled with the fear that others may take away
their possessions; force was used when people were under the spell of fear, and
"what is gained through fear is retained only for as long as fear is present. "103
At the same time, fear breeds hatred. Apparently then, the very first step that
nations must take toward ensuring peace was to dispel fear and, along with it,
mistrust. Gandhi said his instincts told him that if you do not intend violence to
anyone, no one will use it against you either: "It is only when we are afraid of
our opponent, we employ unclean strength like his that we learn unclean ways
and so become weak. ... If we meet uncleanliness with cleanliness, the total
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result would be less of uncleanliness and the people, the world, would be happier for this."\textsuperscript{104}

Gandhi put it succinctly and without any equivocation when he declared: Peace will never come until the Great Powers courageously decide to disarm themselves. . . . I have an implicit faith—a faith that today burns brighter than ever, after half a century's experience of unbroken practice of non-violence—that mankind can only be saved through non-violence.\textsuperscript{105}

And here, Gandhi saw an independent India in the role of a catalyst. In an interview for the News Chronicle, soon after his release from prison in 1944, he observed: I am a lover of peace through and through. After independence was assured, I would probably cease to function as adviser to the Congress and as an all war resister I would have to stand aside, but I shall not offer any resistance against the national Government or the Congress [if they decided to support the war effort]. My co-operation [to the war effort] will be abstention from interfering with even tenor of life in India. I shall work with the hope that my influence will be felt to keep India peace minded and so affect the world policy towards real peace and brotherhood among all without the distinction of race and colour.\textsuperscript{106}

Gandhi maintains, "perfect peace comes when mind and heart are pure."\textsuperscript{107} All his life, he bent the entire energies of his being in purifying the heart and elevating the mind of his countrymen with the contagion of his tireless pursuit of truth—concretized in nonviolence, fearlessness, sense of responsibility and duty, and a loving concern for his fellow beings. Congenital optimist perhaps, but certainly one who had implicit, unbounded, and a proud faith in his country and countrymen, Gandhi seemed to expect unilateral disarmament in India. Perception by a newly independent India may be blunted
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for a time with the euphoria of emancipation. But Gandhi was confident that "even in my absence my influence for peace will last; though I may be far away, my spirit will remain behind." 108

The Central Principles of Gandhian Thought on economics, politics, social reform and prove their relevance to "THE NEW WORLD ORDER." The relevance of Gandhian ideas, and their universal applicability is precisely because of the fact that his ideas and thoughts are not based on colonial dominations and exploitative attitudes, cut throat competition, and some other material and worldly values. As against these they are based on strong human values with moral and spiritual touching. He wanted to give a spiritual touch to all economic, social, political and other problems which he thought as the root cause of all prosperity and happiness. His ideas were always to the best interests and to the real solution of the problems of man kind.

One may argue that the Gandhian declarations on peace contain some practical difficulties for them to be implemented in the present day world. But Gandhi himself would not countenance such a "practical" difficulty. He would counterpoise by saying: "If an individual can practice non-violence, why not whole groups of individuals and whole nations? He believed that one must make a beginning and the rest would follow. The Gandhian concept of world peace should be viewed as in integral part of his philosophy of life and one should try to appreciate his attitude within the general frame work of philosophy of ahimsa. Good means alone can lead us to ever lasting peace. If peace is established by violence it will be of no use. Now a days quite often we read in the newspapers that police, in some places army, marching into an agitating place and peace being established. But that peace is undoubtedly that of the grave yard." But when the non-violent person wins, he wins the heart of the foe.

Peace is a relationship between people and between certain kinds of people. Peace begins with a harmony between individuals. Gandhiji lived and worked for the establishment of such relationship among individuals and groups. His is an unique contribution to peace in the modern context. Gandhiji's style of life and the techniques he propounded deserve to be studied and applied so that the world may be a safe place to live. Gandhian ideas were relevant during his life-time, continue to be relevant in the New Millennium and shall remain so for many decades to follow.

Albert Einstein rightly declared that Gandhi showed how someone could win allegiance, "not merely by the winning game of political fraud and trickery, but through the living example of a morally exalted way of life." Einstein considered Gandhi to be the most enlightened statesman of their time, and he predicted. The problem of bringing peace to world on a supranational basis will be solved only by employing Gandhi's methods on a large scale.