CHAPTER 2

GANDHI'S CONCEPTION OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY

This chapter examines Gandhi's conception of international society and analysis the type of (dis)order it creates. It also conceptualizes Gandhi's strategy for improving as well as for transcending the existing unjust international order.

Nature and Functioning of International Society

Intuitively, Gandhi presumes, like Kant, that there is an international society and it is composed of mainly two elements: (1) nation-states; and (2) of Mankind i.e. individuals at base. Now we will discuss his views on both the components, one by one.

Gandhi and Nation-State

To Gandhi, nation-state appears as two odd phenomena, the 'nation' and the 'state,' subsumed under one single entity. The concept of nation represents according to him a meaningful combination of individuals, each with a distinct potentiality of his own to fulfill a common mission. The state, on the other hand, is a mechanical arrangement super-imposed on a nation. For Gandhi, nation stands for creativity and vitality, while the
state is an archetype of convention and conservatism. Gandhi, therefore, wants to make sure that social potentiality of nation-hood should not be eclipsed by an overwhelming concern of the state to ensure conformity of the people to its political and military prescriptions. Gandhi never wants the state to stifle the creativity of the people as a so-called controller of the destiny of a nation.

Whenever Gandhi writes on 'state,' he painfully points out imperfections and dangers of modern state. He seeks to cut it (state) to its size by propounding a social theory in which the state largely loses its deceptive luster and turns into a mere necessary evil. While expressing his fear upon increasing the power of the state, Gandhi writes, "I look upon an increase in the power of the state with the greatest fear because although while apparently doing good by minimizing exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality which lies at the root of all progress." The state does not possess moral personality or entity as it is an artificially devised mechanism which is bound to be value-neutral. Human intervention whether 'moral' or 'immoral' shapes it into what it becomes. The entire history of political thought deals with the question of 'how to transcend from the notion of 'is' to 'ought' - but for the human concern for good life- 'ought' would have never been an agenda for reformers. The state, being a legal structure, can hardly obtain just order with the help of law alone. Unless the state, as a legal instinct, transcends its limitations - it can not be ideal to achieve denied goals of peace, order and justice.
For Gandhi, the operationalizing principles of International Society are mainly two: the 'force' within the state (violence), and the feeling of nationalism among the people. He considers these two - the feeling of nationalism and the force of arms and army the basis of nation-state system. In other words, nation-state projects itself in international society by the ideology of 'nationalism' and by the display of army and modern weapons. Nation State, in another sense of the term, is an attempt to strike compatibility between its identity which rests on its rooted and cultivated characteristics and its legal structure.

Armaments and Army

The 'state' (which is an organized violence) projects its 'force' aspect in international relations through its accumulated sophisticated arms, weapon system and by well organized and well-trained professional army. The army which is not only loyal to the state, but also having patriotic feeling for a nation, and which is keen to sacrifice themselves and eliminate other in a total war. Every state thinks that it will become powerful if it builds armaments. It upgrades its security vis-a-vis other states.

Gandhi outright rejects the thesis that states get their strength by armaments. If the nation-states needs armaments, Gandhi believes, it means that the international order is ill organized, and that something is seriously wrong with the system. It is fallacious to believe that the
standing army gives nations the 'deterrent' power as well as a sense of security. The deterrence emerges from the conviction in the enemy that the entire nation will fight tooth and nail. According to Gandhi, strength does not come from armaments.

The real strength, Gandhi believes firmly, comes from self-sacrifice, from within and not through physical force. He advises nations to strengthen themselves spiritually. Real safety comes from innocence. He writes, "... it is really forgotten that safety which an individual derives from innocence is safety which no amount of arms will give you."

The idea of 'peace through war' is ridiculed by Gandhi. For him, it is a misconception and hypocrisy. Peace can never be achieved by the disastrous means of war. Gandhi has no faith in the idea that nuclear deterrence (balance of terror) will prevent war. Gandhi maintains that at best the destructive capability of these weapons may temporarily postpone the outbreak of war.

Gandhi views the root cause of armament lust, on the part of the nation-state, to dominate others. If there is no greed, there will be no need for armaments. States arm themselves mainly because they are afraid of each other. Generally, 'force' is used when people are under the spell of fear and what is gained through fear is retained only as long as fear is present. Exploitation and fear give birth to phenomena of war, and nuclear weapons are the natural consequences of it. There is no hope for peace in the world, Gandhi believes, so long as the lust for dominance through power and exploitation, is not curbed.
Disarmament: Abolition of the Means of Violence

Gandhi suggests immediate solution of arms race. He advocates total disarmament. He denounces the idea of arms control. For him, armaments are both a symptom of force and a temptation to use it. By total disarmament, he means to remove, not only symptom of force but its temptation as well. Gandhi stands for total, complete and universal disarmament.

Mental Disarmament

In the context of mental disarmament, Radhakrishnan is worth quoting: "War begins in the minds of men where it could be prevented." Gandhi pleads that the states should, first of all, disarm themselves mentally. People must reject armaments psychologically. Nations must disarm themselves with inner-most mental conviction that arm race is disastrous and will ruin the entire international society. Gandhi wants people to create public opinion and environment against armaments. He believes that if people are convinced from within, they will influence the decision making power of the state. He firmly believes that the elite can play vital role in this. For Gandhi, inward mental disarmament will lead to the total world disarmament. And the total world disarmament will be the only visible sign of that inward mental disarmament. Peace can be secured only by total disarmament. Gandhi advocates that first mental disarmament should be achieved. This means that, he is against enforcing it on nation-state. He knows that no state can be taught discipline by compulsion, it is to be learnt by its own will.
Gandhi is realist enough to understand that the idea of total disarmament can never be operationalized overnight. It is time consuming to convince people and create favourable opinion by which people would determine to seek some arrangement alternative to some arrangement alternative to the ideal of 'security through armaments.' The alternative to armaments suggested by Gandhi is 'non-violence' (non-violent army). Gandhi firmly believes that people will have to learn to fight by non-violent means which will eventually be the weapons of all nations. Although Gandhi is optimistic he knows the human nature. Brief elaboration as to why human nature is to be blamed. He knows that man learns slowly and only after paying a price for it.

The real disarmament can only be effected provided the nations of the world cease to exploit one another. For Gandhi, nations build armies not to deter other nations or to invade, the chief purpose of a modern nation is to exploit other nations economically. In order to hide this motive, nation justifies its building of armaments in the name of security.

**Unilateral Disarmament**

Gandhi advocates a policy of unilateral disarmament before general or total disarmament is achieved. He appealed to the Great Powers of his time to take initiative in disarming themselves. He expressed, "Peace will never come until the great powers courageously decide to disarm themselves." He had great faith in individual initiative. All good things, Gandhi believed,
begin with one single person. He urged that initiative towards disarmament should be taken soon by some country. He pleaded to Great Britain to take initiative in this direction and set the example. Gandhi wrote, "Some nation will dare disarm herself and to take large risks. The level of non-violence in that nation... will be unerring, her decision will be firm, her capacity for heroic self-sacrifice will be great and she wants to live as much for other nations as for herself."

In unilateral disarmament, Gandhi views a bold but perfectly feasible course of action. Unilateral disarmament, however, will not eradicate international anarchy at one stroke but, according to him, it will be a new step in that direction.

**Nation and Power Hungry Elite**

Gandhi views the nation-state as two odd phenomena, but according to him, the nation-state system operates mainly because of violence on the part of state and of the feeling of oneness amongst the citizens of a nation. Gandhi recognizes 'nationalism' as an organizing principle of the people at a national level, but the same principle functions as disorganizing or dysfunctional principle at international level. At domestic societal level, nationalism unites people of different colour, castes, creed and culture. Nationalism is directly connected with the feeling of patriotism. Patriotism makes us to forget our differences or helps us to tolerate those differences. Thus, feeling of nationalism unites
people within the states. Gandhi wonders how it can divide nations at a
global societal level. It is astonishing for him, Gandhi asks, how
nationalism a binding element within a nation becomes a fragmenting force
at international level.

Gandhi argues how can 'nationalism' teach us to hate other nation when
the same feeling of nationalism teaches us to love our fellow citizen at
national level. Hence, for Gandhi 'nationalism' per se is not bad but
badness lies with those who hold power in a state. The selfishness and the
spirit of exploitation nurtured by the power wielder at national level
impel them to fight with others and prosper at the cost of others. Greedy
rulers exploit positive feeling of nationalism and teach people to ruin
others. Hatred for other nation is not an independent attribute of
nationalism. According to Gandhi, the principle of nationalism itself
should not be blamed for its dysfunctionality at international level. The
real blame goes to the selfish leaders of the nation-state who exploit this
principle to become dysfunctional or disorganizing one.

**Negative Nationalism**

Gandhi does not condemn feeling of nationalism per se, but if, in its
name national leaders preach hatred for other nation it has undesirable
repercussions at international level. People are made to think in terms of
'myself' and 'others.' The elite in the nation do so, especially in the
West, because it helps them to stick to powers in their nations. The lust
for power and greed in national leaders create hurdles in the way of removing international anarchy. To Gandhi, one's love for one's own nation is not desirable "such a love is an armed peace." The main problem for Gandhi is how to persuade and change national leaders who preach and practice narrow and selfish nationalism.

While he blames the West for spreading feeling of negative nationalism, Gandhi describes it as too much materialistic, selfish and narrowly nationalistic. What one requires is an international mind, which would ponder over welfare and spiritual advancement of all mankind.

Positive Nationalism

Gandhi, therefore, pleads for positive nationalism, which is another form of internationalism. It teaches nations to learn to live for each other. In Gandhi's thinking, nationalism which teaches hatred for another nation is not in tune with positive nationalism. Nationalism can become reality only when peoples of different countries and cultures are organized in such a way that they are capable of acting as one entity.

But we can not develop internationalism because leaders of nations persuade people that if the feeling of nationalism is extended to the society of states, they may loose their identity as a nation. To Gandhi, it is a misplaced fear. Nationalism is not against internationalism. Gandhi believes that internationalism pre-supposes nationalist, and not a narrow,
selfish, greedy spirit that is often spread under the name of nationalism.

Gandhi's Conception of Nationalism

In Gandhian conception of nationalism, lies the under-current of cooperation and understanding of one people by others in the spirit of humanity and sympathy, rather than in that of arrogance. Gandhi's positive nationalism, is, thus, a part of internationalism. His nationalism does not mean to have any malice, ill-will or contempt for others. It means to have only "good will and peace." He proclaims, "my nationalism is intense internationalism." His patriotism includes good will for mankind in general. The ultimate goal of humanity, to Gandhi, is to achieve brotherhood of all people in the world. It can be achieved provided we convert (the principle of) negative nationalism into a positive one which teaches us to unite, and never to divide. In Gandhi's views, nation-state system can further be strengthened by the ideology of nationalism. The sovereign state-system is weak until the rise of the feeling of nationalism. By that, if becomes the nation-state system. The feeling of nationalism on the part of a citizen makes the system rigid. The national leaders exploit the feeling of nationalism for their narrow selfish motives. The rise of narrow nationalism within the nation makes the system even more anarchical. The two world wars were the horrifying results of the nation-state system prevailing in the first half of the twentieth century. Inspite of the horrifying and bitter experiences, peoples of the world
passed through the system have not improved. The peoples have still remained victims, of narrow nationalism. Gandhi, therefore, wants nationalism to become a force compatible with internationalism.

The main problem for Gandhi is not, therefore, 'nationalism' as such, but how to persuade national leaders not to preach and practice (narrow negative and selfish) nationalism. Gandhi does not see any tension between 'nationalism' and 'internationalism' because they operate at two different levels. He also does not see any contradiction between these two powerful forces. Gandhi is convinced that internationalism is a mere extension of nationalism and the unifying factor is the people, and not the state, irrespective of their diverse identities. In this sense Gandhi integrates nationalism with internationalism and wants it to be 'human centric' in nature.

**Gandhi's Notion of Natural Law**

Like Grotius, Gandhi intuitively evolves a notion of Natural Law. However, there is a difference between them. Grotius propounds a theory of natural law which is basically binding to the mankind as a whole. Gandhi derives his notion from the Indian notion of Dharma. The Indian notion of Dharma is interpreted as an all pervading principle of harmony and of mutual interdependence among all elements of nature and society. It is the principle of 'Truth' which, according to Gandhi, prevails ultimately. It is called 'Natural' because it re-asserts itself when disturbed. It is the
same everywhere and at all times. It is 'Sanatana', i.e., Eternal. The Gandhian social theory is simple because SAT as 'Atman' pervades in each member of a society, and society is a system (Rta) in which sub-system (members) are interdependent entities.

As against the Western tradition of an intellectually postulated natural Law, Gandhi emphasizes an intuitive factor, common to the whole humanity, which he calls 'SAT' at the impersonal level and 'Atman' at the personal level. By virtue of this common factor, human society is a system whose members are governed by the law of interdependence. These members can be nations, regions or individuals. The unity of the whole, which expresses itself through the cordial relations of the parts and filial relations among individual persons, is the basic law. Humanity, therefore, has to be organized to secure an unimpeded operation of this law against elements in the world which would like to harm the interests of mankind or its part.

The Fundamental Law

According to Gandhi, man and institutions formed by him function within the gamut of the fundamental law of universe. Gandhi's fundamental law refers to the fundamental unity in the universe which sustains order and life. Hence man, normally does not live by destruction. While referring to it, Nirmal Bose interprets that Gandhi has drawn that law from history which operates behind universal processes. Many may call it as beyond
one's knowledge; although it is there all the same. Under the influence of that law, mankind makes progress, in course of time, towards a deeper realization of the essential unity of life. Barriers between communities can be pulled down gradually with the help of this law.

The chief purpose of human life is realization of the fundamental law of universe. Then it is the duty of every individual to set his life in accordance with the law. He has to help in the historical process of social progress. If we wish then to break down narrowness which cramps the growth of human life, which is either inherited from the past or handed down by institutions founded in the past, our method of change should also be informed by a higher degree of brotherhood among men. While trying to non-cooperate with institutions, we should bear no ill-will for our opponents, but should seek patiently to convert them through self-suffering. Finally, opponents have to be turned into willing partners with us in creating a new order of life based upon a sense of human unity.

The law of manual labour, according to Gandhi, is a moral law of life. All men have to share the common toil for preservation of life. Such toil will deepen the feeling of fellowship among men.

A civilization based on equality is possible only if all men recognize the law of bread labour and also place their talents, whether moral or material, whether self-acquired or inherited, according to the existing laws of inheritance, at the disposal of the community for common human welfare.
Gandhi, however, propounds his theory of Natural Law in the context of domestic society and evolves many doctrines viz. the doctrine of "the inner voice," the 'Satyagraha,' 'Non-Cooperation Movement,' 'Satya, Ahimsa, Trusteeship, Sarvodaya, Gram-raj, Ramraj etc.

There is no single instance in our knowledge in which Gandhi applied these doctrines himself in international context. Most of his campaigns were undertaken in national context. No one is sure whether these techniques can be mechanically repeated in international situations. However, Gandhian notion of natural law of the essential human unity provides an answer to the threat of total human annihilation on the globe by nuclear holocaust. The problem of survival from nuclear holocaust is not merely a problem faced by nations, it is a problem faced by each man and woman as on the earth. The nation-state system can not save them. On the contrary 'people' of the nation-state are left to suffer consequences of the blunders and misdeeds of their national leaders. Under the circumstances, the nations can not unite people. Only 'people' have to unite themselves, as Gandhi's notion reminds us that we share the whole humanity and not artificially created nation-states.

The message Gandhi left for us, in the international context, is that 'people' of the world have to organize themselves, in addition to the organization of nation-states. The nation-states do not even promise the survival of its citizens which is its primary duty. Under such circumstances, if the mankind does not organize itself in an alternative way, international politics will degenerate into an oligopoly. There will
be competitions amongst powerful nations to establish hegemony over weaker nations of the world. The building of alternative organization and fostering of cooperation following Gandhi's philosophy of Natural law is the first step in the direction of achieving permanent ally of peace. Through his conception of 'natural law' Gandhi puts forward a universally recognized functional reality which has undisputed logic of its operation and, therefore, the strength of his argument is not his own. He only interprets it in his words and that is open for all other states to accept, yet difficult to reject.

Gandhi on War, and Justice

According to the political school of world order, the main cause of the outbreak of war is break down in the present international order. Gandhi goes beyond this and asks why the so-called break down takes place. He does not blame the nation-state system. He blames lack of righteousness on the part of national leaders. According to Gandhi, greed, urge to exploit individuals and opportunities and desire to dominate them are the root causes of outbreak of war. Gandhi, therefore, opposes aggression, whether or not it directly employs military force and receives legal recognition from the concerned parties or from international community. He always disapproves collective security system in order to prevent war mainly because it employs 'military force.' According to Gandhi one force confronting another can not create peace. In this way, peace can never be achieved by force. On the contrary the use of 'force' gets legitimized, in such a system.
Ideologically, Gandhi blames western imperialism, fascism and communism as serious threat to the world peace and as causing wars. Besides this political forces, he views man's economic greed and recourse to violence as deeper sources of aggression. International ideologies driven by diplomacy, propaganda or subversion sometimes cause havoc in internal affairs of other nations. Hence, Gandhi condemns those ideologies and economic, political and military practices generated of them, because they lead to inter-state conflicts or threaten the world peace.

Economic Causes of War

Gandhi interprets colonialism and war in economic terms. While commenting on the British East India Company, Gandhi wrote in 1909 that its object was to increase its commerce and to make money. He further declared that once British imperialism was established, it would maintain arms chiefly to protect its commerce. He, thus, blames "exploitative colonialism as the first cause of war." He claims that European powers fought chiefly to redistribute colonial spoils.

Gandhi on International Treaties

International order operates through two devices. First, it operates either through the systems of balance of power, balance of terror; or through the principle of deterrence (non-use of nuclear power). Second devices view, especially advocated by Bull, maintains that state system
survives through customs, conventions, agreements or treaties. According to Gandhi, both these devices are not adequate enough to maintain order in international society. To Gandhi, international treaties and agreements are just patch works for survival. It is not a lasting solution either to make it function permanently or to turn it into a world order system based on human consideration.

The turbulent period of Indian freedom struggle which Gandhi lived and led was the period between the two world wars. This period gave birth to many international treaties in order to keep the international order going somehow. Gandhi charges openly the Allied Power after the victory in the first world war that they did not have intention either to improve the international order or to create the world order based on justice. The case, he quotes, is that of the Versailles Peace Treaties (1919). In his opinion, it was "a treaty of revenge against Germany by the victors," on the conclusion of World War I. He observes, "If the terms (of the 1919 peace treaties) which are announced had been described as the terms of war, the description would have been truer to facts."

In his views, forced peace is not a true peace. It is a violation of truth. Peace can never be imposed from without, it should flourish from within. Peace concluded through war is not real peace; it is at best a patched up situation resulting from mutual exhaustion. It can not create a new order. Gandhi regrets that the Allied Powers did not show understanding or consideration for Germany in the Versailles treaty. He predicted that the (the first world) war which was greater than the Mahabharat war was
just a prelude to a still greater war.... He further said, "If the defeat of Germany and the Central Powers ended the German peril, the victory of the Allies had brought into a period no less deadly to the peace of the world. While commenting on the Second World War he wrote: "The War will end this year or next, it will bring victory to the Allies. The pity of it is that it will be only so-called.... that victory will be assuredly a prelude to a deadlier war...."

While commenting on a treaty with Turkey, Gandhi described the treaty as a, "monument of human arrogance and man made injustice... is a triumph not of humanity but a demonstration of inhumanity." Gandhi rejected Kellogg-Briand Pacts (of August 1928) as a peace move, as by that pact, the signatories were to announce war as an instrument of national policy. Gandhi dubbed it as a device "to carry on the joint exploitation peacefully," and described it only as another attempt to preserve status-quo. With regard to the Munich Pact, Gandhi said that it merely postponed the war, "the danger of war has been averted for the time being." Gandhi believed, "it marked Hitler's personal triumph of violence." While commenting on Munich Pact, after a decade, Gandhi described it as "peace without honour," and "Europe has sold her soul for the sake of a seven days earthly existence." Gandhi condemned the secret treaties signed during the first world war, as he saw that they could not ensure peace. According to his, it was a convenient arrangement for achieving a particular objective. The signatories were not serious about it, and they even considered, "their own written word as to much waste paper." He
Thus, Gandhi had no faith in bilateral peace treaties concluded by any two or more than two countries. All these treaties, according to him, were motivated to serve selfish, narrow national interests and also to buy time for future possible war. Gandhi says, "peace must be just and in order to be that it must neither be punitive nor vindictive.... The fruit of peace must equally be shared."

Gandhi realized that either bilateral arrangement (Peace Treaties) or multinational arrangement through a type of international institution (League of Nation) might help in perpetuating international order. But this international order was not worth as it was based on injustice and exploitation of the weak by the strong such status-quo would work in favour of the Allied powers and all efforts were directed in preserving that status-quo. For Gandhi, this type of international order can not yield peace and preserve it. It can not create an atmosphere for disarmament or internationalism.

**Gandhi's Concept of Justice in World Politics**

This section abstracts Gandhi's thinking on justice in three parts: Firstly, it inquires Gandhi's meaning of justice in world politics; secondly it analyses, how far Gandhi related 'order' to justice; and
thirdly, to what extent, Gandhi thinks order and justice as conflicting concepts and what is his priority? All of these three are treated simultaneously.

Gandhian Meaning of Justice Within the International Order

(Inter-State Justice)

General Definition of Justice

Gandhi's concept of 'justice' embodies 'Sarvodaya' ("the good of all") as against the maximum good of the maximum people. It is a plea for concern and consideration for the good of the down trodden and or the most neglected man. Gandhi knows that "an ideal is never fully realized in life." It is an ideal, a glorious distant goal which one should strive to achieve. Gandhi takes it as a reference point which indicate to man a direction rather than the destination. In order to realize the goal of sarvodaya, a predominantly non-violent society - internal, and international and world societies - need to be created.

Inter-State Justice

Gandhi's 'sarvodaya; refers to the good for all states in an international society irrespective of any consideration. In order to create an international society, he pleads for "economic justice," sovereign
equality, and peaceful cooperation among states as requisites for international harmony. He visualizes that the present international order is based on injustice as economic injustice is endemic in international society under the domination of western colonialism. Strong nations exploit weak ones and the weaks are at receiving ends. According to Gandhi, 'peace' can be preserved in international society provided it backs the idea of self-determination of most peoples. Gandhi stands for the rules of morality which confers rights and duties upon states and nations. He advocates that all states, irrespective of their size, or racial composition, or ideological leaning, are entitled to equal rights of sovereignty. He pleads for the idea that all nations are also entitled to equal rights of national self-determination.

In international society, the main participators are 'states.' Hence, the state becomes the main focus of everyday discussion of justice in world affairs. Gandhi agreed to the idea of General Justice in international society as he believed that every state does not have only rights and duties in legal terms but also has moral duties to perform - it has to ensure that its policy remains morally correct. He supports the claim of a sense of equality or fairness in treatment between India and other states, or between defeated nations and victorious ones. He pleads specifically for substantive justice by which he claims moral right to sovereignty or independence for all the states in the world. He asserts the right of equal treatment among states of the world, specifically in voting in international assembly. This is because India and other colonies were denied right to vote in the League of Nations, Thus, he also stands for
arithmetical justice. Gandhi often argues out his case for justice from the point of view of a common good of a world community while pleading for distributive justice. He, thus, deals with all sorts of justice in society.

Gandhi pleads for generous attitude to be adopted by the Allied Powers to the vanquished ones while concluding peace treaties. He never conceives a world which has to live under the fear of bomb. Big nations, by monopolizing atomic weapons, blackmail weak nations. This is a part of injustice. He declared that no nation can bully others and no nation should live in fear. Unless this is ensured, justice can not be resorted.

Gandhi propagates interstate fellowship and good will. He has great conviction in dharmic law (law of living) which imposes moral obligation on states, as well as on individuals. He advocates that disputes should be settled amicably at the level of the parties concerned. Orientation of justice, according to him, is based on the idea of 'one world' incorporating the ideals of "truth" and "non-violence."

Justice and War

Gandhi witnessed many small and big wars during his life span. He even participated in the Boer and the Zulu wars as a non-combatant soldier during his stay in the South Africa. The two World Wars were fought when he was at the centre stage of national politics of India. In the First World War, he even recruited soldiers for the British Empire. On every occasion,
Gandhi expressed his views on war. From Boer War to Indo-Pak War on Kashmir, on many such occasions, Gandhi proclaimed that war is evil, nevertheless he maintained that "under exceptional circumstances war may have to be resorted to as a necessary evil even as the body is."

Gandhi maintains that in war 'justice' goes with one of the two sides. War can therefore, enable justice to triumph. He writes, "If the motive is right it (war) may be turned to the profit of mankind and that an 'ahimsaist' may not stand aside and look on with indifference but must make his choice and actively cooperate or actively resist." However, he shows strong and clear preference to resist, he show strongly and clear preference to resist the war by non-violent means, the total satyagraha. But if a nation is not trained in nonviolent resistance or does not know the techniques of it, it can even resist it with violence. He prefers violent resistance in war rather than to cowardly submission to the aggressor. To him, "all killing is not himsa."

Gandhi considers war a vital activity that no nation can remain neutral or detached. He categorically states that if we live in a state and procure all benefits from it (food, protection, etc.) it becomes our duty as a citizen to defend the state. Neutrality in such case is an escapism or cheating oneself from within. Justifying his participation in war he once stated, "The choice before me was only that either we must renounce the benefits of the state or help it to the best of our ability." Gandhi told pacifists that adopting intellectual neutrality during wartime is always indefensible. No matter how much they detest violence, they must decide
which is the just side in a military contest.

In short, Gandhi never believed that war is the absence of justice. He however, maintains that peace is superior to war in all respects. He also believes that war is inbuilt in the nation-state system and, therefore, it breaks out every now and then. Although war is cruel and brutalizing the mankind it is related to justice to the extent that it is a adopted by the parties to realize justice. Gandhi however, never agrees that war is the method to bring about justice.

Atomic Weapons and Justice

War is fought, according to Gandhi, in order to achieve justice. War may not be rational or national in nature. But it is instrumental to achieve justice. With whatever words, we may condemn war. However, it is fought to win in order to get justice. One side must win and other must loose. War is not meant for total destruction. War is not massacre. Echoing this feeling Gandhi states that use of nuclear weapons can never be 'just,' and nothing of value results from an atomic war. Gandhi believes that war has no relation to justice which can be ascertained from the Atomic warfare. He once said: "so far I can see the atom bomb has deadened the finest feeling that has sustained mankind for ages. There used to be so-called laws of war which made it tolerable. Now we know the naked truth. War knows no law except that of might." In short, Gandhi does not believe that Atomic war can't be fought for justice.
It must be borne in mind that for Gandhi, war is not justifiable per se, but 'justice' is involved in war as one side can always be justified to wage a war. War may be condemned, but one can not remain neutral when it is thrust upon us. One has to take the side which ever he finds favouring justice and to participate in it. One may participate to win it, or restrict it or to lessen the damage of it. One has to participate in it because in today's world you are involved in it directly or indirectly. You are a citizen of a state hence you are under the obligation of a state to fight. You, therefore, must fight. Even if you do not fight physically, you participate in it passively by paying tax to the state. War is an activity which does not permit luxury of neutrality. So to participate in it in either way, actively or passively; or directly or indirectly is justice.

Gandhi on Justice in World Order

The idea of justice in society of men relates to what is right and good for the mankind as a whole. It differs from the notion of what is good for the society of states whose constituent member is sovereign state. The notion of world justice concerns what is good for the universal society of mankind whose constituent members are individual - human beings. In the present day world politics, the problem of nuclear disaster, transfer of resources from the poor to the rich countries, or the problem of environment are considered in terms of the solidarity of human beings. The appeal is made not for cooperation among states, but basically for the solidarity of all human beings who face that challenge as human beings. The mankind is
divided among sovereign states. As a result, they don't have the means of interest articulation or political socialization and recruitment which are the hallmarks of political system. We are interested to find out what Gandhi has to say on this situation. At present, we articulate our interest only through the society of states and international organizations.

Gandhi opines that justice in society for mankind can be achieved provided the mankind gives up hunger for wealth and greedy pursuit of worldly pleasures. His central concept of justice is, thus, related to the concept of modern man as a "selfish creature." To pursue self interest is considered a virtue by the modern civilization.

Philosophically he believes that basically men are spiritually united to each other and this transcends their temporal differences. But essentially a spiritual man has become a materialist man, who is guided chiefly by self-interests. He wants to and strives to acquire resources at the cost of other's interests. The excessive concern for pursuit of self-interest creates a mismatch between private and public morality. It also affects adversely the edifice of social obligations and cooperation. In this context, role of violence has been significant. Gandhi calls it a civilizational crisis. Once pursuit of self-interest becomes central in life, the higher values of life such as spirituality, morality, justice, etc. get crowded in individual's life.

Modern civilization which justifies pursuit of self-interest, as natural and rational considers restrictions on individual's life as
hindrance to the development of the personality of individual. The centrality of the pursuit of self-interest makes expediency, rather than morality, the basis of interpersonal and intergroup relations.

Justice in the society of mankind can be resorted to provided 'morality' is restored as the basis of interpersonal relations. The restoration of ethics and morality in private and public life of the mankind can bring back spiritual unity among all men. Gandhi believes that his own principles are reflections of this unity and they are universally applicable in the visible world. The restoration of spiritual unity is 'truth,' to Gandhi, to be realized by every one. Gandhi holds truth as the ultimate good, not peace. It means once the truth is realized, justice will follow automatically and society will be full of peace and justice. In Gandhian scheme, truth, justice and peace are interrelated. Nevertheless justice is given priority over peace. Gandhi never wants peace at the cost of truth or justice.

Gandhi wants that mankind should implement principles of self-help, self-reliance, simple living, high-thinking, satyagrah, non-violence, trusteeship, swadeshi, swarajya etc. in the world society. Justice will follow by it Gandhi does not demand any type of integration, political, economic or cultural, in order to realize justice in International Relations.

In his conception of justice, Gandhi's focal point is man, but he wants to reconstruct the live world with the help of his principles. The
key element in this reconstruction is return to the idea of man forming an essential part of a larger order, spiritual order.

Gandhi further views that the success of the world order does not depend on empowering of man by coercive powers. It certainly depends on the extent to which he values morals and establishes relations with external world on the basis of certain ethical norms. It is sheer arrogance on the part of man if he regards himself as superior to existing laws of beings. He is as much a part of cosmos as any other living or non-living being.

**Justice and Order**

Justice and order are interrelated and they impinge upon each other especially in international society. According to Gandhi, 'justice' can never be obtained in the existing international order as it is based on violence and exploitation. It helps to create the domination of the big military powers over small nations. The imperialist structure of power in Gandhi's time was based on 'injustice' and the Great Powers (England, France) wanted to perpetuate that status-quo. Hence, 'justice,' in terms of equality of nations, and eradication of racialism and exploitation was just a dream. Hence the order needed to be changed.

The international order is based on the principle of deterrence. This means reliance on violence and weapons of violence. These weapons (including nuclear) threaten uprooting of the value systems of all nations.
How can justice be preserved when all the nations have to operate under threat? Under the circumstances, no other value system except 'threat' and 'terror' by nuclear blackmail can prevail.

From the point of view of human civilization Gandhi is a severe critic of the British civilization. He described India's anti-colonial struggle as a conflict between the Indian civilization and the British civilization. The British system was based on a value system of dominance, inequality and fear. Gandhi thought that unless the foundations of this civilization is changed, no justice can prevail. Gandhi, therefore, calls for change in the value system of an industrialized power in general.

Gandhi recognizes an inherent conflict between the values of order and of justice in world politics, and thinks that 'justice' should be given priority. He fought against the British not only to achieve freedom for India, but also to reestablish basic human value. Moreover, Gandhi was all the time demanding decolonization once and for all so that the order based on 'injustice' could be rectified. Besides, Gandhi demanded 'equal treatment' for all nations within and without the League of Nations. He further demanded that all nations should be granted economic equality from the imperialist powers after sovereign equality being granted to them so that exploitation of the weak by the strong could be prevented.

Gandhi fought for India's independence with non-violent means. His struggle intended to subordinate order to 'justice' because that order was prescribed by the British Imperialism and was based on 'violence.' Finally,
Gandhi succeeded in creating a consensus in international society as a whole in favour of a change in terms of decolonization. Thus, without submitting to the 'order' based on violence Gandhi fought for 'justice' from the platform of non-violence.

In the society of mankind (world order), Gandhi prioritizes 'Man' because, according to Gandhi, justice can prevail provided the dignity of human being is maintained in the world order. Gandhi presumes that cosmic spiritual order is already there. It has been disturbed by Man himself as he is driven by self-interest. Man has become 'immoral' and enemy of himself. Gandhi, however, stands for reconstruction of that order in a world of living, with the help of man. The key element in this reconstruction is the return to the idea of man, forming an essential part of a large order.

Gandhi views order as an objective reality. It is a cosmic order. It is governed by certain norms and sustained by dharma (law of living). It is inherent in the very nature of things. That order can be sustained only when each individual contributes in his own way to the preservation of that order by shaping his life activities through thinking and action, in accordance with the cosmic law.

According to Gandhi, man in the present world has refrained from the cosmic law. Hence the order is disturbed. Man's such indifference has two reasons: (1) he has become selfish; and (2) he has forgotten that all of us have emerged from the one centre hence all of us are related to each other.
This realization helps human being to explore the inner depths of his being and initiates the process of self-transformation.

Justice is not maintained in the world order because that cosmic order is disturbed by man himself. Hence, we need to imbibe truth and nonviolence and other values in order to restore that order. This projects a universalistic outlook. Along with it, a concrete path for articulating and realizing these universal values need be chosen.

Gandhi does not advocate homogenization of a world society. He wants that each individual should not give up his own cultural heritage. He believes that only by proceeding from wherever we are, we can make an integral effort required for the progress and peace of the humanity. The dignity of an individual can be maintained if the above-mentioned situation is encouraged in the society of mankind.

Gandhi has different interpretation of justice in international society and in world society. His priority is 'justice' to 'order.' He criticized prevailing unjust order and struggled against them but by non-violent means. Gandhi sometimes treats war as having connection with justice which relegates peace as such to a subordinate level. Peace based on injustice is not real peace to Gandhi. It is a peace of a grave yard. Gandhi stands for dynamic, just and peaceful orders in international society as well as in the world society.
Another equally important component of the international society, as Gandhi views is an individual. Gandhi accords equal importance to individuals as individuals together run the nation-state system. He believes that the people are at the base of the nation-state system. They form the 'state' and how they ought to form a world federation (super state) out of the nation-state system. He even wants individual to sacrifice his life for the benefit of the world. Referring to the place and duty of individual in a global hierarchy, Gandhi writes, "Just as the cult of patriotism teaches us today that the individual has to die for the family, the village for the district, the district for the Province, and the province for the country, even so a country has to be free in order that it may die, if necessary, for the benefit of the world."

Man

Man, as an individual by nature, according to Gandhi, is good, but he has become idle and indifferent to the purpose for which the state is created. The state is created for truth and non-violence, but it has become a house of violence. The state should serve man but man has become subservient to state. In other words, man must be the master of a state, but state in turn has become the master of man. The duty of an individual towards the state is conditional on the degree to growth and welfare. But an individual forgets this. Consequently, the state emerged to operate
internally as a mechanism of dominance to which the people must submit or suffer. The state has brought man to its feet to serve and the society of man had failed to check the power of the state. It had failed to hold the state responsible for the welfare of the individual. Society must restrain and control the state. But it is not so, as a result, the state has become soulless and unresponsive to human feelings and emotions. If the state behaviour continues to be like this, it is never likely to be stripped off its coercive power to which it owes its existence. Gandhi's words defining the relation between the state and an individual - echo in J.S. Mills', "State is a necessary evil and individual has to function within the bounds of 'self-regarding and other regarding activities.'" Here 'self-regarding devotes individual's role and other regarding' stands for the state. The question is whether the state exists for the individual or the individual exists for the state - it is in this inevitable context that both Gandhi and Mill accommodate the state out of sheer necessity and compulsion. The state would be obsolete provided human nature reform itself to that state or position.

Gandhi regard individual as the centre of authority. The state and the government derive their existence and power from individual. Their object should, therefore, be to help the all round evolution of individual by enacting and enforcing law, by preventing problems and by ensuring security, peace and progress to individuals. The state should always hold high the spirit of service and should never behave like the master of the people.
Gandhi wants that state should gradually and eventually become a welfare institution, less and less coercive and cautious. Speaking of his ideal of the state Gandhi says, "There is then a state of enlightened anarchy. In such a state one is one's own ruler. He rules himself in such a manner that he is never a hindrance to his neighbour...."

Gandhi believes that when an individual learns to rule himself (swaraj), he develops fully. He, then, develops moral and social senses naturally. His cultivated moral and social sense further helps him to develop love for humanity which would break all national and geographical barriers.

Hence, an international man as per Gandhian conception is no one else but an extension of a 'national man.' In this way, Gandhi does not see any tension between nationalism and internationalism. Gandhian nationalism draws its inspiration from the dominant Indian belief in the fundamental unity of humanity in spite of diversity, and the consequent belief in the reasonableness of human equality. So nationalism logically leads on to internationalism.

Gandhi says, "My notion of Purna Swaraj" (i.e. complete self-rule) is not isolated independence but healthy and dignified interdependence." Moreover, "our nationalism can be no peril to other nations in as much as we will exploit none just as we will allow none to exploit us. Through swaraj we would serve the whole world."
Gandhi, does not agree with present efforts of creating international institutions like the League of Nations and the United Nations Organization (UNO) for the solution of the problem of war. He suggests to set up a World Federation of nation-states to turn the nation-state system into a society. On two grounds, he objects to the creation of the international institution to solve the problem of war. Firstly, this institution (UNO) has been founded to safeguard the interests of the powers who created them. And secondly, violence is the basic principle applied to maintain peace in the world. Gandhi is convinced that peace can never be preserved by violent means. His views will be discussed, one by one, in the following pages. He evolves a non-violent and constitutional scheme to reorganize the entire international society based on the principles of mutual understanding and mutual help.

Gandhi on International Institutions: Supranationalism

According to Gandhi, the League of Nations or the United Nations Organizations (UNO) cannot further the ideal of one world as they are not universal institutions. After the Second World War, when the Great Powers were deliberating on the creation of United Nations Organization (UNO) Gandhi asserted, "If they are so arrogant as to think that they can have lasting peace while the exploitation of the coloured and the so-called backward races goes on, they are living in fool's paradise." Gandhi
firmly believes that the League and the UNO are the product of war and not the positive manifestations of the natural urge of nations for peace. These institutions were the outcome of lust, anger, fear, mistrust, selfishness and compromise. Gandhi, therefore, thinks that they are not capable to preserve or promote peace. Such institutions can not remove war from the body politic of the international society.

Gandhi, in fact, maintains that the only thing the UNO can do is to legitimatize the use of force by the devise like the collective security system. Gandhi is convinced that war is certainly not the way to tackle inter-state disputes. To Gandhi, violence can never be met with violence. He wonders how such an institutions can give birth to the idea of oneness or equality among the nations of the international society.

In order to remove the feeling of insecurity and fear, and to lessen the degree of exploitation in the present international order, Gandhi proposes the idea of world government through federation of nation-states based on equality.

**World Government Through World Federation**

The ultimate objective of Gandhi is to create a world government. But initially he suggests that 'World Federation,' a federations of all the sovereign nations should have the base of the main principle of non-violence, "I may not get a World Government that I want just now but 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."

Being a realist, Gandhi knows that the nation-states will not give up their sovereignty totally and at once. The sovereignty is very much dearer to them. But somehow, he is convinced that they (nations) could be persuaded to part with it partially. Hence, Gandhi prefers to have first a federation as an immediate institution aiming which may be gradually converted into the world government. He is sure that all the nation-states will agree to have federation because they are afraid of each other. Secondly, they feel isolated, and thirdly, Gandhi thinks, the common people strive for this type of federation. The nation-states, even otherwise are interdependent and, in Gandhi's opinion, the federation will bring about friendly inter-dependence. The friendly inter-dependent will be more acceptable to the nation-states than the forced one.

Dissolution of Empire and Formation of Federation

It was easier, Gandhi thought in 1920s, to form a world federation then. The entire world was then divided into empires: viz. the British Empire; the French Empire; the Russian Empire and the most of the people of Asia-Africa were not independent nations. The Afro-Asian nations have not yet tasted the fruit of sovereignty. Gandhi feared that they would not
agree to give up their (Afro-Asian Nations) sovereignty if they tasted it once. Hence he suggested to turn the "Empire System" into a "World Federation System" as it was easier to do so. The 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.

Gandhi puts three conditions for the formation of federation: first, freedom of all nations, irrespective of whether conquered and exploited ones; second, to recognize the axis of powers immediately after the war ends, as members of the world federation should keep army of its own; third, it should be a non-violent army (or police). These are necessary conditions otherwise the federation will fall to pieces under the slightest strains.

**Mini-Experiment of Federation**

To operationalize the idea of federation, Gandhi advocated to turn the institution of the British commonwealth into that of a federation. It was easy to do so and would be a logical step to the world federation. He stood for transformation of the commonwealth. He advocated to transmit into "a fellowship of free nations joined together by the "silver code of love." He wanted India to join it, as he maintained that "my ambition is much higher than independence" of India.
Unlike the commonwealth, the other international institutions, according to Gandhi were based on the "force." The intention of the founder of the League was hypocritical. In his letter to C. P. Andrews, he chided President Wilson when he tried to justify the use of force through the League of Nations. Gandhi wrote: "... if the moral pressure... failed, the members of the League would not hesitate to use the last remedy, viz., brute force."

The heart of the League of Nations is the system of collective security system. It is based on the principle of "one for all and all for one." But when it failed to translate that system against Japanese aggression on Manchuria in 1931, Gandhi reflected that it was a mere device of the League to serve the national interests of the Great Powers. Gandhi considers the League only an institution to pursue national interests of the few by other means, "What is the League of Nations? Is it not in reality merely England and France? Do other powers count? Is it any use appealing to France which is denying her motto of fraternity, equality and justice?"

While commenting on the Syrian problem, Gandhi held that there was no sense, or use, in making appeals to these organizations, for they were entirely unable to do justice as they have double standards in its application. Advising Abyssinians, he said not to appeal to the League. He wrote: "The League is expected to perform wonders. It is expected to
replace war and by its own power arbitrate between nations who might have
differences between themselves. But it has always seemed to me that the
League lacks the necessary sanction. It depends as it has to, largely if
not exclusively, on the judgement of the nations concerned."

Gandhi knows that the conflict is inevitable in the international
society. Nations are going to pursue their national interests hence there
are chances for incompatibility of interests. At such times, the League is
expected to arbitrate between the disputant parties. But Gandhi expressed
his doubt the future of the League when it was first conceived by President
Wilson. Its composition which was marked by the only two dominant powers
namely U.K. and France, disillusioned him. The Asyssinian and Manchurian
crisis shattered Gandhi's last hope in the international institutions and
their capacity to turn it into a world federation.

As we have seen that Gandhi does not put faith in exclusivist,
expansionist nationalism. He has also lost faith in the institutions of the
League and the UNO based on supra-nationalism. In fact the idea of supra-
nationalism facilitates relatively greater cooperation and possible
understanding, Gandhi now becomes disillusioned with supra-nationalism as
it has turned to be means to dominate and exploit others. Gandhi expresses
great resentment against these institutions because they legitimatize use
of brute force under the guise of the collective security system.

As we have seen, Gandhi was against even the collective security
system to preserve peace. Then what alternative Gandhi suggests to the
collective security system to preserve peace among nations even when the aggression takes place. As pointed out, Gandhi advocates that the nation-state system was not bad, only its operation was dangerous, as it was organized on a principle of violence. Now it has developed nuclear teeth. Hence Gandhi advocates to pull out teeth of nuclear weapons and give up violence and to make the world ready for world federation.

In spite of the fact that the nation-state system gives up armaments some sort of arms will remain. The nation-state will perhaps abolish nuclear weapons and the conventional disarmament may also be implemented. Yet a nation will commit aggression on another nation even by non-lethal weapons like lathi, stone etc. How would Gandhi resist such an aggression? He suggests the following technique to treat the aggressor. It could be divided into three parts:

1. **The Plan for Action Before Invasion Takes Place**

First of all, Gandhi suggests removal of a probable causes or motives behind a possible invasion. According to him, suppose if the motive is economic i.e. the satisfaction of primary needs, hence one should encourage them to be economically self-reliant. Thus Gandhi suggests to implement the principle of helpful neighbourhood, i.e., 'live and let live' in the field of International Relations. Indirectly, it is a plea for free dissemination of ideas and knowledge. He teaches extension of human sympathy to all the people of the world. Done in a purer spirit, as advocated by Gandhi, it is likely to yield increasing
returns. This is a non-violent way of removing the probable causes of invasion.

2. The Plan to be Adopted During the Period of Armed Attack

He suggests that "fighting" against the aggressor should "firstly" be non-violent. He wants to fight to the last man without any bitterness or hatred against the invader. He presumes that the aggressor will be tired of killing non-violent resisters, mentally and physically. He will begin to search a new force which refuses cooperation with him and yet, desists from "hurting." This will probably desist from further slaughter. He, thus, wants to weaken the moral of the aggressor. He says pure Ahimsa or sufferings is self-propagating. The invader, even if invisible is sure to be softened and influenced by it. In any case, by such sufferings 'the resisters' will gain the good will in the entire world.

In the second stage, Gandhi suggests that one may defend even violently if he does not believe or has no faith in non-violent technique. In any case, he does not favour surrendering in a cowardly manner. He emphasizes that even violent resistance may be done with the point of performing duty.

Even in violent warfare, Gandhi advises the minimum possible use of violence and force. He announces his position against the policy of scorched earth, sabotage and secrecy.
The Attitude to be Adopted During the Occupation of Territories by the Invaders

The attitude needs to be taken with the aggressor, as describes Gandhi, is that of "non-violent non-cooperation." He is of the opinion that if there is a total non-cooperation by the conquered nation, the invader is bound to withdraw, sooner or later, in sheer disgust and confusion. One can draw a parallel between the British invasion on India with that of an aggressor's occupation. To protect it, Gandhi resorted to non-violent, non-cooperation techniques - though it did require immeasurable courage and tolerance on the part of resisters. Despite India's ultimate independence, the British held no ill-will against Gandhi.

It is a unique technique but every individual who resides in a nation needs to be a true satyagrahi in the Gandhian sense. Gandhi suggests that an individual needs to be trained to be a true satyagrahi. Satyagrahi soldier is a brave and courageous man. He should not be a coward. Ahimsa is for a fearless man. To practice, it requires a courage of conviction.

Every time war does not break out between the nations, but it is incompatibility of national interests that gives birth to the conflicts between nations. Now let us see what technique Gandhi suggests to resolve conflicts between nations.
Gandhi's Technique of Conflict Resolution Under the Shadow of Nuclear Threat

So long as Nation-State System does not give way to the world government, conflicts will perpetuate under state-system. Gandhi, therefore, suggests a technique of resolving conflicts in which vital interests of the nations are not involved and nuclear disarmament has not yet taken place.

Gandhi wants us to remember that "Cooperation" and "Harmony," rather than "conflict" and "struggle," are the fundamental laws of the universe. And there is a fundamental "unity" in the universe and society which sustains order and life. Gandhi reminds us that man does not live by destruction.

What is Conflict - How to Resolve it

Gandhi views conflicts as temporary irregularities in the even flow of life. He believes that conflict can never be ceaseless phenomena in the universe. Therefore, resolution of creative conflict to him means: (a) elimination of maladjustment; (b) progress toward a better and a more meaningful readjustment; and (c) transformation of violent relationship into a non-violent one. This means that energies of the opponents are to be integrated to achieve a higher goal.
While discussing the reasons for conflict, he does not blame 'individual antagonism, but the 'system.' To him, defective system is responsible for the conflict. He does not regard antagonism between two individuals (or classes) responsible for it. Hence, in order to eliminate the 'conflict' the system needs to be changed. The conflict between India and England was basically a conflict between the Indian national Movement and the British System, and not between Indian and British individuals.

In order to change the system, Gandhi advocates the method of dialogue between the conflicting parties. He suggests social and constructive discourse between the conflicting parties which would resolve into changing the system.

According to Gandhi, violence/himsa is the root cause of conflict. He defines Himsa as (a) willful use of force in the traditional sense to compel one to do things which he would not do otherwise; (b) Using methods synonymous with moral evil in general: corruption, hypocrisy, falsehood, deceit, cowardice and hatred. He uses such methods in two ways: in behavioural sense and in mental sense.

Gandhi says no one can be an apostle of an absolute truth. Truth is always relative. Hence, a conflict always involves different views or relative truths. In order to resolve a conflict, therefore, these varied sets of relative truths need to be synthesized. It becomes an improvement upon one's position. It will be a progress towards the absolute truth. Thus, his perception of truth denies the employment of violence as a means to resolve a conflict.
The Gandhian technique of resolving conflicts differs from the traditional one on many counts: (a) It does not ask any party to sacrifice his positions; (b) It does not demand any concession; (c) There is no sense of victory or defeat of one party over the other; and (d) All synthesis is a triumph for both the parties.

The conflict can't be resolved at a stroke. It is a gradual process. Joan Bondurant classifies it into three stages. Each stage should be taken up only after the failure of the preceding one.

First Stage

1. Persuasion through reason or negotiation.
2. Shock Therapy: To persuade the opponent through self-suffering. It strengthens "Reason" and it opens the eyes of understanding (Shock Therapy).
3. Non-Violent Direct Action: It is characterized by tools such as non-cooperation and civil disobedience. It can be applied against government as well as against individuals or a group conflicts.

It may not be a full-proof technique. Even Gandhi himself never claims as a full proof one. But it is the most viable technique of resolving conflicts in a nuclear age.
The essential problem is how to create a community of men in the world so that conflicts and incompatibility between individual welfare and collective good can be resolved amicably. In order to achieve harmony in the world, Gandhi suggests to change the structure of international order and also pleads to cultivate self-control in an individual, as well as his harmony with the environment, which consists of political power, community and eco-system.

Gandhi suggests the two prong strategies for world order: (1) Resocialization of Man and (2) Harmony between Power, Community and Eco-system. In working out these strategies effectively, he calls for spade work at the grass root level.

Resocialization of Man

In working out this strategy, Gandhi views 'order' itself as the point of departure as it forms an integral part of man's being and becomes the ground for both self-development and social harmony. An individual and his transformation is the central issue of Gandhian thinking. Basically, Gandhi wants to resocialise man through self-discipline and through the system of basic education based on the twin principles of 'dialogue' and 'involvement' of man with man with total involvement of 'heart,' 'head' and 'hand.'
Gandhi's philosophy of resocializing man is based on a simple of assumptions: first, man can be taken as what he ought to be, and not necessarily as what he really is. A desirable change in man's character can be brought about not only by refashioning institutions (environment) surrounding him, but also by reforming man himself.

Secondly, man himself is a part of order, not the world order only. It is a larger order, which forms an integral part of man's being and becomes the ground for both self-development and social harmony. This order considers man as a starting point of any project of reconstruction of the living world. It is in conceivable to compartmentalize 'order' (world) at state or even at individual level and, therefore, Gandhi's conception of order is not based on 'Man vs Nature' or 'Man vs World.' Man is incorporated in the scheme of order, whether the state or the world. The organic unity of man and the universe needs to be realized.

The present world is governed by certain norms and sustained by an order necessary for its preservation. The order is an objective one, inherent in the very nature of things. This order is sustained by Dharma - law of living - which regulates the working of the cosmos and keeps it on a proper course. It signifies both the governance and regulation of the physical aspects of the cosmos as well as a moral order.
What is Self-Transformation?

It is directly connected with transcending self-interest, individual's, or state's. In order to transcend the motive self-interest, one has to perceive himself as the ethico-religious man, and not as bio/psycho/sociological man. Secondly, one must conceive that an individual is a part of a larger whole—a universal community. It is on the basis of this two-fold realization that one can, as Gandhi puts it, "share the majesty of life in the presence of God." This is possible if one rises above the phenomenal and explores the inner depths of one's being. This exploration initiates the process of self-transformation.

The process of self-transformation must take place in this world. The world is essential for self-development and it has to be reshaped in the image of freedom and morality one seeks to attain on one's own life.

A transformed individual will shed the Promethean attitude on the external world and he will emphasize an essential relatedness of all creation. This transformed self widens the circle of community to include those who are currently excluded by separate states. Simultaneously, it also stands for promotion of social and political relations within the boundaries of existing societies.

Gandhi here, redefines relations between 'self' and 'others.' To a transformed self, 'others' cease to be objects separated from the self and become in essence extended selves. Harmony with an ever-enlarging circle of
relationships constitutes a personal aspiration, social goal and cosmic ideal.

The Gandhian orientation of transformation changes the definition of society. To Gandhi, society becomes an extended self rather than a mechanical aggregate of enclosed selves. This image of society locates humanity in a complex web of interdependency. Gandhi is also aware of the fact that no society is wholly composed of persons engaged in the process of self-transformation.

Gandhi also emphasizes ahimsa (non-violence) as a fundamental outlook on life. Commitment to truth and acceptance of ahimsa foster an organismic vision based on the clear recognition that no one individual has a privileged access to truth. The development of true individuality must occur, not through a willful conquest of others, but through harmonizing oneself with an ever expanding network of harmonious, interdependent and cooperative relationships. It is this pattern of self-development that instills rationality and morality in the individual. They can not be instilled from any external source, hence individual himself has to change.

The idea of self-transformation is related to the idea of "swaraj" advocated by Gandhi. Swarajya (self-rule) enables man to resist exploitation and oppression. It will prompt them to fight for what they believe to be. As Gandhi points out, real swaraj is experienced, not by acquisition of authority by a few, but by acquisition of capability by all to resist authority when it is abused.
The second dimension of Gandhian thinking is his system of Basic Education. He assigns to a non-violent state a duty to educate the people. He wants ethical education to occupy the first place. The basic aim of the education should be to make "men of us" and "enable us to do our duty." Character building should be the aim of true education. Hence, disciplining individual is an essential part of education. He writes, "I would feel that if we succeed in building the character of the individual, society will take care of itself. I would be quite willing to trust the organization of society to individuals so developed." Gandhi wants that a child should be taught through manual training and craft work, and not through only text books. The handicraft should also be taught in a "scientific manner" and not mechanically.

The literary education also figures in the syllabus, and subjects like Indian history and Indian geography are to be taught against in the light of world history and world geography. The aim is to eliminate any tendency to narrow and rapid nationalism which can be hindrance to cooperation and peace. Gandhi, thus, suggests a peace-oriented education scheme. Gandhi's way to peaceful world order is through education of right type of subjects and self-discipline.

Harmony Between Power and Community

Gandhi realizes that the 'self-interest' is the primary goal of man and, however, a man may be self-disciplined order can not be achieved as
long as it remains so. Besides the realization of common goods depends on self-control not so much on the part of the individual, as on the part of the authority external to man. It is more so in the international society in which 'state' is going to take decision on behalf of individuals. Hence it is not only necessary to bring reforms in individuals but also to refashion the enveloping institutions. The institutions are founded on power relations. They give birth to the political order based on power. This is again based on coercive capacity of the state.

Political power enters the scene when the clash of interests surfaces. The clash of interests make the "law" to function as the supreme arbiter. 'State' or the world government functions as arbiter through law. It legitimatizes its actions. But the triumph of law does not always assure the triumph of justice. The claim of law is linked with the facts of power and value. The material inequality constitutes the principle basis for order. Then power, and not common standards, becomes the dominant organizing principle of the political system.

It is a common experience that law making and its adjudication favour some over than others. When this is realized by deprived groups, cries go up for equalizing condition of life and removing inequalities for justice. If the political order forcefully and effectively responds to these cries, the way is paved for it to assume more and more power, threatening individual liberty. If, on the other hand, it settles on a path of least interference, its legitimacy faces gradual erosion and the prospects of uncertainty and instability loom large. Finally, the state assumes
absolute power and 'absolute power corrupts absolutely.' Hence Gandhi suggests decentralization of power within the state. He advocates many power centres within the state. The decentralization of powers undermines the primacy of the state. He, thus, suggests the strategy of decentralization of power up to the village level. He is against concentration of power at the top whatever may be the form of government. The decentralization of power, he believes, breaks down the monopoly structure of power.

According to this new structure, organization of the political system must begin from the bottom and move through intermediate levels to the national level. Since the local community will have the basic responsibility and power to manage its own affairs, the overriding importance that we assign today to the national government will be greatly reduced. Thus Gandhi wants that the problems of the people can be solved by themselves. It can be done by claiming autonomy of an individual which he has surrendered to the state in the course of history. The regaining of autonomy on the part of man will bring back his identity. The preservation of identity non-violently, in a non-violent state, within the disarmed world government, will preserve the ultimate dignity of human being.

Thus, the question of world government to Gandhi, is secondary. He, however, wants it to emerge basically to tone-down the interest based power-politics. The world government, therefore, will have function to coordinate and manage global problems affecting mankind.
Gandhi, thus, wants to create a world order not on coercive power, but on moral forces. Its main organizing principle is not 'power,' but 'dignity' of an individual. The world order thus, depends on the extent to which person becomes moral sound and establish relations with external world on the basis of certain ethical standards.

Harmony Between Man and Environment

We have seen how Gandhi removes 'power' from the axis as a main source of conflict by his principle of decentralization of power. The strategy of decentralization breaks down the monopoly of power. Yet the problem remains how to remove conflict of man with nature. In other words how to create harmony between man and his environment.

Man's relations with nature has never been so strained as it is today. Gandhi actually calls it civilizational crisis. He relates man's greed and desire to dominate others. Modern civilization places, as Gandhi sees it, the pursuit of self-interest is deemed both natural and rational, restrains imposed on it are considered to be restrictive of the full flowering of the individual self. The pursuit of self-interest pushes out the pursuit of higher values such as spirituality, morality, etc. What is resentful for Gandhi is that violence becomes the dominant characteristic of this civilization. The more regrettable thing to him is that the present civilization does not suggest which appetite has to be satisfied and which to be suppressed, or where to stop. Hence, life becomes a ceaseless struggle for acquiring more and more for oneself.
This would not have become a problem if resources were abundant and every desire could be satisfied without sacrificing others or conflicting with others. Since this is not the case, in to quote Gandhi, 'life corroding competition' starts, which leads us to exploitation, domination, inequality and oppression.

Such a competition for conflicting interests is reflected not only in the relationship of man with man and nature, but also in the relationship of one country with another. This puts an enormous premium on acquisition of resources at the cost of others' welfare. At the world level, state competes with other state for access to and control over resources, located outside its boundaries. It also wants to control and regulate the environmental forces that may impinge on its security and development. Each state is competing with others in the absence of internationally accepted political authority. In such situation, each state has to rely on his self-capacity and physical power. How then, can order be maintained in international society? According to Gandhi, under the circumstances, order can never be maintained. It is a state of affairs free for all and it is heading towards a self-destruction.

We, therefore, need to transcend international order as it is based on 'threat system.' At any moment, the war may break out and the war fought with nuclear armaments is even suicidal. Hence, the necessity of world order has to be based on restriction of human needs and appropriate technology.
Restriction of Human Needs

What should be the purpose of life? - is the fundamental question. Gandhi perceives that the purposes of life is to pursue high ideals like truth, non-violence, justice etc. And the needs of ordinary life - cloth, food, shelter etc. - should be infrastructure to the former. What Gandhi sees is that the fulfillment of needs of ordinary life has remained a sole concern of human existence with higher significance assigned to it. It is considered natural and essential. The main pursuit of man has been to satisfy biological needs and not to bother moral fulfillment or moral self-realization. The central concern of life has become happiness. Happiness through satisfying desires. It now seems possible that these desires can be fulfilled through the transformation and control of nature with the help of technology. Technological innovations increase and proliferate man's needs, which, in turn, stimulates further technological innovations and so on. This requires access to and control over material resources without which needs can not be fulfilled. This situation gives birth to a clash of interests between man and man and between state and state. To this Gandhi suggests a simple solution. Although it sounds simple it is very difficult to put into practice. He says man is a bundle of desires. Gandhi wants that one should ask direct questions to those desire. What is needed and what is wanted? The need based desire should be fulfilled and other desires be given up. This is a simple way to discriminate what is a good desire and what is a bad one. If one learns to discriminate, the civilizational crisis can be resolved.
Appropriate Technology

Another solution which Gandhi suggests is to apply appropriate technology. Gandhi is not against big machines per se but he is against the use of machine to exploit individuals. However, he is against those machines based on complicated and heavy technology which can lead to large scale environmental pollution, ecological decay, resource depletion, impoverishment and exploitation of the masses. He is against the machine culture which creates inequality and restricts employment. He is also against heavy and high speed transport system which came into existence and continues in existence to subserve the vested interests of the imperialist and commercial establishments and military industrial complexes.

Gandhi although stands for decentralization of production by machine, he is not always against centralized and mass production. He is, however, against the centralized production of the basic necessities of life, like food and clothing. The means of producing them should remain under the control of the people, as air and water are under God's control. But the basic solution he suggests is adoption of appropriate technology. The appropriate technology has many meanings. But it must meet two conditions, i.e., first, it should not render the mass of people unemployed and secondly, it should not poison the eco-system.

Man, Machine and Material have ultimately led to dehumanizing of man. His real-original self, what Rousseau regards as "native man" is lost in a concrete, materialistic mechanically and technologically operated world. It
is only through the techniques suggested by Gandhi that man and nature coexist and one may hope to save the world from great catastrophe.

To sum up, Gandhi agrees with the view that nation-states create order in international society but it is not adequate. It is unjust order and needs to be modified. It does not remove anarchy but adds to it. In order to create an ideal global society, the nation-states are required to be reconstructed and human society must reorganize itself. It can ideally reorganize itself provided its focal point becomes the preservation of human dignity. The preservation of human dignity must be the guiding principle of reorganizing human society. If it is done, the just and peaceful world order can be created. Thus, Gandhi's approach is basically human centric, neither power-oriented nor institutional oriented. Now, we need to view of Nehru's conception. Although Nehru was Gandhi's disciple, and, like his political guide, dissatisfied with the present order, his conception registers a sharp difference to Gandhi's. He suggests institutional approach to create a just and peaceful world order.
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