CHAPTER IV

GANDHISM: DYNAMICS OF CONFLICT AND ITS RESOLUTION

In the nineteenth century, Marx and Engels analyzed class conflict and the Social Darwinist examined conflict among societies. Marxism developed essentially as a doctrine of reform and revolution, while Social Darwinism failed to progress beyond over simplified concepts like "absolute hatred", survival of the fittest, and the conquest state. The first sociologist to focus on conflict as a process both internal and external to the individual and also to the group was George Simmel, whose ideas have been critically restated by Lewis A. Coser [1956]. Most sociologists lost interest in conflict, however, and became increasingly engrossed with patterns and process of social integration. It is only in recent years and especially with the threat of nuclear holocaust, the social scientists have focused serious attention upon problems of conflict.

Whenever two or more individuals or groups come into contact with each other, it may be either conflictual or integrative, i.e., cooperative, supportive and mutually agreed upon the objectives, means of its achievement etc. Some degree of community organization or integration is inherent in the concept of conflict. If the parties in question were not in the same place at the same time or performing two incompatible functions at the same time, or cooperating to inflict reciprocal injury, there would be no conflict. Conflicts help both in establishing contacts and communications and destruction of earlier bonds if the conflictual parties have mutuality. Conflict also varies in its degree and kind. It could be either between
individuals, organizations and groups, between component parts of the single organization, if the person concerned seek to possess the same object, occupy the same space or the same material [wealth] and non-material [prestige, status, position, fame] play incompatible roles, maintain incompatible goals or undertake mutually incompatible means for achieving their purposes.¹

Conflicts are endemic in human societies and are as old as mankind itself. Since Karl Marx analysis of the Social conflict in industrializing England, Social Scientists have devoted increasing attention to developing a conflict theory. Lewis Coser, Dahrendorf and many others have tried to examine the various aspects of conflict. The factors more or less common in all conflict theories are an emphasis and analysis of the fragmentation of social systems caused by confrontation of incompatible values and the study of processes by which various interest groups organize themselves around the conflicting and try to gain advantage over the opposite group. Also, conflict provides an important framework for the study of change; because change usually involves the necessity of promoting or obstructing a value in preference to another, and this necessarily creates a conflict.²

All conflicts starting from individual relationship to a broader global relationships with its various types are disruptive in some degree. But the disruptiveness of most of them is limited by one or more of the following: [a] A framework of more fundamental agreement such as usually exists when the disputants are all members of the same community; [b] one party's recognition of the superior


power of the other; [c] the superior power of the third party which could intervene if the conflict passed beyond certain limits, e.g., the awareness of both sides in an industrial dispute that government action will occur if their conflict leads to an outbreak of violence; [d] awareness of the precise issues at stake; [e] A study awareness of the limited importance of the issues; [f] the fears which the disputant inspires in one another; and [g] renunciation by at least one party to the dispute of the use of certain methods of gaining one’s ends.

The relationship between man with man, man with nature and man with other species could be defined and understood on the basis of programme of action which expressed through super rationality possessed a representatives of the state machinery. The actors are called the representatives of the highest will of the majority of the people who constitute the state. The process of operationalization of the desired ends are activated through ‘a plan of action’, i.e., ideology. Ideology which is a product of socio-economic and historical context, rationalizes the relationship between the producer and production process, consumption pattern and ways of distribution of the goods and services to maintain an idealistic egalitarian, welfare society. The degree and density of violence and its duration, the justifiability also found in different ideologies for achievement of a better objective. The concept of violence has been glorified in totalitarian ideologies. Two particular functions of violence have been described in the literature on totalitarianism. Prior to the totalitarian movements assuming power, violence is perceived to be necessary because the movement calls for total destruction of the old society. Since, there will be opponents, who will resist, they must be treated violently. After the revolutionary power is established, violence continues to be used to impose control over enemies, but the enemy is widely decreed.
as society itself. Violence here is not seen as simply a device to keep the regime from being overthrown by opponents. Arendt [1958], too, has stressed the function of terror, in atomizing society and perpetuating a special kind of rule, rather than merely keeping the government in power.3

There are different theories to define violence in the process of social transformation such as, Biological Theory, Psychological Theory, Sociological Theory, Marxian Theory, Structural Theory and so on. The Biological Theory developed by Konard Lorenz [1952] states that the ‘action specific energy’ found in the central nervous system is diminished by instinctive behaviour. But when such energy accumulates, the result is “vacuum activity” — a spontaneous aggression. Some neurosurgeons and psychiatrists assert that certain basic brain mechanism are actually involved in violence. Experiments in this field indicate that in adolescence, testosterone hormone increases ten times in human male but only two times in female pointing out that females are less violent. The psychological theory explain violence through various instincts, whereas the sociological interpretation emphasizes on environmental forces. Freud, Psychologist saw a definite relationship between violence and sexuality; since he identified with sadism. Freud’s contention that Eros, the life instinct, opposes thanatos or death while all organisms pursue death in order to put an end to all stimulations in now found too abstract and too theoretical. Environmental antecedents of violence are encapsuled in the popular frustration-aggression hypothesis. Dollard has asserted that all violence results exclusively from frustration Berkowitz [1962] has defined frustration as an interference with goal

oriented activities. He elaborates frustration anger hostility chain. Gorr hypothesis is some kind of improvement over frustration aggression hypothesis.

Marxian theorists suggest that in societies with sharp social class distinctions, it is the difference between reality and expectation that leads to frustration and violence. Then there is violence in the process of system transformation and social innovation, permanent revolution and permanent purge. Frustrating forces of modernization, in a period of transition, their speed and direction too cause violence, it is stated. Mass violence is attributed to historical accident that offers vast powers to a diabolical genius [Stalin, Hitler]. Roy Mahadev in his book Let History Judge [1972] observes that the general concept of war and violence [revolution] is based on the assumption that in the absence of peaceful solution, power conflicts may develop between unequal parties. It is “logical causal”. According to George Srel, the structure and change of society are inevitably based on violence. He supported the concept of violence in the social transformation and change and also argued that violence resulted in social progress.4

Elitist “Progress” says Vilfredo Pareto, the Karl Marx of Bourgeoisie, has been always proviolence because that way alone the aristocratic classes could able maintain the status and level of existence. The structuralist who advocated a system as a collection of units and their interrelated interaction, it promotes rank-disequilibrium and the sustenance of the ruling class depends on this disequilibrium. By retaining power and status the ruling class allows concession for some social reform and social change. Men like Frantz Fenon and Mao too have found violence conducive to

modernization. Fanon, the political theorist of "The Wretched of the Earth" Fane believed in "sociogenesis" asserting that all conflict is caused by opposition which explodes through collective catharsis of violence. In that sense, he supported organized violence. Dr Panos Bardis, believed in electric model of violence, which occurred due to the gap between human needs and its gratifications. The western liberal democracies which based on individual dignity, rights and initiative is conflictual with greater social collectivity and the interest of the individuals resulted conflictual for promotion of material pleasure and acquisitiveness. The primacy of rationality over multifaceted cognitive faculty resulted in "seven deadly sins". These are greed, avarice, envy, gluttony, luxum, pride and sloth.5

Anglo-American society and the liberal democratic societies have a strong individualistic concept of civil, liberties, influenced by the Philosophy of John Locke and J.S. Mill. Under this libertarian view, rights belong to individuals, not groups. But the rights of groups in liberal societies are largely dependent upon the exercise of the rights of individuals in these groups. Each individual has the right to associate with whom he/she pleases. The rights of the group are derived solely from some of its parts. We respect the rights of the individuals which comprise the group but give little formal recognition to the right of the collective. The atomistic conception of civil societies has lost its relevance with the development of positive welfare modern state system and democracies. Individual expression today has little impact on political decision making, a single voice has a little sway. The pluralistic democracies of the west are heavily influenced by major groups and associations. Increasingly, individuals

are making their voices heard by joining together to march demonstrate and attend public meetings. Individual join associations, unions and organizations which represent their political, social and economic philosophies. This include trade unions, peace groups, environmental organizations and political parties. The main contention is the group and the community right is not the sum total of the atomistic individualistic rights on which fundamental foundation the liberal democracies stands. To maintain a well order pattern of humorous living the individuals either in group and organization should not conflictual, hierarchical atomistic and self made individualistic but the same should be in congruence, integrated and dissolve with the higher social entity without loosing its identity.  

In liberal traditions, where the centrality lies in promotion and identification with individuality, resulted in equality of development, inequality of both material and spiritual insights which further resulted in conflict in understanding of any social fact and at last create problems for constructive social theory. The intellectual progress and the material standing are intertwined with rare exception. So this creates a gap between total identification of the masses with the elitists and their socio-economic and cultural life, nor they could be able to retain their age old traditional, ethical cultures which created a psychological and perceptual conflict in the conceptual framework of “tradition vs modernity”, matter vs. spirit, culture vs. civilization, use value vs. exchange value etc.


In social life, conflicts are inherent; they occur within and among organizations, communities, social classes and countries. But they are too often managed in ways that harm the conflicting parties. Gandhian approach of peace making includes developing relations among adversaries that are not threatening and entail mutual dependence, hereby raising the cost of conflict escalation. Countries that are physically, economically and socially isolated from each other can easily avoid war, for parties that cannot avoid relations, however, preventing war is a more complicated concept. The struggle persists when the adversaries cannot agree on the terms of settlement; each party says it wants peace, but only on terms that are unacceptable to its opponents. Thus, an escalation of a conflict may necessarily precede a transition to de-escalation, as it did after the Iraq invasion of Kuwait.

In Marxist political ideological framework, the content of conflicts ends in bloodshed revolution to create a healthy socio-economic and political order for the development of total humanity. The ends means causality in this theoretical paradigm is that for a specific objective interests and its actualization, the process, medium, means a mobilization could be anything else. Though Karl Marx put emphasis on the evolutionary factor to create consciousness in the mind of people for the overthrow of capitalistic exploitative system which is based on false and inefficient factors of production and interferes in total social progress, he advocated the concept of violent revolution in contradiction to Gandhian non-violent revolution for social change and progress. In this sense, an analogy could be drawn that perhaps Gandhi was very optimistic about the nature, psychology and ethico religious dimension of the

---

8 Kegley Jr (Charles W) and Eugene R. Willkopf (eds), *The Nuclear Reader*, New York, St. Martin's, 1985, p.47.
individual personality in general and capitalist class in particular, whereas Marx, may be little bit skeptical about the idealistic, moral, and spiritual conception of man and capitalistic class. Marx as a believer of social evolution for human progress, apprehended that in antagonistic societies, evolution inevitably leads to aggravation of contradictions in the mode of production, to increasing need in social revolution. The contradictions could not resolve evolutionally because they touch the essence of production relations, on the basis of which evolutional changes occur. However, these relations cannot be replaced by others evolutionally, for they are safeguarded by the ruling classes, by the political and ideological superstructure of the old basis. The resolution of conflict between productive forces and production relations requires, therefore, fundamental breaking the entire socio-economic and political system, i.e., social revolution.9

The nature, its dynamics and resolution of the conflict could be traced in many theoretical perspectives that have been applied to international affairs fall into three broad categories: statism, populism and pluralism.

1. Statism — The analysts who developed statism and apply it are particularly interested in understanding war and crisis. They view state as a unitary entity that operates according to a clearly ranked set of values and interests. Choosing policies rationally in terms of relative costs and benefits. As articulated by Hans Morgenthau in 1950s, statism also tends to be conventional tough minded and

---


The relationship between social revolution and political revolution is so closely related that to make the former feasible, the latter has to be taken into consideration.
Its adherents argued that their own leaders in a struggle must be tough in order to convince an aggressive adversary to settle a conflict on reasonable terms. De-escalation emerges from abundance of power or from the overwhelming superiority of one party. This statist approach has dominated interpretations of international relations and its description of the world is often used by government officials to justify their actions. Believing in stateism and acting according to its terms and conditions became a reality in modern state system and its interaction in international politics. Crises of the statist approach correctly observe that it implies the belief that peace is based only upon military strength — a position, C. Wright Mills called "crackpot realism". Critics also justifiably note that in the statist view, the concept of peace and military security are highly associated if not identical.\(^\text{11}\)

2. **POPULISM** — It has two major variations. Idealism and Interpersonalism. The idealist version emphasizes the role of values and the views of the masses as well as a elite groups. In the period between two world wars, it was an influential approach, its adherents advocating policies for peace based on national self determination, open diplomacy, international institutions and collective security than a search for a balance of power. Today it still emphasizes the morality of means as well as the ends which is very close of Gandhian methodology of purity of means and ends, and the socially constructed nature of international conflicts and their transformation through changes in thinking.


\(^{11}\) Mills (Wright C.), *The Causes of World War III*, New York, Simon and Schuster, 1958, p. 82.
Adherents of idealism criticize other perspectives for accepting existing practices and social conventions as given rather than offering alternatives. They argue that by acting on their assumptions, people produce a world consistent with their beliefs; if they acted on other assumptions, they could create another world. Some stress reconciliation among adversaries and the avoidance of threats and violence. According to this view, conciliation will generate trust and the discovery of mutually beneficial outcomes to conflicts. De-escalation, they believe, requires conciliatory initiatives rather than coercive threats. It means taking account of the interests of major adversaries and seeking the way for their interests to be or at least partially served. Although this method has scarcely been tried by government officials and seems risky, populist argue that conventional approaches have often failed and carry more risks in the nuclear age.

The idealist approach is close to the relatively new interpersonal perspective which holds that personal factors, interpersonal interaction, social movements and general subjective orientations affect both the outbreak and avoidance of wars. Aspects of this approach have long been emphasized by psychologists and social psychologists. Recently feminists such as Betty Reardon, Diana Russel and Carol Cohn have made a special contribution to this point of view by noting that in nearly all cultures men are socialized to be aggressive and that this is often elaborated into a military that supports a war system.\(^{12}\)

Interpersonalists usually define peace very broadly. Interpersonal and community violence are often linked to international violence to be overcome by

---

greater empathy among adversaries. Security then means not only the security of the state but of all men, women and children in every country. Finally, they stress the role of popular forces, often in the form of social movements. Peace movements and other national and transnational movements of social character generate forces to change the government policies and even topple the regime which basis is violence and other instruments of power than legitimacy. Gandhiji in that sense to make the peace everlasting which original root is based on Indian tradition and culture, supported not only to fight against any imperial power which is based on forces than free will but also decentralization of both economic power and political power, and people united autonomy based decentralized authority structure.

The populist approach could be able to resolve the violence, if its adherents seem to be asserting that if people would only think and behave properly, conflict could be resolved. Often they underestimate the reality of competing interests and the role of coercion.

3. PLURALISM — The third approach pluralism was developed to explain day to day international conduct and foreign policy making. Two major variations are usefully distinguished. The globalists and multiple actor versions. The globalist or world systems perspective focuses on economic development and socio-economic inequalities as a whole. Analysts such as Wallerstein, Cardoso and Magdoff have sought to explain the rise of capitalism as world system and the ways in which dominate economic countries maintain their dominance. The perspective considers global inequalities and underlying conflicts especially among major developed capitalistic [core] countries and peripheral, developing countries that are
economically dependent on the core countries. Underlying conflict is viewed as the basis for overt conflicts, particularly among peoples from underdeveloped countries and among rival core countries. This approach aids in understanding de-escalation moves by providing insight into the context and long term trends of particular international conflicts. Many analysts of the contemporary world system go well beyond global economic interdependence to stress the proliferation of transnational organizations, non-governmental and governmental, such as, the United Nations. Avoidance of violence is based on high levels of integration and mutual dependence and must rely on the effective working of international organizations.

The multiple actor version of pluralism emphasizes that world participants are not only states or transnational organizations but also subnational groups that interact through many processes besides coercive conflict. This approach views foreign policy as a product of bureaucratic politics and routines; it assumes that a government’s preferences are not fixed but are the product of contending domestic and international relations. Persuasion and offers of benefits are crucial as each actor strives to rally supporters and divide opponents. Adherents of pluralistic approach tend to be relativistic, assuming that no one actor has legitimate absolute claims while its opponent lacks these. This is consistent with the search for common security — that is security that does not create insecurity for an adversary.13

The changing dimension of conflict and its adverse effect on the total human society resulted in finding out some alternative source of conflict management. The important intellectual sources of this approach include game theory [based on mathematics and economics], the analysis of interaction based on [social psychology and sociology] and the analysis of organization and interorganizational relations [based on political sciences and sociology]. In recent years, conflict resolution activities have expanded into the areas of community conflicts, inter and intra organizational disputes and the last part of it is related with the scarce resources of the mother earth and its constant exploitation with the help of science and technology for material pleasure and consumer culture resulted in conflict over environment. 14

4. The conflict resolution approach as applied to international conflict draws from this and also from both populist and pluralist perspectives. In this case each conflict in order to be an international or ideological in nature it has undergone to different stages of its development and involving more than one particular issue. The example could be US and USSR conflict which basic objective is to promote either of the biology in total world and any kind of obstacle resulted in continuation of war of different category and variety. In short, it could be well argued and also equally evident that, both the ideological formulations irrespective of their inner essence, their respective operationalization into practice shows that the degree of violence and exhaustion of both material life and human life is substantially more in comparison to Gandhian non-violent social transformation. Each ideology also

advocates violence way of social transformation in terms of internal structural change so its outer interactional spheres. It has been evident from the pages of human history that the degree of violence both in capitalistic regime which ideal model of operation is hierarchical pyramidal, top to bottom approach to individual and society and bureaucratic, centralized regimentation of socialistic mode of social operationalization is not only increased substantially but also a contradiction to human essence, spirit and its total emancipation.\textsuperscript{15}

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi deeply influenced by Indian tradition, culture and other religious and its inner essence advocated the principle of non-violence. Some western thinkers believe that he got the idea from western sources especially from the ‘sermon on the mount’ of the new testament. It was true that he was greatly influenced by the Sermon, Jesus Christ, Daniel, Tolstoy, Thoreau and Ruskin. The concept of \textit{Ahimsa} and its essence also deeply rooted in Indian tradition and also literature, as it is evident from the saying that ‘\textit{ahimsa paramodharma’}, i.e., non-violence is the highest virtue. The greatest influential factors which, shaped Gandhiji personality on the lines of dynamic non-violence are two religions, i.e. Jainism and Buddhism; through other religions including Bhagvad Gita, Ramayan, Mahabhata and personalities like Buddha, Ashoka, Sankara, Ramanunga, Kabir, Nanak and Chaitnya are equally important.\textsuperscript{16} It was non violence which led the Jains to the philosophy of \textit{Anekantvad}, non absolutism which in essence is a persistent search after truth and dispassionate evolution of conflicting metaphysical theories. In the field of logic and epistemology, it has blossomed as a doctrine of nyay and sayadvada, aimed at the

\textsuperscript{15} Parekh (Bhikhu), \textit{Colonialism, Tradition and Reform, An Analysis of Gandhi’s Political Discourse}, New Delhi/London, Sage Publication, pp. 115-130.

\textsuperscript{16} Keorge (Kotturan), \textit{Ahimsa: Gautam to Gandhi}, Sterling Publication Pvt Ltd, New Delhi.
elimination of the element of conflict. Three things in the Jain system of thought influenced Gandhi's outlook the most. These were *Ahimsa* on the religious side, *anekantavada* and *sayadvada* on the philosophical side and the institution of vows on the ethical side. According to Jain sastra, ahimsa is not a negative virtue — a mere mechanical abstention from violence but a positive quality based on universal love resulting from the recognition of oneness of life and kinship of all living beings. The concept of lower species in terms of animal life and plant and their harmonious integration with human life is also evident in Jain tradition which perhaps influenced Gandhi to think in terms of avoidance of conflict among different species of life for greater social progress.  

Gandhiji being influenced by Edwin Arnold's book, *The Light of Asia*, acknowledged his debt to Buddha and at the Ceylon Congress of Buddhists he emphasized three prominent points of Buddha's life and teachings. The first is the belief in all pervading providence of god. Buddha's soul rose in mighty indignation against the base things that passed in his generation under the name of god. Gandhiji said about the significance of Buddhism in human life, that, "if virtually reinstated god in the right place and emphasized and redeclared the eternal and unalterable existence of the moral government of this universe". In his opinion, the greatest contribution of Buddha to humanity was his existing regard for all life based on love and pity which is literally expressed at maitribhava. In this context Prof. Bapat observed that, the influence that the life of the master [the Buddha] exercised on Mahatma Gandhi is self evident. He turned the principle of satyagraha into action in his private and public life and some of his present Indian leaders are the direct heirs of their master, the father of

---

Indian nation". The principle of Satyagraha, implicit in Buddhism, was applied by Gandhiji to secular and political fields. Satyagraha is a conscious application of Buddha’s teaching in public life.

Other religious faiths and their centrality and essence and other personalities and contributions to shape Gandhiji’s personality on non-violent way is also no less important. The proof of this assertion is that there are new and have been non-violent adherents in every faith drawing inspiration from deep within the well springs of their traditions. This include non-violent adherents of indigenous spiritual traditions, non-violent Bahais, non-violent Buddhists, Christians, Hindus, Jews, Muslims and many other traditions.

It includes also those non-violent humanists who disavow adherence to any religious faith but who express profound respect for life in all its forms. Gandhiji rooting himself deeply in non-violent spiritual ground, he makes it possible for adherents of all spiritual, religious and humanist faith to share that ground as a basis from which to work for non-violent global change — however, they may differ in other matters. By his scientific and experimental attitude, which is illustrated in his autobiography and subsequent campaigns in which the validity of non-violent approaches to problem solving is open to lessons to be gained from practical experience. By extension this opens up possibilities of pursuing non-violent global transformation as a subject of modern interdisciplinary scientific investigation engaging the natural sciences social sciences and humanities. On May 16, 1986 to distinguished

scientists in diversified fields of human knowledge like Anthropology, ethnology, psychology with the support of “Spanish representative of a Unesco set forth a ‘servile statement on violence’ are very close to Gandhiji in terms of the dynamic interpretation of non-violence and Gandhian Satyagraha to overcome the tragedy of total extinction.

The central points of the declaration are as follows —

1. It is scientifically incorrect to say that we have inherited a tendency to make war from our animal ancestors and violent behaviour is genetically programmed into our human nature;

2. It is also likewise incorrect to say that in the course of human evolution, there has been a selection for aggressive behaviour more than for other kind of behaviour and humans have a violent brain;

3. It is also scientifically false to believe that war is caused by instinct or any single motivation.¹⁹

In clarity the scientists reached a conclusion that, war and violence are not made inevitable by our animal nature, by our genes by our aggressive natural selections, by our brains or by our instincts. In this context, Albert Einstein has said, “Science itself is not a liberator, it creates means, not goals...we should remember that the fate of mankind [humankind] hinges entirely on mans human [moral] development”. Gandhiji’s nonviolent spiritual vision combined with commitment to

¹⁹ Page (Glenn D), *Gandhi and Global Non-violent Transformation*, Gandhi’s.............. and Darshan Samiti, New Delhi, 1994, pp. 90-95.
discovery to perfect a science of satyagraha provides both moral and scientific direction towards the nonviolent transformation of global civilization.  

GANDHIAN NON-VIOLENT CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN INDIVIDUAL AND INTERPERSONAL LEVEL

Gandhi believed on the primacy of the individual and individualism rejected the modern sociological tradition who advocated the society precedes to individual. He said in this context, “ultimately it is the individual who is the unit, and if the individual ceases to count what is left of society? and “I have discovered that man is superior to the system he has produced and propounded”. In this context, Iyer points out, Gandhi refused to believe that society is governed by laws of growth which are beyond the ability of any individual to alter. At the heart of all his personal and social actions lay an insistence that individual will and reason can effect social and political change. In that Gandhi goes to the extent of undermining the external authority which is the artificial growth and of human reason and will and create hindrances for individual self expression and reaffirm the moral autonomy and authority of the individual as an agent and an active performer in the arena of politics and social life.

Will Durant rightly claim that Gandhiji made very little application of history to the understanding of the present. To paraphrase Bhattacharya, Gandhi either did not, or could not recognize individuals as products of social relations in the sense that the sociologists have generally taken them to be, that is, insisting that individuals must be

---


22 Harijan, 27th May 1939.
looked at in their social and historical milieu. Meaning that man must be discovered “in their origin, in their evolution, in the development of society, in his history”.\(^ {23} \) In the sociological tradition, wholes are seen as determining parts: the individual is not seen as having quite the freedom that Gandhi claims for them — the individual is moulded by the social forces acting upon them — their likes and dislikes, values and modes of behaviour are those of his culture. Charles H. Colley, in his holistic approach to social structure, noted that the consideration of the individual, apart from the society of which they are members, is as artificial as considering society apart from the individuals. He remarked that not only did most people see the two separate and antithetical but that they, like Gandhi, consider the former as the antecedent to the latter. It could be said that, Gandhian thought takes individuals and their individual experiencing, individual mind and selves as logically prior to the social process in which they are involved and explains the existence of the social process in terms of them; whereas the former takes the social process of experience or behaviour as logically prior to the individuals and the individual experiencing which are involved in it, and explains their existence in terms of that social process.

The sociologist, Durkheim perhaps goes farthest in postulating that the individual is a subject whose goals and aspirations cannot be understood without knowing the social system of which he is a member. Durkheim along with other scholars, mentioned and maintained that a person is born into a society which, already has a definite structure and which conditioned their personality, that they are only one of the elements of the totality of the relationships and the relationship and society are

\(^ {23} \) Bhattacharya, *Evolution of the Political Philosophy of Gandhi*, pp. 492-93.
not created by any one individual but by the individuals. A superior life emanates from society which also influences the individual and transforms them. This interpretation of Durkheim that there is only one superior moral authority, i.e., the social collective will goes against Gandhi’s value position on this subject. For Gandhi collective moral rules need not be superior to individual moral judgements. One should remain loyal to institutions as long as they are conducive to inter alia personal growth. Where they impede it, Gandhi boldly proclaims, stressing subjective discretion, it is the individuals duty to be disloyal to it. The moral development of society, for Gandhi, stems from the moral development of the individual.24

The focus on the individual and his/her responsibility for changing the world through changing the self is aptly conveyed in Gandhi’s conviction that non-violence and methods of solving disputes non-violently are contagious if conducted in the right spirit. The more you develop it in our own being, the more infectious it becomes till it overwhelms your surroundings and by and by might oversweep the world. Gandhiji said in this context:

“Non-violence is like a radium in its action. An infinitesimal quantity of it embedded in a malignant growth acts continuously, silently and ceaselessly till it has transformed the whole mass of the diseased tissue into a healthy one. Similarly even a little of true non-violence acts in a silent subtle, unseen way and leavens the whole society.” 25

24 Young India, 13 August 1925. Mahatma Gandhi pointed out the relationship between social will and individual will and if the former acts as an agent of interference of individual development then the latter has every right to go against it.

It was evident from the pages of human history that Gandhi’s approach of individualism and positive humanism based on the intention of reforming the individual which will ultimately reform the whole society. Gandhi himself led large mass movements that were concerned with social issues. Satyagraha means fighting injustices. Self reformation cannot come about in isolation, selflessness is the key to its attainment. Reformation of the society and the self are inextricably linked — reform yourself and you have started to reform the world, reform the world non-violently and you will have reformed yourself. This interplay between the individual and the society can be seen when Gandhi speaks of the attainment of swaraj [independence] for India. In order to promote moral courage and a sense of ethical conviction against the tyranny of British rule, Gandhian conception of individualism against social will which was in fact externally dominated will of Britishers was justified to build India on the backbone of Indians. But the contemporary relevance of the atomistic individualism perhaps is a hindrance of any kind of social growth and progress.

In the context of conflict between self and society, individual and society and state power, current sociological knowledge does not indicate that Gandhi’s interpretation of the interplay between society and individual is necessarily invalid, it merely means that stepping outside the social norms to change the society is not easy. The sociological debate, however, has great bearing on the question of whether satyagraha, as developed by Gandhi, has any applicability as a method of conflict resolution outside the social setting in which it was developed. As the individual is indebted to their society for the great many of their modes of behaviour so too are their responses to interpersonal conflict institutionalized. From the point of view of Durkheim and others, Gandhi’s philosophy cannot be separated from Gandhi the
person or from the cultural traditions, historical circumstances, or the economic political and social organizations of the society in which satyagraha emerged as a technique of conflict resolution. All societies have their shared concepts of moral rules and disputes processing practices which allow members of the society to live together with minimum frictions and conflicts — methods imported from a foreign social setting may not fit.26 As Rudolph and Rudolph has pointed out at least in theory much of the west’s adversary legal tradition and political life embodies “the belief that conflicts are best resolved through the frank confrontation of alternatives, the clear articulation of alternatives, the clear articulation of opposites, their clash and the victory of one alternative over the other”, while traditional Indian ideas of conflict management in both politics and law tend to stress arbitration, compromise and the de-emphasis of overt clashes, of victories and defeats.

Gandhi’s interpretation of the relationship between society and the individual, he argued society does not make the individual but it is otherwise. Satyagraha and non-violence is a human science which crosses all barriers of culture and having a multi-dimensional and universalistic application, irrespective of human being and lower species.27 In order to resolve the evergoing conflict between man as an individual and society as an institution, he argued western capitalistic pattern of modernization resulted in institutionalization of social living and excluded the personal element, and along with this the exclusion of the basis of morality. This bring the individual up

against the 'system' which is immune to the moral influence on which satyagraha depends. Thus, he concludes modernism and satyagraha are incompatible.\(^{28}\)

The logical extension of conflicts between modernity and tradition which also reflected between individuals inner essence and spirit on the one hand with outer pleasure, i.e., sensual pleasure in the individual level could be resolved if the individual is guided by the former than the later. It is also well evident that the conflict between different body structures became comparatively more due to the invention and application of technology and placement of individual whole structure by artificial machine, which is a product of human rationality. Modern concept of rationality give birth to easy living, pleasure seeking and after power and money rather than the totalistic development of man. Gandhian satyagrahi personality, as he propounded was for totalistic development of individual personality including humanistic and spiritualistic aspects than making the man an atomistic, alienated and pleasure seeking animal. In that sense Michael Focault, the French Philosopher who accepted as the most unchallenging philosopher is very close to, what Mahatma Gandhi talks in terms of modern man and its place in the high tech era. Rousseau’s interpretation is also quite conformity with Gandhi in terms of modernity and high technology and how it demolish the essence of man into only a sense gratifying creature.\(^{29}\)

The modern society which is otherwise known as market society based on the principle of naked self-interest, egoism, Darwinian and hedonistic principle of


utilitarianism. The market society in a sense unites individuality with sociality but in so far as individuality is equated with egoism. The man whose individuality is expressed in terms of egoism — more specifically, acquisitive and possessive egoism is also sociable in the utilitarian sense that his interests drives him into relations of division of labour, exchange and so on. The achievement of self identity through appropriation, that is defining of ‘I’ through the ‘my’ constitutes the foundation of an atomistic society that emerges out of the aggregation of autonomous, self defining entities. In such society, possession in the words of Dewey, shapes and consolidates the I “of philosopher”. “I own therefore I am” expresses a truer psychology than the Christian “I think therefore I am”. Egoism as the basis of social cohesion, however, does not work in practice.\(^{30}\)

Man and society, since they are microcosmic expressions of the universal order, must represent the same principles of integral unity, universality, hierarchy and harmony. Just as the soul rules over the body land the transcendental self-over the empirical self, so emancipated reason would rule over untouchy passions. All human laws would be fed by one divine law, as Hirakleitos said and there would be no place for violence and exploitation. Contingent conflicts and temporary disputes will be resolved through an appeal to the first principles which are common to all. In such a society, there will neither be tyranny of the minority or of an individual nor anarchy created by the reckless masses. There will neither be any justification for deadly wars between nations or an impetus to subjugate nature and aggravate ecological crisis. For both arise from a schism in the soul and an artificial disjunction between man and nature. Modern science, according to Gandhi, contradicts the ethico-philosophical and

metaphysical dimensions of man which is also well evident in great theoreticians' arguments like Rene Guenon. Modern science as a contra-distinguished from traditional wisdom inherited the following drawbacks —

a) It denies the transcendental dimension of reality and rejects the transhuman, transtemporal, divine source of knowledge and authority. It believes in phenomenal world, the world of sense experience and reason, is the only reality and that the method appropriate to the explanation of physical nature that is, the empirico-logical method is the only method for understanding the world at each and every level.

b) Another related feature of the modern science which replaces the cosmic metaphysical “I” to anatomical, visual eye is its reductionism in methodology which reduces higher to lower, essence to substance, form to matter, reality to process, value to fact, intellect to reason and reason to unreason and emotions.

c) Modern science not only distorted the totality of man but also introduces the notion of mechanistic explanation and technological, instrumental rationality. Modern reason is not the quality by which man is united with god. It is simply as Hobbes put it, “reckoning of consequences of general names”. Cut off from its transcendent source, modern reason inclined more and more towards an inferior pole of existence, towards materiality which is always susceptible to endless multiplicity and manipulatibility.\(^\text{31}\)

In this context, Gandhi’s concept of appropriate technology and critical approach, modern science which not only introduces high technology, but also disfigured the human face is quite in conformity with the social scientists who criticize modern science and technology for science and technology sake but for service of the total humanity.

\(^\text{31}\) Rene (Guenon), *Crisis of the Modern World*, London, Luzac & Company, 1993, pp. 78-79. Modern Science is ignorant knowledge, “knowledge of an inferior order”; and also

Gandhian social structure was not like individualistic atomistic and self centred one but he advocated very strongly about the usefulness of community life where strong sense of feeling and inter-relationship is evident. In that he favours is individual and its integration with the higher and broader sociality. Gandhiji thought and said the first and fundamental factor to resolve the interpersonal conflict is to internalize the true spirit and essence of satyagraha and its flexibility of understanding and accepting the other viewpoint and equally treating the other as a “you” rather than as an “it”. When interpersonal conflicts arise whether they be between parties having different degrees of authority (for example parent/child in the home or teacher/student in the school) or between parties having theoretically equal power (friends, marriage partners etc.) the general ways of bring conflicts to an end are for the parties to attempt to impose their will on each other, for authority figures to exercise their authority or for one party to give in. The first in these “zero sum” approaches [authoritarian] may produce resentment and hostility in the loser, provide them with little motivation to carry out the solution, requires heavy enforcement, inhibits the growth of self responsibility, self discipline and creativity, fosters dependence and submission [mainly out of fear] and may make the winner feel guilty.32

The insistence upon self suffering has, then, an element of expediency in it. The resort to self-sacrifice and voluntary submission to injury is a positive policy and is not merely a matter of last resort. Gandhi was careful to distinguish his method from that of passive resistance which either suggests lack of capacity to employ

violence or tends to be a preliminary step to violence. Gandhiji guarded against attracting to his satyagraha movement. Those who feared to take up arms or felt themselves incapable of resistance. "I do believe", he wrote, "that where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence. Non-violent conduct, Gandhi, insisted is never demoralizing where cowardice always is".  

It is well evident that the modern liberal theory of man and capitalistic mode of social growth created a gap of individual psychology cultural differentiation in the name of modernization and secularism further extended the gap of every kind including communication which resulted in conflict and its logical extension, i.e., violence. J. Habermas interpretation clearly points out that differential developments inn different aspects of individual life and creation of false sense of rationality, information [computer and other informative technology] resulted in false knowledge and belief of the social fact and enhances both structural [material] and cultural conflict. The present trend of violence, perhaps is deeply rooted with this kind of ideological operationalisation and its reflection in other aspects of life. He further added by saying the liberal democratic capitalistic man replaced the cosmic spiritualistic and totalistic concept of "I" with visual, structural eye which is guided by external appearance rather than inner value and reality. This resulted in subjective violence in vision, perception, thinking and understanding of social fact and explanation.

Gandhi, on the other hand, believes in the Idealistic School of Thought, opposed the capitalistic mode of production on different grounds including the

---


creation of a wider gap between different social structures and individuals, which could be integrated in the whole process of social development. Gandhian concept of community backed by common goal of shareability and based by self love and feeling has been replaced by group theory based on interest and its fulfillment further resulted in naked concept of atomistic individualism. This resulted not only in competition but also in conflict and violence.

The interpersonal relationship and its variety of aspects, perhaps could be reintegrated in the social developmental process, if the capitalistic mode of development and its present logical extension in almost all aspects of human life would not be introduced and followed. However, Gandhi was fond of emphasizing the need for caring and cooperative interpersonal relationship based on consensus than competition, value than fact, essence than existence. He firmly believed that the individual self is the fundamental ground to be ethical and morally trained and purified to make the social self or collective self better and healthy.35

Gandhian interpersonal relationship in the community life is based on both individualism and social collectivism where mutuality, reciprocity, interdependence and face to face contact with common value is present. But, perhaps the concept of community and interpersonal relationship is being affected in a greater degree when the ideology of modern liberalism take over and widen the gap between different role structures, occupational patterns and at last individualism and social collectivism. One of the reason for the failure of liberal thought to reconcile individuality and sociality

lies as wood suggests, in the fact that, the model of liberalism is characterized by a conception of liberty in which human freedom is not incompatible with subjection even to objective forces external to the individual; and a conception of community as externalized, perhaps enforced coexistence, assuming atomistic relationships among individuals and, insofar as individuality tends to be equated with atomism and privatization, an essential antagonism between individuality and sociality. The liberal view of the individual fails to provide a ground for the reconciliation of the different claims of individuality and sociality. But there are theoretical perspectives that resolve the antagonism between individual and the society by refusing to treat them in antithetical opposition. Wood said, in this context, characterized by a conception of freedom as self activity, autonomy and transcendence of objective determinism; and a conception of community as an integral part of the human psyche, United in consciousness with individuality, so that sociality and individuality — which here does not simply mean atomism or privatization, but the impulse towards self activity, creativity and self development — are not antagonistic but mutually supportive.

Gandhin in this sense to integrate the individual with community and to resolve the permanent conflicting situation between the two, puts stress on the essential unity of things. This is reflected in his commitment to the *adhyatmam-adhidaivam* perspective that sees the manifestation of the supreme spirit in all the self living beings and material objects. To give allegiance to the *adhyatmam-adhidaivam* perspective in itself constitutes an orientation that prevents super arrogation of the self. This projects an organismic vision of the cosmos that overcomes the opposition

between the self and the other, paves the way for the identification of the self with the external world and provides the basis for the self to relate meaningfully with others. Gandhiji insisting upon self transformation as a means for self realization, emphasizes the spiritual sanctity of life and wants to completely identify himself with life. As he says, “the ocean is composed of drops of water; each drop is an entity and yet this is a part of the whole; ‘the one and the many’. In this ocean of life, we are little drops. My doctrine means that I must identify myself with life, with everything that lives, that I must share the majesty of life in the presence of god. The sum total of this life is god”.37

Gandhi, perhaps to justify the transformative and progressive social life based on tolerance, common sharing and many-ness of the truth and its subjective and relative truth/value argued; given the essential unity of everything, however, this essential unity evokes different shapes of meaning in different persons and communities. To impose one’s own will is not only to ignore the vital difference but also to violate the truth. The perception and manifestation of different shapes of meaning necessarily mean the recognition and acceptance of relativism within the overarching frame of advaita. As Gandhi says:

“I am an advaitist and yet I cannot support Dvaitism [dualism]. The world is changing every moment, and therefore unreal, it has no permanent existence. But though it is constantly changing, it has something about it which persists and it is therefore to that extent real. I have therefore no objection to calling it real and unreal and thus being called an anekantavadi or a sayadvadi”.38


38 Ibid., p. 107. [Anekantavad and sayadvad means a believer in the manyness of reality].
The recognition of many particles of reality coupled with the perception of the many as the manifestation of the same reality prevents any exclusivity insofar as any insistence on pursuing just one path excludes the possibility of accommodating the divergent interests and concerns of human beings. But this recognition leads to more than a mere negation of exclusivism. The reluctance to impose one's way on others is, in a very important sense, the recognition of and consideration for the integrity of the other and also a recognition that one can never fully comprehend the other to the same extent and in the same degree as one can comprehend oneself. As Gandhiji says —

“It has been my experience that I am always true from my point of view, and I am often wrong from the point of view of my honest critics. I know that we are both right from our perspective point of view. And this knowledge saves me from attributing motives of my opponents or critics. The seven blind men who gave seven different descriptions of the elephant were all right from the point of view of one another and right and wrong from the point of view of the man who knew the elephant. I very much like this doctrine of the manyness of the reality”. 39

The interpersonal conflict which is based on all kind of relationship starting from social, political, economical and cultural could be build on a strong and stable foundation if all the individuals in personal level guided by the principle of both subjective reality and relative reality of the social fact. The subjective and reality facets of life, provide a sufficient space for tolerance, mutuality and a strong sense of

commonality and shareability. In that sense, Gandhi rejected the concept of exclusivism and his respect for the others are rooted in satya and ahimsa. The attitude of ahimsa is more than abstaining from injuring any living being whether by body or mind, ahimsa in its positive sense means the largest love the greatest charity. If I am a follower of ahimsa, I must love my enemy. I must apply my same rule to the wrong doers who is my enemy or stranger to one, as I would do my wrong doing father or son. This active ahimsa includes truth and fearlessness.40

To pursue ahimsa in one’s interaction with others does not mean a submission to collective social sanctions. As a matter of fact, self transformation, in Gandhi’s sense, means neither isolated self control nor an uncritical submission to the restrictions or concerns of society. Nor does it undermine either social collectivity or the individual self. On the contrary, it forces one to transcend the duality of the individual and society. Drawing a comparison of individual and society is just like drop and ocean, he advocated/argued that one cannot survive without the other. The question of the relationship between the individual and the society cannot in Gandhi’s view be discussed in terms that gives primacy to either. As Tu Wei-ming points out—

“ideally the dangers of self isolation and social coercion can be conquered if the fundamental change has been made in the dichotomous way of perceiving the relationship between the self and the society. In a practical sense, the source of such a change is located neither in the self

40 CWMG, XII, p. 295, Gandhiji defined non-violence as a positive force of love and compassion.
nor in the society exclusively. It has to be sought in both, and indeed in
the between".41

Gandhi recognizes the mutual dependence between the self and society. The
individual for Gandhi remains important not because the individual is prior to society
but because he is the most active component of society and corporate growth is
dependent entirely on individual growth. To avoid conflict between individual rights
and social growth, he said, there is no distinction between individual growth and social
growth. The social growth is therefore entirely dependent upon individual growth and
hence the English proverb "a chain is no stronger than the weakest link in it is a
conformity with Gandhiji".42 To build an ideal society free from all kind of conflicts,
he does not conceptualize in terms of superior divine will against irrational egocentric
will and its dictation against the former so far as the individual level is concerned but
also logically extended this ideality into interpersonal relationship and their attitude,
culture, religious faiths and way of life. Perhaps, Gandhi, in order to unify and
integrate the total masses against the foreign hegemonistic power and understanding
the essence and operation of social life of the people, its spatio temporal dimension and
its diversity, he tried to synthesize through the process of sociological assimilation and
cultural unity.

Gandhian concept of manyness in one and its proper autonomy in the process
of social transformation, integration and unity also found its place with the modern
social scientists interpretation of multiplicity, plurality and diversity of approaches to

41 Tu Wei-ming, Humanity and Self Cultivation: Essays in Confucian Thought, Berkeley,
Asian Humanities Press, 1979, p. 23.

42 Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, XXXIV, p. 505.
study the social issues and integrate these with the process of social transformation. The differential socio-economic structure influences both the standard of living and essence of life, which is reflected in ideology [plan of action], culture [attitude] towards life and religion [i.e., how man lives and what man believes]. In that sense to resolve conflict between culture and religion he said categorically, "I do not want my house to be walled on all sides and that my windows blinded. I want all cultures of all countries to come into my house. But I refuse to be wiped away by any culture whatsoever". Gandhiji who opposed to colonialism and its different forms of operation, argued for cultural identity, cultural autonomy and cultural self expression. It is also well evident from the "multi-causal explanation vs. mono-causal truth" that all the cultures and ways of life should be given due respect and autonomy. In that sense, Gandhi is quite close to great Poet Rabindranath Tagore and idea of culture and universalism.

For Gandhiji, Indian civilization and culture were essentially plural and non-dogmatic. From the very beginning, it had realized that the ultimate reality was infinite and inexhaustible and that different individuals grasped different aspects of it. None was wholly wrong and none wholly right. Everyone was therefore left free, even encouraged to live out the truth as he saw it and to discover for himself its limits and possibilities. This is why, in his view, Hinduism allowed its adherents full freedom of choice between different religious texts, conceptions of God and forms of worship. In that context Gandhi said and argued, Indian civilization was not only plural but pluralist, that is committed to plurality as desirable value, not just a collection of

different ethnic religious and cultural groups but a unity in diversity. Since it held that
different men perceived ultimate reality, differently and that a richer view of it could
only be attained by a dialogue between them, it is not only tolerated but respected and
welcomed diversity and encouraged discussion between its constituent groups. It was
an open civilization with permeable boundaries allowing new influences to flow in and
vitalize the old, so that the new became part of the old, the old was discarded or
vitalized and the whole civilization renewed itself. Over the centuries, Gandhi went on
Indians ‘blended with one another with the utmost freedom’ and made India a
microcosm of the world, a synthesis of different cultures, a happy family whose
members, vastly different in temperaments, habits and modes of thought, enjoyed a
relaxed relationship. Indeed, India had developed an arcane faculty for assimilation
and an amazing tolerance for opposite ideas.44

GANDHIAN CONCEPT OF NON-VIOLENCE AND INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT

By understanding the causality and its disastrous effect on human society in
1960s, Herbert Marcuse made a statement by saying, non-violence is not a virtue but it
is a necessity. Gandhi saw that for a less armed world “some nation will have to
disarm herself and take large risks. Such unilateral action, it seems will reduce
international tensions rather than merely encourage stronger nations to strike. Osgood
who also very close to Gandhian non-violent conflict and total disarmament argued in
terms of tension reduction as a process and it should start by unilateral means. He
stated that after the first state starts the process and the second does not reciprocate
after the first move, the first state who initiated the process should wait and then take

44 Young India, 11 August 1927.
the second move. He claims that in this way, there is every possibility of conversion of the unilateral conflict into bilateral, multilateral and at last universal disarmament.\textsuperscript{45} Gandhiji pointing out the multiple causality of conflict said the economically developed states always want to control the weaker states and continue their exploitation and equip themselves with armaments to face the later states. In this sense the real armament is related with economic exploitation and the disarmament with end of exploitation in its various forms and kinds. Gandhi said in this context —

"war does not always result from the perceived external threat, it may result from a dispute over a scarce resources, or they may be used as a means of solving internal problems of a country by providing employment, creating group cohesiveness by diverting aggressions outwards or bolstering a self image of honour and courage".\textsuperscript{46}

Gandhi’s ideal society which is based on exploitation of any form both material and non-material would aim to resolve international conflicts by helping its neighbours alleviate their economic problems and endeavouring to remain on friendly terms with them by adding them with superior technical skills and knowledge, to develop their local resources to the utmost extent. That it would cease to exploit these neighbours in axiomatic. Gandhi’s definition of exploitation is very broad, encompassing the belief that, he who claims as his own more than the minimum that is really necessary for him is guilty of theft”. This applies to individual at its fundamental and primary level and

\textsuperscript{45} Osgood (C.E.), \textit{An Alternative to War or Surrender}, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1962, p. 111.

\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Harijan}, 13 April 1940.
could be extended to national and international level.\textsuperscript{47}

These ideal Gandhian prescriptions at the empirical level have to be understood in terms of his ultimate values, which are also the decisive determinants of Gandhian methodology of conflict resolution at all levels of social organization. Gandhi’s ultimate value is truth and justice which are conceptually interchangeable with each other. Justice is a synthetic value, consisting of freedom, equality, mutuality and interdependence not only among the finest species that is among the individuals, but also among animals, plants and their harmony with nature. The inter-relationship among all species and species with nature and their non-exploitation based on common good and surviving together ethics embarked Gandhian thought and its practical relevance to the contemporary society.

In order to put an end to exploitation which directly gives birth to violence and injustice, Gandhiji said:

“If I take anything that I do not need for my immediate use, and keep it, I thieve it from somebody else. I venture to suggest that it is the fundamental law of nature without exception that nature produces enough for our wants from day to day and if only everybody took enough for himself and nothing more, there would be no pauperism in this world, there would be no dying of starvation in this world. But so long as we have got this inequality, so long we are thieving”.\textsuperscript{48}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{47} Gandhi (M.K.), \textit{Ashram Observances in Action}, p. 58.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
Gandhian concept of non-violence and satyagraha which, based on ethical and moral foundation, preaches end of exploitation of any form, i.e., either man by man, man to nature and natural resources [of course, not related with need], first world to second or third world and at last man to lower living animals and plants. Psychologically, socio-economically and culturally, it is true that the degree of violence depends upon the degree of gap between two societies and their socio-economic and cultural life which is a byproduct of exploitation of one by the other. In the process of cultural assimilation, economic integration and social integration the lower variables not only feel threatened by the higher one but also sufficiently exploited and dominated by the first one. In that sense and context, he [Gandhiji] advocates for a new world order arising from the restructuring and restructuration of national societies or in his own words through “non-violent nationalism”. He builds for an enduring world order from bottom upwards by two steps or stages namely, the discipline or training of the individual and the transformation and reconstruction of the political and socio-economic structures of the nations along non-violent lines. And it is this pervasive and thorough going character of Gandhi’s approach to world order that tend to distinguish from most of the other approaches.49

Ultimately, the nations of the world will organize themselves into a world federation or international league. Thus, he wrote to Frydman in July 1942, ‘I told you that I was at one with you that I was trying to take the congress and everybody towards world federation’. But Gandhi points out that “the structure of the world federation can be raised only on the foundation of non-violence, and violence will have

to be given up in world affairs”.\textsuperscript{50} He expressed the same in 1931 while speaking in Geneva about the League of nations. The League is expected to replace war and by its own power, to arbitrate between nations who might have differences among themselves. According to Gandhi, “there would be an international league only when all the nations, big or small, composing it are fully dependent. The nature of that independence will correspond to the extent of non-violence assimilated by the nations concerned. In 1947, Gandhi said that the only condition on which the world can continue to live is that it should be united under one central governing body composed of the elected representatives of the component parts.

There is a new reality in the contemporary arms race not comparable with anything in the past. Static notions first and the second world wars, help to obscure the entirely new environment and dynamics underlying the current arm race:

1. The arms race today is no longer a competition in quantities only, but predominantly a race in modern technology. The complex nature of nuclear armaments not only create a threat perception but also hinder the quality and dynamics of social growth, economic progress and political stability.

2. With technology becoming the focal point in armaments, the dynamics of the arms race have changed profoundly.

3. The magnitude and proportion of the destructive power of modern arms have reached unprecedented levels. This is primarily due to second and third generation improvements in nuclear weapons. New technology has also amplified both the operational efficiency and the destructive power of conventional weapons to an extraordinary degree.

4. Socio-political and economic motives for the arms race have grown stronger in response to the transformation of the industrial society, the changed role of the state, the centralization of the state authority, the

\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Gandhiji's Correspondence With The Government [1942-44]}, Ahmedabad, 1955, p. 175.
abundance of means, the explosion of technology, broader and stronger corporate constituencies behind armaments and the polarization of the international community.

To create an order of non-violence in the world society Gandhi took a serious note of the above factors and causes which help in the direction of global nuclear threat and total annihilation. Yet another new dimension to the contemporary, arms race with its vertical escalation in weapon modernization and destructive capabilities, is a horizontal proliferation of global dimensions. The peace setters here, again are the Soviet Union and the United States followed by powers like France, the federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and to a lesser extent by countries like Czechoslovakia and Poland. Weapons are exported and sold both for strategic-political and economic reasons. One basic motivation for weapons export is the need to sustain an economy of scale in the armaments industry and to support large military research and development establishments in the major arms manufacturing countries. The following are the broad category of explanations which are based on political, economic, technological and psychological factors for arms race in international arena and push Gandhian non-violence world order aside. They are —

1. imperial and national rivalries, power politics and expansionist schemes;

2. security dilemmas caused by aggressive and rapacious policies of neighbours or other powers;

3. system competition and ideological or religious enmity, i.e., Cold War crusades;

4. Profit of other vested interests of industry, the military, the state, the bureaucracy and the technological establishments,
5. the technological momentum caused by pressures of science and technology, their impact on the art of warfare and weapon modernization.51

Though the factors are clearly distinguished on the basis of its objectives and nature for proper understanding, but generally it is found that all factors are interrelated with each other and no single factor exists independently and influences the arms race and its causality exclusively. In different contexts and circumstances, the Prime causation may be attributed to a specific set of determinates but to some extent all the above factors are represented in most of the situations.

Global security issues deal with possible improvements including radical qualitative improvements, in individual and national security for large numbers, even for all of humankind. For example, in today’s tinder box world, a total nuclear freeze could be envisaged, meaning that a nuclear devastation would henceforth be impossible, but that a new political climate could be inaugurated which could generate some optimism and confidence as a byproduct to achieving an end to or a suspension of further production, testing and deployment of new and still quicker and deadlier weapons of mass destruction; a reduction perhaps even a qualitative one in levels of danger and in levels of fear, on both sides in our world which divided into east and west, ideologically. The most powerful and relatively more powerful nations are not governed by the interest of the humanity or even their own people’s interest. The leading NATO nations, for example, are governed in the interests of powerful economic and political interest coalitions, and the prevailing rhetoric of liberty and national security are powerful tools in the arsenals of class domination. The power of

this rhetoric is magnified by modern television, which facilitates the projection of an image regardless the substance.⁵²

The international community in a broader sense, perceives national and international security in their existential totality. This means not only military security but also economic, political and social security also directly and indirectly related with it. The policy and movement of non-alignment have contributed, in a particular, to the consolidation of this concept by insistence on the key thesis that a radical transformation of the whole system of the international political, economic, social and cultural relations is a condition for realizing international security. Gandhi's concept of non-violence which has multiple implications is in close conformity with the present day international security which does not exclusively depends upon military but also on economic, social, cultural and other factors. The United Nations also very recently trying to expand its area of action and operation to the economic, social and cultural fields to create a genuine international security. The fact that there can be no international security without narrowing the gap between the developed and the developing countries, without balancing the world economy and without equality in international relations. Gandhi also fought in that sense to avoid violence and corruption and supported the equitable distribution of material wealth and decentralization of power both economical and political, which he thought, perhaps would resulted in violence of greatest degree.⁵³

---


⁵³ Gandhi (M.K.), Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule, 1909, Navjivan Publication. And also Mehdi (Haider), Disarmament and Development, Socialist Perspective, Progressive Publisher, Lahore, 1988, pp. 70-73.
The history of evolution clearly points out that technology and technological inventions created a different way of life, system of production and productive relations and at last structural change and new structural equations and adjustments. The invention of iron contributed in that sense to create a new type of civilization, better and easy way of production and at last human happiness through leisure. The historical development of entire human society could be equated with technology. In the 16th century, the transformation in the level of technological invention resulted in creation of a strong national state with the concept of individualism and reflected in ideology of liberalism which could integrate individual liberty and technological development together. The ideology of technology, i.e., liberalism not only accelerated the concept of individualism up to a level but also created conflict among interests of individual. To avoid that conflict and make the concept of collective society, collective interest and common good possible the ideology of liberalism has undergone a substantial change.

This clearly indicates that technology and technological intervention in productive life influences ideology for its operation. This also resulted in differences of development, nationalism and individualism which having a consequential effect of conflict of various type and degrees. The Realist School of International Relations Theory, which is a product of nationalism as an ideology and protection and promotion of national interest is the highest priority states that the final output and result is war of highest technological kind and global devastation. Perhaps the greatest votary and protagonist of realist theory Hans Morgenthau, like Machiavelli, supported the
concept of war for the sake of promotion of national interest. The war has its justification if the output is better and superior than the cost involved, but it may not have its validity if it is at the cost of total destruction. The concept of Gandhian individualism and its ultimate transformation into internationalism has the concept of nationalism, but it is neither opposed to individualism nor internationalism. The recent development of international global society with mutuality and interdependence not only nullified the concept of nationalism but also more closer to Gandhian international globalism without violence of any kind and war.  

Headly Bull argues that the presence of sovereign independent states which are divided politically, ideologically different and militarily armed, it is unreasonable to expect peace. He observes that war is endemic with the system of states. Burton identified the following three different causalities which are responsible for conflict in international system—

a) Imperial powers which is a culmination of colonialism and exploitation of the third world have pursued their national interests at the expense of the needs of the people of the third world states.

b) The conflict and its causes are so complex that neither the cause of the conflict is understood nor the management process that might have been used to resolve the conflict.

c) Due to the inadequate understanding of the conflict and its resolution processes, imperial elites have relied on violence and adversary negotiations when other processes including non-violent conflict resolution are more appropriate. The failures, Burton argues can all be traced to the shortcomings of the domestic institutions of national societies whether they are capitalistic or socialistic.

---

By 1980s Burton observes national societies are characterized by escalating levels of conflict [ethnic, street violence, poverty and management]. In these circumstances many national elites, relied on military force to maintain internal control and to resist political change. This is because national elites are always intended to defend the existing structures and systems by going to war if necessary against the pressures for change generated by the external influences that accompanied normal international relations. Galtung's interpretation of conflict is related with centre-periphery approach and their interconnectedness of the former to maintain its hegemony over the later. Galtung divided the entire international society into first world, second world and third world on the basis of concentration of power and its different forms. The elitist of the first world who controlled the centre of the same also could able to control its own periphery and its modes of operation. Secondly, the elitists of the first world also control the centres of the third world through communicative and other mechanism and through them their control could be extended to the third world periphery also. The alliance between the elites provides the bridgehead by which the centre countries penetrate and exploit periphery countries. The key to exploitation is the vertical division of labour, which means that when products traded are ranked in terms of their degree of processing [the amount of capital, research technology and management as opposed to the amount of raw material and unskilled labour that go into the products] and in terms of the challenges built in the task of creating them, the centre gets much more positive spin off effects, including value added than does the periphery. This economic exploitation which in practice is

reinforced by the cultural, political and if necessary military power of the centre results in denial of the basic needs of ordinary people in the periphery. According to Galtung, the North-South conflict is a vertical one involving centre and periphery nations in which each nation has its own centre and periphery.

The basic differences between Burton and Galtung is that when the former admits and argues that international conflicts, are the spill over of domestic conflicts at the same time the later argues that the centre-periphery conflicts and their structural manifestations are not the spill over of a domestic problems in the periphery countries, but are the direct result of policies and structures of exploitation maintained by elites in the centre countries. The origin of international conflict Galtung argues may thus be traced to both domestic and foreign sources. Galtung argued these conflicts could be resolved by the following three levels —

1. Process adjustment, policy adjustment within an existing system of structures;
2. Adjustment of structures within a system;
3. Change of the system itself

a) Conflict according to Gandhi is both positive and desirable. It is an important means to greater human unity. John Galtung points out that instead of separating two parties it tried to unite them because they have their incompatibility in common. Gandhi believed that conflict should be antagonistic of the deeper, perhaps transcendental unity of life because the spiritual bond is greater than the bond of social relationship.

b) Gandhi also saw conflict in social structures than in the individuals. In that sense, though there is a conflict between different functional entities what Gandhi entities what Gandhi

---

called vanavyavastha, it is natural and through it, the whole system could be transformed into a better well order system. The concept of untouchability which later on followed by the division of labour it followed due to the individual attitude towards a particular function and attaching superior and inferior value to it. In the sense of sufficient space for structural transformation which is beyond ascriptive principles as well as trying to make a man an ethical sound and ideal personality, Gandhi thought and endeavour for both structural and self purification.

c) Gandhi saw conflict as a perennial condition and put emphasis that how to manage conflicts and create new social arrangements free from structural violence. This emphasis is in stark contrast to Marxist doctrine which provides no guidelines for dealing with new type of conflict [including those related to class] as emerged in socialistic and communist societies.

Galtung in conformity with Gandhi, in order to resolve conflict coined "conflict triangle" which means conflict could be resolved if the three factors will be taken into account [a] the attitude, [b] the behaviour, [c] the goal incompatibility itself. Satyagraha for Gandhi, which is based on truth, morality and multiplicity of truth, excludes the concept of violence because it cannot fulfill mutually agreed upon satisfactory solution nor accommodate and integrate the relative morality and individual perception for maintenance of a highest ethical order. Gandhian approach to conflict resolution could be broadly classified into the following three categories —

a) While satyagraha implies cooperation with the opponent as a person with context of the human unity structures — the deep structures to which every one belongs — it implies non-cooperation with the opponents role in the context of the social structure.
b) Compromise with the basic principles when the same is not challenged. This reflected his desire to cooperate with the opponents whenever possible throughout struggle in order to build relationships and create the basis for a sound post conflict life.

c) Gandhi tried to maintain synthesis and promote transcendence forgetting the lower level of conflict for the better unity and transformation where the best of both the parties in conflict are reflected and integrated. The aim according to Bondurant, the Gandhian Theorist, was to create new choices and to restructure the opposing elements of a conflict in order to achieve a synthesis that was satisfactory to all parties and superior to any one of the original positions.57

Gandhian non-violence continued, until persuasion has carried the conflict into mutually agreeable adjustment. And this adjustment, in the formula used by Galtung entail three elements: correction in the steep self-other attitudinal gradient, reversal of the behavioural polarization pattern and removal of the goal incompatibility, if necessary by creating new social structures. For Gandhi, success also implies the creation of a superior social structure, higher degrees of fearlessness and self-reliance on the part of both satyagrahis and their opponents and a greater degree of human unity at the level of social relationships. It also well understood that Gandhian satyagraha which is a panacea to violence and its logical extension, i.e., war of total destruction is based on the principle of [a] unity of means and ends, [b] a recognition of unity of all life, and [c] a willingness on the part of the satyagrahi to undergo suffering including suffering for other by which confidence in the mind of the opponent could be restored.

The logical extension of conflict is ideological conflict which is well evident from the USA and USSR relationships and supported by their respective ideology oriented states. This ideology is also related with technological developments and make the nature and degree of conflict into a nuclear warfare. Ideology, historically analyzing is directly related with the technological invention and scientific discoveries, renaissance, reformation etc. The 16th century historical developments, and creation of individualism, liberalism, capitalism and the unequal, disharmonious relationship among the various factors of production and end of human suffering, i.e., socialism and somehow the concept of welfare state is a direct result of technology and its role in shaping the future of humanity. So, the centrality of technology by shaping the ideology based on human happiness not only help the humanity positively but also equally negatively by producing atom bombs and other high variety of global suicidal warfare technologies. For total survival Vs total annihilation the choice left in the hands of the man is ideology of peace and its primacy over technology of war. To explain the point further, it could be well argued that though ideology is a product of technology for human happiness, upto a certain level ideology of survival should give direction to the technology land what should be ideal relationship between man and machine, rationalism and wisdom, global ethics of collective life than total annihilation based on individual craziness for power and domination. Gandhian concept of non-violence and its dynamics based on interdependence, mutuality and harmony for maintenance of peaceful coexistence is perhaps a close approximation to world peace and total survival than total destruction. In essence, it could be argued that capitalistic ideological intervention in human life the concept of consensus, harmony land solidarity was more in human society, and it also could reindoctrinate in the post
capitalism phase, if non-violence and its wider applicability transcends the concept of violence and war.  

'Global security' refers to the probability of reduced hazards for all nations without exception, and for all communities within each nation and for each individual within each community, the probability enhanced protection for individual lives and rights and for collective entitlements everywhere. The concept of Global security could reduce the hazards relating to [a] human lives, [b] human health, [c] human dignity and solidarity, [d] human freedom and choice. Nuclear war, whether by insanity or accident or pseudo-sane design, is by far the most massive menace to our global security, but there are many others — pestilence, drought, imperialist oppression, environmental deterioration, terrorism, crime and so on. The protection of our global security depends upon, truly international defense efforts, against many kinds of hazards, transnational agencies concerned with dealing with most urgent challenges and the most promising preventive and remedial strategies, and sharing resources and personnel for defensive action.

The mad race for armament in international politics and partially national and regional politics maintain the ideological statusquoism through use of naked instruments of compulsion not only create psychological insecurity in the mind of the people and the government but also exhausted large scale money, men and material in the military pursuit which could be otherwise used for socio-economic development and other developmental purposes. The process of militarization and nuclear warfare not only exploit the natural resources, manual labour which output and end result is to dig out the grave of entire humanity, but also creating pollution to a great extent. The

Gulf crisis has reminded us of the dangers with which weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery are fraught and has demonstrated the seriousness of the problem of their proliferation. On the one hand, the crisis has brought to light a number of weak spots in the system of international security established over the last several decades. On the other, it has shown the ability of the international community to react adequately on the whole to the emerging threats. Unfortunately, events went so far that the response had to take the form of force both with respect to the liberation of Kuwait and the elimination of certain types of weapons in Iraq itself—the latter process amounting, in fact, to forced disarmament. In that context, a major lesson has been learnt from the recent events and its impact on animal life, plant, life and sea life and other chemical reactions that certain arms of mass destruction have to be proliferated unanimously to avoid these problems.59

DISARMAMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT — GORBACHEV AND GANDHI

According to the assessment by UN experts, about 25 per cent of the world's scientific workers and engineers are employed in the military sphere, particularly in those areas which develop and produce new type of weapons. The militarization of science impedes scientific and technological progress in the civilian branches of the capitalistic economies. Millions of people in the capitalistic countries do not work for creative purposes, but for preserving and continuously strengthening the military machine. Because of the arms race, due to social conditions, existing system under which they live at the cost of social development causes huge economic losses.

According to some estimates, the cost of the excess capacity in the USA aircraft industry alone, amounts to at least 300-500 dollars per year. In addition, the military industry utilizes the latest achievements of science and technology with up to date production techniques and employs a major and most qualified part of the scientists, engineers and workers. In many countries, all this restricts the development of civilian branches of economy and their productive forces. Militarism and arms race also create hindrances on full use of international division of labour and violate the normal economic ties among states, especially those with different social systems. During the Cold War years, problems of international trade between USA and USSR on the one hand, and developed and developing countries on the other were artificially hindered.60

To avoid insecurity of every sense and hindrances of socio-economic development by armament and militarization, it is indispensable to fill the notion of development with a new substance in tune with the programme and objectives of the policy and movement of non-alignment and the United Nations in the struggle for changing the whole system of international political and economic relations and placing it on new democratic and progressive basis. In that sense, the contemporary definition of development is not only on economic and social development, social change, highest degree of social justice in the society, overall quality of life in the developing countries and ecological imperatives with a view to ensuring the best possible conditions of life to the present and future generations.61

60 Chopra (V.D.), *Disarmament and Development: Their Relationship*, International Institute for Southern Asia-Pacific Studies, 1988, pp. XVI-XX.

The failure of Marxism and Power Bloc on the one hand and emergence of the concept of globalization through economic and other aspects of human life and its liberalization on the other, brought a drastic change in the concept of development. It not only confined to economic but also social, political and at last cultural, and to make these developments possible, the concept of national community based on global security felt very much essential. The international stability of every national community is one of the essential pre-requisites for strengthening the stability of the entire international community, i.e., international security. Secondly, Gorbachev’s vision of “disarmament for development” not only put to an end the “catastrophic maladies and ecological disturbances but also make possible other aspects of ecology of human life like social, political and psycho-cultural through narrowing the gap between the North and South [i.e., developed and developing] eliminating one of the potentially most serious causes of instability in the third world and at last strengthening interdependence in the world on the basis of equal rights and mutual respect.  

Soviet society under the leadership of Gorbachev considers the utilization of natural resources a special kind of socio-economic activity, one that is designed to meet the material and spiritual needs of all the members of society to protect and regenerate the resources of development, biological stability and the aesthetic integrity of the environment. The utilization of natural resources is directed towards the following directions except production of nuclear arms and armaments, and hence further militarization. The other areas of its interest are — [a] the production of goods and services [b] international cooperation and [c] education and raising of the cultural

62 Ibid., pp. 78-80, and also Sardesai (S. G), *Gandhi, Gorbachev and India Today*, Perspective Publications Pvt, New Delhi.
level and exchange among all members of the society. Lenin, the founder of
Communist Party of the Soviet Union, first initiated the concept of natural resources
utilization by formulating 90 laws, decrees and other normative legislative documents
aimed at the protection of the nature and the cautious handling of the natural resources
which were adopted in the first years of the USSR. A respectful relation to nature and
scientifically grounded principles of rational utilization of biospheric resources were
directly linked not only with building the material foundation of a new society, but also
to the ideals of a world without war and of equal and mutually beneficial relations with
all other states in an integrated world economy.63

Damage to the environment and agriculture inflicted by such peacetime military
activities as combat exercises and the movement of troops grows with every passing
year. Such activity by armed forces spoils the topsoil, destroys the vegetation and
damages the landscape, thus negatively affecting the state of the economy and of
human welfare. Still another consequences for the global biosphere of peacetime
militarism is the more and more frequent accidents with weapons of mass destruction.

Ecological imperatives provide a theoretical basis for the limitation of all kinds
of military activity. The USSR sees in these steps towards disarmament a tangible way
of protecting the biospheric and of establishing harmonious relations between society
and nature. Such a perspective conforms to the interests of all the states of the world.
Important in this regard was the Soviet initiative of 15th January 1986 to eliminate
nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction by the year 2000. In the
worlds of General Secretary Gorbachev “continued testing causes tremendous and

---

63 Westing (Arthur H.), Cultural Norms, War and the Environment, Stockholm
International Peace Research Institute, Oxford University Press, 1988, pp. 34-35.
perhaps not yet fully studied harm to nature, to the environment in which we all live. Do we not feel obliged to show concern for our own home? And not only for ourselves, but for our children and grand children?64

It also provides a new approach to the limits of growth concept which was first initiated by Western scientists in 1970 in conformity with the global population growth to set a limit to the scientific, technological and socio-economic development of nations. However in Soviet eyes, it seems more expedient that limits to growth be set as a consequence to the normalization of international relations and the development of universal cultural norms that exclude military manipulation of the environment.65

In the above context, it could be well argued that Gandhian concept of non-violence both positive and dynamic to avoid social conflicts which is a product of disproportionate development between man vs nature, man vs machine and at last man vs man and its consensus rather than capitalistic conflicting model of development with nature and natural resources could be possible if the world becomes free from nuclear warfare and promotion of militarism. With the declaration of disarmament for development by Gorbachev which is a natural growth of human history, perhaps Gandhian non-violence, from individual to global level could be able to justify its authenticity and usefulness in the era of collective peaceful life, common survival, collective security, common natural resources and at last common sharing globe.

---
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