



*Journal of Advances and  
Scholarly Researches in  
Allied Education*

*Vol. V, Issue IX, January-  
2013, ISSN 2230-7540*

## REVIEW ARTICLE

# GANDHIAN MODEL OF WORLD PEACE

# Gandhian Model of World Peace

**Dr. Vishwajeet Singh**

Assistant Prof., Political Science, D.A.V. College, Pundri, Distt. -Kaithal – Haryana (India)

-----X-----

Longing for peace has never been so profound as it is now at the threshold of the new millennium when the entire humankind is sitting on the powder keg of huge stockpiles of sophisticated nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. Apart from the nuclear weapons, -equally terrible prevalent diseases like AIDS, Cancer, SARS etc. are wide spread in different parts of the globe posing serious threat to humanity. Apart from these, wars, regional conflicts, terrorism, exacerbation in violence etc. are other dangers that threaten humanity. Thus, at almost all levels, the world is in the grip of either real or potential conflicts. In order to free the world from the state of conflict situations, several formulas and theories and techniques such as the Balance of Power Model, Global Centralism Model, the Marxist Model! the Revolutionary Model, and the Structural Model etc. have come up in the recent past. Initially these theories gained wide recognition and support, especially in the West and efforts have also been made to put them into practice. But still, "international conflicts have increased both in number and in their dimensions"<sup>1</sup>, thereby proving the futility of these theories/models to measure up to the challenge.

With the founding of the United Nations in the immediate aftermath of the end of the Second World War, the hopes were raised to rid humankind from the fear of war. However, Mahatma Gandhi even at that juncture was convinced that peace was not merely cessation of hostilities. He was disinclined to share the diplomatic view of peace. At a time when negotiations for establishing the UN were going on at the San Francisco Conference, Gandhi reiterated his conviction of peace by saying: "There will be no peace for the Allies or the world unless they shed their desires in the efficacy of war and its accompanying terrible deception and fraud and are determined to hammer out real peace based on freedom and equality of all races and nations. Exploitation and domination of one nation can have no place in world striving to put an end to all wars."<sup>2</sup> The subsequent developments that took place proved the failure of the United Nations

as an effective international agency to establish permanent peace in the world.

## TOWARDS WORLD PEACE MODELS

Soon after the establishment of the United Nations, questions started being raised about the effectiveness of the world body in dealing with problems of averting war and establishing peace. There emerged world federalist movement which argued that it would be impracticable to control war between and among nation-states without a world government. The thinking that evolved between 1946-1968 period laid stress on acceptance of liberal reform politics to the international scene, the legal and structural reforms and emphasis on the world order in terms of 'order' and 'prevention of war'. This approach was more rooted in the politics of Cold War rivalry between the USSR and the United States and ignored the interests of the developing countries.

Having applied the physical, economic and social technologies of both socialist and non-socialist West for several decades, most of the developing countries realized that the quality of life for them was worsening. The social scientists in these countries started reflecting on the experiences of their people and developing their own criticism of European development. As early as the 1950s it was pointed out that the development experience of the South would have to fit the geo-cultural conditions of each region, each society. At UNESCO's first North-South conference on economic and social development held in 1954 "the warning voices spoke clearly, but it was not until the late 1970s that they were heard."<sup>3</sup>

In 1968, the World Order Models Project (WOMP) was launched in the United States with a broad subject matter of inquiry which inter alia included along with war prevention, the related problems of economic well-being, social justice, and ecological stability. The definition of world order was formulated as thus: "World order is the study of international relations and world affairs which focuses primarily on

<sup>1</sup> Manish Sharma, "Gandhian Approach to Peace", in Anil Dutta Mishra (ed.), Challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, Mittal Publications, New Delhi, 2003, p. 339.

<sup>2</sup> M. Maharajan, "Gandhian Concept of Peace", in R. Balasubramanai And T.S. Devadoss (eds.), Gandhian Thought. University of Madras, Madras, 1981, P. 97

<sup>3</sup> Elise Boulding, "New Frames of Reference for a Peaceful International Order", in D.A. Hunter and Krishna Mallick (eds.), Nonviolence: A Reader in the Ethics of Action, Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi, 1990, p. 267.

the questions of how to reduce significantly the likelihood of international violence and to create tolerable conditions of worldwide economic welfare, social justice and ecological stability."<sup>4</sup> The major objective of this WOMP project was to produce materials that could be used in academic environments throughout the world. This project involved scholars, intellectuals, and political activists from various regions of the globe engaged in research, education, dialogue and action to work out a framework designed to aim at promoting a just world order.

Until early 1970s, some books produced by the scholars working for the WOMP were received well in the academic community and generated some debate without any clear outcome. It was perceived by many scholars in the Third World as a trick of the United States in its game against the former Soviet Union. By that time, many developing countries had joined the Nonalignment Movement or NAM which had emerged as a powerful forum to raise the issues pertaining to the vital interests of the nonaligned countries. The developing countries had learnt a lot from their frustrating experiments with both socialist and non-socialist models for modernization. These countries utilized the forum of the NAM and the UN General Assembly to raise their demands. New International Economic Order, Brandt Commission Reports of 1979 and 1983, the New International Information Order, the 1980 MacBride Commission Report, the New International Cultural Order, the New International Security Order, the Palme Committee Report etc., were the positive outcomes of the endeavors of the developing countries.

Following the end of the Cold War in the beginning of the 1990s and the onset of a post-Cold War era, hopes were raised for the emergence of a more stable and peaceful world order. In the wake of the Gulf War in 1991, the United States announced the commencement of a New World Order which, in fact, unveiled the emergence of the United States as a 'Unipolar Power.' Samuel Huntington, in early 1990s, came out with the notion of 'Clash of Civilizations', which was broadly perceived in terms of 'West versus Islamic World.' Following the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York and on the headquarters of the US Military establishment at Pentagon on September 11, 2001, the so-called 'Clash of Civilizations' is now being perceived as 'West versus Islamic Fundamentalism.' Combating international terrorism has become the prime objective of the American foreign policy. Thus, violence is being met by violence and peace, at the dawn of 2006 still remains a distant dream.

## GANDHIAN NONVIOLENT WORLD ORDER

<sup>4</sup> R.C. Slye and S.H. Mendlovitz, "World Order models Project", in Linus Pauling et. al (eds.), *World Encyclopedia of Peace*, Vol. 2, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1986, p. 577.

In these troubled times when most of the previous peace models have failed to deliver the humankind from the trouble of violence, a world Peace Model based on Gandhian ideals holds the promise of bringing in permanent and lasting peace in the world. The choice before humanity is 'coexistence or co-extinction', between nonviolence and non-existence. Therefore, the Gandhian techniques of conflict resolution remain relevant even in the context of nuclear age. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia once said that Gandhi and the Atom bomb were in fact the two originalities of our time and one would defeat the other before it ended.<sup>5</sup> And this assessment of Dr. Lohia still seems to be relevant and it is Gandhian approach that will triumph over the Atom and rid the world from the fear of nuclear destruction as well as violence.

Gandhi is justly acclaimed as a messenger of peace. He advocated 'peace- but not at any price', for his philosophy was a philosophy of commitment and it was based on the concept of moral responsibility, as well not that of 'peace at any price' which underlay his ethic of intention.<sup>6</sup> Gandhi's philosophy of peace is distinguishable from the conservative plea for 'peace at any cost' which is, in essence, a plea for the maintenance of status quo. Gandhi's concept of peace is integrally related to justice. As Gandhi wrote: "peace must be just."<sup>7</sup> Peace for him connoted a positive state of affairs, the pre-condition being freedom from exploitation. Undoubtedly, Gandhi experimented with his ideas in India and this fact does not negate the universal appeal and application of most of his ideas. His internationalism was rooted in his nationalism. Gandhi's message of the spinning wheel was much wider than its circumference. Its message is one of simplicity, the service of humankind, living so as not to hurt others. In one of his letters to Nehru he wrote:

I am convinced that if India is to attain true freedom and through India the world also, then sooner or later the fact must be recognized that the people will have to live in villages, not in towns, in huts, not, in palaces... I hold that without truth and nonviolence 'there can be nothing but destruction for humanity... I must not fear if the world today is going the wrong way. It maybe that India too will go that way and like the proverbial moth burn, itself eventually in the flame around which it dances more and more fiercely. But it is my bounden duty up to my last breath to try to protect India and through India the entire world from such a doom.'<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Manish Sharma, "Gandhian Approach to Peace", op. cit. p. 341.

<sup>6</sup> M. Maharajan, "Gandhian Concept of Peace", op. cit., p. 97

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> J.S. Mathur, "World Order: Gandhi's Concepts and Contributions", in Linus Pauling et. al. (eds.), *World Encyclopedia of Peace*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1986, p. 572.

Gandhi anticipated a peaceful, non-exploitative social system that could permit a fuller and richer life to individuals, establish understanding between the individual and social order, remove possibilities of exploitation of individuals by individuals, of one group by another, of villages by cities, and weaker nations by stronger nations. He visualized a system that would enable peaceful socioeconomic changes consistent with 'changing times and aspirations of the people, and permit individuals and small groups and communities to retain initiative and leadership within them. Aware of the criticism that it could be branded as an idealistic concept, Gandhi remarked: "I may be taunted with the report that this is the utopian and, therefore, not worth a single thought. If Euclid's point, though incapable of being drawn by human agency, has an imperishable value, my picture has its own for mankind to live... We must have a proper picture of what we want, before we can have something approaching it..."<sup>9</sup>

It is noteworthy that Gandhi never formulated any conceptual framework or developed theoretical patterns about international relations systematically. Besides, "he never propagated any theoretical contours of world order, nor promulgated it as a model or paradigm to deal with present ills or to formulate a futuristic world."<sup>10</sup> Gandhi frequently articulated his views on numerous issues pertaining to international affairs and commented on contemporary affairs. He was well versed in global as well as national developments that obtained during his life span, as can be evidenced from the variety of topics he has written about. In essence, his thought is a theory of 'action in essence.'<sup>11</sup> It is essential that "the problem of world order must be considered within the entire philosophy of life."<sup>12</sup>

Gandhi was opposed to poverty and maintained that, "to a people famishing and idle, the only acceptable form in which God can dare appear is work and promise of food as wages."<sup>13</sup> At the same time he cautioned that the civilization, in the real sense of the term, consisted not in the multiplication but in the deliberate and voluntary reduction of wants. He also warned against laying exclusive emphasis on

materialism and a rush for material comfort would spell ruin for humankind. Increase in material comforts seldom contributes to moral growth. While he was against poverty, he was equally opposed to wealth. In his view, affluence bred competition, inequalities, and violence, and disabled individuals and groups for social service and nonviolent action. What is true for individuals is true for groups and nations. Gandhi was convinced that happiness was a mental condition and was in way associated with material possessions. Therefore, he wanted the people to restrain their desires: "The more we indulge our passions, the more unbridled they become. Our ancestors, therefore, set a limit to our indulgences. They saw that happiness was largely a mental condition."<sup>14</sup>

## **2. CONTROL OF TECHNOLOGY**

Technology beyond human control is one of the gravest dangers confronting the human race. There is urgent need for having a fresh look on the extent to which technology is required. In Gandhi's view, if there were too many clever machines we would have too many stupid people:

If the craze for the machinery method continues, it is highly likely that a time may come when we shall be so incapacitated and weak that we will begin to curse ourselves for having forgotten the use of living machines given to us by God. Millions can not keep themselves fit by games and athletics. And why should they exchange the useful, productive, hardy occupation for the useless, unproductive and expensive games and exercise.<sup>15</sup>

Gandhi made a distinction between tools and implements and large-scale machines, between technology that increases the productivity of individuals and groups, and technology that leads to concentration of power and exhaustion of nonrenewable sources of energy. The one leads to peace, cooperation and universal fellow feelings, and the other leads to violence, concentration of power into the hands of the few, irresponsibility, hopelessness and helplessness, aggression and exploitation. He was in favour of giving new direction to technological developments through the symbol of the spinning wheel.

While remaining steadfast in his commitment to the principles of truth and nonviolence, Gandhi tried to provide new meaning and direction to technological development. He said: "Today, machinery merely helps a few to ride on the back of millions. The

<sup>9</sup> J. S. Mathur, "World Order: Gandhi's Concepts and Contributions ", op. cit., p. 573.

<sup>10</sup> R.S. Yadav, "International Peace and Gandhian World Order", The Indian Journal of Political Science, Vol. LXVI, No.1, January-March, 2005, p.445,

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p.446.

<sup>12</sup> R.S. Beal, "Faint light on an uncertain Prospect: Gandhian Insights n World Order", in K.P. Misra and S. C. Gangal (eds.), Gandhi and the Contemporary World: Studies in Peace and War, Chanakya Publications. Delhi, 1981, p. 134.

<sup>13</sup> J.S. Mathur, "Need for Clear Concepts of 'Peace'", Gandhi Marg, Vol. 18, No.2, July-September, 1996, p.218.

<sup>14</sup> M.K. Gandhi Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule, Navjivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1928, p.20.

<sup>15</sup> J.S. Mathur, "World Order: Gandhi's Concepts and Contributions ", op. cit., p. 573.

impetus behind it all is not philanthropy to save labour but greed. It is against this constitution of things that I am fighting with all my might."<sup>16</sup> Since industrialization entails excessive use of technology and dependence on heavy machinery, Gandhi was opposed to this kind of industrialization. According to him, the personality of man was likely to be affected by the evil effects of industrialization. Since industrialization is based on the division of labour, it limits man's self-expression. Hence the work loses its variety, initiative and colour. No doubt such a division increases the productivity. But it obstructs the full growth of man's natural skill.

Not only this, industrialization does not serve up the biological needs of man. Man, as a biological being, requires a specific temperature, a specific quality of climate, air, light, humidity and food. It is by working in such conditions that man maintains his bodily equilibrium. Industrialization captures these organic needs of man. Moreover, industrialization tends to gather man in the collective. This finally helps in the growth of totalitarian impulse in man. Man becomes careless about of his own sovereignty. He merges his personality in the collective with the result that finally he gets used to put up with every form of tyranny and cruelty in the name of the collective wellbeing of the society.

Gandhi was affirmative in his opinion that nonviolence could not be built on a 'factory-civilization', but it could be built on 'self-contained' villages. In his view, the rural economy eschewed exploitation altogether and "exploitation is the essence of violence."<sup>17</sup> According to Gandhi, both the system of ownership and the technique of production were the real cause of the malady. Marx attacked the system of ownership in his humanistic zeal. But he left the technique of production altogether untouched. Gandhi focused his attention on the technology also. He suggested that large-scale technology should give way to small-scale technology.

However, this does not suggest that Gandhi was against the application of science to the instruments of production, i.e. machinery. To this he replied, "What I object to is the craze for machinery, not machinery as such..."<sup>18</sup> In fact he was in favour of the application of science towards developing the small-scale technology. He was eager to welcome every improvement in the cottage machine. Replying to a suggestion whether he was against all machinery he said, "My answer is emphatically No. But I am against its indiscriminate multiplication. I refuse to be dazzled by the seeming triumph of machinery. But simple tools and implements and such machinery as saves

individual labour and lightens the burden of millions of cottages, I should welcome."<sup>19</sup> What he feared from large-scale industrialization was the exploitation. According to him, industrialization of on a mass scale would necessarily lead to passive or active exploitation of the villagers as the problems of competition and marketing would come in. He further averred:

...[T]herefore, we have to concentrate on the village being self-contained, manufacturing mainly for the use. Provided this character of the village industry is maintained, there will be no objection to villagers using even the modern machinery and tools that can afford to use. Only they should not be used as a means of exploitation of others.<sup>20</sup>

In other words, Gandhi was not against machinery as such. His whole approach to machinery and the use of science was radically different, deeply revolutionary and humanly conscious. A technique which tended to make man a robot, deprived him of his constant impulse for freedom and made an all-out invasion on his political, economic and social liberties was unacceptable to Gandhi. When suggested that mechanization would take hold of the country after independence, Gandhi's instant reaction was: "Then there is no escape from violence. Complete mechanization is impossible in India without resulting in violence in some shape or other... The movement of the spinning wheel is an organized attempt to displace machinery from the state of exclusiveness and place it in its proper place."<sup>21</sup>

### 3. DECENTRALIZATION

Gandhi's concept of decentralization seems very significant factor as a forerunner of peace in the present era. While elaborating his concept of decentralization, Gandhi said:

I suggest that, if India is to evolve along nonviolent lines, it will have to decentralize many things. Centralization cannot be sustained and defended without adequate force. Simple homes from which there is nothing to take away require no policing; the palaces of the rich must have strong guards to protect them against decoity. So must huge factories. Rurally organized India will run less risk of foreign invasion than urbanized India well equipped with military, naval and air forces. Centralization as a system is inconsistent with nonviolent structure of society.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>16</sup> J. S. Mathur "Need for Clear Concepts of Peace", op. cit., p. 219.

<sup>17</sup> M.K. Gandhi, My Religion, Navjivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, reprint, 1958, P. 123

<sup>18</sup> M. K. Gandhi, Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule, op. cit., p.38.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid

<sup>20</sup> Harijan, 29 September 1936.

<sup>21</sup> J. S. Mathur, "Need for Clear Concepts of 'Peace'", op. cit., p. 219.

<sup>22</sup> Young India, 18 January 1942.



Thus Gandhi's concept of decentralization is different from the notion of decentralization and delegation as they are understood or interpreted in present sense of the term. In general, the term 'decentralization' is interpreted as the one under which power remains with the centralized authority and permits, if at all, insignificant freedom to the people. Decentralization, as perceived by Gandhi, entails the basic philosophy of giving strength to groups to be able to resist exploitation and unfairness. Local face-to-face primary committees are truly the nurseries for the people and can function as the basic units of participatory democracy and development. Prevalent centralized units are too large for the people's participation, initiative and sharing. They only serve the needs, aspirations, noticeable consumption, and extravagant lifestyles of a microscopy cross-section of society in comparison to the whole population. Centralization attributes vastness to things of low utility in relation to the needs of the entire population. Gandhi, therefore, emphasized on the evolution of independence and development from the grass-roots level. In his opinion:

Independence must begin at the bottom. Thus every village will be a republic or panchayat having full, powers. It follows, therefore, that every village has to be self-sustained and capable of managing its affairs even to the extent of defending itself against the whole world. It will be trained and prepared to perish in the attempt to defend itself against any onslaught from without. Thus ultimately, it is the individual who is the unit.<sup>23</sup>

Gandhi's emphasis on decentralization of the means of production or say economic power is the only way out of the problem of unemployment not only in India but also in many other developing countries. Some have argued that it seems desirable to go in for decentralization because huge capital investment is required to industrialize the country through large-scale industries. They also contend that because large-scale industrialization presupposes the existence of foreign markets which this country cannot have, decentralization is the only sustainable goal. In other words large-scale, industrialization will be preferable in case the problem of capital formation and foreign market are solved. However, viewed in a broad scale, this line of reasoning constitutes a danger to the whole theory of decentralization as put forward by Gandhi. It seems to be a wrong presumption that Gandhi propounded his theory only to suit Indian conditions. On the other hand, Gandhi's theory of decentralization was the result of his keen and almost prophetic insight into the numerous political, social and cultural ills, which the age of large-scale industrialization has brought in its wake.

<sup>23</sup> M.K. Gandhi, *India of My Dreams*, compiled by R.K. Prabhu, Hind Kitabs, Bombay, 1947, p. 26.

In the socio-economic field, Gandhi's conception of decentralization is to be attained by means of small scale and widely scattered or cottage industries. Every village will be largely self-sufficient and production will be geared to the requirements of the local population. In the realm of politics, Gandhi's conception of decentralization entails the widest possible diffusion of power. His 'predominantly nonviolent' State would have a federal structure in which the Central Government would have only a few, enumerated functions of national importance. Village is designed to be the real storehouse of functional power or responsibility. The village, being the smallest socio-political unit, will be place where the people will rule over themselves, with little scope for domination by one over the others, and for political indoctrination, manipulation or abuse of authority.<sup>24</sup>

#### **4. NEW CONCEPTS OF GROWTH AND MOTIVATION**

Gandhi's approach to new concepts of growth and motivation can be summarized suitably in his own words:

Whereas religion to be worth anything must also be capable of being reduced to terms of economics. Economics to be worth anything must be capable of being reduced to terms of religion or spirituality. Therefore, in this scheme of religion-cum-economics there is no room for exploitation..., there is no room in true economics which is convertible with religion for the owning of slaves whether they are human beings, cattle or machinery. There is no room for slavery in economics.<sup>25</sup>

He was of the firm view that undue emphasis has been placed on the people's greedy instincts, and felt that by proper training and education, persons and groups can be motivated by generous motives.

#### **A. THE CHANGE AGENT**

Gandhi's concept of change included both the individual and the structure of society.

##### **A.1 THE INDIVIDUAL**

Individual people in Gandhi's concept are not isolated entities cut off from the mainstream of the society, but constitute an integral part of the social system. They are engaged in trying to uplift themselves and in this

<sup>24</sup> S.C. Gangal, "Gandhi and World Order", in K.P. Misra and S.C. Gangal (eds.), *Gandhi and the Contemporary World*, Chanakya Publications, Delhi, 1981, p. 163.

<sup>25</sup> J. S. Mathur, "World Order: Gandhi's concepts and Contributions", op. cit., p. 574.

process uplift the society- the small community, the nation, and the world community.

Simultaneous efforts designed to transform the social system and the individual can be instrumental in introducing a new socioeconomic order based on justice and fair play within a short period and with fewer tensions and strains. While attempting to conceive a radical change in the socioeconomic and political system, Gandhi also laid rather greater emphasis on radical changes in aspirations, motivation, and value patterns for individuals in society. Gandhi said: "... begin with one convert. If there is one such, you can add zeros to the one and the first zero will account for ten and every addition will account for ten times the previous number. If, however, the beginner is a zero, in other words, no one makes the beginning, multiplicity of zeros will also produce zero value."<sup>26</sup>

## A.2 STRUCTURAL CHANGE

In order to disallow exploitation, inequity, and centralization of power and authority Gandhi favored a nonviolent social order based on consumption control, new technology, decentralization, and new motivation. People will be organized to resist attempts to acquire authority, power, and riches and would offer nonviolent resistance against such attempts. Gandhi's definition of swarajya was not the acquisition of authority by the few but the capacity of the masses to resist authority when abused. However, in a nonviolent order the occasion for such misuse of authority would not generally arise and in the rarest of cases, when such an occasion were to arise, the wrong-doers would change as they faced nonviolent resistance from the people. In 1946, clarifying the role of Satyagraha in making the rich realize their duty towards the poor, he replied: "The same as the against the foreign power, satyagraha is a law of universal application. Beginning with the family its use can be extended to every circle."<sup>27</sup> In such a social order both production and consumption, at least where basic wants are concerned, will become localized and the temptation to speed up production indefinitely and at any price will disappear. Gandhi's description of such a society, based on truth and nonviolence was:

In this structure composed of innumerable villages,, there will be ever-widening, never-ascending, circles. Life will not be pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom. But it will be an oceanic circle whose centre will be the individual always ready to perish for the village, the never aggressive in their arrogance but ever humble, sharing the majesty of the oceanic circle of latter ready to perish for the circle of villages, till at

last the whole becomes one life composed of individuals which they are integral units.<sup>28</sup>

## B. TECHNIQUES

Real nonviolence and the technique of Satyagraha were Gandhi's main techniques for transforming the existing world order. He laid stress on the adoption of nonviolence to the utmost extent possible and felt that this would be India's greatest contribution to the peace of the world and' establishment of a new world order. Gandhi was so confident of the possibility of changing the present order, which he quite often termed as Satanic, that he once remarked, that the existing structure of economic society could not last for twenty-four hours if his weapon of satyagraha could be gripped by the people.

Gandhi proved the productiveness of the nonviolent technique of socioeconomic change. His experiments in South Africa had sufficiently demonstrated to the world the efficiency of nonviolence. Subsequently, on his return to India, .Gandhi applied his technique for tackling economic, social and political problems with laudable success and organized many successful satyagrahas. Nehru's reaction to the historic Dandi March and Salt Satyagraha was that it seemed as though a spring had been suddenly released. Gandhi's crucial role in restoring peace during the communal disturbances of 1946-47 earned him the appellation of being a 'one man force' from Lord Mountbatten.

The practitioners of nonviolent techniques are required to make revolutionary changes in their own lives and subject themselves to strict discipline. The followers of the leaders are expected to accept their advice like disciplined militia of a nonviolent army. To the question, "Can masses practice nonviolence, when we know that they are all prone to anger, hate, ill-will and fight for the most trivial things?" Gandhi's reply was: "They are, and yet I think they can practice nonviolence for the common good."<sup>29</sup> Several examples of successful use of nonviolent techniques can be quoted from the history of India's freedom struggle. Referring to his followers Gandhi observed, "Their belief in nonviolence was unintelligent, even as the belief in the earth being round is unintelligent. But their belief in their leader was genuine and that was enough. With those who lead it is another matter. Their belief has to be intelligent, and they have to live up to all implications of the belief."<sup>30</sup>

Gandhi was convinced that the eradication of exploitation could become possible only when the

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., p. 574

<sup>28</sup> M.K. Gandhi, India of My Dreams, op. cit., pp. 26-27.

<sup>29</sup> J.S. Mathur, "World Order: Gandhi's Concepts and Contributions ", op. cit., p. 575.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

people gained the strength to resist injustice and exploitation. Strength to resist could be acquired through decentralization and new motivations and also through right type of leadership. When the leaders identify themselves with the common people, the downtrodden, and steadily look into the problems confronting the people, they can easily command belief and faith of the masses in their leadership. Leaders are called upon to evolve a strategy of action in which those who are affected can participate, and thus create conditions for the emergence of new leaders and revive the confidence of the masses in their capacity to solve their problems without recourse to violence or help from any external authority.

In Gandhi's view, concentration of power in the hands of the state could not provide the lasting solution to the problem of exploitation and injustice. According to him: "The State represents violence in a concentrated and organized form... I look upon an increase in the power of the State with the greatest fear, because although while apparently doing good by minimizing exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality, which lies at the - root of all progress."<sup>31</sup> He further remarked:

Our capacity for swaraj depends upon our capacity for solving without reference to, or intervention of the government, all the varied and complex problems that must arise in the affairs of one of the biggest and the most ancient nations like ours...<sup>32</sup>

Satyagraha seems to be the only recourse available to an oppressed people in this age when resort to highly technical means of oppression is frequently adhered to. The prospects of success are certainly as great as are the chances of violent revolution under the modern police-state system.

Invigorated by the efficacy of nonviolent techniques of social change, Gandhi introduced his doctrine of trusteeship- voluntary association of riches and power sharing the same for the common good. The dilemma is that, left alone, people become unequal and any attempt at making them equal is liable to render them not to be free. Gandhi's blueprint for trusteeship can be expected to provide a way out of this impasse. To the question whether history at any time records such a change in human nature, Gandhi's answer was:

Such changes have certainly taken place in individuals. One may not perhaps, be able to point to them in a whole society. But this only means that up till now there has never been an experiment on a large scale in nonviolence... Ahimsa (nonviolence) is

definitely an attribute of society. To convince people of this truth is at once my effort and experiment .<sup>33</sup>

Gandhi's conception of nonviolent state bids farewell to arms and police.<sup>34</sup> They are to be replaced by peace brigades or the satyagrahis who, while discharging their duties, would be prepared even to lay down lives without resorting to arms or force. According to Gandhi, the prime qualities of the soldiers of a nonviolent army should be a living faith in God, discipline, truthfulness, and devotion to duty. After these alterations in the internal political and socioeconomic structure of the various countries, the way will automatically be paved for an international society in which all countries- small or big- will be like equal partners. In other words, Gandhi erects the edifice of his new world order arising from the restructuring of national societies or as he himself put it for 'internationalism through nonviolent nationalism.

## CONCLUSION

Gandhi's model for world peace is not only unique but indispensable and easily adaptable by the different countries of the world which until the recent past seem to have exhausted the available alternatives for establishing lasting and permanent peace in the world. His techniques, as demonstrated by his own example, manifest an exemplary struggle of mass truth against degradation. Peace for Gandhi is not merely the absence of war, rather a protracted process bearing close semblance to the entire system in toto. Nonviolence as practised by Gandhi entailed three basic components: (a) the creation of a human society involving nonviolent methods of resisting exploitation; (b) the education of the oppressed to take positive and constructive steps to resist exploitation, and development of good and harmonious relationships between oppressed and oppressor once the struggle is over; and (c) the ushering in of unexploitative decentralized economic and political institutions.

In the present era characterized by globalization where dependence on technology, especially on Information Technology, has become a must, Gandhi's views on technology may seem to some as obsolete. However, it seems pertinent here to point out that Gandhi's views should not be interpreted literally but in the entire context. His opposition to machine and technology was in terms of 'loss outweighing gains' of human resources and the resulting in exploitation. Besides, Gandhi's views on disarmament, particularly in the field of 'unilateral disarmament' are also subject to disapproval by

<sup>31</sup> J.S. Mathur, "Need for Clear Concepts of Peace", op. cit., p. 221.

<sup>32</sup> MK Gandhi, India of My Dreams, op. cit., p. 8

<sup>33</sup> J. S. Mathur, "World Order: Gandhi's Concepts and Contributions", op. cit., p. 575.

<sup>34</sup> S.C. Gangal, "Gandhi and world Order", op.cit., P. 164.



some. Again, such perceptions also need to be viewed in the whole context of time and space. He suggested a way out for lessening tension, eliminating the curse of war and thereby paving way for peace. Non-compliance with his suggestions has resulted in the intensification of tensions and threats to world peace have increased.

Thus Gandhi's ideas are not idealistic or romantic concepts but are to be practiced alike by the individuals as well as the nations. While emphasizing on the need for pursuing them, Gandhi opined:

I have been taught from my childhood and tested the truth by experience that the primary virtues of mankind are possible of cultivation by the meanest of the human species. It is this undoubted universal possibility that distinguishes the human from the rest of God's creation. If even one great nation were unconditionally to perform the supreme act of renunciation many of us would see in our lifetime visible peace established on earth.<sup>35</sup>

The Gandhian model of world peace is neither a utopia nor a religious lecture that is heard formally to be forgotten later. It is a blueprint for a world minus nuclear weapons, without violence and absence of exploitation. Realization of this kind of world is the holy duty of each and every one. It requires sincere, dedicated and earnest endeavours along with having unshaken faith and resolute determination as Gandhi had in the principles of truth and nonviolence and apply those principles in daily life at the local, regional, national and then at the international level.

<sup>35</sup> J.S. Mathur, "World Order: Gandhi's Concepts and Contributions", op. cit., p. 576.