

Gandhian Nonviolence as A Strategy for Achieving A Just and Equitable World Order: A Philosophical Investigation

Jalaja.K.N, Research Scholar, Department of English, Sunrise University, Alwar, Rajasthan, India
Dr Ashok Kumar, Associate professor, Department of English Sunrise University, Alwar, Rajasthan, India
Corresponding author E-mail: jalajakn46@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

There have been two groups of philosophers in the annals of philosophy: those interested in obtaining insight into the world as it is, and those who desire to change it. The former group of philosophers idealises a life of contemplation, whilst the latter group envisions a life of activity. The view of mankind and the world alters when the emphasis switches from theory to action. The basic job of the human brain, according to the former, is to process information in order to construct an accurate mental representation of the world. People, according to the latter, are fundamentally concerned with action and the achievement of definite goals in order to bring about the required change in the world. While the world is unchanging under the cognitive model, the activities of individuals who choose to engage with it can shape it. The depictions of man in these two models are diametrically opposed. To be credible, our representations of the world should mirror reality, yet the opposite is true when it comes to taking action. Gandhi saw philosophy as more than just a mental exercise. It's essentially a rallying call. The widespread consensus is that Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi belongs to the second group of thinkers, whose overarching purpose is to achieve genuine and long-term societal transformation. To make meaningful changes, however, it is necessary to have a thorough understanding of the society in which you live, and the only way to do so is to plunge in and get your hands dirty. As Kant put it, knowledge without action is worthless, and action without knowledge is ineffective.

INTRODUCTION

According to Gandhi, truth and nonviolence are interdependent. This is a significant realisation with many consequences, all of which will be discussed in this article. It highlights the importance of the relationship between reality and value¹. Gandhi's emphasis on the connection between truth and nonviolence emphasises the importance of a solid philosophical foundation for morality. In India, ethics has always been intellectual. As a result, both theoretical and practical factors must be considered. Gandhi's worldview is a great illustration of this synthesis of knowledge and action. Gandhi saw knowledge and action as inseparable companions. As a result, he lays an emphasis on the link between truth and nonviolence, which he regards as the foundation of both action and knowledge. The concept of truth is important to Gandhi's ideology. In Gandhian thought, the concept of truth is highly laden with meaning. Because this concept is critical to understanding what Gandhi means by "nonviolence," the book will look into the various connotations Gandhi brings to this term. As previously stated, Gandhi was opposed to violence and had already identified two sorts of it: passive and physical. Passive violence occurs all the time, whether intentionally or unintentionally. Once again, it is the spark that causes genuine bodily harm. Gandhi understands the essence of violence by using the Sanskrit word for "injury" as a point of reference. Gandhi says that people who can maintain nonviolence in the face of overwhelming violence are blessed. A man who can recognise the ahimsa (nonviolence) precept although surrounded by violent individuals and surroundings is blessed. We bow down to such a man because of his exceptional character. The darker his surroundings, the more desperate his want for release from the cage of the body that serves as his vehicle. Gandhi is opposed to violence because it breeds more hatred.

When it appears to help, it is only transient, and it cannot aid in the long run. A genuine nonviolence activist's purpose is not to avert violence, but to accept it without retaliating with violence. This is an example of heroism, which will be discussed in more detail later. When Gandhi emphasises that for the sake of human rights, one must bear violence and self-suffering, he is not endorsing weakness. He considers cowardice to be "the greatest violence, without a doubt, far greater than bloodshed and the like that normally go under the term of violence." Criminals and

other violent offenders, according to Gandhi, are the outcome of a damaged society. According to Gandhi, violence is not a human characteristic. It can only be done via practise. Nonviolence is an excellent strategy for dealing with violent circumstances. Gandhi's understanding of the universe was centred on nonviolence, or "Ahimsa" in Sanskrit. Although its literal English translation, "nonviolence," implies merely the avoidance of physical violence, "ahimsa" implies far more. The ahimsa philosophy is based on complete nonviolence, which encompasses the absence of both active and passive aggressiveness. Gandhi defines the Ahimsa concept as "love." In an interview, Arun Gandhi noted, "Love is what ahimsa implies," Gandhi stated. Because no one would purposefully harm someone they care about or respect." Gandhi considered nonviolence to be the most powerful tool available to humans. It is more destructive than any nuclear weapon. Stronger than simply utilising force. No one has ever been or will ever be able to comprehend the full scope of this living, breathing source of power. Gandhi's nonviolent philosophy is based on the search of truth. The most important principle of nonviolence, according to Gandhi, is truth. His entire life may be summed up as "truth experiments." Gandhi discovered nonviolence during his quest for truth, and he elaborated on this concept in his autobiography, "The practise of Ahimsa is the bedrock of honest inquiry." It is becoming evident to me that unless my efforts are founded on ahimsa, they will be futile."

KEYBOARD: Nonviolence, Philosophers Idealizes, Psychological Aspects, Equality, Philosophical Analysis, Unidimensional and Multidimensional Nature of Equality

SOCIAL ASPECT

Gandhi had firsthand knowledge of 'race prejudice' at the worldwide level. One could argue that caste came second for Gandhi after experiencing racial oppression. Many endorsed racists still supported and believed in racism even in the 19th century. Some even attempt to link scientific theories that suggest racial variations in biology to support this. The majority of these racists have this belief in the existence of different races. However, the majority of scientists now disagree with the legitimacy of the idea of "race" or the biological underpinnings of race. However, racism still exists today in the background of social and legal structures. The so-called "first peoples" or indigenous peoples of the world are said to have engaged in racism. They experienced something distinct. They claimed that the dominating European descendants had relegated them to the sidelines and the margins. They lost their land and ownership. Additionally, a large number of people have vanished. Indigenous people in North America are thought to have numbered between 10 and 12 million in the fifteenth century, or prior to Columbus. However, by the 1890s, only about 300,000 people remained. The outcomes were comparable in certain regions of Latin America. The forced removal of Native/Aboriginal children from their homes has reportedly been a practise in Australia, Canada, and the United States during the second part of the 20th century. The practise was concentrated on Aboriginal children of mixed races in Australia.

Caste equality has been more widely anticipated throughout India's history, where Gandhi was born. By "varna," or caste group, the traditional Hindu society was divided into four hierarchical divisions. Equal advantages were denied to the untouchables' lowest echelons. A complete denial of identity and equality, "untouchability," in Gandhi's opinion, was a grave disgrace. The current global crisis, which is affecting trade, jobs, and the loss of people's homes, particularly in the West, is a third motivation for this study. There is the significant pain crisis. Practically every country has been impacted by this. All of the major G 7 and G 20 countries are frantically trying to salvage the global economy. As a result, there are more injustices and insecurities than ever before. These worries about inequality and insecurity pique our interest in learning the true reason for all of this. Many contemporary thinkers jump to the conclusion that these are caused by the new idea of "globalisation," claiming that it has severely harmed people in general and failed to bring about global equality. The result was an extremely polarised and unequal world.¹² Through multinational cooperation, nonprofit organisations, and international organisations, globalisation

has also adversely impacted nation governments' sovereignty. As a result, in politics, globalisation weakens the power of nations and national democracies. Local cultures are the ones most impacted. In other words, globalisation looks to be a threat to equality and the root of all disparities. Gandhi, however, did not accept that defence. He opposed people blaming outside forces to avoid taking personal responsibility. According to Gandhi, the root of inequity lies with people themselves. It is as a result of their avarice, selfishness, and abuse of power. Therefore, the answer can also be discovered in and through people. In order to understand the driving forces behind human behaviour, he descended to the depths of the soul or human nature, much like previous Indian philosophers. Gandhi requested that this be done in order to examine human motivations, attitudes, and character traits in the creation of things, possessions, and economic, sociopolitical, and even interpersonal interactions. When considering equality, let's remember that it's not the sameness of identity or possession of exactly the same quantities of items as others. Equality does not imply a carbon replica of the other. On the contrary, it essentially affirms the uniqueness of each person, group, and nation as well as their equality in relation to others.

The prevailing expectation is that everyone should enjoy roughly the same level of material wealth and should be treated fairly. Therefore, equality in practise means that "B" is not "A," but instead aspired to be like "A." Additionally, rather than in a vacuum, the notion of equality must also be understood in relation to others. As a result, plurality or others are implied in the egalitarian ideology. It implies the presence of others rather than the eradication of uniqueness. In real life, equality should be present at all levels of society—economic, social, political, and interpersonal. It ought to be carried out in a more cordial manner. Checking the motivations behind economic, social, and political behaviours is necessary to achieve this. Gandhi shared the view of many anthropologists and psychologists that equality should be defined in terms of two key areas. The first is the material and physical aspect. The other, which is psychical, is about respect in terms of interpersonal interactions. The fundamental elements of equality are those. Again, equality is not exactly mathematically equal when considering material factors. This is not achievable because needs can vary between individuals and circumstances. Thus, equality is as much as possible, or equitable, in a physical and material sense. However, it pertains to arithmetic sense when we discuss the psychical essence of equality in the sense of equal regard. Therefore, treating people equally without any discrepancy or consideration of lower and higher degrees is required by morality. In contrast to materials and things, however, immeasurability is the challenge. When someone extols and admires someone else, it can be difficult to understand what that person is thinking. Even respect for humans as equality is met with increased scepticism. As a result, mathematic calculation becomes challenging even from a psychological perspective. This is primarily due to the challenges involved in measurement and observation. Due to the ambiguity in the words and behaviours used to demonstrate respect, the word "equitable" could also be employed here.

All individuals and all nations should make significant efforts to produce the basic foods they consume, as well as the clothes they wear and the home they must live in. This is especially true in the material and economic aspects. Again, all of these productive tasks (bread labour) should be performed manually wherever feasible to prevent industrialization and provide employment for as many people as possible. Due to the fact that everyone is engaged in constructive work, there is no sense of superiority or inferiority as a result of their preference for physical labour. But in Gandhi's overall view of the value of productive labour, food production and agriculture are given top priority. He thought that everyone would at least receive equality and a decent diet. Second, people have a propensity for owning things in addition to producing them. The finest advise given is to control greed and maintain things just for needs in the interest of possessing more and more material stuff. Therefore, it could be preferable for equality if everyone made a conscious effort to reduce excessive needs and almost adopt a non-possessive mentality. Gandhi hopes that everyone will be roughly equally motivated to have equality in possessions. Gandhi did not believe that

having more was always bad; rather, he believed that everyone should have roughly the same level of prosperity. He put out this with the idea of achieving equality for everybody. Third, maintaining real estate in a cooperative and co-ownership fashion is always preferable when managing money and material resources. To raise awareness of the need for everyone to serve as wealth trustees. Therefore, regulation of individual ownership of large outcomes and assets must ensure that ownership and administration are shared among many, rather than being solely held by one or two people.

It is encouraged to adopt a decentralised power-sharing mentality with reference to the sociopolitical power struggle. Therefore, there is no one to use authority to subjugate, dominate, or control. Sharing the sociopolitical powers will boost the grassroots and the periphery as part of the power-sharing process. As a result, everyone will have the chance to share responsibility, and there will be lots of room for experienced leadership and equality for all. Finally, true respect for one another on an equal footing is essential in human interpersonal relationships. This may very well be put into practise in all of our words, actions, and ideas. The I-Thou relationship proposed by Martin Buber may be the best expression of human regard. Additionally, this type of respect for all human beings should be demonstrated in all discussions and conversations with all civilizations, populations, and governments. Gandhi also held the view that everyone can be assured of equality if all productive labour, possession, economic and sociopolitical power management, and most importantly, human interpersonal connections, are done in a spirit of understanding, collaboration, sharing, and friendliness. And this could serve as a template for achieving all kinds of equality. Because the aforementioned facts finally have two fundamental physical (material) and psychical (human respect) characteristics, both of which are necessary elements of any equality. Equality would be lacking if these two fundamental factors weren't taken into account. The chapter on "Equality, a Philosophical Analysis" made this abundantly evident. To live in a communitarian way of life, love and concern for one another are ultimately what are required for this. One can learn to comprehend, share, work together, and be sincere in interpersonal relationships here. The logical conclusion is that if this philosophy can be used at the micro level of the person, then it is not impossible to extend it to the national and international levels in order to create a world order that is fair.

PSYCHICAL ASPECT

The beauty of Gandhi's nonviolent technique, as we consider it now, is that it is the sole way to attain all these features of equality, which are possible via good human motivations and done in communal spirit. These physical and psychological dimensions of equality can be attained with the use of nonviolence as a tactic. Therefore, using violence or the violet approach is not necessary to accomplish these features of equality. When considering the production of material commodities, the attitude would be that each person tries to provide food, clothing, and a place to live if we were to extend the definitions of nonviolence to include both the negative and positive implications of "no harm" and "love." Nobody would live as a parasite and take advantage of other people's labour. All individuals and nations will live off their own labours during this period. They will actively engage in creative work for the welfare of the individual and for everyone, rather than imposing or expecting others to perform slave labour. When nonviolence is practised, everyone will just keep what they need and not amass according to their greed. They wouldn't have the audacity to mistreat or harm someone else's property. Positively, if they took nonviolent action, they would drastically cut down on their needs and greed and only maintain what they absolutely needed. In managing economic resources, including others rather than excluding them would be the fundamental standard. As a result, the use of the trusteeship and cooperative management models will grow. The peaceful strategy in all social political power struggles is decentralisation. Doing "no harm" means they won't attempt to dominate others by acquiring power. Power sharing is peaceful, while power dominance is violent. Thus, the benefits of nonviolence include love and the sharing of resources to support one another. Therefore, it can be in favour of equal power

sharing and brotherly affection. In the end, individuals would prefer to operate in a non-violent manner by showing one another love and respect while maintaining an I-Thou mentality in their relationships. They would never intend to utilise an I-it connection, which is by its very nature violent and harmful. Living in a community can be quite helpful in this situation, or to put it another way, an equitable life will be made easier in a community. In order to achieve equality and a just world order, everyone must embrace Gandhi's nonviolent approach and work together in good faith.

EQUALITY, A PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS

The thesis' main argument is that Gandhian nonviolence can create an equitable world order. I start this chapter off by introducing the idea of equality. The chapter's major goal is to shed more light on what equality actually entails. To begin with, an analysis of a few basic equality distinctions is attempted. The fundamental meaning and core of equality is then derived while keeping in mind the initial distinctions. Gandhi's viewpoint on equality is briefly presented in the conclusion.

PRELIMINARY DISTINCTIONS IN EQUALITY

It is necessary to keep in mind a few warnings to prevent misunderstandings in order to have a clear knowledge of what equality is. The following list of warnings includes some preliminary equality distinctions. Additionally, taking into account these initial distinctions gives the definition of equality philosophical significance. Above all, this makes it easier to comprehend and derive the concept of equality in various contexts. Thus, it would be possible to start by keeping in mind the following basic distinctions.

UNIDIMENSIONAL AND MULTIDIMENSIONAL NATURE OF EQUALITY:

The first thing philosophers see when discussing equality is that there is a common factor that runs through all ranges of variations and conditions as a principle of shared identity. Singularity and one-dimensionality are other concepts. In addition, there is the shared identity, which serves as the very ground for the claim of equality. It is argued that the philosophical observer not only seeks equality that is unidimensional but also a very rich multidimensional equality through this common denominator flowing across all of universal mankind. As a result, equality is a multifaceted and interrelated principle. But nature has evolved a sophisticated multileveled calculus scheme. The cosmos is to be mirrored in this technique of nature as unity in diversity and diversity in unity. Every individual taking part in mankind is a microcosm. Nature views humans as a multidimensional, integrated, interconnected, related, and autonomous whole. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the nature of equality in terms of multifaceted and multidimensional conditions.

SPECIFIC EGALITARIAN IDEALS:

The call for equality is frequently made in response to one or more specific disparities. It could manifest as sexual discrimination, racial discrimination, or discrimination against a specific individual or group. While equality is multifaceted, it can also be linked to particular egalitarian values, such as those that are racial, gender, or economically related. True, one consideration inevitably affects the others. Sexual inequality complaints imply unspecified relations, such as wages, jobs, etc. But whether they are used in different settings or when a particular egalitarian goal is mentioned, these principles do not always have the same implications.

BASIC PRINCIPLE OF EQUALITY:

There may be a defining characteristic that serves as the basis for the equality principle. Regarding the person, it is true that many egalitarians attempted to claim that despite numerous inequalities, all men are similar in possessing "reason" or "soul" or another basically human quality or nature. In general, many philosophers recognised human rationality as a unique and common phenomena. Many ethical, moral, and nearly all religious thinkers felt that the "soul" was a shared component. Some social thinkers, for example, founded their ideas on equality on a particular trait. They contended that because of this typical occurrence, all people are equal. As a result, there may be a shared experience or identity within equality.

EQUALITY BEFORE LAW:

Later philosophers placed more emphasis on objective principles and used an objective standard to evaluate both individuals and cohesive organisations. Equality before the law is a common example of this objective principle. In those days, the French revolutionaries specifically defined equality as equality before the law. Because of the importance of laws and the pre-existing disparity in France between the rich and the underprivileged, individuals had to strive for equality. Therefore, objective standards as laws are a huge aid in defining and establishing equality.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY:

Universal equality, however, has meant more to some thinkers than just treating all men equally under the law. Some people place a great deal of importance on equality of rights in order to guarantee equality of freedom and opportunity. As a result, every man has the freedom to live the "kind of life that seems good to them." One is granted this equality of chance to life as one pleases. Many people seem to find this to be sufficient. But ultimately, it doesn't matter as long as one man's interests do not conflict with those of another.

EQUALITY FOR THE WEAK:

How do we view those who are frail, hampered, or disabled in respect to equality? True, the weak are given special consideration in modern welfare governments. The disabled are frequently given particular amenities, including wheelchairs, by many contemporary states. In actuality, this type of addressing shortcomings is more accurate than broad inequities. Wheel chairs, however, are not intended to allow the disabled to compete in races alongside runners. The benefits that the majority of the community's residents typically enjoy do not govern this requirement. The assertion is more based on his personal interests and wants than on those of a wealthy community. As a result, equality is not necessarily determined equally by the wealthy and the poor.

EQUALITY FOR THE SUPERIOR TALENTED:

The needy and weak are treated equally, but the weak are given special regard. In contrast to the weak, however, men born with greater talents or unique social advantages cannot claim any merit. Because this can lead to increased disparity and inequality, men with better talents shouldn't have a specific place among the weak and the destitute.

IRRELEVANT JUSTIFICATION

Only when privilege differences are deemed to be excessively restricted or irrelevantly based are systems regarded to be unequal. For instance, it is excessively limiting if having white skin is a requirement for the right to vote in Europe. Therefore, using racial infirmities as justification to deny equal access to voting and other rights is unjustifiably limiting. There may have been instances like this in South African law, but that is irrelevant justification. On the contrary, it might entail doing away with the advantages that rich people have over impoverished people. Once more, it may imply that nobody should be denied access to a fair trial, etc.

MEANING OF EQUALITY

The aforementioned preliminaries demonstrate the care that must be taken in order to define equality in a single line. It will be challenging to define equality because of how many diverse settings in which human beings can encounter its tentacles. When used with various connotations, it can be used to indicate many different things. The goal of the following attempt is to determine what the word "equality" really means when used in a real-world context. Again, it is clear that the word "equality" has more than one meaning and that the disagreements over it are at least in part a result of the employment of the same theme with several interpretations.

"... On the one hand, it may affirm that men are on the whole, very similar in their natural endowments of character and intelligence. On the other hand, it may be asserted that, while they differ profoundly as individuals in capacity and character, they are equally entitled as human beings to consideration and respect, and that the well-being of a society is likely to be increased if it so plans its organization that, weather their powers

are great or small, all its members may be equally enabled to make the best of such powers as they possess”.

EQUALITY, A GANDHIAN PERSPECTIVE

It was made apparent that there are two key factors to take into account while discussing equality. One is taking into account that everyone has equal financial and material needs. The second is treating everyone equally, which can be used in social, political, and interpersonal relationships. Gandhi treated economic equality in one of these two key areas in an intricate manner, despite the fact that he considered treating people as equal to be of utmost importance. He spent a lot of time discussing economic equality as a result since he believed it to be the "master key" to all other equality. Therefore, economic equality is more crucial and fundamental in his fierce pursuit of equality. He did not, however, hold a literal view of quantitative economic equality.

Economic equality of my conception does not mean that everyone will literally have the same amount. It simply means that everybody should have enough for his or her needs.

Despite his general opposition to literal mathematical equality, Gandhi insisted on some sort of "levelling up" despite this. Or, to put it another way, it has to do with 'levelling down' from living in extreme poverty to luxurious lifestyle. Gandhi was forced to make this choice because of the numerous destitute individuals he encountered. He even made accusations for it, pointing out that the wealthy hold the majority of the country's wealth.

CONCLUSION

One of all people's basic desires is to want to live a life of equality. Nobody likes to be unacknowledged and treated unfairly by others. In today's interconnected world, equality is a goal shared by communities, institutions, and international governments in addition to people. If everyone has this as a natural interest, how can we define and accomplish equality? First and foremost, equality is not identity, identity, or being like other people. One is an exact replica of the other; neither are equal. On the contrary, it essentially affirms the uniqueness of each person, group, and country. Therefore, equality in a practical sense means that "B" is not "A," but instead aspired to be like "A." Additionally, rather than in a vacuum, the notion of equality must also be understood in relation to others. As a result, plurality or others are implied in the egalitarian ideology. It implies the presence of others rather than the eradication of uniqueness. In real life, equality should be present at all levels of society—economic, social, political, and interpersonal. These factors might all be categorised into two main levels. When viewed from a physical perspective, it may be more about material equality, whereas when viewed from a psychological one, it is about equal esteem. People and nations should make significant efforts to create the fundamental foods they consume, as well as the clothes they wear and the homes they must live in. This is especially true in the economic realm. Again, whenever possible, all of these productive tasks should be carried out manually to prevent overindustrialization and to provide employment for as many people as possible.

As a result, regardless of one's preference for physical labour, everyone engaged in productive work experiences no feelings of superiority or inferiority. By being willing to accept and recognise physical works, everyone will become equal. Second, given the propensity to accumulate material possessions, the greatest advice is to control greed and maintain possessions solely for necessities. This could be accomplished by consciously lowering excessive wants and approaching possessionlessness. Third, it is always preferable to maintain properties in a cooperative spirit and be conscious of the fact that everyone should act as wealth trustees when managing wealth and material resources. Therefore, regulation of individual ownership of significant results and assets must ensure that ownership is shared among many, rather than being totally held by one or two people. It is encouraged to adopt a decentralised power-sharing mentality with reference to the sociopolitical power struggle. Therefore, there is no one to rule over, subjugate, or control. Sharing the sociopolitical power will strengthen the grassroots and the periphery as a result of this process.

As a result, everyone will have the chance to share responsibility, and there will be plenty of chances for mature leadership that doesn't favour anyone in particular. Finally, true respect for one another on an equal footing is essential in human interpersonal relationships. This may very well be put into practise in all of our words, actions, and ideas. Martin Buber believed that an I-Thou relationship was the highest form of human respect that was attainable. There is no longer an I-it relationship with the other person or the other planet. Additionally, this type of respect for all human beings will be demonstrated in all conversations and discussions with various civilizations of other people and nations. Gandhi also thought that if this can be lived and practised on a personal level, it is feasible to extend it to a larger scale at the national and worldwide levels to create a more just world order. Gandhi's nonviolent approach had the virtue of being able to attain all these dimensions of equality. Therefore, using violence or other aggressive tactics is not necessary to realise these characteristics of equality. When considering the production of material commodities, the attitude would be that each person tries to provide food, clothing, and a place to live if we were to extend the definitions of nonviolence to include both the negative and positive implications of "no harm" and "love." Nobody would live as a parasite and take advantage of other people's labour. All individuals and nations will live off their own labours during this period. They will actively engage in creative work for the welfare of the individual and for everyone, rather than imposing or expecting others to perform slave labour. When nonviolence is practised, everyone will just keep what they need and not amass according to their greed. They wouldn't have the audacity to mistreat or harm someone else's property. Positively, if they took nonviolent action, they would drastically cut down on their needs and greed and only maintain what they absolutely needed. The fundamental standard for managing economic resources would similarly be include others rather than excluding them. As a result, the use of the trusteeship and cooperative management models will grow.

The peaceful strategy in all social political power struggles is decentralisation. Doing "no harm" means that they won't dare to amass power and rule over others, hence there can be no harm done. Power sharing is peaceful, while power dominance is violent. Thus, the benefits of nonviolence include love and the sharing of resources to support one another. Therefore, it can be in favour of equal power sharing and brotherly affection. In the end, individuals would prefer to operate in a non-violent manner by showing one another love and respect while maintaining an I-Thou mentality in their relationships. They would never intend to utilise an I-it connection, which is by its very nature violent and harmful. Living in a community can be quite helpful in this situation, or to put it another way, an equitable life will be made easier in a community. Therefore, achieving equality and an equitable world order is achievable if everyone adopts Gandhi's nonviolent approach and works together in a spirit of community. Gandhi's nonviolent resistance will be present, though, if the evil of inequity continues without any prospect of abatement. The goal is not to injure the evildoer in any manner, but rather to want and expect that he will change his ways out of love and compassion. As a result, he will also join the group, lovingly treating everyone equally.

REFERENCE

- Dasgupta, Ajit K., *Gandhi's Economic Thought*, New York, Rutledge, 1996 pp 88. ff.
Charles, K.J., *Total Development*, Vikas Publication 1932, p.18.
Ibid. as quoted, p.18.
McMahon, Walter W., *Education and Development: Measuring the Social Benefits*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999, p.111
Economic Report of the president, January 1974, Washington, pp. 4-5, as quoted by Charles, K.J., *Total Development*, Vikas Publication 1932, p.18.
Sen, Amartya, *Development as Freedom*, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1999 p. 187
Ibid. p.15
<http://www.mkgandhi.org/richpoor.htm>, update Feb13, 2007

<http://academic.udayton.edu/race/01race/race.htm>, updated Feb 28, 2007

(Ian F. Haney Lopez, *The social Construction of Race: Some observations on Illusion, Frustration, and Choice*, 29 Harvard Civil Rights Civil Liberties Law Review 1-62,6-7, 11-17, 1994).

Modi, Ishwar (Ed.), *Dangers of Globalization: Human Values & Social Change*, Rawat Publication, Jaipur and New Delhi, 2000, p.435.

Paper by Robertson Work, "Overview of Decentralization Worldwide: A stepping Stone to Improved Governance and Human Development", on the 2nd International conference on Decentralization, 25-27, July 2002, Manila, Philippines, on behalf of United Nations Development programme.p.1

<http://www.gandhi.ca/news/speakers/pearson.php>, update Jan 1, 2007. (Theme: "The Force of Love: Creating a Peaceful World", Dr. Anne M Pearson, talk to High School Students, Edmonton, Canada, October 1, 2002).

Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 'Equality Moral and Social', by Stanley I Benn, Reprint (Ed.), Vol.3&4, pp.40-41

Tawney, R.H., *Equality*, As quoted by, S.A. Palekar, Concept of Equality and Ideal Society, Basaveshwara's Model, Rawat Publication, New Delhi, 1997, p.43.

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/egalitarianism/> updated 2/29/2008; (First published Fri 16 Aug, 2002).

Rajendravora and Palshiker (Ed.), *Indian Democracy*, Sage Publication, New Delhi, 2004, p.229.
Dewey, *Lectures on Psychological and political Ethics*: Donald F. Koch, (Ed.), Collier Macmillan Publishers, New York, Hafner Press, 1898, p.442.

Ibid. Dewey, 1898, p.441.

<http://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Poli/poliBalz.htm>, update 3/19/2008. (Wolfgang Balzer, Freedom and Equality in the Comparison of Political Systems)

Gandhi, M K., *My Theory of Trusteeship*, Ravindra Kelkar, (Compile.), Navajivan Mudranalaya, Ahemadabad, p.88. Constructive Program, 1941, p.18.

Parekh, Bhikhu, *Gandhi*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1997, p.98.

