

**Gandhi on World Federation:**

1)

INTERVIEW TO "THE NEW YORK TIMES"

[Before April 22, 1940]

Harijan, 27-4-1940

CWMG 72 pp. 10-12

Q. Have you any views about world federation [Streit's scheme of 15 white democracies with India excluded at present, C. K. Streit, an American journalist, a scheme he had propounded in Union Now] or about a federation of Europe with the British Commonwealth and again excluding India? Would you advise India to enter such a larger federation so as to prevent a domination of the coloured races by the white?

A. Of course I would welcome a world federation of all the nations of the world. A federation of the Western nations only will be an unholy combination and a menace to humanity. In my opinion a federation excluding India is now an impossibility. India has already passed the stage when she could be safely neglected.

2)

INTERVIEW TO H. V. KAMATH

SEVAGRAM,

September 5, 1941

The Hindu, 5-11-1941

CWMG 74 p. 295

Q. Can you, Mahatmaji, envisage the emergence of a non-violent new world order in the Atlantic Charter?

A. No. I am not able to envisage in the Atlantic Charter the emergence of a non-violent new world order of my conception.

3)

LETTER TO MAURICE FRYDMAN

SEVAGRAM,

July 28, 1942

CWMG 76 p. 341

If I can get freedom for India now through non-violent means, power of non-violence is firmly established, Empire idea dissolves and world State takes its place, in which all the States of the world are free and equal, no State has its military, there may be a world police to keep order in the absence of universal belief in non-violence.

4)

QUESTION BOX

SEVAGRAM,

[On or before August 2, 1942]

WORLD FEDERATION

Harijan, 9-8-1942

CWMG 76 pp. 350-352

Q. Instead of striving for India's freedom why would you not strive for a far greater and nobler end-world federation? Surely that will automatically include India's freedom as the greater includes the less.

A. There is an obvious fallacy in this question. Federation is undoubtedly a greater and nobler end for free nations. It is a greater and nobler end for them to strive to promote federation than be self-centred, seeking only to preserve their own freedom. They are finding it difficult if not impossible for individuals to retain freedom without a combination. It has become a necessity while the war lasts

and it would be good if they voluntarily pledge themselves now, to remain united even after the war. Defeat of anyone member should make no difference. The survivors will not rest content till the defeated member is avenged. Still this won't be a world federation. It would be a mere defensive alliance between a certain combination. The very first step to a world federation is to recognize the freedom of conquered and exploited nations. Thus, India and Africa have to be freed. The second step would be to announce to and assure the aggressor powers, in the present instance, the Axis powers, that immediately the war ends, they will be recognized as members of the world federation in the same sense as the Allies. This presupposes an agreement among the members of the world federation as to the irreducible fundamentals. If this is not forthcoming, the federation will fall to pieces under the slightest strain. Therefore it has to come about voluntarily. I suggest that non-violence is the basis of voluntariness. It is because of all the nations of the world India is the one nation which has a message, however limited and crude it may be, in that direction that it must have immediate freedom to enable it to play its part. You may not quote against me Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I know that they do not hold the view I hold on non-violence. When India gets her freedom the probability is that I shall no longer be wanted by any party and everybody would be war-mad. Nevertheless there will be, I am quite sure, a respectable number of votaries of nonviolence who will make their contribution. But this subject is not germane to the question. Moreover, I am discussing that aspect more fully elsewhere. I hope you will agree with me that India, in seeking first to be free, is not retarding federation. It wants her freedom for the sake of the nations in distress, especially China and Russia and for the whole of humanity-in your language world federation. You will also, I hope, see that no universal federation is possible without India becoming free now. It would be an earnest too of the Allied declarations.

5)

SPEECH AT A.I.C.C. MEETING

BOMBAY,

August 7, 1942

The Hitavada, 9-8-1942; also The Bombay Chronicle, 8-8-1942

CWMG 76 pp. 377-381

My democracy means every man is his own master. I have read sufficient history and I did not see such an experiment on so large a scale for the establishment of democracy by non-violence. Once you understand these things you will forget the differences between the Hindus and the Muslims.

We are aiming at a world federation, in which India would be a leading unit. It can come only through non-violence. Disarmament is only possible if you use the matchless weapon of non-violence. There are people who may call me a visionary but I tell you I am a real bania and my business is to obtain swaraj.

6)

INTERVIEW TO RALPH CONISTON

Of the Colliers Weekly

[Before April 25, 1945]

Mahatma Gandhi-The Last Phase, Vol. I, Book I, pp. 113-6

CWMG 79 pp. 421-424

R. c. What kind of world organization would promote an enduring peace or preserve it?

G. Only an organization based predominantly on truth and non-violence.

R. c. With the present imperfect condition of the world and human nature, what means would in your opinion promote peace?

G. Nearest approach to the condition laid down in my answer to the previous question.

R. c. Would you have a world government?

G. Yes. I claim to be a practical idealist. I believe in compromise so long as it does not involve the sacrifice of principles. I may not get a world government that I want just now but if it is a government that would just touch my ideal, I would accept it as a compromise. Therefore, although I am not enamoured of a world federation, I shall be prepared to accept it if it is built on an essentially non-violent basis.

R. c. If the nations of the world were to consider world government as a means for preserving peace and promoting the welfare of all peoples, would you advocate the abandonment of India's aspiration for independence in order to join in the general plan?

G. If you will carefully go through the much abused Congress resolution of August 1942, you will discover that independence is necessary for India becoming an efficient partner in any scheme for the preservation of lasting peace in the world.

7)

SPEECH AT PRAYER MEETING

NEW DELHI,

July 4, 1947

Prarthana Pravachan-I, pp. 217-20

CWMG 88 pp. 273-275

I do not want India to be a frog in the well, unaware of what happens outside the well. Jawaharlal and other leaders have said that we will not be hostile to any country. We shall have friendship for all including the British. Do they then want a world federation? As I said at the Asian Relations Conference, a world federation is possible of realization and in that case it would not be necessary for countries to maintain armed forces. Some countries today describe themselves as democratic but of course one does not become a democrat by simply saying so. What is the need for an army where there is rule by the people? Where the army rules the people cannot rule. There can be no world federation of countries ruled by armies.