We all are fully aware about the fact that everywhere, we always confront with some conflicts, big or small in our day to day human affairs. However, the repeated tests of H-bombs and their results, have made it clear to the world that total war can no longer settle conflicts. And as a matter of fact, no conflict can be ended in its inner reality by the alleged deterrence from the possession of nuclear weapons. In such a stalemate the possibility of using non-violent resistance might be worth examining. However, for many the term “non-violent resistance” may be self-contradictory as how can any resistance be effective in this modern world unless it has backing it a great strength, power and, if need be, even weapons? Accordingly, at least a threat of violence may seem an essential of resistance. Nevertheless, there have been many instances in human history where great courage, deep conviction and a fine cause have prevailed without violence, against armed might. In this respect, Gandhi’s struggle for the freedom of India was one such instance. The unity of the human species is not only a biological and physiological fact; but it becomes a reality when wisely and fully asserted and acted upon with great soul force. Human unity is actual in man’s universal capacity to think, feel, will, understand and act, and to apprehend spiritual truths. Accordingly, human unity is a power that can overcome all differences of race, nationality, ideology or culture. Military leaders have aroused partial unity by means of fear, pride, anger, hate, revenge and lies. But unity can also be aroused, more fruitfully and enduringly, by love and the desire for justice. If we want a better world, we must be prepared to do some careful thinking. It is time when we should stop being sketchy on a matter that touches us all so closely. For in reality this matter of handling
conflict constructively is of immediate concern to everyone who has ever been angry or afraid, resentful, revengeful or bitter; who has ever taken part in a fight, mob violence or war; or who has been the object of anger, hatred, exploitation, injustice or oppression. Moreover, it touches all those who are troubled lest the vast economic, political and social questions that are pressing upon all nations will issue in still more appalling violence and increased insecurity for everyone, or even destruction of the human race. It is also important to those who hope that somehow the ideals of mankind can be made practical and harmonized with its conduct.¹

As it is evident from history that in the past so many wars have been fought on one account or the other but along with war, man has also tried to bring peace at all levels. And now in the 21st century, peace is required much more than the previous centuries to live and sustain. As a result of new inventions and scientific advancements, the world has become a small family. But with these advancements as already mentioned, the ways and dimensions of destructions are coming up increasingly with more powers. And it has been observed that every time humanity has found itself again on the brink as it has failed to learn lessons from history. The most tragic part of this episode is while we are quick to discern disaster, we do precious little to cry a halt to it. The choice before humanity is co-existence or co-extinction. According to Rev. Martin Luther King, today the choice before mankind is between non-violence and non-existence. Accordingly, we have to examine the efficacy of Gandhi’s non-violence in the light of this significant statement.

In an article, Marguerite Theophil, “Waging Peace Through Constructive Images”² says that recently this sentence stopped her short:

“Before we can live in peace, we have to be able to imagine, to image peace.” On similar lines, sculptor and activist Dana Toomey writes that reading the newspaper, she counted 50 different kinds of war around the globe. Why it is when most of us want peace, war is so prevalent, she wondered. Trying to envision a new culture without war, she asked herself – since humanity has never experienced life without violence, what would peace be like? How would we get the things we want? Who would be our heroes? Is anyone or anything pointing the way?

These questions became the driving force of Dana Toomey’s life. She formulated an education project in which she asked students: “What does peace look like?” And found how difficult it was to describe what’s not there. We usually describe peace as the absence of war since we do not have ready images or language for peace. As a six-year-old girl said to Toomey: “Everybody has a different picture; a different idea. May be that’s what peace is seeing everybody’s idea.”

For countless centuries man has been training himself in the art and science of killing. The question is: “Why did he constantly endeavour to learn the art of killing?” For many the answer may be that, because till now, violence was the only way of conflict resolution for him. However, the journey in developing violent means of conflict resolution has led man astray, into an abyss of mass annihilation. As a result, he has found himself entrapped in the very machine that he had created for his salvation. Now, at last, has come the moment when he must cry halt to this mad march towards self-destruction and now man has to evolve new methods of conflict resolution, new techniques of salvation.

Gandhi believes that creators of violence, crime and other troublesome behaviours cannot be changed through punishment or by killing. He believes that the only sensible approach is to change persons
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through non-violent means. For instance Gandhi says that “Crime is a product of the prevailing social system,” which needs thorough examination and the right kind of method to solve it.

If we look back that during the fifties and sixties we will find that many people felt that the ultimate decision in any disagreement or conflict could only come through war, or weapons that were believed to deter war. Today, more and more people are realizing that the proper way of resolving differences is through human understanding and humility.

The technological explosion we have been witnessing has two directions, those of war and of peace. While one seeks to achieve competence for total kill, the other seeks to enslave humanity through surfeit. In the first category falls the variegated weaponry of mass destruction: Nuclear, Thermonuclear, Chemical, Bacteriological and others on the perfection of which rich and developed nations have spent astronomical sums of money and the greater part of their scientific talent, and which all till the dissolution of the Soviet empire and consequent end of the Cold War, were seen to present an imminent threat to the survival of mankind. The good sense at last seems to have dawned that the race for the mastery of such weaponry is a race towards sure doom for all mankind, including those in the lead, and for some time hectic efforts have been underway, in the shape of various international arms, omitting agreements, to check their further development, production proliferation and their use.

The threat of atom and the nuclear bombs confirmed Gandhi’s faith in non-violence much more rather than shaking it. It is worth mentioning that solemn warning about the destructive potential of nuclear weapons have been shown to be well-justified by subsequent researchers of nuclear
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technology, which have come as a grave warning regarding all destructive nature of the world wars. Russell’s approval of the Gandhian technique of the disobedience, in opposing nuclear weapons is a notable event in this context. This technique has been adopted by leaders in France, Ireland and other countries and had been endorsed by U-Thant, the former Secretary General of the United Nations, who declared once that Gandhi’s philosophy has a meaning and significance far beyond the confines of his country or his time. Moreover, the course of events in international relations is a clear pointer to the fact that bypassing Gandhi’s creed of non-violence would amount to inviting a disaster for the world.8

Similarly, the great psychologist, C. G. Jung, once said that the task of humanity in this age was to integrate the shadow. Where was the darkest shadow found? Opposite the brightest light. And so in the right glare of our consumerist civilization today, we must not neglect the fact that it is throwing a dark shadow. And unless we integrate that dark shadow, unless we are able in the crucible of our individual consciousness, to take that poison as it were, and convert into ambrosia, we cannot survive.

Gandhi, once claiming to belong to all humanity, said that he was humble servant of India and in trying to serve India, he served humanity at large too after nearly fifty years of public life, was able to say that his faith in the doctrine that the service of one’s nation was not inconsistent with the service of the world had grown.9

According to Gandhi, his mission was not merely freedom of India, though it undoubtedly engrossed practically the whole of his life and the
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whole of his time. But through realisation of the freedom of India, he hoped to realise and carry on the mission of brotherhood.

Further, he had that implicit faith in his mission that if it succeeded it was bound to succeed and history would record it as movement designed to knit all people in the world together, not as hostile to one another, but as parts of one another.

Besides, he stressed that his work would finish, if he succeeded in carrying conviction to the human family that every man or woman, however weak in body, was the guardian of his or her self-respect and liberty.\(^{10}\)

Today, the nuclear technology has posed a grave danger to the world. Events like the Chernobyl and Bhopal accidents adversely affected not only the local population but also people, animals and plants in distant lands as also generations. Yet unborn children, still in the wombs of their mothers, were found to be affected by the nuclear fall-outs resulting into all sorts of physical and mental deficiencies. Also it is feared that the third world war, if and when it comes, will be a total destructive war leaving "no victor and no vanquished."\(^{11}\)

According to Gandhi, there are two methods of fighting, "the best and the most effective is not to defend at all but to remain at one's post risking every danger. The next best and equally honourable is to strike truthfully in one's self defence with weapons and place one's life in the greatest possible danger."\(^{12}\) Gandhi adopted the first method. Imam Husain was not allowed to adopt the first course and had to resort to the other equally honourable method to fight tyranny and injustice. The Battle of Karbala was the most unequal battle in all history where Imam Husain with his handful of followers died fighting the mighty army of a
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mighty empire for the self-respect of a mightier cause. It was the only battle in recorded history where the victor lost to the vanquished. And it is rightly regarded by Gandhi as the greatest example of a non-violent struggle. Ahimsa does not ask us to abstain from force at all time. “Restrain evil by love. If we cannot do it, restrain by force.” His reply was that one should eschew violence in one’s dealing with robbers and thieves or with nations that may invade India. 

Strictly speaking no activity and no industry is possible without a certain amount of violence. Even the very process of living is impossible without a certain amount of violence what we have to do is to minimize it to the greatest extent possible. People committed the mistake of thinking that all that did not involve killing was non-violence.

Once an old woman asked Lincoln, “How can you speak kindly to your enemies when you should rather destroy them?”

Lincoln replied, “Madam, Do I not destroy them when I make them my friend.”

Similarly, Vinoba also expresses that, “It is absolutely safe to love the enemy.”

Another big misconception about non-violence is that it is not practical and workable. However, the whole of Gandhi’s life is the loudest refutation of this wrong assessment of a very highly workable proposition. “The instruments for the quest of truth,” Gandhi said, “are as simple as they are difficult. They may appear quite impossible to an arrogant person and quite possible to an innocent child. The seeker after truth should be humbler than dust. The world crushes the dust under its feet, but the seeker after truth should be so humble himself that even the dust could crush him.”

Like the secret meaning of the poem truth
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reveals itself only to a trusty heart – the heart of a child capable of making friends with the fairies and elf’s (a sprite or little creature). The whole of our freedom movement after the advent of Gandhi is a shining example of the workability of non-violence not only at an individual level but on a National scale. Gandhi conducted a colossal experiment in the mass application of non-violence in a world used to the mass application of violence with no weapon except the steely will and unshakable faith in the righteousness of his cause.

According to Mother Teresa:  
“When we say ‘No to Violence’, we always imagine a knife, a gun, but to me violence which is caused with our tongue, violence which is caused by our attitude… that is greater violence.”

Similarly, Jonathan Schell argues in ‘The Fate of The Earth’ that nuclear weapons force us to be either strategic or moral idiots. Gandhi appeared to argue for Schell’s strategic idiocy as he contended that even Hitler could have been fought with techniques of nonviolent resistance – namely Satyagraha (truth force or soul force) which sounds strategically idiotic. Images of citizens of Russia, the Ukraine, Lithuania, and elsewhere successfully battling the Soviet Military with nonviolent demonstrations raise the possibility that Gandhi may not have proposed such foolishness after all.

On the other hand, the armaments race not only increases the risk of war but also leads to the diversion of resources to unproductive and meaningless purposes. Accordingly, it undermines the economic health of nations and deprives the peoples of the world many of their comforts and benefits which modern science possibly can provide. Moreover, the continuing arms race threatens the stability of the world’s economic

structure, on which alone the foundations of a lasting peace and a stable world order can be established. We must keep in mind that the framers of UN Charter were fully aware of these dangers when they stressed the desirability of achieving “The least diversion for armaments of the world’s human and economic resources” and spoke of the “establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments.”

When we look around the modern military weapons, we find that they have become so indiscriminate and their efforts so catastrophic that the very existence of mankind is threatened. Unscrupulous pursuits of material welfare without ethical substance and human values, has eaten into the very vitals of human life and culture. The moral fibre of the people has been weakened. The only practical way to resolve these problems in a lasting manner is to turn once again to the teachings and ideals of Mahatma Gandhi, study and analyse them in depth and find proper solutions for our increasing ailments.

In this respect, the views of Prof. Dennish Meadow are quite relevant when he points out that human environment today is shocking and there is limit to the world material growth and the world economy faces a very gloomy picture in the new millennium if we do not change radically our present policies on armament race. The indiscriminate use of technology and the pursuance of industrialisation on competitive basis have led to serve economic and social consequences of new and different nature. The ever widening gap between rich and poor, worsening economic and political relations, economic imperialism, multinationals and techno structure are among the more important problems at both the internal and international levels, the solution of which is not becoming possible through the traditional and conventional methods of modern world. Accordingly, he advocates non-violent approach to change the

present scenario. In the light of what is happening these days, Prof. Tinbergen also says, "the rich of the earth should prepare themselves for the simple life in future. The leading philosophy of the present day society which always asks for more material goods and does not attach much value at simplicity of life or modesty in claims has to be replaced by alternative philosophies and surely much could be learned from Mahatma Gandhi's words and examples. The real values of life do contain a sufficient quantity of goods and shelter, but it is not necessary to have the luxuries now aimed at. Cultural values will have to be upgraded again."

Gandhi had also supported the same view when just a few months before his death, he had written to Pandit Nehru that the New Social Order that they had envisaged had not to be judged by the quantity of material comforts and luxuries that they were able to govern the life of a nation. Accordingly, he had advised simplification of the standard of living and that one should place voluntary limits on his property and practice self renunciation. Further, he held that many of the so called comforts of life were not only indispensable but positive hindrances to the elevation of mankind. As a result, having correctly diagnosed the disease, he had called for the revival of village economy with indigenous industries so that the people could have enough to eat and keep the wolf off their doors.

While going through the present scenario of armament race, no one can get peace anywhere. However, the race for armament is still going on. The U.N.O. recognises that the Governments of all the countries of the world are not prepared to renounce war for one reason or the other. Throughout all the wars, we had seen that war's had neither produced peace nor harmony. On the other hand, war produces only another war.

Besides, one can’t expect peace from the balance of power since it nourishes mutual hatred, struggle for widening the sphere of influence, and creates fear and suspicion, which may be the elements of generating wars. Hence some new and basic thought will have to be adopted for permanent and lone lasting world peace.

In this respect, Gandhi advised to mobilise millions of people for non-violent resolution of conflicts and for the proper achievement and establishment of world peace. This would mean the adoption of the following ways:

(a) Starting a non-violent movement on the International level. Peace workers all over the world must unite with full confidence and eagerness to work.

(b) Through peace education workers should bring change in mentality of the masses and infuse the feeling of unity.

(c) Peace workers of each nation should press their governments for total disarmament which requires a strong public opinion, so long as total disarmament is not accepted at least nations should not join military pacts.

According to Gandhi real disarmament can’t come unless the nations of the world cease to exploit one another. If the mad race for armaments continues, it is bound to result in a world of slaughter such as has never occurred in the human history. Gandhi further asserts that, absence of fundamental sincerity would make all talk about the limitation of armament useless and meaningless. Not disarmament – whether partial or total in respect of nuclear weapons, but renunciation of all forces is the only answer to the problem on international peace. He has also suggested that only a world organisation backed by a moral or non-violent sanction can guarantee international peace. He had given his own view regarding
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the nature of this world organisation different from the nature of the present day U. N. O. According to him, this world peace organisation must have the following characteristics:\footnote{Ibid., pp. 13-14.}

1. The individuals and the nations composing the world should be predominantly non-violent.

2. All the nations of the world should be fully independent. There can be no place in such a world for colonialism, imperialism and race hatred.

3. The distinction of big and small should be obliterated and every nation should feel as tall as the tallest. Each and every nation must be represented in the International Organisation.

4. It should be based on general disarmament. Failing that some one nation, at least, should take the initiative and give a lead to the rest of the world. Its example may become infectious in course of time, even as the example of the non-violent individual become infectious.

5. The international Society should be a voluntary organisation of states for the common good, in which every nation should be willing to sacrifice itself for all.

6. All disputes between nations should be settled peacefully and amicably by such methods as negotiation, mediation and arbitration.

Gandhi showed to the whole world the efficacy of the principle of love and peace as instruments of social change. His undying faith in the goodness of man and the efficacy of non-violence is beyond doubt. Since the individual is the basis of all social progress, one should place greater reliance on the development of the individual than of any intellectual device. Man is not a “lost” creature. He is ever capable of self-
development. The fundamental Gandhian methods for bringing about social change rests on the reformation of the individual “internally, morally and spiritually.” He elaborates that if all individuals practise self-control, a control over all senses, follow the principles of truth and non-violence in their daily dealings and try to incorporate these principles in their thoughts and attitudes, society would gradually gravitate towards the ideal he cherished. Essentially, all the teachings of Gandhi, were entirely based on the concept of individual’s efforts for perfection by a strict adherence to truth and non-violence.  

If we look around the scenario of the present world, one thing is clear that the modern society has affected man in two ways at the same time as he has become independent, self-reliant, critical and egocentric on the one hand and isolated, alone, afraid of on the other. The two processes have gone through together and are two aspects of a dynamic system viz. the individual. When we analyse the results of both aspects, we find that it is sometimes difficult to see both these aspects, especially the inner process as we are prone to imagine that the problem of freedom lies in gaining more and more freedom from external restraints: social, political and moral. This is the traditional freedom which undoubtedly has to be increased and maintained but we have also the more important and difficult task of acquiring and realizing our own individual selves and becoming more and more free in our mind in our spirit. This is sometimes known as spiritual freedom. All other types of freedom are but stages towards the ultimate goal. It is precisely in this context that the Gandhian approach to world peace comes to acquire a sharp relevance. Rightly, Gandhi is often associated, with unilateral disarmament. As a messiah of peace and non-violence, he repeatedly asserted the supremacy of moral force over physical force: His advocacy of the use of soul force in
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preference to physical violence even in the atomic age under scores, his strong faith in the spirit of man and the capacity of weak countries to resist aggression from strong ones. Gandhi has in his armoury weapons to promote world peace even in this nuclear age.

Once a correspondent discussing an important topic with Gandhi, argued: 24
Why are you against violence? Do you think that every act of violence is an expression of Himsa? Is it not strange that we should feel a kind of horror, pity and disgust when we see a murder or assassination, and silently witness the slow sucking of blood going on every day in the world? If one believes that a successful bloody revolution would ameliorate a good deal of misery in the world, why should he not resort to arms? . . . Don’t you realize that the rulers of the world have become so callous that, to understand you or humanity, they must again become children. I don’t mean to say they are born bad. But their badness is a physical fact and, in spite of themselves, they cannot alter it.

In response to this question, Gandhi replied that, it was because of the rulers, if they were bad, so, not necessarily or wholly by reason of birth, but largely because of their environment, that he had hopes of their altering their course. It was perfectly true, as the writer said, that the rulers could not alter their course themselves. If they were dominated by their environment, they did not surely deserve to be killed, but had to be changed by a change of environment. But as a matter of fact the environment is we—the people who make the rulers what they were. They were thus an exaggerated edition of what we were in the aggregate. If his argument was sound, any violence done to the rulers could be violence done to themselves and it would be suicide. And since he did not

want to commit suicide, nor encourage his neighbours to do so, he
became non-violent himself and invited his neighbours to do likewise.

Moreover, violence can destroy one or more bad rulers, but, like
Ravana's heads, others will pop up in their places, for, the root lies some
where else. It lies in us. If we will reform ourselves, the rulers will have
to change themselves automatically.

The correspondent seemed to imagine that a non-violent person had
no feelings and that he was a silent witness to the "slow sucking of blood
going on every day in the world." In fact, non-violence is neither a
passive force nor so helpless as the correspondent would make it out to
be. Barring truth, if truth is to be considered apart from non-violence, the
latter is the activest force in the world as it never fails. Violence only
seemingly succeeds, and nobody has ever claimed uniform and
everlasting success for violence. Non-violence never promises immediate
and tangible results. It is not a mango trick. Its failures are, therefore, all
seeming. A believer in violence will kill the murderer and boast of his
act. But he never killed murder. By murdering the murderer, he added to
it and probably invited more. The law of retaliation is the law of
multiplying evil.

A non-violent man will act upon the murderer through his love. He
cannot, by punishing the murderer, undo the murder already committed.
But he hopes by gentleness to get the murderer to repent of his deed and
change the whole course of his life. A non-violent man always and
automatically turns the searchlight self ward and discovers that the best
course of conduct is to do unto others as he would have others to do unto
him. If he was the murderer, he would not like to be killed for his
madness but would like the opportunity of mending himself. He knows,
too, that he must not destroy what he cannot create. God is the sole Judge between man and man.  

Time and again at many places, people keep asking Gandhi, which acts may be termed violent and which non-violent and, what is one’s duty at a particular time. While some of these queries reveal the ignorance of the inquirers, others serve to bring out the difficult dilemmas involved. A Punjabi gentleman had put a question the answer to which is worth to quote here:

The question was: What should be done when tigers, wolves and other wild beasts come and carry away other animals or human beings? Or, what should be done about germs in water?

Gandhi very humbly replied that in his opinion the simple answer was that where there was danger from tigers, wolves and so on, then killing them could become inevitable. Similarly, the germs that water contains must also be inevitably destroyed. Violence which was inevitable did not therefore cease to be so and became non-violence. It has to be recognized as violence. He had no doubt that it would be best if we could contrive to survive without destroying tigers, wolves, etc. However, who could do so? Only he who was not afraid of these animals and could regard them as friends, he alone could do so. Anyone who refrained from violence because he was afraid, was nevertheless guilty of violence. The mouse was not non-violent towards the cat. At heart, he always had a feeling of violence towards the cat. He could not kill the latter because he was weak. He alone had the power to practise the dharma of ahimsa who although fully capable of inflicting violence does not inflict it. He alone practises the ahimsa dharma who voluntarily and with love refrains from inflicting violence on anyone. To Gandhi, non-violence implies love, compassion and forgiveness. The Shastras describe
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these as the virtues of the brave. This courage is not physical but mental. There have been instances of physically frail men having indulged in grave acts of violence with the help of others. There have also been cases where those as physically strong as Yudhishtira have granted pardon to such persons as king Virata. Hence, so long as one has not developed inner strength, one can never practise the dharma of ahimsa.

The Mahatma knew our weakness during the World War-I when he went all out to recruit soldiers in Kheda. And, it was for this very reason that he said at that time that perhaps the most brutal act of the British Government was to have disarmed and thus emasculated the Indian people. He held the same view even after independence. If anyone afraid at heart could not, while remaining unarmed, rid himself of that fear, he should certainly arm himself with a stick or even more deadly weapon.

In fact, Ahimsa is a great vow; it is more difficult than walking on the edge of a sword. Complete adherence to it is almost impossible for one who has a physical form. Severe penance is required for its practice. Penance should be taken to mean renunciation and knowledge. Anyone who desires to possess land cannot practise ahimsa. A peasant necessarily has to protect his land. He must guard it against tigers and wolves. A peasant who is not prepared to punish these animals or thieves, etc., should always be prepared to abandon his field.

Further, he added that in order to be able to practise the dharma of ahimsa, man must abide by the limits laid down by the Shastras and custom. The Shastras do not enjoin violence. But they permit certain acts of violence by regarding them as unavoidable at particular times. For instance, it is believed that the Manusmriti permits the slaughter of certain animals. Such slaughter has not been ordained. Thereafter, with progress in thinking, it was decided that this would not be permitted in the Kaliyuga. Hence it is customary today to regard certain forms of
violence as pardonable, while some of the forms of violence allowed by *Manusmriti* are forbidden. It is obviously wrong to argue that we can go beyond the concessions allowed by the Shastras. There is dharma in self-control and, *adharma* in indulgence. Anyone who does not make use of the latitude given by the Shastras deserves to be congratulated. Ahimsa knows no limits because there are none to self-control. The latter has been welcomed by all the scriptures of the world, while opinions differ widely regarding indulgence. A right angle is the same everywhere, while there is no end to the number of other angles. Non-violence and truth together form, as it were, the right angle of all religions. Conduct which does not fit into that angle should undoubtedly be given up. Imperfect conduct may, perhaps, be permitted. Anyone who practises the dharma of ahimsa should increase his inner strength by being always on the alert and progressively restrict the latitude that he has allowed for himself. There is certainly nothing religious about indulgence. Renouncing through knowledge the worldly life – this is the attainment of *moksha*. Such absolute renunciation is not to be found even on the peaks of the Himalayas. The true cave is the one in the heart. Man can hide himself within it and thus protected can remain untouched by the world even though living and moving freely in it, taking part in those activities which cannot be avoided.26

At another point once he was asked about the cultivation of Ahimsa, that “What is the good of your crying ‘ahimsa, ahimsa’ in season and out of season? Will it by itself teach people to be non-violent? Would it not be better, instead, to tell people how pure ahimsa or the ahimsa of the strong can be cultivated?”

Gandhi while considering the question, a timely one replied that he had attempted before that on more occasions than one to answer it. But

his effort had, he confessed been rather desultory. He had not concentrated upon it, or given it the weight he might had. This was all right while he was devoting all his energy to forging means to give battle to Government. But it had the result of retarding the growth of pure ahimsa, so that today we are not even within ken of the ahimsa of the strong. If we now want to advance further, we ought, at least for some time, to completely forget the idea of offering non-violent resistance to constituted authority. If non-violence in the domestic field is successfully achieved, we shall surely see the non-violence against constituted authority revived in its purified form, and it will be irresistible.

Once an Indian friend asked Gandhi, “Of what avail is non-violence? Yesterday Reuter in pathetic terms related how the population of Norway under the rain of bombs and machine-gun bullets was fleeing from towns completely demoralized and in panic. . . The futility of violence, and also. . . its temporary efficacy, is being proved. . . Let us hope eventually everyone will see the futility of violence and a new era may dawn. But are we really making a non-violent contribution towards the world problem? Of what avail is our non-violence to Norway, Sweden and Denmark? Virtually are we not giving a handle to Germany? True, we are doing nothing beyond embarrassing Great Britain, and perhaps we may say that such an embarrassment is inevitable and is not caused deliberately. . . We are not likely, it seems, to succeed in changing England’s heart. And victims like Norway, etc., can never appreciate our attitude. In the light of our present attitude, the International World can with justification misinterpret our past help to victims of aggression like China and Spain. Were they more deserving of our help than the present victims? And if not, then why this distinction? . . . You have never regretted your action during the last war when you vigorously recruited people for military purposes. This time your attitude appears to be in sharp contrast, although you say that both attitudes are right.”

In response to that Gandhi replied that his correspondent was not alone in bemoaning the lot of the most cultured and inoffensive people like the Danes and the Norwegians. This war is showing the futility of

violence. Supposing Hitler becomes victorious over the Allies, he would never subjugate England and France. It would mean another war. Supposing the Allies are victorious, the world would fare no better. They would be more polite but not less ruthless, unless they learn the lesson of non-violence during the war and unless they shed the gains they have made through violence. The first condition of non-violence is justice all round in every department of life. Perhaps it is too much to expect of human nature. I do not, however, think so. No one should dogmatize about the capacity of human nature for degradation or exaltation.

He pointed out that Indian non-violence had brought no relief to the cultured Western powers because it was still poor stuff. Why travel so far to see its inefficacy? For instance, Indians were torn as under in spite of the Congress policy of non-violence. The Congress itself was distrusted. Not until the Congress or a similar group of people represented the non-violence of the strong. Will the world catch the infection? India’s aid to Spain and China was merely moral. The material aid was but an insignificant token of it. There was hardly an Indian who did not feel the same sympathy for Norway and Denmark who lost their freedom overnight. Though their case was different from that of Spain and China, their ruin was more complete perhaps than that of Spain and China. Indeed there was a material difference even between China and Spain. But there was no difference so far as sympathy was concerned. Pauper India had nothing to send to these countries except her non-violence. But as Gandhi had said this was not yet a sendable commodity. It would be, when India could gain her freedom through non-violence.  

In an interview with some American Teacher, regarding the status of Non-violence, the question and answer from both sides were like this: Teacher: How would you, an old and experienced leader, advise young men to throw away their lives in the service of humanity?
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Gandhi: The question is not rightly put. You don’t throw away your lives when you take up the weapon of Satyagraha. But you prepare yourself to face without retaliation the gravest danger and provocation. It gives you a chance to surrender your life for the cause when the time comes. To be able to do so non-violently requires previous training. If you are a believer in the orthodox method, you go and train yourselves as soldiers. It is the same with non-violence. You have to alter your whole mode of life and work for it in peace time just as much as in the time of war. It is no doubt a difficult job. You have to put your whole soul into it; and if you are sincere, your example will affect the lives of other people around you. America is today exploiting the so-called weaker nations of the world along with other powers. It has become the richest country in the world, not a thing to be proud of when we come to think of the means by which she has become rich. Again, to protect these riches you need the assistance of violence. You must be prepared to give up these riches. Therefore, if you really mean to give up violence, you will say, “We shall have nothing to do with the spoils of violence, and if as a result America ceases to be rich, we do not mind.” You will then be qualified to offer a spotless sacrifice. That is the meaning of preparation. The occasion for making the extreme sacrifice may not come if you as a nation have fully learnt to live for peace. It is much more difficult to live for non-violence than to die for it.

Teacher: The friends wanted to know if non-violence as enunciated by Gandhi ji had a positive quality.

Gandhi: If I had used the word ‘love’, which non-violence is in essence, you would not have asked this Question? But perhaps ‘love’ does not express my meaning fully. The nearest word is ‘charity’. We love our friends and our equals. But the reaction that a ruthless dictator sets up in us is either that of awe or pity according respectively as we react to him violently or non-violently. Non-violence knows no fear. If I am truly non-violent, I would pity the dictator and say to myself, ‘He does not know what a human being should be. One day he will know better when he is confronted by a people who do not stand in awe of him, who will neither submit nor cringe to him, nor bear any
grudge against him for whatever he may do.’ Germans are today doing what they are doing because all the other nations stand in awe of them. None of them can go to Hitler with clean hands.

Teacher: What is the place of Christian missions in the new India that is being built up today? What can they do to help in this great task?

Gandhi: To show appreciation of what India is and is doing. Up till now they have come as teachers and preachers with queer notions about India and India’s great religions. We have been described as a nation of superstitious heathens, knowing nothing, denying God. We are a brood of Satan as Murdoch would say. Did not Bishop Heber in his well-known hymn “From Greenland’s Icy Mountains” describe India as a country where “every prospect pleases, and only man is vile”? To me this is a negation of the spirit of Christ. My personal view, therefore, is that if you feel that India has a message to give to the world, that India’s religions too are true, though like all religions imperfect for having percolated through imperfect human agency, and you come as fellow helpers and fellow seekers, there is a place for you here. But if you come as preachers of the ‘true Gospel’ to a people who are wandering in darkness, so far as I am concerned you can have no place. You may impose yourselves upon us.

Teacher: What is India’s real message to the world?

Gandhi: Non-violence. India is saturated with that spirit. It has not demonstrated it to the extent that you can go to America as living witnesses of that spirit. But you can truthfully say that India is making a desperate effort to live up to that great ideal. If there is not this message, there is no other message that India can give. Say what you may, the fact stands out that here you have a whole subcontinent that has decided for itself that there is no freedom for it except through non-violence. No other country has made that attempt even. I have not been able to influence other people even to the extent of believing that non-violence is worth trying. There is of course a growing body of European opinion that has begun to appreciate the possibilities of the weapon of non-violence. But I want the sympathy of the whole world for India if she can get it while she is making this unique experiment. You can, however, be witnesses to that attempt only if you really feel that we are making an honest effort to come up to the ideal of non-violence and that all we are doing is not fraud. If your
conviction is enlightened and deep enough, it will set up a ferment working in the minds of your people.
Teacher: This is an admirable charge.
Gandhi: Take that charge with you then.

Similarly, once a London based friend had put seven questions on the working of non-violence. Though similar questions had been dealt with in *Young India* and *Harijan*, it was profitable to answer them in a single article, if perchance the answers might prove helpful.

Q. 1. Is it possible for a modern State (which is essentially based on force) to offer non-violent resistance for countering internal as well as external forces of disorder? Or is it necessary that people wanting to offer non-violent resistance should first of all divest themselves of State-authority and place themselves vis-à-vis the opponent entirely in a private capacity?

A. It is not possible for a modern State based on force, non-violently to resist forces of disorder, whether external or internal. A man cannot serve God and Mammon, nor be ‘temperate and furious’ at the same time. It is claimed that a State can be based on non-violence, i.e., it can offer non-violent resistance against a world combination based on armed force. Such a State was Ashoka’s. The example can be repeated. But the case does not become weak even if it be shown that Ashoka’s State was not based on non-violence. It has to be examined on its merits.

Q. 2. Do you think that it would be possible for a Congress government to deal with foreign aggression or internal riots in an entirely non-violent manner?

A. It is certainly possible for a Congress government to deal with “foreign aggression or internal riots” in a non-violent manner. That the Congress may not share my belief is quite possible. If the Congress changes its course, the change will prove nothing save that the non-violence hitherto offered was of the weak and that the Congress has no faith in State non-violence.

Q. 3. Does not the knowledge that the opponent is wedded to non-violence often encourage the bully?

A. The bully has his opportunity when he has to face non-violence of the weak. Non-violence of the strong is any day stronger than that of the bravest soldier fully armed or a whole host.

Q. 4. What policy would you advocate if a section of the Indian people tries to enforce by sword a selfish measure which is not only repugnant to others but also basically unjust? While it is possible for an unofficial organization to offer non-violent resistance in such a case, is it also possible for the government of the day to do so?

A. The question assumes a case which can never exist. A non-violent State must be broad-based on the will of an intelligent people, well able to know its mind and act up to it. In such a State the assumed section can only be negligible. It can never stand against the deliberate will of the overwhelming majority represented by the State. The government of the day is not outside the people. It is the will of the overwhelming majority. It is expressed non-violently, it cannot be majority of one but nearer 99 against one in a hundred.

Q. 5. Is not non-violent resistance by the militarily strong more effective than that by the militarily weak?

A. This is a contradiction in terms. There can be no non-violence offered by the militarily strong. Thus, Russia in order to express non-violence has to discard all her power of doing violence. What is true is that if those, who were at one time strong in armed might, change their mind, they will be better able to demonstrate their non-violence to the world and, therefore, also to their opponents. Those who are strong in non-violence will not mind whether they are opposed by the militarily weak people or the strongest.

Q. 6. What should be the training and discipline for a non-violent army? Should not certain aspects of conventional military training form a part of the syllabus?

A. A very small part of the preliminary training received by the military is common to the non-violent army. These are discipline, drill, singing in chorus, flag-hoisting, signaling and the like. Even this is not absolutely necessary and the basis is different. The positively necessary training for a non-violent army is an immovable faith in God, willing and perfect obedience to the chief of the non-violent army and perfect inward and outward co-operation between the units of the army.
Q. 7. Is it not better under the existing circumstances that countries like India and England should maintain full military efficiency while resolving to give non-violent resistance a reasonable trial before taking any military step?

A. The foregoing answers should make it clear that under no circumstance can India and England give non-violent resistance a reasonable chance whilst they are both maintaining full military efficiency. At the same time it is perfectly true that all military powers carry on negotiations for peaceful adjustment of rival disputes. But here we are not discussing preliminary peace parleys before appealing to the arbitrament of war. We are discussing a final substitute for armed conflict called war, in naked terms, mass murder.  

Commenting on what Pandit Nehru called “a very extraordinary argument”, to which a member of the Indian Parliament seemed to hint, that “We should look after our own defense, why should we bother about that [Disarmament], and if disarmament comes it may affect our defence,” Prime Minister Nehru observed that, that argument indicated a total absence of full consideration being to the various aspects of the disarmament problem. He added:

If world disarmament comes, the world is changed and we are far more secure that we would otherwise be obviously; there can be no world disarmament with any major country remaining armed. It is out of the question that even if the Soviet Union, United States of America, England, France and may be some other countries agree to disarmament and China does not, that is not disarmament. In fact, they will never agree to it. You cannot imagine the great or small powers leaving out of any pact on disarmament a mighty power and allowing it to keep all these armaments. It cannot happen. It is not disarmament. When we talk about disarmament, it must apply to all countries in a appropriate measures.

Replying to such criticism as to “Why should we get entangled in disarmament and other matters,” Prime Minister Nehru, in his statement in the Lok Sabha on 23rd November 1960, had stated that he was surprised and a little pained to hear those remarks reflecting, as he said, the “narrow groove of thought” and ignorance of “What lies behind all this business of disarmament.” The question of disarmament, he observed, was more important than any other problem, internal or external, national or international, because it was a one national problem, apart from being an international. The whole future survival of India and every Indian “depends upon it.” In carrying it out, he stated, it affected the great powers. “If we can help in any way in that” Nehru added, “obviously we should do so” because, as he puts it, “It is our concern and it is our problem.”

It is quite significant to mention here that the three points – the stress on the abandonment of the arms race, the necessity of continuing negotiations with a view to reach an agreement and the banning of the weapons of mass destruction (the ABC – Atomic, Biological and Chemical Weapons) – have constantly figured in the subsequent Indian attitude or posture on disarmament. Explaining the advantages of embodying the results of the work of the Atomic Energy Commission in the form of a declaration in much the same way as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the Assembly in December, 1948, the Indian representative, B. N. Rau, had suggested that the proposed declaration might contain the following three propositions “The development and use of atomic energy having now become a matter of international concern, it is the duty of every State to submit to, and act in aid of, an effective system of international control adequate to insure the use of atomic energy only for peaceful purposes and the elimination of weapons of mass destruction.”
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atomic weapons from national armaments as well as to protect complying States against the hazard of violations and evasions. Secondly, no state or individual shall manufacture, possess or use atomic weapons. Thirdly, no state or individual shall use atomic energy except for peaceful purposes.\textsuperscript{33}

It has been observed that Gandhi’s success in India legitimated the mass mobilization of nonviolent action in a way that nothing before him had been done. He crafted a form of struggle out of various strands of cultural traditions from both the East and the West and thrust it into the center of political life. Prior to the Indian freedom movement, nonviolence was not considered an option beyond marginal religious circles. But later on it became an essential part of our “vocabulary of courage and heroism,”\textsuperscript{34} as expressed by Ram Chandra Gandhi.

In this respect, Gandhi’s concept of a system of nonviolent security envisioned the creation of what he called “Shanti Sena,” which to him contribute meaningfully in order to promote non-violent approach to resolve the conflicts. These “Peace Brigades” would be trained in nonviolent methods of conflict and would intervene in the event of an outbreak of violence, either internal to the community or as a consequence of invasion by a foreign power.

According to Gandhi, the goal of the Shanti Sena is two fold – like a militia, its members are to be mobilized in the event of a crisis; and, when there is no immediate need for conflict intervention, they are to be engaged in what Gandhi called “Constructive Work.” These two elements – nonviolent intervention and constructive work – are interrelated and are central to the Gandhian concept of security as well as to his
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understanding of how one should engage in conflicts. He successfully defended the nation that security comes not simply from military might but from the general well-being of the people and a variety of factors that go far beyond one’s ability to engage in violence.

If we go through the history of mankind, we would find that history has proved that the vast empires can be run and administered better with the rule of Ahimsa (non-violence). The golden eras of Emperor Ashoka, Nalanda, Kanishka and Harshvardhan, are the shining examples in the annals of history. The history of these great emperors is a lesson that the contentment and peace which they could not find after conquering nearly the whole world, they got by adopting the pious cult of Ahimsa. These emperors became Bhikshus (monks) to spread the Light of Ahimsa in this world. Piety ruled over their domains which converted their vast empires into heavens of peace where their wars had placed havoc of destruction. There remained no lust for war in the rulers and no crime in the ruled.35

The message is clear. It now depends upon our attitude, judgment and decision, whether to continue to make this world a hell by fighting wars with deadly weapons and remain under perpetual fear of destruction or to make a heaven of this world with the doctrine of Ahimsa as followed and imbibed by Mahatma Gandhi.

There have been numerous instances of the successful use of non-violent resistance in different countries at different time intervals and at different levels. In some of the instances the non-violent resistance was by individuals, in other instances it took a mass or corporate form. In some cases it is the individuals, who play the major role and in some other instances it is the mass mobilization, which together plays the major role.

We may punish thieves, because we think they harass us. They may continue to transfer their attentions to other victims also. The other victims are also human beings who react against their behaviour. The trouble from thieves continues to increase, as they think it is their business to steal. In the end we see that it is better to endure the thieves than to punish them as the forbearance may even bring them to their senses. By enduring them we realize that thieves are not different from ourselves, they are our brethren, our friends, and should not be punished rather they should be reformed not to repeat. But whilst we may bear with the thieves, we may endure the infliction. That would only induce cowardice. So we realize a further duty. Since we regard the thieves as our fellow beings, they must be made to realize the relationship. And so we must take pains to devise ways and means of winning them over. This is the path of ahimsa. It may entail continuous suffering and the cultivating of endless patience. Given these two conditions, the thief is bound in the end to turn away from his evil ways. Thus, step by step we learn how to make friends with the entire world; we realize the greatness of God – of truth. Our peace of mind increases in spite of suffering; we become braver and more enterprising; we understand more clearly the difference between what is everlasting and what is not; we learn how to distinguish between what is our duty and what is not. Our pride melts away, and we become humble. Our worldly attachments diminish, and the evil within us diminishes from day to day.

It is perhaps clear from the ongoing analysis, that without ahimsa it is not possible to seek and find truth. Ahimsa and truth are so intertwined that it is practically impossible to disentangle and separate them. According to Gandhi, they are like the two sides of a coin, or rather of a smooth unstamped metallic disc. Who can say, which is the obverse, and which is the reverse? Nevertheless ahimsa is the means; truth is the end.
Means to be means must always be within our reach, and so ahimsa is our supreme duty. If we take care of the means, we are bound to reach the end sooner or later. When once we have grasped this point, final victory is beyond question, whatever difficulties we encounter, whatever apparent reverses we sustain, we may not give up the quest for truth which alone is, being God Himself.  

**Efficacy of Non-violent Resistance in the Present Context:**

It has been observed that perhaps none of Gandhi’s followers have created so many worshippers of Truth and Non-violence, so many genuine workers as has Vinoba Bhave. Vinoba Bhave was one of the great spiritual leaders and reformers of modern India, whose work and personal example moved the hearts of countless Indians. Born in 1895, at the tender age of ten, Vinoba took a vow of life-long celibacy and selfless service to others searching for a way of life that would synthesize both spiritual Truth and practical action. Vinoba discovered Gandhi, and joined in Gandhi’s work for the regeneration and freedom of India. As Vinoba himself put it: “I experienced with Gandhi the peace of the Himalayas the revolutionary spirit. Peaceful revolution, revolutionary peace, the two streams united in Gandhi in a way that was altogether new.”  

Gandhi also wrote to Vinoba’s father, “At a tender age, Vinoba has acquired a degree of spirituality and ascetism that took me years of patient labour.”

In 1940 Gandhi chose Vinoba to be the first Satyagrahi i.e. non-violent resister, to offer non-violent resistance to the British regime. Vinoba’s social atavism was founded on a lifetime’s study of the other major world religions. Vinoba’s life, reveals the harmony of the inner and outer life of a great man, who had an unwavering commitment to the

---
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practice of non-violence, to an engaged spirituality and to the universal power of love.

After India had independence, Vinoba started out on his extraordinary and unprecedented in recorded history, the Bhōdān (Land-Gift) Movement. Over a period of twenty years, Vinoba walked through the length and breadth of India persuading land-owners and land-lords to give their poor and downtrodden neighbours a total of four million acres of land.

For Vinoba the future of India was essentially a contest between the fundamental creeds of Gandhi and Marx. In coming to Hyderabad, Vinoba and other Gandhians were confronting a challenge and testing their faith in non-violence. On April 11th 1951, the final day of conference, Vinoba announced that on his walk home to Pavanar he and a few companions would tour the Communist infested areas of Telangana to spread the message of Peace i.e. Non-violence. Once in Telangana, Vinoba quickly showed his sensitivity to the new situation. On April 17th, at his second stop, Vinoba learned at first hand that village people were afraid of the police as well as the Communists and that the village was torn along class-lines.

On April 18th 1951, the historic day of the very genesis of the Bhōdān Movement, Vinoba entered Nalgonda district, the centre of Communist activity. The organizers had arranged Vinoba’s stay at Pochampalli, a large village with about 700 families, of whom two-thirds were landless. Pochampalli gave Vinoba a warm welcome. Vinoba went to visit the Harijjan (the Untouchables) colony. By early afternoon villagers began to gather around Vinoba at Vinoba’s cottage. The Harijans asked for eighty acres of land, forty wet, forty dry for forty families that would be enough. Then Vinoba asked, if it was not possible to get land from the government, was there not something villagers
themselves could do? To everyone’s surprise, Ram Chandra Reddy, the local landlord, got up and said in a rather excited voice: “I will give you 100 acres for these people.” At his evening prayer meeting, Ram Chandra Reddy got up and repeated his promise to offer 100 acres of land to the Harijans. This incident neither planned nor imagined was the very genesis of the Bhooḍān Movement and it made Vinoba think that therein lay the potentiality of solving the land problem of India. This movement later on developed into a village gift or Gramdān Movement. This movement was a part of a comprehensive movement for the establishment of a Sarvodaya Society (The Rise of All socio-economic-political order), both in India and outside India.

The movement passed through several stages in regard to both momentum and allied programmes. In October 1951, Vinoba was led to demand fifty million acres of land for the landless from the whole of India by 1957. Thus a personal initiative assumed the form of a mass movement, reminding the people of Gandhi’s mass movements. This was indeed a very remarkable achievement for a constructive work movement. The enthusiasm for the movement lasted till 1957 and thereafter it began to wane.

Meanwhile the Bhooḍān Movement had been transformed from a land-gift movement to a village-gift or Gramdān Movement, in which the whole or a major part of a village land was to be donated by not less than 75% of the villagers who were required to relinquish their right of ownership over their lands in favour of the entire village, with power to equitably redistribute the total land among village’s families with a provision for revision after some intervals. The Programme of individual land-gifts was still there, but henceforth became a neglected activity.

However, the Gramdān idea did not prove popular in the non-tribal areas and this partly accounted for the decline of the movement at the end
of the 1950s. All this continued till 1974. From the viewpoint of its ups and downs. But there was another aspect as well and it related to allied programmes unfolded from time to time. Those programmes were Sampattidan (Wealth-gift), Shramdan (Labour-gift), Jeevandan (Life-long commitment to the movement by co-workers), Shanti-Sena (Peace-army), Sadhandan (gift of implements for agricultural operations).

As regards attitudinal transformation, the propagation of ideas combined with the above material achievements, could not but affect the mind of the thinking people. The movement directly influenced the lifestyle of the co-workers, especially the life-long co-workers and through them many workers and associates or fellow-seekers. By adopting Gandhi’s ideas to the solution of the basic economic problem of land collection and equitable redistribution among the landless, the Movement kept Gandhi’s ideas of socio-economic reconstruction alive at a period when the tendency of the educated elite was to overlook, if not to reject Gandhi’s ideas as irrelevant. The Movement kindled interest in the individuals to study Gandhi’s ideas and to assess their relevance. Jayaprakash Narayan, a renowned Marxist, and a Socialist, and one of the fore-most leaders in politics, before and after India’s Independence, came to be more and more intimately associated with the movement and realized that it was a superb endeavor to bring about revolution in human relations founded on the Gandhian philosophy of non-violence. Ultimately Jayaprakash devoted his entire life to the construction of a Sarvodaya society.

The Movement spontaneously attracted the attention of many fellow-seekers and thinkers from outside India. Louis Fischer, the famous American correspondent said: “Gramdān is the most creative thought coming from the East in recent times”. Hallam Tennyson, the grandson of the famous English poet, Alfred Tennyson, wrote a book, the Saint on the
March. He narrated his memorable experiences as he moved with Vinoba into rural India. Chester Bowles, the American ambassador to India, observed in his book, The Dimensions of Peace: we experienced in 1955, the Bhooman Movement was giving the message of Renaissance in India. It offered a revolutionary alternative to communism, as it was founded on human dignity. The British Industrialist, Earnest Barder was deeply impressed by the Bhooman Movement and implemented the Gandhian concept of Trusteeship by allotting 90% share in the company to his industrial workers. The British quaker, Donald Groom, trekked with Bhooman Sarvodaya co-workers for six months in the central India covering a distance of 1400 miles. The American friend Rev. Kaithan turned himself into a Sarvodaya co-worker and established a community centre in South India. David Graham, an English journalist of Sunday Standard, included Vinoba as one of the creative rebels. Arthur Koestler, in 1959 wrote in London Observer, that the Bhooman Movement presented an Indian alternative to the Nehruvian model of Western development.

However, the Bhooman-Gramdhan Movement, despite all its real and apparent limitations, it would ever be deemed as a glorious attempt for a peaceful and non-violent solution of the basic land problem of Indian society and through it for a non-violent reconstruction of the Sarvodaya socio-economic-politico order of universal relevance and significance. This was the record in world history to take initiative to as a surprising venture through non-violent way.

Similarly, Vinoba also promoted Gandhi’s idea of Shanti Sena. The basic problem of the world today is the establishment of peace. Perhaps in no other age has there been such a world-hunger for peace as today. There are countries whose whole way of thought, up to yesterday, was deeply dyed in violence; today, even those country long to find release
from violence. True, they go on increasing their armaments, but nevertheless they are wondering how to get rid of them. The sheer inertia of habit makes for the stockpiling of arms. But intellectually people have come to understand that arms will achieve nothing - nothing, that is, except losses for the poor and the blocking of all progress in real welfare, consequent on the immense expenditure of resources on the army. Even those countries where revolutions have taken place through bloodshed desire peace today. Why? Because whereas in the former days the weapons were in the hands of men, it is so no longer; men are now in the hands of their weapons. If the spark of war should not set the world on fire, no man will be able to control it. Mankind has, therefore, lost faith in the possibility of solving its problems through war or violence. That, in itself is a great thing to have happened and the way forward is now open. If arms can no longer settle our disputes, then some other way of settling them must be found. That is what the Shanti Sena is designed to do.\textsuperscript{39}

The Shanti Sena is not a new proposal. We owe both the word and the idea behind it to Bapu, who himself endeavoured to give it a practical shape. He was both its commander and its first soldier. As commander he issued the order ‘Do or Die’, as a soldier he obeyed it. That is, his life and actions give us a complete picture of what the Shanti Sena is. No doubt, he also expounded his ideas freely in words, but it was through action, through life, that his thought was most fully expressed by Vinoba Bhave.\textsuperscript{40} The Shanti Sena is an army which offers its services in perpetuity to all men without distinction. A sick man is given the same care, no matter what his caste, his religion or his politics, and no matter whether he lives nobly or wickedly. All that matters is that he is a man in need. We have therefore to set up this sort of army which will serve the
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needs impartially, disinterestedly, without asking for any reward. Its whole vocation will be to confront hatred and to promote peace through love.41

Regarding qualifications of a Shanti Sainik, the member of Shanti Sena, whether a man or a woman, must have a living faith in non-violence. This is only possible if one has a living faith in God. Without that, one would not have the courage to lay down one's life without anger, fear and desire for vengeance.

The messenger of peace is required to have equal respect for all the prominent religions of the world. If he is a Hindu, he would have equal reverence for other religions also. He should have the knowledge of the principles common to various religions. It need not be mentioned that one who works for peace should have a blameless character. He should be reputed for his impartiality.42

**The Pledge of a Shanti Sainik (Peace Soldier):**
The main principle of Shanti Sena is that they should be free from partisanship, hatred and fear. They will trust in each other and will fear none, and will frighten none. They will consider no man their enemy; their hearts will be filled with love. This is the pledge of the Shanti Sainik.43

Some portion of the primary training of the army is also essential for Shanti Sena. It is about discipline, drill, chorus singing, etc. A volunteer should know how to remove the wounded. He should have such articles with him as are need for First Aid. He should know how to extinguish fire, how to enter safely a place on fire, how to climb up with or without a load and to descend safely.44
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Women and Shanti Sena:
If women will take up the work of Shanti Sena, the face of the world will change, and we shall be able to achieve freedom from the problems which we are facing today in the country and abroad. Men cannot do all this. They are not in their proper senses every time. They cannot think of it. The only solution for some is to increase armaments. Thus in this age of science, when men's brains have become paralysed, if our women come forward with their divine qualities of restraint and modesty, and use their mother-power, they can establish the rule of compassion, love and affection which can play a very significant role in promoting non-violent approach to conflict resolution.

It has been observed that in the path of violence, men will always lead. But in the part of non-violence, women can go ahead of them. So it is essential that women should lead, and that too in their own way. The way of women is the way of compassion and love.

Shanti Sena and War: The Aims and Outcome
Under confrontation with armed forces in times of war, Vinoba replies that the task of the Shanti Sena would be quite unique as, wars are not a daily occurrence; even quarrels do not occur every day, and twenty-four hours of the day. It will be the Shanti Sena’s task to remove the root causes of unrest - the gulf between the haves and the have-nots, the pride of ownership, the insistence of ‘mine’ and ‘thine’, on high and low, on caste distinction, on religious differences and disputes. These are all causes of unrest, some economic, some social and some religious. The Shanti Sena will, therefore, be a full-time service army, working to remove these causes of dissensions and to find peaceful solutions to national problems. The result will be a cleansing of the national mind and growth of mutual goodwill. When that takes place, the government will

45. Ibid., p. 816.
46. Ibid., p. 817.
not have to spend much on the army; the moral strength of the nation will be increased and it will be able to make its influence felt in the international field. Thus, the full time friendly service which it renders will make it respected both at home and abroad.\textsuperscript{47}

However, there are some essentials for a Shanti Sainik as mentioned earlier also:

(i) Faith in Truth and Non-violence.
(ii) A fearless, non-malicious and non-party attitude.
(iii) Making no distinctions on the basis of country, creed, race, caste, language, etc.
(iv) Standing fully aloof from power and party politics. (v) No support to war.
(v) Preparedness to undertake even risk to life in calming disorders.
(vi) Observance of the Shanti Sena discipline, etc. etc.\textsuperscript{48}

\textbf{Surrender of Dacoits of Chambal: A Lesson to the World}

In 1960’s there happened a miracle when the dreaded dacoits of Chambal surrendered before Vinoba Bhave twice through Gandhian non-violent methods of persuasion, negotiation and arbitrations. The task which seemed to quite difficult, became easier and fruitful. After proper treatment the same dreaded dacoits proved to be very useful to the community. Similarly, Jayaparaksh Narayan (JP) was also very much impressed by Vinoba’s movement and made very successful experiment in this respect.

The dozens of dacoits who were all from the jungles of Bhind and Morena surrendered their weapons in April 1972. For this purpose an open jail was to be inaugurated at the same time which was to be their new home after their surrender and of the armaments. The whole place was full of policemen, officials, workers of Sarvodaya, politicians,

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., p. 820.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., p. 1206.
journalists and others. Hundreds of village women with their children were trying to get close to Tahsildar Singh the son of the legendary Madho Singh whom people venerated as Dadda.

As mentioned earlier, JP had seen the logic behind Vinoba’s initiative. After the first lot surrendered there was a long gap and politics had pushed the event to the background.

To bring it back to the attention of the people it needed a person of high integrity and honesty. After Vinoba Bhave only JP could do it. It took months of negotiating, long meetings in Bhopal, in Delhi and more often in the jungles of Madhya Pradesh. Former rebels like Tahsildar Singh and Lokman were mediators who commanded the respect of both parties – workers of Sarva Seva Sangh (Sarvodaya) and the rebels. In this respect, Lokman not only narrated the story, he also made sharp comments on various sections of society.

The stone slab near the entrance which announced the opening of the jail had a different story written on the back. The old inscription belonged to Madhav Rao Scindia, the grandfather of the late Congress MP. He had notified the land of Mungawali in order to rehabilitate the criminal tribes (Jaraim Pesha) of the state. Mostly tribes were settled in the village. Instead of finding a new stone officials of MP Government just turned the old one over and written their own script on the same.

Next day they had enough time to meet various gang leaders, before the ceremony. There were all types of gangs, small and large, some notoriously fierce like that of Mohar Singh, others known for well-knit organisation like that of Madho Singh. With red eyes and stiff moustaches Mohar Singh was whispered about as being the most unscrupulous dacoit. But Madho Singh was quite different. This lean having six feet height and former homeopathic practitioner had a highly organized 55-member gang. Madho Singh was called ‘Master’. Waiting
for JP to arrive, Madho Singh was recounting his experiences to Jawahar Kaul, a Journalist, when a police officer, probably a sub-inspector, said something to him. But Master not only ignored the policeman but also used a derogatory term for him. At this Jawahar asked JP, “Why are you behaving like this, aren’t you happy with this surrender?” In response to this, JP looked in his eyes and said, “Can I become a saint overnight?”

“Who says you have to?

“Only last month I paid him his monthly commission of three hundred rupees. Is it to easy to accept him as a custodian of law?”

JP seemed emotionally disturbed that day. He was trying to control himself but finally, tears started to flow down his cheeks and he could not speak for sometime. It had an electric effect on the audience, including dacoits. Most of them were sobbing. Prabhavatiji, the wife of JP and his close companion, had died recently and he was addressing this momentous meeting without her, his first after her death.

However, the mission was a success. This shows that Gandhi’s non-violent methods are effective but the only condition is that we have to apply the proper treatment which is very important. As a matter of fact, this is a lesson to the whole world to study and follow.

Nelson Mandela’s Faith in Gandhi’s Approach:

After Martin Luther King (Jr.) the path of non-violence was followed by Nelson Mandela for the freedom of South Africa from the clutches of the Whites. Nelson Mandela is one of the great moral and political leaders of our time: another international hero whose lifelong dedication to the fight against racial oppression in South Africa won him the Nobel Peace Prize and the presidency of his country. Since his triumphant release in 1990 from more than a quarter-century of
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imprisonment, Mandela has been at the center of the most compelling and inspiring political drama in the world. As President of the African National Congress and head of South Africa's antiapartheid movement, he was instrumental in moving the nation toward multiracial government and majority rule. He is revered everywhere as a vital force in the fight for human rights and racial equality.

*Long Walk to Freedom* is his moving and exhilarating autobiography, a book destined to take its place among the finest memoirs of history's greatest figures. Here for the first time, Nelson Rolihlahla Mandela tells the extraordinary story of his life - an epic of struggle, setback, renewed hope, and ultimate triumph, which has, until now, been virtually unknown to most of the world.

The foster son of a Thembu chief, Mandela was brought up in the traditional, tribal culture of his ancestors, but at an early age he learned the modern, inescapable reality of what came to be called apartheid, one of the most powerful and effective systems of oppression ever conceived. In classically elegant and engrossing prose, he tells of his early years as an impoverished student and law clerk in Johannesburg, of his slow political awakening, and of his pivotal role in the rebirth of a stagnant ANC and the formation of its Youth League in the 1950s. He describes the struggle to reconcile his political activity with his devotion to his family, the anguished breakup of his first marriage, and the painful separations from his children.

He brings vividly to life the escalating political warfare in the fifties between the ANC and the government, culminating in his dramatic escapades as an underground leader and the notorious Rivonia Trial of 1964, at which he was sentenced to life imprisonment. He recounts the

surprisingly eventful twenty-seven years in prison and the complex, delicate negotiations that led both to his freedom and to the beginning of the end of apartheid. Finally he provides the ultimate inside account of the unforgettable events since his release that produced at last a free, multiracial democracy in South Africa, following the path of Non-violence as guided by the teachings of the Mahatma Gandhi.

To millions of people around the world, Nelson Mandela stands, as no other living figure does, for the triumph of dignity and hope over despair and hatred, of self-discipline and love over persecution and evil. Like Gandhi, he also embodies his spirit in *Long Walk to Freedom* in a book for all times to come.

**The Case of Burundi and Role of Nelson Mandela: The Magic Spell of Non-violence**

The bitter civil war in Burundi has been the subject of much research and political enquiry. The perceived ethnic differences between Hutu and Tutsi were initially manipulated by colonial powers, and later replicated during the on-off military rule by the minority Tutsi-Hima. It is this group that has shown the greatest reservations about entering into any agreement, claiming that any change in the balance of power relations could result in violence and pointing to acts of widespread group violence against Tutsis during Hutu-led reprisals.

Historically, the Hutu people experienced major economic and social restrictions in society. For example, many were prevented from having access to education, particularly higher education. The monopoly on political and military power in Burundi over the last 40 years by Tutsis has been replicated at almost every level. Similar to South African society under apartheid, Burundi’s society is characterised by considerable political tension and mistrust. Inevitably, many Hutu people
feel alienated and resentful of state institutions while Tutsis feel threatened and insecure as a minority. Coupled with other destabilising factors in the region, the conflict between these two groups had created a tragic human catastrophe in Central Africa.

**Nelson Mandela’s role as facilitator:**

In January 2000, following the death of former president Julius Nyerere, Nelson Mandela assumed the role of facilitator in the conflict at the negotiations in Arusha, Tanzania. This was at the request of the regional leaders in the Great Lakes and at the particular insistence of President Thabo Mbeki and President Yoweri Museveni of Uganda.

From the beginning, Mr. Mandela took an uncompromising moral standpoint which he upheld during the process. He criticised the government for the forced regrouping of civilians as well as for jailing people without just cause. He leveled strong criticism at opposition rebel groups who had ignored a declared cease-fire and at opposition groups for their intransigence.

And on his first visit to Burundi in June 2000, Mandela criticised the leaders of the negotiating parties for failing to reach agreement and for the ongoing violence, saying “the daily slaughter of men, women and children is an indictment of every one of you.” From the outset, his even-handed and hands-on approach earned him the reputation of being a tough, but fair negotiator. At the first meeting he saw to it that a party previously excluded for technical reasons was admitted to the process. Mandela was insistent that the armed rebel movements who had previously been excluded from the negotiations had to be included if there was to be a lasting peace accord. Without their participation and agreement, no permanent peace could ever be achieved.

---

In Burundi, Nelson Mandela entered a climate of social and political chaos, made worse by acute poverty, rising HIV statistics and dwindling resources. He took personal responsibility for bringing the international community together in support of the Burundi peace process. In highlighting the plight of the Burundian people, he emphasized the importance of the success of the negotiations for the stability of the region as a whole. Mr. Mandela was invited to address the United Nations Security Council where he effectively conveyed the severity of the conflict in Burundi. As a result of his address, the Security Council adopted Resolution 1286 on Burundi, which was more positive and supportive than any of the previous resolutions.

The Arusha Agreement was signed on 28 August 2001. As late as 26 August, Mr. Mandela was still in talks with the parties to convince all 19 delegations to sign. Only 13 of the 19 delegations ultimately signed. In a statement expressing his disappointment with the six abstaining parties, Mr. Mandela said: “We have a section of the leadership which does not care for the slaughter of innocent people.”

By the end of September 2001, all 19 parties had signed the agreement. Despite the obvious shortcomings of the Arusha Accord, it is clear that it laid the foundation for peace and economic reconstruction in Burundi.

**Assessment of Mr. Mandela’s Role:**

The major stakeholders in Burundi – government, opposition parties and rebel groups, Hutus as well as Tutsis – viewed Mandela’s facilitation as indispensable. According to the Institute of Security Studies, his facilitation was successful because he was able to bring the opposing parties together, thereby letting Burundians own the reconciliation process. Léonce Ndikumana, speaker of the Burundi National Assembly,
made these remarks about Mandela’s role in the negotiation process and the example set by other South African leaders such as Deputy President Jacob Zuma: “The negotiation process may benefit from Mandela’s international reputation and, through him, the experience of South Africa in dealing with tragic history. South African leadership offers probably the best chance for convincing Burundian leaders that nation-building involves hard choices in a give-and-take process where primitive revenge has no place.”

It is widely believed that South Africa’s role in the ongoing struggle towards a settlement in Burundi is immeasurable. Mandela’s ‘all-in’ approach as well as his insistence on reaching an agreement (albeit an imperfect one) drove the peace process further in one year than it had come in the previous three. South Africa’s peacekeeping role, which has facilitated the functioning of the transitional government, has also been noted, as well as the remarkable efforts of Jacob Zuma in continuing to work towards a final peace agreement for Burundi.

At a donor conference in Paris in 2001 which Mr. Mandela chaired and where $440-million was pledged to rebuilding Burundi, President Pierre Buyoya commented: “Allow us to convey to you our joy and deep gratitude (for) your tireless efforts to convince Burundian leaders to have a sense of urgency to negotiate quickly and to reach an agreement to put an end to the violence and destruction that have caused so much pain to the people of Burundi.”

It is a mark of Nelson Mandela’s greatness and grace that he never failed to pay tribute to Mwalimu Julius Nyerere as the one who had laid the foundations of the Burundi peace process and eventual accord.
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Case of Montgomery (United States): Non-violence Speaks Loudly and Boldly

Throughout the Southern States of the United States, custom and State laws had combined to segregate Negroes from Whites in respect to hotels, restaurants, schools, housing, use of parks and recreation grounds, waiting rooms in railway stations, on trains, buses, street cars and all sorts of public facilities. In many localities in such States, Negroes were not and are still not allowed to vote. Until fairly recently, white mobs would occasionally lynch a Negro without even the pretence of a trail. Often Negroes would be arrested and punished for alleged misdemeanors, the real reason being to assert the superior status and power of the white man. All this was the result of the fact that Negroes were formerly slaves of the whites in some parts of those States. The white man’s idea of his own superiority had been unyielding.

After 1870, Negroes gradually got more and better education and became sound economically. During the First World War Negro regiments made a good record. They were compelled to suffer and die for the White man’s civilization. In the Second World War Negroes were integrated with Whites in the same companies and regiments and were admitted as pilots in the Air Force, and again did splendidly. But after the war, when they came back to civilian life, they were treated again as second class citizens. Naturally they did not care to be considered cannon fodder, and naturally they keenly resented such indignities, but the majority of Negroes were discouraged and unwilling to assert their rights. In 1954, however, the United States Supreme Court decided that segregation in public schools was unconstitutional and should be stopped, though it allowed more time for the change.

In Montgomery, Alabama, the “cradle of the Confederacy”, racial segregation of course continued to prevail. In the buses, the first four
rows of seats from the front, holding about ten persons, were reserved for Whites, and theoretically the last three rows of seats were reserved for Negroes. But if a White person boarded the bus when the front four rows were filled with Whites and the last rows filled with Negroes, the bus driver used to ask a Negro to “move back” and he would have to stand while the White took his seat. Sometimes this request was made courteously but often rudely and insultingly and the sign of indiscrimination were clear in action.

On December 1, 1955, a Negro seamstress, Mrs. Rosa Parks, boarded a bus to get home after her day’s work. She sat down in the first seat behind the section reserved for Whites. Soon after she took her seat, some White persons got on the bus and the driver ordered Mrs. Parks and three other Negroes on that seat to move back in order to accommodate the Whites. By that time all the other seats were occupied. The other three Negroes complied with the orders but Mrs. Parks quietly refused. The driver called the police and she was arrested for violating the city’s segregation ordinance.55

She was a quiet, dignified person, with a sweet personality, soft-spoken and calm under all situations, and highly respected in the Negro community. She could no longer endure the indignities to which she and other Negroes had been subjected. Her self-respect could take it no more. This arrest proved to be a trigger which released the long-smouldering resentment of the Negro community into action. A few Negro leaders, including E. D. Nixon, head of the local union of sleeping-car porters, and a number of Negro ministers agreed that a non-violent boycott of all the buses by all the Negroes should be undertaken as a protest. A meeting of Negro leaders of almost all groups in the community was called and they decided that the whole Negro community of Montgomery “Don’t

ride the bus to work, to town, to school, to any place, Monday, December 5...come to a mass meeting Monday at 7 p.m...for further instructions."56 The Negro ministers agreed to tell their congregations on Sunday. From the beginning, the Negro ministers played a significant role in the leadership of the protest. The newspapers got hold of the story and published it and thus spread the news all through the Negro community.

The boycott was a complete success. Not one of the fifty thousand Negroes of the city rode that day in a bus. That same day Mrs. Parks was tried in court and fined $10. She appealed from the decision to a higher court. The mass meeting that night filled the church to overflowing, two and a half hours before the time set for it. Those present decided unanimously to continue the boycott until:57

1. courteous treatment by the bus operators was guaranteed;
2. passengers were seated on a first-come first served basis – Negroes seating from the back of the bus toward the front while Whites seated from the front toward the back;
3. Negro bus operators were employed on predominantly Negro routes.

They formed an organization to direct the protest, and named it the Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA). They chose as president of it a young, highly educated Negro minister, Martin Luther King Jr., who had pondered social problems earnestly and had been much influenced by Thoreau’s ‘Essay on Civil Disobedience’ and the teaching and programme of Mahatma Gandhi. Most of the other leaders of the MIA were ministers, and all were Negroes, except Robert Graetz, White

minister of a Negro church, the only White minister in the whole city who took part in or showed sympathy towards the organized protest.

Besides, the leaders promptly organized several committees for transportation, finance and strategy, a programme committee for the mass meetings, and an executive committee. The transportation committee first organized a Negro taxi service, but this was blocked by an existing law which required a minimum fare of 45 cents for any taxi ride. Then a car-pool was formed and later was added to by station wagons bought and operated for this purpose by several of the Negro churches and by other contributors. Transportation under the car-pool was quickly and efficiently organized. Yet thousands of Negroes had to walk. Once a pool driver stopped beside an elderly Negro woman who was trudging with obvious difficulty. “Jump in, grand-mother,” he said, “you don’t need to walk.” She waves him to go on. “I am not walking for myself,” she called out, “I am walking for my children and grandchildren.” Another Negro woman said she preferred tired feet to a tired soul.

Moreover, mass meetings were held twice a week in the Negro churches, rotating from one to another. They were always crowded, frequently using loudspeakers for the people who could not get in. The programmes included prayers, scripture readings. Much singing of hymns, especially Negro spirituals, and reports by committees. Enthusiasm ran high. Dr. King and the other leaders explained the philosophy and methods of the movement night after night. It was a combination of Jesus’ ethic of love and Gandhi’s non-violent resistance. Dr. King explained in great details its effectiveness, efficacy and applications, emphasizing the essential importance of love and non-violence, no matter under what provocation. To make the method more vivid, they acted out possible situations where violence might be used against them, and how to behave under such circumstances.
The boycott proved effective, complete and enduring. The city council tried to break it by having Negro car drivers arrested on all sorts of pretexts. The insurance companies were pressured into cancelling the insurance on Negro cars. But this attack was defeated by getting car insurance from Lloyds of London. False rumours were spread that Negro leaders had agreed to call off the boycott, and a fake settlement was announced in the newspapers. Attempts were made to disrupt the unity of the Negro leaders by inciting jealousy. Dr. King was arrested and jailed for allegedly speeding in his car, but the crowd of Negroes who promptly gathered at the jail was so large, though entirely peaceful, that the jailer took fright and released him on his own bond. Then anonymous persons, members of the Ku Klux Klan and probably of the White Citizens' Council, segregationist organizations, began sending anonymous letters and telephone calls to the Negro leaders, especially Dr. King. On the night of January 30, 1956, a bomb was thrown on the porch of Dr. King’s house. Luckily the property damage was slight and nobody was injured. A crowd of angry Negroes rapidly gathered, but Dr. King pleaded with them not to be violent or angry and further asked them that “we can’t solve this problem through retaliatory violence...we must meet hate with love...we want to love our enemies,” and they obeyed him without any sign of aggression, fear or revenge. Two nights later a bomb was thrown at the house of E. D. Nixon, another leader. But this violence only made the boycott stronger and firmer.

All these events were dramatic and the protest most unusual, especially in the South and yet more especially because of the complete, deliberate, disciplined, religiously motivated non-violence of the Negroes. The news of it traveled all over the world. Although no public appeal or funds was made, contributions poured in from all over the
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world. Gifts ranged from one dollar to five thousand dollars. Negro and White churches in almost every city in the United States sent money. Labour, civic and social groups supported the movement. Almost every branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People helped. A former Federal Judge wrote, “You have shown that decency and courage will ultimately prevail.” From Singapore came a message, “What you are doing is a real inspiration to us here.” A Swiss woman sent five hundred dollars and words of encouragement. The crew of a ship at sea cabled, “We offer a prayer in sympathy in the fight for justice.” From Pennsylvania came a cheque for one hundred dollars from an elderly lady, and a note saying, “Your work is outstanding and unprecedented in the history of our country. Indeed, it is epoch-making and it should have far-reaching effect. ‘Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, faith the Lord’ – this might well be the motto of the Montgomery Improvement Association.”

However, a large number of the Negro leaders were indicted, arrested and tried for conspiracy to prevent the operation of a lawful business. Dr. King was tried first, found guilty and fined five hundred dollars. He appealed and the Negro lawyers then filed a suit in the United States Federal Court asking that bus segregation be stopped because it was contrary to the 14th Amendment to the U. S. Constitution. After about three weeks the Federal Judge decided that the city bus segregation laws of Alabama were unconstitutional. The city appealed the case. So the boycott had to continue and it did continue too.

However, the city brought suit in November 1956 to enjoin the operation of the Negro car-pool. The petition was directed against the Montgomery Improvement Association and several Negro churches and individuals. During the trial, news came that the United States Supreme

Court had affirmed the decision of the lower Federal Court that the Alabama State and local laws requiring segregation of buses were unconstitutional. The executive board of the Montgomery Improvement Association, on advice of counsel, decided to end the official protest immediately but to delay the return to the buses until the official mandatory order from the Supreme Court was received.

That night there was an enthusiastic meeting of eight thousand Negroes. Later in the evening the Ku Klux Klan paraded in the Negro section of the city, but this time the Negroes were not intimidated. In subsequent Negro mass meetings, the people were instructed to be completely non-violent and conciliatory in manner and action when they began riding the buses again. Scenes of possible provocation were described, enacted and rehearsed in “socio-dramas” at these meetings. Constant courtesy and loving attitudes were enjoined. The Supreme Court’s mandate was received on December 20, 1956, a little over a year after the beginning of the boycott. Except for a few minor incidents of White anger against Negroes, the resumption of riding by Negroes passed off smoothly. As far as possible, two Negro ministers rode on each bus line in the city during the rush hours of the morning and afternoon of the first day, with the idea that their presence would give courage to the Negro citizens and make them less likely to retaliate in case of insults.

When Dr. King boarded the first morning bus, the bus driver greeted him with a cordial smile. As he put his fare in the box the driver asked, “I believe you are Reverend King, aren’t you?”

Dr. King replied, “Yes, I am.”
"We are glad to have you this morning," said the driver. Newspaper reporters and television men were also on the same bus.

But within ten days, White violence began. City buses were fired upon. Negroes were assaulted. Four Negro churches were bombed and also two Negro ministers' houses. Two of the churches were almost completely destroyed; the two others severely damaged. Luckily, no person was injured in the bombings. The violence made the White leaders realize that such anarchy and violence were making the town unsafe for everybody and giving it a bad name in the country at large. The local newspapers published a strong editorial against it. The white man's business association publicly opposed the lawless violence. A number of White ministers denounced the bombing. Still there were more bombings. The city authorities offered a four-thousand-dollar reward for information leading to the arrest and conviction of the bombers. Seven White men were arrested and tried, but despite clear evidence of guilt the jury refused to convict them. The diehards had, however, made their last stand. The violence stopped abruptly. Desegregated on the buses proceeded smoothly.

So non-violence, unity, forgiveness and love for enemies proved powerful. The racial problems of Montgomery were only beginning to be solved, but what Dr. King called a "stride toward freedom" had certainly been made. Accordingly, the foundations of non-violent resistance were laid and the same paved the way for its future success.

---


When King had been to India in February, 1959, his biggest surprise was that the action against the Montgomery bus system was well known in India. King concluded that the Indian news media had given a better sense of continuity to the 381-days boycott than had most American newspapers.62

Another Example in Respect of Martin Luther King (Jr.): When Martin Luther King’s (Jr.) home was bombed in Montgomery back in 1956, the men of the neighborhood came to the scene of the bombing carrying weapons. This was a natural response. Every one in the nation had been conditioned by the violence of that war and beneficiaries of extensive military training. But Martin, even as a young man of twenty-six, had a vision of another possible approach to the problems and conflicts we faced as human beings. He urged the men to go home and take their guns back to the safety of their closets. If we follow the Old Testament law of ‘An Eye for an Eye and a Tooth for a Tooth.’ We will just end up with a nation that is blind and toothless. “No”, he said, “We must discover ‘a more excellent way.’”63

When Martin went to jail in Albany, Georgia in 1962, Andrew Young was a new arrival in the movement. He was given the task of visiting him in jail twice daily to keep him informed of the movement’s progress and problems. “On my first visit, when I entered the jail and said politely, “Excuse me, I’d like to see Dr. King, please.” Without even looking up, the desk sergeant shouted to the jailer, “There’s a little nigger out here to see those big niggers back there.” I was so taken aback that I didn’t know what to do. To express his indignation would only get me


Ambassador Andrew Young was the Ambassador of USA at the U. N., he participated in the Civil Rights Movement along with Dr. Martin Luther King (Jr.).
thrown in jail or barred from visiting, and someone had to be able to move in and out of jail to keep information flowing if it were at all possible. Violence was no answer. The sergeant was six foot five-inch, 250-pound, former football player with a stick and gun. I did, however, make a note of his name on his uniform. When I came back the next day, I addressed him by name. “Good morning, Sergeant Hamilton, how are you doing today?”

“Now, the sergeant seemed shocked, and grunted, “Okay”. From that time on, I never went to jail without addressing sergeant Hamilton by name and engaging him in some brief small talk before asking to see Dr. King. He never again spoke disrespectfully to me, and we actually became familiar with each other’s families and sports interests. Of course as everyone in the Southern farm belt does, we talked about the weather. I not only survived, I accomplished my mission and visited the jail daily until Martin was released.”

Constant confrontation with people with whom you differ requires some solution. Most of the time, Black people just avoided the confrontation and accepted the mutual animosity. That was pattern of behaviour before the movement. But for Black Americans it was impossible to completely avoid confrontation and humiliation. These problems almost always occurred when they were least prepared and lest expected it.

However, through the civil rights movement they continued their attempts to change the pattern of avoidance and accidental confrontation which left so many Black people intimidated, demeaned and insecure. Their movement was to change the relationship from one of fear and distrust to a relationship of respect and understanding. That meant they
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had to aggressively challenge the system and its violence, but with active, organized, disciplined goodwill.

Accordingly, with non-violent direct action, they had a method with which to bring alive that radical notion that all men, women and children belonged to the same heavenly Father. They pursued this method as the means by which they could make Christ’s call at least a partial reality and not just a utopian ideal as nonviolent direct action seeks to change an unjust situation by addressing it openly and publicly in an attempt to raise it “before the court of world opinion” in the confidence that it can be changed without violence. There is no guarantee, of course, and no method is foolproof. However, with nonviolence or, Gandhi called it “truth force”, neither person nor property is destroyed. At times, one will be called on to suffer, but never will one inflict suffering.

Thus, the outcome of the movement could be seen on July 2, 1964, when President Lyndon Johnson signed the historic Civil Rights Package. Martin went to join Roy Wilkins of the NAACP, Whitney Young of the Urban League, and other for the signing of the bill into law, which committed the United States of America to the enforcement of protection for the rights of all citizens. This legislation also made a provision of protection for the rights of women and Hispanic citizens. The refusal to hate, the willingness to forgive and begin a new pattern of relationships under federally enforced law marked a new era for the South and the nation. Southern White churches had not been in the forefront of the struggle for racial injustice, but once the law was changed, they encouraged and supported compliance. The resistance melted surprisingly fast. The people experienced one of the most radical shifts in law and tradition, when compared with the armed conflict and terrorism which had characterized most movements for social change.
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The South America almost immediately began to heal its wounds and began an era in which it could inspire and provide leadership for the nation and the world. The emergence of men and women of talent and vision from the South led to the election of several of the nation’s most progressive and innovative governors. One of them, Jimmy Carter, became President in 1976 and made the American ideal more clear—"that all men (and women and children) are created equal and endowed with certain inalienable rights"—which became an important element of America’s foreign policy. And Young Andrew, after some time, moved from a battered form lying in the streets of St. Augustine to the halls of the United Nations as Ambassador and spoke for his nation’s human rights policy.

However, this degree of rapid progress and results was possible only because in their struggle they destroyed no resources, and overcame evil with love and discovered that there was a power of the spirit that could change people and nations more effectively than bombs and bullets. According to Andrew Young, I will always cherish two memories of St. Augustine that symbolize nonviolence at its best. First, that a small group of women and young people had the faith that “God will take care of you”, this unwavering belief led them out into the night of hatred and violence with a quite courage and determination. Secondly, the beautiful sound of the Black community singing as the Ku Klux Klan marched through St. Augustine Street on a Saturday evening, after having inflicted their hatred and violence on them for weeks.67 As the Klan passed by, Black people greeted them singing, “I love everybody in my heart.”68

In a similar way, on November 13, 1993, President Bill Clinton, when he went to Memphis, Tennessee, to address a Convocation of Black
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ministers. Referring to street violence, Clinton tried to imagine what Dr. King would say:

“I did not live and die to see the American Family destroyed. I did not live and die to see 13-year-old boys get automatic weapons and gun down 9-year olds just for the kick of it. I did not live and die to see young people destroy their own lives with drugs and then build fortunes destroying the lives of others. That is not what I came here to do.”

According to William Lucy, these days there are signs of a resurgence of non-violence. Leaders as disparate as Lewis Farrakhan, Jesse Jackson and Benjamin Chavis are urging the revival of activism in the nation’s African American families and communities. Similar stirrings were evident in Latino and Asian-American communities. In Congress also, the lawmakers now are debating measures that would better prepare young people for a life of work and create job opportunities for them. In this respect now legislation has already been passed in America to teach the lesson of non-violence in schools.

**The Nonviolent Struggle in Burma:**

The nonviolent struggle in Burma, started with the Second World War, which marked a turning point as Burmese nationalists refused to aid British war efforts unless they received a promise of independence in return for their support. Young activists, dreaming of a free Burma, traveled to China and Japan in search of resources of training. They returned as the Thirty Comrades, ready to form an independence army. Among the Thirty Comrades was Aung San, the magnetic commander of the army whose family had been in opposition to British rule since annexation of the country in 1886. Aung San and the other nationalists had returned to Burma with Japanese troops, who were to help them to gain independence. He along with his fellow nationalists formed the

---
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underground Anti-Fascist people’s Freedom League (AFPFL), and he was astutely able to use the unity of the league to obtain a position on Burma’s Executive Council in 1946; Aung San had essentially become the nation’s prime minister, although the office was still subject to British rule. From his newfound position, he hammered out an agreement in London, with British Prime Minister Clement Atlee, that provided for Burmese independence by 1948. Subsequently, Aung San’s party won a majority of seats in the elections that were held for a constitutional assembly. The British were successfully removed from Burmese soil by 1947, but, although Burma was declared free, the nature of its freedom was elusive. Aung San would have become the country’s first elected Prime Minister had he and his cabinet not been gunned down in that same year by agents of his principal rival. Martyred at thirty-two years of age, he left behind a widow and three children, among them a two-year-old daughter (Suu Kyi, later on who became the nonviolent soldier of the country). After his death, there was chaos, insurrection, communist insurgency, official corruption and political chicanery.

Aung San’s daughter, Aung San Suu Kyi, spend her early fifteen years of age itself in Burma, later on she came to India with her mother and she also served as the first woman as head of a Burmese diplomatic mission. Here she became familiar with the campaigns and writings of Gandhi and obtained insights that she would bring into play years later. Along with the influence of Gandhi, she was very much influenced by his father’s writings, as she started writing about his father by 1984. And by 1988, she was back to her homeland, first to Rangoon, as her mother was ill at that time.

In 1988, the rule was under the General Ne Win, who was taking very strict and strong measures so that no one could raise voice against his regime. Suu Kyi’s made her first public presentation on 26th August
1988, before a crowd of half million listeners at the immense multi-tiered and gold-gilded Shwedagon Pagoda, the most sacred of Burma’s innumerable shrines (said to have been built 2,500 years ago). She provided a point of focus for popular disenchantment by directing the fury of the people toward democratic reclaim through coherent nonviolence. The sincerity of her convictions and the memories of her father dazzled the crowds that hoped she would carry on his struggle. Beginning at that moment, Suu Kyi would rapidly gain attention as the most effective leader of the broad, popular movement to end Burma’s military dictatorship and establish democracy and human rights. Perhaps most telling was the way in which she held high regard for the military in one hand, while bidding for rights and democracy with the other. She was able to straddle both the civil and military spheres of society because of her own personal history, speaking of her attachment to the military and how soldiers had cared for her as a child.

On 24th September 1988, Suu Kyi became one of the founders of the National League of Democracy (NLD), as well as its general secretary. Propounding the ‘middle path’ of nonviolent struggle and echoing her father’s polices she also insisted on advocating for the rights of the ethnic non-Burmese nationalities in the country as well as the Burmese. She called for a new constitution to be drafted with the participation of every political element – one that would take into account the reasonable demands of all the people.71

In less than one year, between August 1988 and July 1989, Suu Kyi gave a thousand speeches, sometimes traveling by bullock cart, small boat or bicycle. By August 1989, the nonviolent prodemocracy movement had grown to 2 million dues-paying members out of a

population of 40 million. Suu Kyi’s potent ideas about nonviolent struggle, justice, democracy, nationalism and human rights were spread by a video camera that was carried without much notice by an assistant. After videotaping her addresses, the videotapes were copied and recopied; Suu Kyi’s speeches were distributed clandestinely into the most isolated sections of the country. Used to reduce the expenses incurred by the movement, the technology of Japanese-built videos served a function that the engineers who had designed them could not have imagined: they were ‘ready-made to undermine the political monopoly of an authoritarian regime’, and many persons were willing to pay three or four days’ wages to buy one of the banned tapes. Thousands consistently defied the ban on the assembly of more than four persons in order to hear Suu Kyi speak, a tiger orchid tucked in her hair. Next to loudspeakers, dozens of Burmese could be seen holding voice recorders and taping every word on cassettes that would multiply in number as they, too, were reproduced, the only other medium through which her message could be communicated. ‘Word spreads’, commented a chemist, ‘from mouth to mouth.’ At rallies, buttons were passed out showing a photograph of her father with the tiny visage of his daughter perched on his shoulder.

**Truth: The Ultimate Reality:** The military government, on 20th July 1989, arrested forty-two key leaders of the National League of Democracy and placed Aung San Suu Kyi under house arrest. An additional 2,000 party activists were also detained. When Suu Kyi was advised that SLORC had ordered her restrained, she turned to the men who had informed her and said, “I do not hold this against you.”

---

75. Ibid.
a pitcher of water and drinking glass, she poured drinks for perhaps thirty friends and supporters who had gathered at her home for her impending arrest, yet her chief concern seemed to be to comfort them. One supporter recalls, “At 10 o’clock that night we were sent to the Insein jail. Aung San Suu accompanied us to the car. Her last words to us were those of encouragement... “Truth will come one day.”76 Forced to remain within her family compound, eleven truckloads of troops were stationed outside her house and forced her back inside when she tried to visit a mausoleum.

Further, as she was maturing in her understanding of peace, politics and perhaps most importantly in her understanding of what the people of Burma wanted in their future, she early had realized that it was the most basic of human yearnings inspiring people to speak out that were at the root of a peaceable resolution. The words of tolerance, dignity, freedom and security came to hold particular significance for Suu Kyi. She realized fully that there could be no peace without human security and that such security was not based in weaponry, but was concerned with life and dignity. Accordingly, the actions she took and the words she spoke reflected her understanding that the people of Burma were searching for freedom from fear and want of basic necessities. Besides, Suu Kyi emphasized the need for tolerance. Her predisposition to Gandhian strategies was evident in her emphasis on keeping open the channels of communication with SLORC and her bid for all parties involved to ‘meet new challenges without resorting to intransigence or violence.’77

Thus, Suu Kyi’s inspiration led to innovative actions. Perhaps the best example of nonviolent ingenuity was the monks’ boycott. Following

an incident in August 1990 in which two monks were killed and two lay persons injured, a group of Buddhist monks decided to apply their own distinct nonviolent sanctions. In Mandalay, the monks took the most serious steps that members of the clergy could take when they decided to boycott all dealings with Burmese military officials and their families. Refusing even the interaction of accepting alms from them, they also declined to officiate at weddings or funerals. This ‘excommunication’ had dire implications, putting the sincere believer in a grave predicament in the present life. By preventing their ability to attain spiritual worthiness, the monks were helping guarantee a painful rebirth in the next. The monks declared the government and military to be an abomination. Religious military families were visibly affected by this rejection. The boycott spread from Mandalay, South to Rangoon and out to other parts of Burma before it was crushed by a brutal military clampdown.78

Now, the question was what then had terrified the military dictators about a diminutive intellectual, a community of monks and student activists? Suu Kyi’s frequent citing of Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr. invoked a form of power that they – with all their military equipment, coercion and repression – could neither purchase nor possess. Even in Burma, immured against the world, Suu Kyi’s words conjured up nonviolent tools against which military machines lose power. Justifiably, the unelected dictators would be fearful at her invocation of such potent images.

The world community stood as witness to the courage and conviction of Aung San Suu Kyi and the people of Burma, when she was awarded the Noble Prize for Peace in 1991. The Nobel Committee, accepting the nomination made by Vaclav Havel, stressed the

significance of Suu Kyi’s efforts in forging a nonviolent movement based on reconciliation. “She became the leader of a democratic opposition which employs nonviolent means to resist a regime characterized by brutality,” the official announcement read. “Suu Kyi’s struggle is one of the most extraordinary examples of civil courage in Asia in recent decades.”

Despite a hunger strike by Suu Kyi in 1992, and the proclamation of eight former Nobel Peace Prize winners who gathered in Bangkok in 1993 to press for her release, the regime remained unmoved. Her supporters sometimes feared that the already slender women was starving to death. The 1994 visit, of US congressman Bill Richardson, the first outsider allowed to see her, was widely credited with her release in July 1995, six years after her house arrest. “I have always felt free”, she told the British Broadcasting Corporation, “because they have not been able to do anything to what really matters – to my mind, my principles, what I believe in. They were not able to touch that. So I am free.”

In fact the actual meaning of Aung San Suu Kyi means “A Bright Collection of Strange Victories.” After Martin Luther King (Jr.) and Nelson Mandela, Aung San Suu Kyi is another name which still shows the relevance of Gandhian techniques of non-violence in this violent world.

---


The Power of Non-violence: The Case of Hungary: The example can be taken of the mid-nineteenth century. The emperor Franz Josef was trying to subordinate Hungary to the Austrian power, contrary to the terms of the old treaty of union of those two countries. The Hungarian moderates felt helpless, as they were too weak to fight. But Ferenc Deak, a Catholic landowner of Hungary, protested to them: “Your laws are violated, yet your mouths remain closed! Woe to the nation that raises no protest when its rights are outrages! It contributes to its own slavery by its silence. The nation that submits to injustice and oppression without protest is doomed.”

In this context, Deak proceeded to organize a scheme for independent Hungarian education, agriculture and industry, a refusal to recognize the Austrian Government in any way, and a boycott against Austrian goods. He admonished the people not to be betrayed into acts of violence, not to abandon the ground of legality. “This is the safe ground,” he said, “On which, unarmed ourselves, we can hold our own against armed force. If suffering must be necessary suffer with dignity.”

Accordingly, the advice was obeyed throughout Hungary. When the Austrian tax collector came, the people did not beat him or even hoot him – they merely declined to pay. The Austrian police then seized their goods, but no Hungarian auctioneer would see them. When an Austrian auctioneer was brought, he found that he would have to bring bidders from Austria. The Government soon discovered that it was costing more to distrain the property than the tax was worth.

However, the Austrians attempted to billet their soldiers upon the Hungarians. The Hungarians did not actively resist the order, but the Austrian soldiers, after trying to live in houses where everyone despised them, protested strongly against it. The Austrian Government declared
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the boycott of Austrian goods illegal, but the Hungarians defied the decree. The jails were filled to overflowing. No representatives from Hungary would sit in the Imperial Parliament.

The Austrians then tried conciliation. The prisoners were released and partial self-government was allowed to function. But Hungary insisted upon its full claims. In reply, Emperor Franz Josef decreed compulsory military service. The Hungarians answered that they would refuse to obey it. Finally, on February 18, 1867, the Emperor capitulated and gave Hungary her Constitution.

However, this campaign seems to have been defective because of some violence of inner attitude on the part of the Hungarians. But even so, it provided a remarkable example of the power of non-violent resistance, even though the principle was imperfectly realized and applied.85

The Case of Denmark: The Nazis invaded Denmark in April 1940, giving the Danish King and Prime Minister only one hour to choose between admitting German troops without fighting or having the Danish cities bombed like Rotterdam. The King and Prime Minister, within the hour, issued a proclamation calling on the army and Danish people not to fight. The Nazis, eager to win converts to the New Order and probably wanting to use Danish agriculture to the utmost and save their troops for attacks elsewhere, pledged that they would not in any way interfere with Denmark’s constitutional guarantees of civil liberties or with the workers’ or farmers’ organizations.

The German Government issued strict orders to its soldiers to behave with the utmost “correctness” toward the Danes; the coalition cabinet under social Democratic leadership was permitted to function, and an effort was made by the Nazis to convert Denmark into “show

85. Ibid., pp. 4-5.
window” for the New Order. From the first of the invasion the king, in
order to encourage the people, rode on horseback every day through the
streets of the capital city. Though at first the Nazis interfered relatively
little with Danish domestic policy, gradually they began to put pressure
on the Danes to conform to the Nazi programme.

Late in 1940 the Nazis displayed the Swastika emblem from a
Danish public building. According to a report in The New York Times,
“the monarch protested that the act was contrary to the occupation
agreement and demanded that the flag be removed. The German military
officials refused. ‘I will send a soldier to remove it,’ the King replied, or
so the story ran. He was informed that soldier would be shot. ‘I am the
soldier,’ he retorted and the Nazi flag was lowered.”86

The Nazis compelled the Danish Prime Minister, Scavenius, to sign
the Anti-Komintern Pact without consultation with his cabinet colleagues
or with King Christian. But the Danish Government flatly disavowed the
pact.

The German efforts to win over the Danish people were
unsuccessful. Danish response to German offers of friendship was the
“cold shoulder”. While large scale sabotage was discouraged by the
Danish authorities, the Danes used the slow down and other similar
tactics whenever possible against the Nazis.

However, when the Germans tried to compel the Danes to adopt the
Nurnberg laws against the Jews, the Danes refused. When the Germans
ordered that all Danish Jews should wear a yellow star and that a Jewish
ghetto should be established, King Christian announced that if this were
done he would be pleased to move from his palace to such a ghetto and,
according to an Associated Press dispatch of October 11, 1942, said, that,
if the Germans wanted to put the yellow Jewish star in Denmark, he and
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his whole family would wear it as a sign of the highest distinction. He attended in full uniform a special celebration in a Copenhagen synagogue. All over Denmark opposition to the German plans of repression arose. Pastoral letters were issued by the Bishop of Zealand and others, protesting in the name of Christianity against the introduction of humiliating anti-Jewish measures.

In a Danish parliamentary by-election held in March 1943, the vote was 95 per cent against the Nazis. From June to September 1942, the King was sick with jaundice, and in October, while riding in the streets, he was thrown from his horse and received severe head injuries. Then he got pneumonia. Thus the people were deprived of their great leader till May 1943.

However, among the people, resistance to the Nazis increased, especially in the form of sabotage. In May 1943, the King warned the people against the growing sabotage in munition works and railways. The British Government had secretly been instigating the Danes to more sabotage and violence. In August 1943, fighting broke out between German soldiers and Danish civilians, especially in Odensee, the third largest city in the country; there was a four day general strike at Esbjerg; the Danes scuttled one of the ships of their navy, and naval units fled to Sweden.

The Germans placed King Christian and his family under house arrest and poured troops into the country, and several thousand Danes were killed. All this time the Danes, at great risk to themselves, had been sheltering Jews and smuggling them to Sweden in spite of the German ships patrolling the intervening seas. Even while under house arrest, the King refused to form a pro-Nazi Government. He was quoted by Danish refugee as having requested the Danish Bishop Fugelsang Damgaard to "tell everyone that peace is on its way. We have allies in other countries
fighting for our cause. Let everyone know that so long as the Germans are in the country I will sign no decree forming a new Danish Government. What I have signed so far has been forces. God protect you all. God protect our country."  

Thus the Danes, without previous preparation or training in non-violent resistance, nevertheless used this kind of defense, not perfectly, yet effectively, against the ruthless Nazis whose cruelty and iron discipline was a byword. The Danes resisted non-violently and successfully for two and a half years, until the warring British Government persuaded them to use violence. The non-violent efforts, thus, ultimately established people’s faith in the efficacy of non-violence.  

**Norway Follows:** Denmark’s neighbour, Norway, was invaded by the Nazis in April 1940. For two months the Norwegians offered armed resistance which was wholly suppressed by the far more powerful Nazi troops. A pro-German Norwegian, Vidkun Quisling, was made dictator of the country by the Germans. The Norwegian King and Government fled to London, leaving the people leaderless. The people wanted to resist but did not see how they could do so. Until September of that year there was confusion among the people. In the autumn some underground newspapers were started and distributed secretly.  

The pressure and violence of the Nazis generated resistance. Spontaneously and without organization, school children and others began wearing paper clips as a sign of unity. The authorities sensed the meaning and forbade this action. Then people began wearing other

---

emblems – coins, flowers on the king’s birthday, red caps, even potatoes. Secret organizations grew up with headquarters at Oslo.

The first organized resistance came from the hundreds of thousand of youth in the athletic clubs. As soon as the Nazis tried to take control of these clubs, all organized activities immediately ceased and remained in abeyance till the Nazis left. Next to resist was the Supreme Court of Justice. As soon as the Germans tried to reshape the laws in accordance with Nazi principles, all the members of the Supreme Court resigned. The teachers and clergy especially embodied, upheld and stimulated the spirit of resistance. No leaders were chosen in advance; the resistance struggle produced its own leaders.

Gradually the resistance took form. Haaken Holmboe, a teacher in a small town north of Oslo, had heard of Gandhi and read a little about him. But very few others knew of Gandhi or the method of the Indian struggle for freedom. Holmboe became a contact point for resisters in a large rural district in East Norway in the autumn of 1941. During that autumn an underground press was started and maintained all through the five years of the German occupation. By this means the people were informed of what was happening and what they should do to resist. Imprisonment, torture and killing by the Nazis only made the resistance firmer and more complete.

In June 1941, Quisling abolished the former teachers’ organization. His Government was trying in various small ways to influence people to adopt Nazi ideology, such as by decreeing that Quisling’s portrait should be hung in all schools. These efforts aroused strong opposition among both students and teachers. In February 1942, Quisling tried to start a corporate State on Mussolini’s model. He began with the teaching profession. After the abolition of the former teachers’ organization, a few teachers’ organization was started with the Chief of Quisling’s secret
police as its head. A new youth movement was set up by the Government, also, modeled after the Nazi youth movement of Germany. The Government decreed compulsory membership in it for all young people 10 to 18 years of age.

A secret illegal organization among the teachers had been developing. Its members decided that teachers would resist all the following four points:

1. any Government demand that teachers should become members of Quisling’s party, the Nasjonal Samling;
2. any attempt to introduce Nasjonal Samling propaganda in the schools;
3. any order from outside the school authorities;
4. any collaboration with the Nasjonal Samling youth movement.

On February 20, 1942, between 8,000 and 10,000 of the total of 12,000 Norwegian teachers each wrote to Quisling’s Education Department a declaration reading, “I declare that I cannot take part in the education of the youth of Norway along those lines which have been outlined for the Nasjonal Samling Youth Service, this being against my conscience. According to what the leader of the new teachers’ organization has said, membership in this organization will mean an obligation for me to assist in such education, and would also force me to do other acts which are in conflict with the obligations of my profession. I find that I must declare that I can’t regard myself of the new teachers’ organization.”

Accordingly, keeping in view the spirit of the objective, every teacher wrote this statement himself, signed it with his own name, and mailed it himself to the Education Department of Quisling’s Government. On February 24, the Bishops of the State Church, who had already

protested about the Nasjonal Samling Youth Service, resigned their official posts but retained their religious duties. On the same day, 150 University professors also protested against the Nasjonal Samling youth front.

On February 25, the Quisling Government announced that the teachers’ protests would be regarded as official resignations and that if they persisted they would be discharged. On the same day the Education Department closed all schools for a month, on the pretext of a shortage of fuel. From all over the country offers of fuel came to keep the schools open. The official newspapers told nothing about the teachers’ resistance, but the “fuel holiday” spread the news.

On March 7, the official newspapers announced that 300 teachers would be called to do “some kind of social work in the north of Norway.” In a bulletin of the Education Department issued only to teachers, March 15 was set as the final date for compliance; teachers who resisted Governments orders after that date were threatened with loss of jobs, pay and pensions. The Quisling Education Department received tens of thousand of letters of protest from nearly ten per cent of Norway’s parents.

When March 15 came, the teachers remained defiant. None of them crumbled. Beginning about March 20, about one thousand teachers were arrested, among them was Haaken Holmboe, but no women teachers. However, the arrests did not terrify the people. Arrests seemed to be haphazard. Neither all the leaders nor all the weaklings were arrested. After the arrests, the clergy made a statement in the churches at Easter, and nearly all of them resigned their jobs. Many of the clergy were transferred to other places than their homes; their leaders were sent to prison and concentration camps.
From southern and western Norway about 650 of the arrested teachers were transferred from jails to a concentration camp at Grini. From some undisclosed source – not the Government – their families received the equivalent of their salaries all through their detention. In the camp the Government issued an ultimatum to the imprisoned teachers, but only three gave in.

On March 31, 650 teachers were taken in cattle cars to another concentration camp about two hundred kilometers from Oslo. At the railway stations, children gathered and sang to them as the train passed through. A few more were added, making their total number 687. After a few days at the new camp they were put on rations of four small slices of bread (150 grams) a day and water. The bread was given out at night. Each morning they were compelled to crawl and run in deep snow for an hour and half. Then came an hour and a half of heavy work, mostly shoveling snow, followed by another hour and a half of crawling and running in the snow. Then they were given a meal of hot water. After the second day of this, seventy six of the older teachers, from 55 to 59 years of age, were questioned by camp officials, but not a single one of them backed down.

In most places elsewhere in Norway, the Government reopened the schools on April 8 except in Oslo and Aker, and even there the schools reopened a few days later. But in reporting for work, all the teachers publicly repudiated membership in Quisling’s new teachers’ organization and told their classes so the first day. The teachers spoke to the children of conscience, of the spirit of truth and of the responsibility to the children. However, among the teachers there was a strong feeling of solidarity.

Among the imprisoned teachers two cases of pneumonia developed. When another of the teachers physically collapsed and a
German officer asked him why he did not give in, the teacher answered, “Because I am a Norwegian.” After several days more of this treatment, the camp authorities marched the prisoners through, a room, asking each one if he would sign a retraction of his protest. As they filed through the room each prisoner said “No,” often in advance of the officer’s question. Out of 637 prisoner teachers only 32, after this grueling treatment, retracted. So the terrorism and torture gymnastics were resumed, and the starvation rations continued. All the time, threatening rumours were circulated among the teachers, both inside and outside of the camp. Yet the wives of the teachers said they did not want their husbands to yield, and sent that word to them.

After about a week of this treatment, 499 of them were taken in cattle cars to Trondheim and thence in a steamer built to carry only 100 passengers, north for thirteen days to Kirkenes, a small town near the Finnish (now Russian) border, far beyond the Arctic Circle. There, custody of them was transferred from the German Gestapo to the Wehrmacht. In a few days more the remaining 153 teachers, after again refusing to give in, were also sent to Kirkenes.

When the schools at Oslo reopened on May 7, the teachers there also dissociated themselves from the new Government sponsored teachers’ organization. At Kirkenes there were no beds, bedding, mattresses or furniture for the teachers. Surreptitiously they got hay from nearby haystacks. The prisoners were put to work unloading from ships heavy crates of supplies and oil drums. Though they had not been trained for such work, they worked seven days a week. One was killed, two lost an eye each, and one broke a leg and both arms.

The deportation of the teachers to Kirkenes stiffened the morale and resistance of the other people of Norway enormously. Quisling knew that if he became harsher with the teachers, the resistance of the rest of
the country would become far stronger and more difficult to deal with. Talking to a group of teachers in a small town on March 22, Quisling threatened, stormed and raged at them. He added by saying, “You teachers have destroyed everything for me.” He had them all arrested. Next day a few teachers of that school who had been absent when he spoke went to the hall and asked to be imprisoned with the others. Quisling had intended the new organization of teachers to be the pilot project of his corporate State, but the teachers blocked it.

In late August, 50 teachers who were ill were sent home. On September 16, a second group of about 100 were sent back home. On November 4, the remaining 400 or so were sent home from the camp, after eight months of hard force labour. They were allowed to remain teaching without recanting their principles.

Accordingly, all this non-violent resistance was unprepared for. There was no training. It grew up out of the strong urge to resist somehow. There was no theory or philosophy in it. Most of the people would have used violence if they had had the means. Toward the end there was a secret military organization called Milarg, promoted and supplied by the British. But most of the resistance, which lasted five years was non-violent.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt is reported to have said on September 16, 1942, “If there is anyone who doubts the democratic will to win… let him look to Norway… Norway at once conquered and unconquerable. At home the Norwegian people have silently resisted the invader’s will with grim endurance.”

This Norwegian non-violent resistance was possible because all the people were self-respecting, self-reliant, self-confident, courageous, filled

---
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with a spirit of unity, independence and liberty, and felt urgently and steadily that they had to resist somehow. It was unpremeditated and spontaneous.

Of the forms it took, one of the leaders, Diderich Lund, wrote afterward that the Norwegian economic resistance broke down completely. Sabotage was effective only to a small degree, and secrecy was also not as effective as bold, forthright candour and adherence to open truth. Those who resisted in this spirit were filled with a “strange feeling of quiet happiness… even under hard and difficult conditions,” says Lund. “The unshakable conviction of fighting in a good cause has always been the strongest incitement to the making of fanatical soldiers, and perhaps we also need fanatics. But above all we need efficiency and wisdom, courage and readiness to self-sacrifice. If we possess to some degree these qualities, non-violent resistance will give us the sure and joyful knowledge of fighting in the cause of justice and love. And we shall also know that our fight is the only one leading to lasting victory.”

In this way the non-violent approach gained strength and confirmed the faith of the people in it.

The Fall of the Berlin Wall of the Mind and Efficacy of Non-violence:

The Pastors’ movement exemplifies the efforts of moral or political jiu-jitsu. When the guns of the East German Government were aimed at unarmed protesters and elicited no violent reaction – only sputtering candles – the regime was unsure of how to react and respond. Armed soldiers and police, doubtless felt stirrings of identification with the nonviolent protagonists, perhaps identifying with the jeopardy faced by the protesters at the end of their guns. The leadership offered by the ministers, and the staunch nonviolent discipline of the resisters, threw the regime off balance when its totalitarianism succeeded in provoking

nothing but more nonviolence; the more the government used force, the more the nonviolent opposition maintained discipline. As the police faced protesters in Leipzing and elsewhere, their confusion grew as their power was drained from them. The number of nonviolent demonstrators continued to swell as they gained self-assurance, so that somewhere between half a million and one million persons gathered in the streets of East Berlin on 4th November 1989.

As fear of repression receded from the ever-growing numbers of demonstrators, their slogans reflected a subtle shift in attitude. Placards and chants changed from ‘We want to leave’ to ‘We are staying here.’91 One banner bespoke more than its few words: “As we demonstrate today, so shall we live tomorrow.” Personal transformation and inner change, rather than anything in the external circumstances, were igniting the people to assert themselves. Thousands who had previously silenced their feelings of dread began to voice their wants and – importantly in the context of nonviolent struggle – their willingness to sacrifice for those desires. The sight of hundreds of thousands of citizens peacefully seeking the most basic human rights was reminiscent of the movement that transformed the American South: “Potentially violent crowds were proceeding silently, in self-imposed order, holding candles in their hands... The non-violent methods borrowed from the US Civil Rights Movement and the goals of achieving human rights created instant sympathy for the citizens’ movement abroad.”92

Resignations of Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands (SED) government figures during the autumn of 1989 were followed by the steeping down of the entire government under Willi Stoph on 7th November. After hundreds of thousands of protesters formed a

nonviolent human chain across East Germany, the entire Politburo and Central Committee resigned. On 9th November, a spokesperson for the government declared that all East German citizens could travel abroad at will and without official permission. That night, thousands climbed over the Berlin Wall, by then the object of almost round-the-clock vigils. A story is told of a man who left East Berlin in November 1989 and went, via the West German embassy in Prague, to Hungary and Austria and on to West Germany, where he then took a flight to West Berlin, exactly in time to see the Berlin Wall opened. Had he waited, he could have arrived at the same destination, but a few miles away, by foot.93

Further, as the Pastors’ Movement sustained the East German street demonstrations, the government disintegrated. The SED agreed to change its name and break with its Stalinist past on 16th December, its force spend and its legitimacy vitiated. On 30th January 1990, Moscow agreed to the reunification of the two Germanies. The first free East German parliamentary elections took place on 16th March 1990, with a voter turnout of more than 93 per cent. Virtually all of the demands of the nonviolent protagonists who had poured out of the Nikolai Church every Monday after peace prayers had been met by the time spring blossomed in 1990. By the summer of 1990, the West German Deutschmark had been introduced into East Germany. On 3rd October 1990, the unification of the two Germanies was completed through the annexation of the GDR by the Federal Republic. A national festival celebrated the reunion. In what had formerly been West Germany, Roman Catholic bishop Karl Lehmann challenged the political leaders of the newly reunified country during a thanksgiving service in Munich’s Marienkirche: “Now that the

A transition had been made from fear and obsequiousness toward those possessing official power to popular empowerment. Nonviolent struggle abetted the democratic awakening. When the Brandenburg Gate had been physically crashed, a more significant Berlin Wall of the mind had also been scaled. Ahead lay the more complex matter of national unification.

So here we can say that what the power of violent means could not achieve the power of nonviolence was able to resolve the problem and united the hearts of people for betterment.

**The Polish Fight for Freedom with Non-violent Means:**

Lech Walesa has made a very significant observation in the following words:

“We have already tried and tested every form of violence, and not once in the entire course of human history has anything good or lasting come from it.”

As we are already familiar that the Polish Constitution of 1791, was famous for promoting democratic ideals in the world. But in the autumn of 1939, the brutal force of Nazism fell on Poland as a result more than 6 million Polish people lost their lives fighting for their homeland during the Second World War or were killed in Nazi death camps, including 3 million of the nation’s 3.5 million Jews. While a vision of freedom remained in their minds, the Poles had first to make their escape from authoritarianism. In an environment of frustration and despair, Polish nonviolent resistance was born. After the war, workers had hoped for and
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expected higher wages and better working conditions. The predominantly Roman Catholic population yearned for religious freedom and the liberty that would allow free expression of their spiritual values.

In June 1956, the people of Poznan rebelled against communist rule with strikes and demonstrations that demanded both ‘bread and freedom.’ Although the revolt was quickly extinguished by government troops using brute force and killings, the uprising nonetheless resulted in a change in government leadership to one which promised reforms. By the autumn of 1956, the population was filled with hope during a period known as October Springtime, the name suggesting a feeling of euphoria. It did not last long. The government quickly forgot about its vowed improvements, and life went back to chronic food shortages and low wages.97

On the other hand in the first month of 1968, the students demanded the right to freedom of expression and an end to censorship. But their voice was razed down with the help of violent means and most of them were forced to exile. It was one young man, a short, mustached electrician named Lech Walesa, however, encouraged his fellow shipyard labourers to view the student grievances as being related to their own concerns.

By the December 1970, the labourers in Warsaw reached a breaking point. Sudden price increases without corresponding wage boosts left workers struggling to feed their families. More than 9,000 angry workers took to the streets, only to be met by swift and brutal government repression.98

The face of the resistance was altered in 1976 when two events modified Polish efforts to resist Soviet-backed oppression. In June, the government called for significant price increases in staple items, sparking demonstrations that were once again brutally repressed. In response to the needs of workers (and their families) who had been jailed, exiled or fired, a group of intellectuals set up the committee for the workers’ defense, more typically known by its Polish acronym, KOR. For the first time, groups without ties to the communist regime were being organized.\(^9^9\) In retrospect, KOR was the development that signaled the coalescence of Polish society into a concerted effort against communist rule. Students began collaborating with workers and speaking on their behalf; labourers coordinated their efforts with dissident intellectuals. At the same time, the Roman Catholic Church was experiencing something of a renaissance and had expressed its interest in human rights. KOR and the church complemented each other’s efforts, producing a unique set of circumstances that opened the door to a peaceful revolution that would take a decade to realize.

Throughout the 1970s, knowledge of varied techniques of resistance spread quickly. A Catholic periodical published translations of publications on nonviolence by Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr. Groups that were undertaking hunger strikes specifically mentioned Gandhi and King as their influences.\(^1^0^0\) The ideas of KOR intellectuals echoed the thinking of Gandhi, King, Tolstoy and Thoreau. KOR theorists championed the ‘rejection of violence and the acceptance of brotherhood and of productive labour’ as essential elements in the transformation of society.\(^1^0^1\) Nonviolent resistance was seen as the best means for reaching the desired end because it could minimize repression.

\(^1^0^0\) Zielonka, Jan, Political Ideas in Contemporary Poland (United Kingdom: Gower Publishing Company), 1989, p. 95.
\(^1^0^1\) Ibid., p. 81.
By the middle and late 1970s, independent grass-roots local movements were spreading across Poland in validation of the basic thrust of KOR. The organization itself continued to maintain an apolitical stance, declaring that it was only a simple action group. In April 1978, Walesa and others formed the Baltic Committee for Free and Independent Trade Unions. One of the first actions of the surreptitious organization was publication of the ‘Charter of Workers’ Rights’ in the committee’s magazine, ‘Coastal Worker’. The thousand-word document was signed by sixty-five activists, most of them intellectuals. The manifesto encouraged people to stand up for their rights and look after their own interests.

Small strikes began erupting throughout Poland. Interestingly, the word ‘strike’ was not mentioned in the Polish media reports concerning the various incidents; after all, if a communist government was supposed to be the true representative of the industrial proletariat and their interests, there should be no reason for workers to strike. Yet strike they did. Walesa had headed negotiations with the government. Transmitted by loudspeaker, the proceedings were heard by the striking workers in the Gdansk shipyard. On 31st August 1980, the negotiations ended. The government agreed to all twenty-one demands. The Gdansk Agreement, as it was called, regulated employer-employee relationships. Collective bargaining was to occur through free trade unions, and emphasis was placed on an economy rooted in self-reliance, with local autonomy for both enterprises and trade unions. A difficult path still lay ahead. Changes that had been agreed upon were slow in coming. The government tried to derail the process stipulated by the Gdansk
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Agreement by delaying the official registration of Solidarity as a free trade union until November 1980, three months later than stipulated.\textsuperscript{104}

A major setback occurred on 12\textsuperscript{th} December 1981, when 500 days of nonviolent measures came to an end. The Jaruzelski government descended on Solidarity buildings, taking possession of property, arresting members and declaring the union illegal. Martial law or ‘war’, as Polish citizens called it, was officially imposed. One of the first to be arrested was Walesa. From prison, he sent out a call – an appeal echoed by the rest of Solidarity’s leadership – for all Polish citizens to resist the regime nonviolently. On more than one occasion, he invoked the memory and inspiration of Gandhi.\textsuperscript{105}

The imposition of martial law and the arrest of Walesa rejuvenated a Polish desire to unite under the banner of nonviolent direct action. Eager to continue the struggle, the populace responded quickly, inspired by reports that Walesa had refused to divulge any information to his captors. Walesa’s silence and his use of the potent method of fasting became the symbols of the resistance. Groups named ‘Without Violence’ began emerging throughout Poland, laying claim to an inheritance from nonviolent movements around the world. Underground publication of works by Gene Sharp helped to guide their thinking.\textsuperscript{106}

Walesa was released from prison on November 15, 1982. Polish authorities claimed that he had been forgotten and that his movement was dead, but the huge crowds that welcomed him home told another story. Following the suspension of martial law on 13\textsuperscript{th} December 1982, Walesa tried to revive his efforts. He was constantly followed and harassed. Solidarity members found themselves being arrested and beaten, but the Poles managed to maintain their nonviolent stance; “pursuing nonviolent

\textsuperscript{104} Ibid., pp. 88-89.
\textsuperscript{106} Zielonka, Jan, Political Ideas in Contemporary Poland, Op. Cit., p. 95.
solutions to the nation's problems was a deep commitment."107 Polish resistance efforts were again rejuvenated in 1983 with the visit of Pope John Paul II, the first Slavic pope. In meeting with Walesa, the pope stressed the significance of the Poles' adoption of nonviolent strategies: "If the world grasps what you are trying to do, if it sees in your movement hope and a way to resolve conflicts, it is precisely because you have renounced violence."108

Solidarity's acclaim beyond its own borders became evident when Walesa was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1983. Fearful that he would not be allowed back into Poland if he left, Walesa asked his wife and son to travel to Oslo to accept the award for him. In his acceptance speech, which they carried, he spoke on behalf of the people of Poland and confirmed his faith in nonviolent struggle: "My most ardent desire is that my country will recapture its historic opportunity for a peaceful evolution, and that Poland will prove to the world that even the most complex situations can be solved by a dialogue and not by force."109 And above all Solidarity became recognized as the "first mass nonviolent challenge to Soviet domination."110 Poland's transformation moved at a rapid pace. Elections were held in 1989, giving a majority of the seats in the parliament, or Sejm, to Solidarity. The following year Walesa was elected President of the Third Republic of Poland. Poland had become the first communist state to bring to an end to a tyrannical system through

---

See Also: Mary, King, Op. Cit., pp. 397-408.
nonviolent struggle. By the time communism fell, the populace had been training itself in nonviolent methods for more than a decade.

Accordingly, if we see the situation from a Gandhian point of view and the path shown by Gandhi to the masses, we find that the Polish people, in this way have fulfilled Gandhi’s dream of nonviolent society.

**Non-violent Revolution:** The so-called “glorious” English revolution of 1688 was a non-violent revolution resulting in the removal of a tyrannical ruler and a consequent re-ordering of the state. The spirit of this revolution was truly expressed by John Milton who expounded St. Thomas Aquinas’ theory justifying the removal of tyrants. But Milton also emphasised that men “naturally were born free,”¹¹¹ because they were created in God’s image and that they had “the liberty or right of free-born men to be governed as seems to them best.” With the secularization of life, the way was clear for such a revolutionary assertion of the principle of government by consent, and not violence. Milton wanted “popery (the papal system; the Roman Catholic Church)” to be “extirpated”, but “extirpation” did not mean violence. Thus he recommended that “all charitable and compassionate means be used to win and regain the weak and misled”, although he maintained that what is “impious or evil absolutely either against faith or manners, no law can possibly permit.” Historians have identified certain elements of social revolution in the English political revolution. There was the underlying struggle in the seventeenth century England to liberate the productive forces from the constraints of feudal power. But democracy and freedom meant involving wider social forces, and, in the course of the revolution, certain sections of the population felt that they were not satisfied with the content of the new freedom which they had won. While Cromwell, the revolutionary, thought that to be “free” meant having sufficient property,

and he limited the property qualification to particular groups, the more progressive levelers only wished to extend the limit and were equally constrained by their own concepts of property and class (servants and wage-earners were not “people”, for instance). Thomas Paine was a Quaker turned freedom fighter, but he was a humanitarian pacifist at heart. Indeed, the ethical logic of a non-violent society appealed to him. In this respect, his idealism was shared by the makers of the American Revolution. Thus, he said: “America has demonstrated to the artificial world that man must go back to nature for information.” He was associating America with the ideal of “original simple democracy,” as he put it. He held out the following ideal: “To make a world happy, to teach mankind the art of being so, to exhibit on the theatre of the universe a character hitherto unknown… let the world see that America can bear prosperity, that her honest virtue in time of peace is equal to the bravest virtue in time… that it possessed a charm that wins upon the world and makes even enemies civil… that it gives a dignity which is often superior to power.” Thomas Paine told Americans after the revolution; “Man is not the enemy of man, but through the medium of a false system of government.” Since the “false system of government” had been revolutionised, a peaceful society could come into existence. For him, the uniqueness of the American Revolution lay in the establishment of the “republican principles of peace and domestic prosperity and economy” – the essence of a non-violent society.

112. Ibid., pp. 419-20.
113. Ibid., pp. 421-22.
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It may be mentioned here that, Thomas Paine was an admirer of the French revolution (he participated in it after he had seen the American revolution through to its triumphant conclusion), but his critique of the French revolution was most perceptive, in terms of his ideals of a peaceful society. The terrorism and violence of the French revolution (he spent ten months in prison himself and suffered from serious illness) had shocked him. He explained this phenomenon as follows: “All the disorders that have arisen in France during the progress of the revolution have had their origin, not in the principle of equal rights” (as Burke had argued), “but in the violation of that principle.” And he stated that this principle had been violated “not by the majority, but by the minority, and that the minority has been composed of men possessing property as well as of men without property.” In fact, the essay in which these passages occur was written in Paris in July 1795. Indeed, he was prophetic about the consequences of violence flowing from the unbridled exercise of power by the leaders of the French revolution. Thomas Paine’s logic was similar to Gandhi’s. He said: “Those who may happen to be first convinced have not a right to persecute others on whom conviction operates more slowly. The moral principle of revolution is to instruct, not to destroy.” Undoubtedly, this was also the moral principle of the revolution which Gandhi set in motion in India. Thomas Paine thought that the extreme violence of the French revolution was avoidable. “Had a constitution been established”, he said (in 1795), “two years ago, the violence’s that have since desolated France and injured the character of the revolution would have been prevented.” Instead of a constitution, “a revolutionary government, a thing without either principle or authority,
was substituted in its place, virtue and crime depended upon accident and that which was patriotism one day became treason the next... instead of principle governing party, party governs principle. An avidity to punish is always dangerous to liberty.”

Fanon thought in the African perspective and against the background of one of the most ruthlessly violent and long-drawn wars of national liberation in modern times. He had seen at close quarters the unfinished revolution in many African countries. He took up the cause of the poor, the unemployed and the under-privileged masses mostly concentrated in the African countryside, in the forests and swamps and mountains and the desert fringes, and in the shanty towns. Fanon found that the poor were helpless against the power elites, whether White or Black. His mind and heart were weighed down by the burden of this tragedy, as Gandhi’s was when he was in South Africa and after he came to India and traveled over the length and breadth of the country. Fanon had imbibed that best of European culture, but he was caught in vicious contradictions of racism and struggled hard to find his authentic identity. Like Gandhi, he said: “Let us try to create the whole man whom Europe has been incapable of bringing to triumphant birth.” This was his anguished exhortation to the people of the “third world.” Fanon generalized on the basis of his Algerian and African experience. Some of his findings are similar to Gandhi’s. He had an idealized vision of the role of poor peasants – “a coherent people”, he said, “who go on living, as it were, statically, but who keep their moral values and their devotion to the
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See Also: The Permanent Revolution, Op. Cit., pp. 171-74. Although Thomas Paine strongly criticized Burke’s conservative view on the French and the American revolutions – his obsession with the imposing symbols of authority and with a European order representing certain permanent elements of human nature – he seems to have accepted one of Burke’s charges that the French revolutionaries were absorbed in the ends and were inconsiderate about the means.
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The unfinished revolution in many countries has yet to involve these men, the “wretched of the earth” (les damnes de la terre), the title of his book which has become the watchword of the Black militants in the USA, but has not caused even a ripple in Africa, against the background of which it was written. Fanon thinks that the only way in which neo-colonialism could be fought in Africa is to nationalize both production and trade. But he does not believe in a centralized state socialist organisation which, as Gandhi also thought, only increases the strength of the power elites. Like Gandhi, Fanon believes in radical decentralization of power and democratic participation by the masses in cooperative enterprises. He, however, thinks that at the national level, the crucial factors of growth are integral planning (which Gandhi did not like to emphasise), austerity (which Gandhi considered to be of foremost importance) and education (one of Gandhi’s primary concerns).

When we make the comparison between the two i.e. Gandhi and Fanon, we find that to Fanon, colonialism is violence – political, economic, cultural and psychological. To Gandhi also, colonialism was broad-based violence. Gandhi thought of non-violent means with which to eradicate this massive violence. At an early stage, Fanon also thought of non-violent resistance or coercion as a kind of humanistic, but radical, self-assertion of the individual. But later his tragic experience in Algeria and in other parts of Africa determined his choice of collective revolutionary violence as a means of liberation. His advocacy of violence is a kind of existentialist mystique. “At the level of individuals”, Fanon says, “violence is a cleansing force, it frees the native from his inferiority complex and from his despair and inaction.”

The thesis of terrorism and violence as possible instruments of social transformation is often depended in the names of Marx and Engels,
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their theoretical formulations bearing on this theme may be briefly reviewed. First, there is a philosophical aspect of the question that has recently attracted some attention. Can man recreate himself by violence? Marxism returned a pronouncedly negative answer. Marx said (Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844) that “industry” may be conceived as “an exoteric form of the realisation of the essential human faculties.” On this basis, Marx conceived of what he called “the natural essence of man.” Thus, according to him, man can recreate himself by labour, because labour operating on nature transforms nature and is also recreated in the process. This, of course, is materialism and an antithesis of the Hegelian idea that man can recreate himself by thought. It is poles apart from Gandhi’s or Huxley’s thought. But there is no room in Marx’s thought for the role of violence as some modern revolutionaries seem to think when they try to find a philosophical proof for violence as the fascists once did.124

Aldous Huxley exposed the crux of the ethical question in his Ends and Means (1937), a book he wrote at a turning point of his personal life and at the time when fascist violence had shown its ugly face and dared to hold the world in thralldom and Gandhi was employing non-violence as a means to freedom for India.125 Huxley reflects on Barthelmy de Ligt’s dictum: “The more violence, the less revolution.”126 Huxley’s ethical logic was as follows: “To be regarded as successful a revolution must be the achievement of something new. But violence and the effects of violence – counter-violence, suspicion and resentment on the part of the victims and the creation, among the perpetrators, of a tendency to use more violence – are things only too familiar, too hopelessly un-
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See Also: Huxley, Aldous, Ends And Means (London: Chatto And Windus), 1951, Chapter – IV.
revolutionary. A violent revolution can't achieve anything except the inevitable results of violence, which are as old as the hills.\footnote{127} He further draws our attention to the fact, so often stressed by Gandhi too, that violence is the outcome of weakness, moral impotence, which seeks a short cut to the desired social end and really stems from ideological intolerance, which is another symptom of weakness. “So strong is our desire to believe that there is a short cut to Utopia, so deeply prejudiced are we in favour of people of similar opinions to our own, that we are rarely able to command the necessary dispassion. We insist that ends which we believe to be good can justify means which we know quite certainly to be abominable; we go on believing against all the evidence that these bad means can achieve the good ends that we desire.”\footnote{128} Huxley concedes (unlike Gandhi) that the “effect of violence can be undone only by compensatory non-violence after the event”, i.e., “by acts of justice and goodwill.” But he is certain that “when violence has been used for a long period, a habit of violence is formed and it becomes exceedingly difficult for the perpetrators of violence to reverse their policy.”\footnote{129} Huxley is perceptive enough to worry about the complex chain-reaction of violence as a means to social end. Thus he says: “The results of violence are far reaching beyond the wildest dreams of the often well-intentioned people who resort to it.”\footnote{130} He refers to the worldwide revolutionary violence of the 1930s leading to fascism, to rearmament, to progressive de-liberalisation in democracies – in a kind of complex chain-reaction.\footnote{131} He also refers, in this connection, to the dubious means often adopted by nations to play upon the fear of violence from foreign countries and to project the aim of using violence more
effectively in future international wars. Apart from the fact that this is a self-stultifying exercise, it enables dictators to gain their ends without domestic terrorism or violence, and, indeed, with the sanction of public opinion behind their regimes of violence and terrorism.

The importance of non-violence as a means to social ends, as Huxley and Gandhi have urged, arises from the fact that what is denied by violence is the affirmative principle of the power of consent or consensus that sustains society and the state as the organised social power. The power-complex is a reality that rests on a moral basis and if it does not work, the basis of social or political obligation is shaken. On the other hand, violence is merely an instrument which may be used, within limits, to sustain it and maintain it, largely as a force held in reserve. As Hannah Arendt rightly argues, violence, being instrumental can’t be the essence of the power-complex. It can no doubt destroy power, but it can’t be the source of power. That it can’t be proved by the fact that massive civil resistance of a non-violent kind, as Gandhi demonstrated, can succeed in the assertion and re-affirmation of the moral reality of the power of the society or the state. Even if peaceful civil resistance is suppressed by violence, what comes out in the defeat of non-violence is the triumph of non-violent power. The impotence of violence, on the other hand, is demonstrated by the fact, so perceptively noted by Hannah Arendt, that “the well known reversal in reckoning with means and ends has taken place. The means, the means of destruction, now determine the end with the consequence that the end will be the destruction of all power.”

It is quite significant to note here that, when the ethical principle of non-violence is translated into practice as an instrument or technique of resistance several difficult questions arise both on the ethical level and on
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the level of technique. Since Gandhi was primarily concerned with the ethical purity of means, we find numerous references to this very significant aspect. The instrumental aspect of non-violence was, to him, a pragmatic and experimental issue as we know that it was an “experiment” with truth. When some of his disciples requested him to prepare a manual on non-violence as a guide to action he pleaded his inability to do so because he was trying out the technique in a tentative way and could not obviously reduce it to doctrine. To him, non-violence was a method, not a body of precepts or rules organised into a system. Therefore, Gandhi leaned heavily on the ethical purity of means, particularly the purity of motivation underlying non-violent action. Some of Gandhi’s leading ideas on the subject of the practice of non-violence with such comments on them are warranted in the interest of understanding Gandhi as under:133

1. Gandhi drew a clear distinction between non-violent resistance of his conception and pacifism. In 1930 he discussed the subject of protest against military service with Pierre Ceresole, the leader of the International Voluntary Service for Peace. Einstein had appealed to the people to court imprisonment rather than perform military service. Gandhi argued that refusing military service was not enough. He said: “He or she who supports the state organised in a military way, whether directly or indirectly, participates in the sin. Each man takes part in the sin by contributing to the maintenance of the state by paying taxes... Refusal of military service is more superficial than non-cooperation with the system which supports the state.”134 As we have seen, there was a philosophical anarchistic streak in Gandhi’s idealism. Non-payment of taxes to enforce de-militarisation of the state, although logically
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more effective than pacifist courting of imprisonment, is a remedy
that can work only when it is on a mass basis. Otherwise individual
civil disobedience is a possible alternative, but then it stands on the
same footing as courting imprisonment rather than performing
military service.

2. In 1938 Gandhi was once asked whether non-violence was related
to pacifism which, as his Western questioner put it, “we Westerners
are trying to adopt without much success.” Gandhi’s reaction was
as follows: “In my opinion non-violence is not passivity in any
shape or form. Non-violence, as I understand it, is the activist force
in the world. Therefore, whether it is materialism or anything else,
if non-violence does not provide an answer, it is not an active force
of my conception… During my half a century of experience I have
not yet come across a situation when I had to say that I was
helpless, that I had no remedy in terms of non-violence. Non­
vioence is the supreme law.” Gandhi’s fundamentalist
absolutism with regard to non-violence being the supreme law
follows from his ethical position, but it is, nevertheless, subject to
limitations when non-violence has to be used as a means of
resistance by a large body of persons.

3. As a matter of fact, Gandhi did realise that these limitations arise
out of the limitations of human nature. In 1922 after the eruption of
violence in the wake of the mass non-cooperation movement,
Gandhi had reflected on these limitations as non-violent attainment
of self-government, he asserted pre-supposed a non-violent control
over the violent elements in the country. In a general
insurrectionary movement even his powerful moral influence was
not a sufficient curb on the violent elements. Gandhi was not

unaware of this fact. Indeed, he said that a certain amount of unintended violence was pardonable, i.e., he did not consider civil-disobedience impossible in somewhat imperfect conditions, but the present movement was admittedly a dangerous experiment under fairly adverse conditions as he pointed out that if we are not to evolve violence out of non-violence, it was quite clear that we must hastily retrace our steps. Accordingly, Gandhi agreed with others who differed with him on the strategy of retreat in thinking that the repression was out of all proportion to the insignificant popular violence in the areas of repression. But he foresaw the danger of violence setting up a vicious circle. So, he maintained his fundamentalist ethical position apart from considerations of expediency and strategy as civil disobedience was never followed by anarchy and criminal disobedience could lead to it. Every state puts down criminal disobedience with force. It perishes, if it does not. But to put down civil disobedience is to attempt to imprison conscience. Gandhi withdrew his broad-based programme of non-violent resistance and suggested that in the present case, aggressive civil disobedience had to be confined to the vindication of the right of free speech and free association. Therefore, his use of the word aggressive in this context was more significant. The country had a foretaste of aggressiveness. The momentum of aggressiveness should not have been lost. Only it could not be wasted, in the face of repression which was bound to follow “popular violence.”

4. Similarly, the limitations within which non-violent resistance operates in practice create a kind of psychological tension against the ethical purity of non-violence. Gandhi gave expression to the reality of such a tension by drawing a sharp distinction between
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“passive resistance” and “non-violent resistance.” In a letter to Madame Privat (dated November 29, 1947) Gandhi wrote: “Resistance both the forms are, but you have to pay a very heavy price when the resistance is passive, in the sense of the weakness of the resister,”\(^\text{137}\) as he identified passive resistance as the resistance of the weak and not the non-violent resistance of the strong. The former may be undertaken as a policy out of one’s weakness and with a clear consciousness of one’s weakness. Gandhi confessed that the “non-violent resistance” had failed in India, which was “passive resistance” of the weak masquerading as “non-violent resistance”, although it achieved a political end. The failure of the means, Gandhi guessed, was bound to result in an eruption of suppressed violence. Thus he said: “whilst we undoubtedly got, through passive resistance, our political freedom... we are daily paying the heavy price for the unconscious mistake we made, or better still, I made, in mistaking passive resistance for non-violent resistance. Had I not made the mistake, we would have been spared the humiliating spectacle of weak brother killing his weak brother thoughtlessly and inhumanly”\(^\text{138}\) (Gandhi was referring to the communal carnage immediately before and after independence).

Gandhi also told Prof. Stuart Wilson that what he had mistaken for satyagraha as passive resistance. In this connection in his letter to Madame Privat, Gandhi mentioned that Europe had committed the opposite mistake of confusing Christ’s non-violent resistance with passive resistance. Gandhi said: “Europe mistook the bold and brave resistance, full of wisdom, by Jesus of Nazareth for passive

---
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resistance, as if it was of the weak... Has not the West paid heavily in regarding Jesus as a passive resister?"\textsuperscript{139}

5. Moreover, Gandhi had an occasion to examine the possibility of Satyagraha as a means or technique of self-defence. This problem has received a good deal of attraction in recent years, as evidenced by a remarkable collection of essays entitled ‘Civil Resistance as a National defence: Non-violent Action Against Aggression’, edited by Adam Roberts. (Pelican Book, 1969.) Generally, as Gandhi demonstrated, non-violent action can succeed when:

(a) The participants practise non-violence strictly; otherwise the combination of violence and non-violence, even tactically speaking, fails, because the entire weight of repression comes down on everyone, in the name of averting anarchy;

(b) repression and suffering alienate an increasing number of people who join the group of non-violent resisters;

(c) the methods of non-violent action are chosen in such a way that the economic or civil disruption (to begin with) caused by it do not alienate large numbers of people from non-violent action. In the complex context of India’s freedom movement, Gandhi was extremely cautious and had waited for 20 years before he launched the great historical rebellion of 1942.

\textbf{The Nonviolent Tradition in American Literature:}

Although only occasionally recognized in standard histories of American culture, the literary record of nonviolence is extensive, dramatizing the search for nonviolent alternatives over a three-hundred-year period. These lines, from John Beecher’s poem “Engagement at the Salt Fork,” for example, describing the San Francisco to Moscow Peace
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Walk, as it crossed the Oklahoma prairie in the late winter of 1961, describe, also the gentle, persistent strength of the American tradition of non-violence: “Like tumbleweeds before the wind we moved across the continent’s huge heedless face... Blasts, born on Yukon tundra’s, knifed us through and buffeted our sign: Man will end War or War Will End Man.”

It is no coincidence that the Black Revolution, which made black history and literature available to us, has brought the history and literature of nonviolence – oral as well as written – along with it. That “ghetto” known as “the great Western and Christian tradition” has begun to recognize roots, long-hidden, of a radical, nonviolent past.

**The Tradition of Bloodless Revolution: The Case of Czechs and Slovaks:**

The Czechoslovakian struggle for personal freedom and self-government was the result of 1989 Velvet Revolution. The Czechs and Slovak, two closely related peoples, had tried since the seventeenth century fully to blend into the monarchies that governed them, although they each longed for independence. Despite constitutional protections and amendments that guaranteed their rights to political participation, the efforts of the Czechs and the Slovaks to feel at home with their rulers were frustrated. Lacking other alternatives, both ethnic groups accepted their status as subjects of foreign monarchies. The First World War offered a glimmer of hope that independence could be achieved, and it finally came in 1918, not as the fruit of their struggle but as a byproduct of the war. The two people who had so long sought autonomy joined together as one nation in Czechoslovakia. Bohemia, with its Czech
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population, formed the western section, Moravia occupied the center, and Slovakia lay to the east. The unification of the Czechs and Slovaks was warmly received by both peoples as a step forward, and the bloodless transition to independence was seen as the first ‘Velvet Revolution’ to be experienced by these two nations in the course of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{142} This peaceful transformation was part of a pattern that was repeated again and again in the region.

But later on with the change in the time, the conditions and the attitude of the governing council, they all changed and the country was in the grip of the dictatorship like situation. It was Vaclav Havel – playwright, actor and a man who would play a significant role in the history of his nation – became one of the first persons openly to voice his refusal to conform and to express concern over his government’s flagrant disregard of the principles that would be outlined in the Helsinki Accords. On 8\textsuperscript{th} April 1975, Havel expressed his conviction that “we cannot remain silent in the face of evil or violence; silence merely encourages them.”\textsuperscript{143} He broke the quietude when he sent an ‘Open Letter to Gustav Husak’ in which he protested the efforts of ‘normalization’. As the contents of the letter became known by way of underground publications, waves of dissent, followed by repression, soon began anew. Moves to suppress youth and cultural activities sparked petitions, and dissident groups began rapidly to form throughout 1976.\textsuperscript{144} Ultimately, the young playwright would assume a pivotal role in rejuvenating the nation’s resistance to oppression and violence.

\textsuperscript{143} Havel, Vaclav, Summer Meditations on Politics, Morality and Civility in a Time of Transition (London: Faber & Faber), 1992, p. 98 (Translated by Paul Wilson).
On New Year’s Day in 1977, a document was released that contained signatures of more than 200 citizens.145 Its originators included leaders from the Prague Spring, professors, engineers, journalists, artists and clergy, plus the author of the ‘Open Letter’, Vaclav Havel. It was also known by the name of ‘Charter 77’ and was inspired by the Helsinki treaties and guided by the need to confirm the essential rights of human beings. Among these entitlements was the right to a dialogue with one’s government. Its basic principle was that society cannot be transformed by orders from above. The writers, actors and intellectuals involved held the strong conviction that change must originate from below. In fact, Charter 77 was not an organisation, and there was no official membership to it, it was based on people’s own interest and will. At other points too the people showed their courage against the mighty powers and kept their faith of nonviolence alive.

Furthermore, the beginning of the second ‘Velvet Revolution’ can be marked as 17th November 1989, when a Prague demonstration condemning the Nazi occupation and its resulting deaths turned into the largest demonstration known in Czechoslovakian history. The event was peaceful, as the people rallied for democracy, and participants carried flowers, held candles and waved flags in Wenceslas Square, which filled with good-natured students.146 Hundreds were injured when the security forces charged the crowd. In that moment, the people became bound together in shared outrage against violence. This strange dance between the nonviolent minglers and armed troops lasted for more than five days. Vaclav Havel spoke to those gathered in the square and begged them not to use violence. His credentials as a leader and statesman were growing. To his refusal to be cowed by the authorities had been added time spent

in prison, the prolific crafting of political tracts and, now, his skills as an orator. The Civic Forum, established on 19th November 1989, backed up the call made by Havel. The new organization, which was composed of all the opposition groups, students, artists and a variety of socialist political parties, issued a statement on 23rd November outlining a renewed commitment to the tradition that had been passed down from earlier generations: “We are against violence and do not seek revenge.”

These were not merely the words of a few intellectuals. When these activities were going on, one young man of around 25 of age, spoke with great pride and excitement that “Gandhi would have been proud of us.”

In real sense, the people of the Czechoslovakia were enacting the power of Truth, as Gandhi had defined it as and as Havel reinterpreted it, as ‘living in truth’. Havel had chosen this as his motif, having early in his youth rejected automatic subservience to those in authority and instead determining to search for truth in forbidden books and thoughts.

Under intense pressure, some Federal Assembly parliamentarians resigned from their positions, making room for opposition representatives to join the national legislative body. The first gathering of the incoming parliament, on 28th December 1989, produced a new – yet not so new – chairman in Alexander Dubcek. The assembly gathered on 29th December and unanimously elected Vaclav Havel president of the Czechoslovak Republic. Two months earlier he had been in prison, condemned as a dissident playwright. Havel consistently pleaded for no retribution but only reconciliation. The new statesman recognized that the revolution’s end could evoke feelings of joy, then crisis and, only afterward, catharsis. Havel believed that an essential part of the process
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necessary for rebuilding the country was to be truthful, to possess a willingness to forgive, to take personal responsibility and create an atmosphere of love.  

A difficult road was ahead for the Czechs and Slovaks as Havel’s pleas for reconciliation, morality and truth were not easily attainable. Executing a nonviolent revolution was demanding enough, but after all the joy and tears that went with freedom, the hard work of construction and reconstruction remained to be done. “Before, it was very simple”, a childhood friend of Havel’s noted. “Differentiating between good and evil was much easier.” By the end of his first year in office, the name of the country as a whole had been formally changed by law from Czechoslovakia to the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic. Three years after Havel took office, in 1993, the Slovaks voted to secede. Havel thus ultimately became president of the Czech Republic.

In 1979, he was sentenced to four and a half years in prison and later on also he was to stay in jails for many times up to three years more. Like Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr. and Nelson Mandela, Havel also used to write in jail and these writings became the inspiration for the outer world. He devoted his life to avoiding the trap of thinking that people were powerless against government forces. To that end, he has written influential essays on totalitarianism, dissent, the origins of power and, perhaps most significantly, on “living on earth”.

According to Dalai Lama – another personality advocating and propagating nonviolence, remarked that Havel “was one of the few world leaders... who remained completely devoted to peace, non-violence and

---

moral responsibility". Accordingly, Vaclav Havel’s life is proof of the power of ideas, and his movement, Charter 77, is the evidence of the power of revolutionary nonviolence.

As one of the volunteers has said that Gandhi would have pleased to see our nonviolent approach towards the mighty people, yes he has rightly said it. The way they had taken care of the situations, they were just like Gandhi’s own Satyagraha movements of South Africa and India. **No Middle Path for Peace Pilgrims:** Working for peace with different groups, one could notice that so many were angry people. A part of them could understand anger at injustice and violence. But as individuals, it was difficult to connect these seemingly ‘noble’ feelings with the same strong feelings that create the hated ‘Other’, and support the ‘logic’ of aggression or retaliation. However, peace on earth can only begin with inner peace. One person put this realization into action. She came to be known simply as ‘Peace Pilgrim’. In 1952 Mildred Norman, traveling along, became the first woman to hike the entire length of the 2,050-mile-long Appalachian Trail in the US. She kept walking all her life, talking to people about peace, criss-crossing the US six times. Dressed in her trademark blue slacks and tunic with pockets that held her meager possessions, she carried no money, and went without food until it was offered or she found it in the wild. The Peace Pilgrim’s walk for peace was prompted by McCarthyism and the Korean War. She said, “There was a great fear at that time, and it was safest to be apathetic. It was… most certainly the time for a pilgrim to step forward, because a pilgrim’s job is to rouse people from apathy and make them think.” Today, the
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possibility of a US-led attack on Iraq has created a similar situation. In such a situation, apathy can be dangerous.\footnote{157}

According to the Golden Rule, “If you want to have friends, you must be friendly,” and, “if you want to make peace, you must be peaceful.” Achieving peace within your life is a pre-requisite for world peace. “Inner peace is not found by living life on the surface or by escapism… Inner peace is found by living life squarely, solving its problems, and delving as far beneath its surface as possible…”\footnote{158}

Through trial and error, the Peace Pilgrim worked out her ‘Steps to Inner Peace.’ Once she attained inner peace she was on fire to share it with everyone. She often said she could not have become a pilgrim without having first gained inner peace.

The Peace Pilgrim was increasingly convinced that wandering was unnecessary, the ‘pilgrim’ could happen right where one was. The real journey was inner. Deep within, we all desire peace on earth, we would speak for peace if we were not bound by apathy, ignorance or fear. The primary job of peacemakers is to inspire us to be less apathetic, to dispel ignorance with truth, to allay fear with faith that God’s laws work – and for good.\footnote{159}

**Case of Thailand: A Transnational Movement for Democracy, Human Rights and Nonviolence:**

Behind the glitter and pomp, despite the serenity and the languid pace, the Thai people experienced a long history of violence and authoritarian rule as the military apparatus had hidden behind the moral authority of the monarchy. However, Thailand has always presented a
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friendly hand to other nations, and its respectable image has helped it to escape the harsh judgments expressed about other military regimes.\textsuperscript{160}

It has been observed that movements that champion democracy and human rights have come and gone in Thailand for years. Brutal military suppression, endorsed by unelected prime ministers who came to power through coups, consistently interfered with expressions of the populace's desire for a more just and democratic homeland. Out of ten eventful military coups, five were "intended to overthrow civilian governments and dissolve parliament".\textsuperscript{161} Trapped in a cycle of coups, authoritarian rule, countermoved toward democracy and, finally, collapsed – usually leading to yet another coup by the military forces – political stability thus escaped the Thai people. The strength and unity of the military, the most structured interest in Thailand, has given it sufficient leavers to overwhelm any civilian government whenever it chooses.\textsuperscript{162} As a result, this cycle has hampered the development of civilian political parties and organizations. "Political parties failed to organize, strengthen and develop in the way the military was able to do", and when civilian rule could not take hold, "military coups became institutionalized", states Suchit Bunbongkarn, a noted expert on the Thai military.\textsuperscript{163}

Just like Gandhi in Indian freedom struggle, Sulak Sivaraksa, amongst the Thai people, refused to accept the violence and authoritarian rule of the Thai military forces and fought the explosion in Thai commercialism. Through lectures and books, and exploring the concepts of love and nonviolence in the Gandhian and Buddhist traditions, he fought the dictatorships of the armed forces. Born in 1933 to an upper-
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middle-class Siamese family, Sivaraksa grew up with aspirations of becoming the country's prime minister. Like Gandhi, he traveled throughout the country to understand their concerns and perspectives. He also voiced his criticism of the war in Viet Nam. He was perturbed by the predicaments facing his country, which made him re-evaluate the direction he wanted for his life. 

The life of Sulak Sivaraksa is quite similar to that of Gandhi, like Gandhi, he also started a journal 'Social Science Review', which offered a forum for alternative points of view. In the stifled atmosphere of dictatorship and propaganda, the publication quickly became the leading journal for the nation's intellectuals and a prized outlet for the venting of opinions and the circulation of ideas. Young people who were attracted by the journal began meeting under the tutelage of Sivaraksa to discuss alternative political concepts and air proposals for their own actions.

During the late 1960s and early 1970s, the young leader-editor attended two Quaker seminars. These seminars, along with his Buddhist background, helped to solidify his conclusions about nonviolent struggle as a method of resistance. While attending a World Council of Churches meeting in Sri Lanka, Sivaraksa met Thich Nhat Hanh, a Vietnamese Buddhist monk who was to have a profound effect on him and has since provided lasting friendship and counsel. In 1963, under the leadership of Sulak Sivaraksa, the Buddhist monks and nuns of Viet Nam used the various techniques like, fasting, petitions, the singing of satirical songs, acceptance of arrests by the thousands, the carrying of family altars into streets to protest the movement of tanks and self-immolation

Sivaraksa was also very much influenced from the writings of Gandhi. He was aware of certain similarities between his own experiences in England – studying the law and being called to the bar – and those of Gandhi; he maintains that Gandhi is still a force in Thailand today. He claims that Gandhi’s proposals for nonviolent struggle, self-reliance, pride in one’s roots and culture and concerns about the impact of technology are vital issues. Gandhi was concerned that machines and technology displace human labour and add to the concentration of power in a few hands. If Gandhi’s words resonate for the Thai people, much of the explanation is due to Sivaraksa; in a personal way, Gandhi serves as a point of reference for him.167 Regarding Gandhi, he says:

“His adherence to truth and nonviolence and his fighting the British with these two principles convinced me that we can actually fight with nonviolence against any gigantic organization, or any violent ideology, or even the promotion of greed through consumerism.”168

In 1968, he founded the Sathirakoses-Nagapradipa Foundation, which worked on many fields and also as a meditation centre. Again in 1976 and in 1980, on the same principles, the groups reorganize themselves with Coordinating Group on Religion and Society and Thai Inter-Religious Commission for Development (TICD) respectively. The coordinating group offered a nonviolent alternative to the extreme choices offered by the political spectrum, which often seemed to be the

only options. It also worked to save the lives of students following a violent coup d'état in October 1976, in which hundreds of youth were killed in their efforts to block the military takeover. After the military coup of 1976 that overthrew the elected government, Sivaraksa went into self-imposed exile, fearing that he would be arrested for his efforts in the community. He continued his activism from abroad until able to return home without fear of arrest.

Sivaraksa's activities were sidetracked by another military takeover in 1991. General Suchinda Krapayoon came to power in February, as a result of a coup d'état that ended a government led by Chatchai Choonavan, Thailand's first civilian leader to be popularly elected in modern times.169

But in December 1991, Thailand's fifteenth constitution was drafted with the idea of making Thai society more democratic. The apparent display of interest in democracy meant little to those who had been banished or were trying to withstand the authoritarian rule of the coup leaders. Sivaraksa was not the only one dissatisfied with the dictatorship of Suchinda; moreover, the fruits of his labours had ripened to the point of mass action. In May 1992, tens of thousands took to the streets in the largest protests Thailand had seen in decades.170 The military was quick to respond. Soldiers clashed with the peaceful throngs that had gathered to voice their desire for constitutional amendments; they proclaimed their desire to make the post of Prime Minister an elected position, and demanded the resignation of General Suchinda, who had broken a pervious promise and appointed himself Prime Minister.

This time also many of the unarmed nonviolent people killed in this process and many were arrested by the army.

It was King Bhumibol Adulyadej, who brought the killings to halt. Fundamental to the concept of kingship in Buddhist cultures is the idea that rulers take “the principle of nonviolence and noninjury as the ideal basis of statecraft.” In a televised admonition, the king used his unique position in Thai society to bring an end to the strife. He brought together in an audience the Prime Minister and a leader of the prodemocracy movement. He admonished them, saying that the country’s fate rested in the swift resolution of the conflict. The King’s call for the cessation of the military crackdown on demonstrators was able to bring an end to the repression and chaos. When the week of strife ended. On this account, Suchinda has to resign. After this a number of reforms were instituted to strengthen the basis for democracy. The constitution drafted at that time has remained in effect and five amendments have been added. The most significant provision for the nonviolent protesters – a byproduct of their toil – is the Fourth Amendment, which alters Article 159 and came into force in September 1992. It stipulates that the Prime Minister must be a member of the elected House of Representatives, appointed by the King, and approved by the Speaker of the House, who is also elected. The salient protections of this amendment are now embodied in the constitution as Article 163. In other words, the road to becoming premier of Thailand now runs through democratic elections rather than military coup. The Fifth Amendment came into force in February 1995 and makes the constitution still more democratic, including guarantees of

173. Amendments provided by Vijavat Isarabhakdi, first secretary (political), Royal Thai Embassy (Washington, D. C., 29 March 1996), Fax.
individual freedoms, equal rights regardless of gender and the right of access to state information. The nonviolent direct action encouraged by Sivaraksa had made its mark.

The on going discussion proves the efficacy of non-violence and accordingly, it can be said that Gandhi’s teachings of truth and nonviolence are still relevant and effective and they can be applied anywhere, provided we tend to follow them in the same spirit as practiced by Gandhi himself.

**Spain Blasts: Millions March Against Terror:** After Millions of Spaniards flooded the streets in condemnation of deadly train bombings, the wounded nation turned toward Sunday’s General Elections with questions about the blasts unanswered.

An estimated 11 million people, more than a quarter of the population, took part in marches on Friday to condemn the violence of Thursday, when 10 bombs exploded in four packed commuter trains, killing 199 and wounding 1500. The Friday night protests grew raucous and festive at times, but more serene mourning was expected on Saturday, when a funeral service for 40 victims was set in Alcala de Henares, a town east of Madrid where investigators believed the bombs might have been put on board the trains.¹⁷⁴

**Other Instances:** In addition to the foregoing examples there were in the olden days in China extremely effective economic boycotts, non-violent in outer form, against foreign goods. Soon after the First World War the coal miners of the Ruhr, in Germany, engaged in a predominately non-violent strike and non-co-operation movement against the French Government. It was so nearly successful that the victory of the French was really pyrrhic. In 1952 and again in 1957 in Johannesburg, South Africa, there were impressive non-violent struggles by non-whites against

---

the white-supremacist Government. These were only two “battles” in what promised to be a long struggle. In March 1957, after a ten-year non-violent struggle under the leadership of Kwame Nkrumah, what was formerly the British colony of the Gold Coast became the independent country of Ghana, in the British Commonwealth. Nkrumah knew of Gandhi and deliberately followed his method and advocated its use by all the African colonial peoples for attaining their freedom.

The principle of non-violent resistance had been conceived and applied independently by numerous seers and courageous people in many different countries. Among them were Lao-tzu, Buddha, the Jain Tirthankaras, Jesus, St. Francis of Assisi, George Fox, Henry David Thoreau, Leo Tolstoy and many others too numerous to mention. But Gandhi was the outstanding person in modern times who worked out the theory and applied it to mass movements in organized corporate fashion, and proved the validity of this extension by actual successful campaigns in numerous difficult situations. It seems probable that this method will be used increasingly in the coming years, especially since total war is now at stalemate because of nuclear and hydrogen bombs.

The method is adapted not merely to Oriental psychology and modes of thinking, feeling, acting and living. Its success does not depend on a value system shared by both parties to the struggle. Its record shows successful use by illiterate peasants and city-bred intellectuals, by saints and the ordinary run of mankind, rich and poor, property owners and homeless vagabonds, women as well as men, by meat eaters and vegetarians, Europeans and Americans, Negroes and Whites, Chinese and Indians, by the religious-minded and those not so accounted. It has been used successfully in political, economic and social conflicts, and against armed invasion by ruthless and highly disciplined troops. It has been used successfully by individuals and groups, both large and small.
No War Cry Joins Crowd Around the World: Washington: Activists poured on to the streets around the World on Saturday (January 18, 2003) in mass protests against an attack on Iraq as UN arms chiefs headed to Baghdad to tell its leaders cooperation was the only way to avoid war.

With Washington massing troops and equipment in the Gulf and Baghdad declaring itself mobilised for battle, tens of thousands of demonstrators in Europe, Asia and the America beat drums, clogged traffic and chanted slogans denouncing a US – led war on Iraq.

In West Asia, the protests sounded a more ominous note as thousands of demonstrators in Beirut carrying Palestinian and Iraqi flags chanted: “Sign your name on a suicide attack on US interests, so we can fight an American attack along with Iraq.”

With the clock ticking on a possible war with Iraq, those opposed to an attack mobilised with a new sense of urgency. Outside of the American Embassy in Moscow, protesters held banners that read: “Iraq isn’t your ranch, Mr. Bush” and “USA is International Terrorist No. 1” and shouted “US, hands off Iraq!”

In Britain, Washington’s staunchest ally on Iraq, demonstrations were planned in London, Birmingham, Manchester and Nottingham. Tens of thousands of Syrians marched through the streets of Damascus, blocking traffic for hours, to protest against what they saw as a US plan to attack a fellow Arab state.

Similarly, about 1,000 demonstrators protested in Central Cairo against any US led strike on Iraq, security sources said. The demonstrators called on the Egyptian Government to prevent US and British warships from using the Suez Canal en route for a possible assault on Iraq.

Thousands of Japanese gathered in central Tokyo and in the Pakistani city of Rawalpindi, a few thousand people formed a human chain to condemn any US led attack.

In France, where President Chirac said a unilateral attack by the US would violate international law, left-wing parties, trade unions and peace groups planned to hold rallies in Paris and several provincial cities.\footnote{Ibid.}

**Anti-virus Package for Human Mind:**

The present age is computer based, so another aspect of the life can be seen with the help of the computer and its related products or the programmes. Such example related with our life has been taken up by Mr. Akhil Chandra, who has written ‘Anti-Virus Package For Human Mind.’\footnote{The Times of India, Op. Cit., Monday, November 10, 2003, p. 10.} A computer virus, *Blaster*, infected several computer networks across continents recently, disrupting all normal functions, creating havoc in the business world. During the vicious virus attack, the utilization of the Central Processing Unit (CPU) of the computer – which is its main tank – was found to be extremely high, overshooting all permissible limits and causing computers to behave in an abnormal fashion.

The human mind is often compared to a computer. In fact, we can draw an interesting analogy between a computer virus attack and the mind being plagued by virus-like evil thoughts. The human mind, too, needs to protect itself by sharing up goodness, through right thinking and living. This will help us immunize ourselves against virus-like corrupting influences.

Honesty, compassion and charity are virtues programmed into the human mind by God. All we have got to do is respond to and build on these virtues spontaneously and this doesn’t require much mind processing. These virtues are so natural that responding to them requires minimum or ‘low CPU utilisation’. Since the mind does not get loaded...
during such reactions, it remains relatively stress-free and normal. Undesirable attributes like falsehood, hate, jealousy, deception, fraud, oppression, anger, hypocrisy and arrogance are like computer viruses that cause the mind to function in an abnormal manner, overloading CPU utilisation. This in turn creates further negative reactions like anxiety, fear, suspicion, trauma and guilt, breaking down the mind’s immunity to evil viruses.

A “virus-infected” mind in turn severely affects the health of the body which in turn affects the individual’s general well being. In contrast, virtues are divine by nature and help to keep mind and human body in good form.

Krishna says in the Bhagavad Gita (Chapter 16.3): “Sublimity, forbearance, forgiveness, fortitude, purity, bearing enmity to one, absence of ego-these are the marks of him who in turn with the divine gifts.” So, like anti-virus programmes designed to thwart virus attacks in computers, we, too, have to protect ourselves from getting carried away by demonic, virus-like attributes.

A vengeful mind recalls past ill-events from memory, reprocessing them repeatedly, causing further stress and strain and possibly leading to a complete breakdown. Forgiveness is a stress-buster; it helps release pent-up negative feelings and helps bring CPU utilisation levels of the mind once again to normalcy. It is said in the Bible that “to err is human; to forgive is divine.” The practice of yoga, too, helps us to clear the dirt of our minds. Particularly effective is the Shavaasan posture which reduces mind processing to the bare minimum, taking us closer to a state of divinity.

Like firewalls designed to protect computers from virus attacks, the human mind too, can institute safeguards, “firewalls” of right conduct as
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out lined by Krishna in the Gita (Chapter No. 16.2): “Non-violence in Thought, Word and Deed, Truthfulness and geniality of Speech, absence of anger even on provocation... composure of mind, abstaining from malicious gossip, compassion towards all creatures, absence of attachment to the objects of senses... mildness, a sense of shame in transgressing against the scriptures or usage and abstaining from frivolous pursuits.”

Unscrupulous and infected minds will continue to allow harmful viruses to thrive, but the onus is on us to deflect all temptations that is likely to provide the fertile ground for evil-virus breeding. A secure environment can be created through perseverance and discipline.

Here, in this part we will try to look at how the entity of nonviolence has been treated in peace research. Has it been promoted as the lodestar to follow, come what may, (i.e., the Utopianist position) or has it been argued with an awareness of possible contradictions and the existence of developmental violence (i.e., the constructive position)?

We can see that there are examples of both the positions: the dominant mode of application has, however, been the Utopianist. The clearest example of this is of course the instances where nonviolence is put forward as the brilliant solution to all our problems of change. All that is necessary is to discover the road of nonviolence and a better world is right around the corner:

As a non-Machiavellian and non-Marxist alternative to global transformation, our orientation shies away from managerial quick fixes of (liberal) reformist strategy as well as political-structural quick fixes of (Marxist) revolutionary
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strategy... There is a third alternative – a nonviolent revolutionary praxis for the transition from value commitment to principled action. Both Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King (Jr.), have given concrete political expression to nonviolent protest, nonviolent non-cooperation, and nonviolent intervention. The key to nonviolent revolutionary praxis for transition politics is not winning political power but generating the political consciousness and mobilization required to challenge and transform an unjust social order rooted in violence.183

When Gandhi began his experiments, “the dominant note all over India was one of waiting or expectation full of hope and yet tinged with fear and anxiety.”184

We thus see, that to be a real devotee is to realize oneself. Self-realization is not something apart. One rupee can purchase for us poison or nectar, but knowledge or devotion can’t buy us either salvation or bondage. These are not media of exchange. They are themselves the substance we want. In other words if the means and the end are not identical, then the problem can not be solved. The extreme of means is salvation and salvation of the Gita is perfect peace.185

While on the one hand it is beyond dispute that all action binds, on the other hand it is equally true that all living beings have to do some work. Here all activity, whether mental or physical, is to be included in the term action. Then how is one to be free from the bondage of action, even though he may be acting? The manner in which the Gita has solved

the problem is, to my knowledge, unique. The Gita says: “Do your allotted work but renounce its fruit – be detached and work – have no desire for reward and work.”186

The Power of Love: According to Rev. Jose “Chencho” Alas, there are two ways to resolve a conflict among people; one is through the power of the mind and the heart, the other one is through the power of canons. So it is very clear that the first one has to do with conviction, the second is the fruit of imposition. That is why the first one has instrument of power of the words, whereas the second has the power of the bullets. These two ways of resolving conflicts can not avoid violence that is part of our spirit. But there are two kinds of violence, one that is irrational, based in greed, and the other one that is rational, based in love. Jesus said: “Do not think that I have come to bring peace to the world. No. I did not come to bring peace, but a sword.” (Mt. 10, 34) From this quotation, we can better understand that the ‘Sword’ here is not the one that serves to kill people. He prevented peter, his disciple, from using the sword, when he was arrested “All who take the sword will die by the sword.” (Mt. 26, 52)

The same thought was also generated by Gandhi, ‘As human beings, our greatness lies not so much in being able to remake the world as in being able to remake ourselves.’ The prophets have the power of the worlds. They denounce the structure of sin, what is wrong in society, in ourselves; and announce the kingdom of love, understanding, reconciliation, solidarity. They proclaim a world without violence against others. It doesn’t matter where they come from, what their origin, religion or faith, they have in common the only “salvific” word for human beings, understanding and love. Jesus, Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King (Jr.), Archbishop Oscar Romero affirmed their faith in mankind, that is what they shared and for that they gave their lives. This

fact is open to the world that they do not silence the others with guns, they open their ears and hearts to hear the others and walk together in this life, on this violent planet. That is the basic and big difference between a general and a prophet.187

The events of Somalia and Yugoslavia have revealed alarming tensions in our post-cold-war world. One response to these tensions has been quite understandably the increased calls for UN Peacekeeping operations. The use of this type of intervention has evolved dramatically - with more operations in the four years 1988-1992 than in the previous forty - but far from adequately. General Secretary Boutros-Ghali called for expanding the UN’s mandate from ‘peacekeeping’ to ‘peacemaking’ and called for a standing peacemaking force. On the first point there is widespread agreement but no one has a clear cut idea about what UN peacemaking would be like and as for the second point there is understandable resistance from many quarters to the idea of a standing UN army, especially now that UN military operations have come under the cloud of superpower domination during the Gulf War. We all are caught in the dilemma of ignoring desperate calls for help or responding with military force which is increasingly problematic whether under UN auspices or not. One way or the other, as NATO head John Shalikasahvili said early in 1992, ‘the days of pristine peacekeeping as we have understood it for years are probably over.’ His solution was a NATO-former Warsaw Pact global police force.188 Nonviolent peacekeeping – also known as peace witnessing, interpositionary peace bridges and so forth – uses means that are more congruent with such ends. And that makes all the difference. One of the cardinal principles of non-violence

in Gandhi’s words, that “means are everything”. Classical peacekeeping can reduce a conflict (when it works) but cannot lead to long-term peace. We do not call for the abandonment of armed peacekeeping (at least not before a viable alternative is in place), but the theory and the actual history of nonviolent peacemaking show it to be much more effective not only in the short term (surprisingly enough it seems to be not only more effective but safer than peacekeeping by force of arms), but in the long-term project of leading to an eventual regime of stable peace.

**Indo-Pak Peace Process: Present Status:** The normalization process between India and Pakistan is progressing on the right track: There is reason for satisfaction that Indo-Pakistan relations have moved in the right direction on the margins of the 12th SAARC Summit in Islamabad. In some respects, the outcome of discussions between Atal Bihari Vajpayee and Pervez Musharraf went beyond expectations, and not only because of the disturbing ambiguities which characterized New Delhi’s public pronouncements on the possibilities of bilateral discussions with Pakistani leaders during the summit. The results of the discussions went beyond what was expected in the context of policy statements made by New Delhi before the SAARC Summit. Not only some significant decisions were taken to move forward in the process of normalization, but a road map for further interaction was also clearly stated at the end of the visit.

It was agreed that the present ceasefire will be extended indefinitely. It was announced that the bilateral dialogue will be resumed by February and that the dialogue will cover a composite agenda, including issues related to J & K. Vajpayee and Musharraf agreed that high level political contacts will be sustained regardless of the ups and downs in Indo-Pakistan relations.
While India expressed its willingness to discuss issues related to J&K, Pakistan pledged that it would not allow any terrorist activity from territories under its control. There was also an agreement that within the framework of the additional protocol on countering terrorism, India and Pakistan will cooperate in combating the menace. It is worthwhile examining the progress made so far in Indo-Pakistan peace efforts since April 2003 and to speculate on what constructive steps could be taken to make substantial progress for normalizing relations. The suggestions and proposals made so far, some of which are in the process of being implemented, are essentially confidence building measures aimed at creating a positive atmosphere for restoring dialogue scheduled for February, 2004. India rather moved forward beyond these CBMs and addressed the substance of the issues affecting Indo-Pakistan relations. The official dialogue resumed from February had the following objectives in the agenda: the Directors-Generals of Military Operations (DGMOS) of both countries should meet once every three months to ensure a continuation of the ceasefire and to maintain peace and stability on the LOC. This arrangement should go beyond ‘hotline’ telephone connections existing between the two DGMOS, and which hopefully now stand activated. The meetings between DGMOS should continue regardless of marginal violence that occurs in J&K.189

In an another significant manner, Indian and Pakistani sides on January 13, 2004, agreed to an increase in the fare of the Lahore-New Delhi bus service, additional buses to meet the passenger rush and renew the agreement till 2008. The agreement was first signed in February 17, 1999. The service was disrupted two years later in December after the attack on the Indian Parliament. The service was resumed in July, 2003. Suggesting renewal of the agreement, Pakistan also reportedly proposed

stopovers at Amritsar, Kartarpur and Panipat. Since the two countries were poised to resume the Samjhautha Express service between Lahore and Attari from January 15, those interested in traveling to Punjab could use the train, the Indian representative suggested. Pakistan also proposed a bus service between Lahore and Amritsar. Later, the proposal was taken up separately.  

**Come What May, Non-violence has a Chance:**  
Giving a determined push to their blossoming bilateral relationship, India & Pakistan on Wednesday 18, 2004, announced an ambitious “roadmap” for talks and meetings aimed at a peaceful settlement of all bilateral issues, including Kashmir.

They also decided that the two foreign ministers will meet to take stock of the progress made. Kashmir and the omnibus peace and security, including confidence-building measures to be the subject of talks when the two foreign secretaries meet in New Delhi in May-June. In a significant manner both the sides agreed upon the following points that from both sides the Director Generals of India & Pakistan Rangers and Inspector Generals, Border Security Force would also interact, the foreign secretaries would meet to promote peace between the two countries. CBMs, Kashmir, expects to discuss Nuclear CBMs. While the six other subjects of the composite dialogue – Siachen, Wuller Barrage, Sir Creek, terrorism and drug trafficking, economic and commercial cooperation, and the promotion of friendly exchanges in various fields were to be taken up by officials in the month of July, in Islamabad. As already mentioned, the foreign and external affairs ministers were also expected to sit and review the overall progress in the month of August, 2004.

---

In another positive side, the Pakistan President Pervez Musharraf, speaking before a Conference of religious teachers in Islamabad, ordered an “end to a jihad led by individuals” and sought the resolution of the “freedom struggle” in Kashmir through dialogue, the announcement of a reinvented composite dialogue between India & Pakistan in May-June was nearly reduced to a sideshow.

While addressing a big gathering, General Musharraf said, “Individuals can’t undertake jihad when and where they like. The decision to undertake jihad can only be given by the government. We have to show (to the world) that we are responsible people. (As for) the freedom struggle going on Kashmir, we have to resolve this through dialogue… with India.”

While announcing the agreed schedule at a crowded press conference, Pakistan’s Foreign Secretary Riaz Khokhar said both sides had “agreed they would approach the composite dialogue with the sincere desire to discuss and arrive at a peaceful settlement of all bilateral issues, including Jammu & Kashmir, to the satisfaction of both sides.” The reiteration of the significant portion of the January 6 statement between the former Prime Minister Vajpayee and President Musharraf, “to the satisfaction of both sides.” With officials from both Foreign Offices wreathed in smiles, reiterating that they had concluded this round of “talks about talks” in a spirit of camaraderie, and assuring cynical journalists about their determination to move ahead “on all fronts”, the obvious change from past bureaucratic hostility and indifference was clearly apparent.

193. Ibid.
In this respect, the interview of Moulvi Abbas Ansari with Arun Joshi is quite significant to mention here:  

Q: How do you view the recent talks between India and Pakistan?  
A: it is good step. I am sure this has resulted in reducing distances and differences between the two countries. Much of the bitterness too has melted. An atmosphere of goodwill and peace has been created and now there is need to maintain and sustain this atmosphere.

Q: How is it good for the people of Jammu and Kashmir?  
A: Once the two countries start talking, we the people in Kashmir, may not be able to shake hands with the people across the borders. But we can exhibit our sense of relief and joy by waving our hands to each other. We will get rid of the shelling and the violence.

Q: But how does it affect any solution to the Kashmir crisis?  
A: When Delhi and Islamabad talk, peace will come and we will get rid of the bloodshed and violence. We are dying everyday. Kashmiris are going into graves. We want an end to it. I am sure when India and Pakistan bring down the walls of their hatred, a solution to the Kashmir crisis will also emerge.

After the change in the regime of Indian Government from May, 2004, onwards, the two sides (India & Pakistan) are making good efforts to establish the good relations with each other. In this segment, both sides External Affairs Minister counterparts have met in China for the Asia

All Parties Hurriyat Conference Chairman, Moulvi Abbas Ansari was basking in the spotlight of the media ahead of his talks with the former Deputy Prime Minister L. K. Advani. He believed that the recent Indo-Pak talks in Islamabad had opened a new chapter of peace for Kashmir. He told Arun Joshi that there was a need to sustain this atmosphere of peace and friendship that was crucial for peace in the region.
Cooperation Dialogue Meet on June 21, 2004, where in the two meetings, they did discuss Jammu and Kashmir, nuclear questions and other bilateral issues. According to the spokesperson of the Ministry of External Affairs, “The two ministers also agreed to remain in touch and provide continuous political guidance to the ongoing (peace) process”. After the meeting, Natwar Singh told reporters that “the Chemistry was pretty good”, while Kasuri said they discussed “all the issues that are necessary for us to discuss” and he further added that “we had a very positive frame of mind towards all issues.”

In the further developments from both sides, on June 27, 2004 at New Delhi, both the countries agreed on Nuclear-Confidence-Building-Measures and both sides agreed on opening the consulates in Mumbai and Karachi and both agreed on release of civilian prisoners, PoWs and fishermen.

If we see these events in the light of Violent and Non-violent means to resolve the conflicts, then we can say soundly that the later part is more effective and more suitable and sustainable to the mankind.

**Breakthrough in Lanka Talks:**

**Path to Peace:**

July 23, 1983: Beginning of LTTE’s Guerilla War,
July 8, 1985: Talks with LTTE in Bhutan fail,
January 26, 1998: LTTE banned,
December 30, 1999: President Chandrika invites Norway to help negotiate peace,
December 5, 2001: Prime Minister Wickremesinghe revives peace effort,
February 22, 2002: Ceasefire announced,

September 4, 2002: Ban on LTTE lifted,
September 18, 2002: LTTE drops state demand. While speaking from Sattahip (Thailand), Tamil Tiger rebels wrapped up a historic peace conference on Wednesday demanding only self-determination, and not full independence from Sri Lanka. This is the clearest sign yet that they are determined to negotiate an end to 19 years of bloody civil war.197

Ending three days of talks, the two sides announced major progress in peace making, and agreed to meet again in Thailand on Oct. 31 – Nov. 3, Dec. 2-5 and Jan. 6-9 to discuss substantive issues. Balasingham’s comments on self-determination are seen as a major shift in the Tamil Tigers’ position, who in the past had been ambiguous about what homeland meant.198

Sri Lankan Government and Tamil Tiger rebels agreed on December 6, 2002 to work out a federal model granting regional autonomy for the island nation in a breakthrough in efforts to end a 19-year separatist war.

Both parties made an unprecedented historic decision, rebel negotiator Anton Balasingham said after four days of Norwegian-brokered peace talks in an Oslo hotel with chief government negotiator G. L. Peiris. The accord on limited autonomy for Tamil areas is a big step towards ending the separatist conflict in which 64,000 people have died. The rebels last month dropped the North and East of the island.

According to the decision, this federal model would be within a federal Sri Lanka, Balasingham said. The parties decided to explore a political solution founded on internal self-determination based on a federal structure within a united Sri Lanka, said Norwegian Deputy Foreign Minister Vidar Helgesen, who hosted the talks.

197. Ibid.
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See Also: The Indian Express, Chandigarh, Friday, December 6, 2002, p. 10.
Present Situation in the World Against Violence and Practical Implication of Non-violence:

Throughout the world, the divide between ordinary people and politicians is growing. It’s important to recognize that divide. Post-September 11, bewildered Americans asked ‘Why do they hate us?’ A mood of introspection crept in. And most thinking Americans are horrified at the way their government’s foreign policy has wreaked havoc on the economies and the fortunes of Latin America, Africa and Asia. People have begun asking why their money was used to create and support Saddam Hussein, why he was supplied arms and nerve gas? Who created Osama Bin Laden? Not every American is willing to but the axis of evil theory.

In the mid-1950s, the pacifist fellowship of Reconciliation, learning of famine in the Chinese mainland, launched a ‘fed thine enemy’ campaign. Members and friends mailed thousands of little bags of rice to the White House with a tag quoting the Bible, “If thine enemy hunger, feed him.”199

The President did not acknowledge receipt of the bags publicly, certainly, no rice was ever sent to China. What non-violent activist only learned a decade later was that the campaign played a significant, perhaps even determining role in preventing nuclear war? Twice while the campaign was pending, President Eisenhower met with the Joint Chiefs of Staff to consider US options in the conflict with China over two islands, Quemoy and Matsu. The generals twice recommended the use of nuclear weapons. President Eisenhower each time turned to his aide and asked how many little bags of rice had come in. They numbered tens of thousands. Eisenhower told the generals that as long as so many Americans were expressing active interest in having the US feed the

Chinese, he certainly wasn’t going to consider using nuclear weapons against them.

Arthur Schlesinger Jr., Kennedy’s adviser, and twice Pulitzer Prize winner, provides a refreshing account in Newsweek, of the history of dissent and debate in America. In the midst of America’s greatest war, the Supreme Court upheld the right of students to resist being compelled to salute their flag or pledge allegiance to it. This verdict was handed down on Flag Day 1943 even as young US Soldiers laid down their lives for their country. Americans have always cherished their independence and defended it to the death. Schlesinger points out that dissent and debate is essential before people are sent out to kill and be killed.

Forty-one of America’s most brilliant minds have come out against an attack on Iraq. Nobel laureates in Science and Economics signed a statement saying an unprovoked strike on Saddam Hussein would damage the security and standing of the US, even if it was successful. Eighteen of them received the national medal of Science, America’s highest Science Honour. More were ready to sign up. The ‘Not in Our Name’ petition was signed by 45,000 public figures, including actor Martin Sheen, Lord of the Rings star Viggo Mortenson, Susan Sarandon, rapper Mos Def, Jane Fonda and Yoko Ono.

In December 2003, more than 100 entertainers, including academy award winner Kim Basinger, Helen Hunt and Matt Damon, sent President Bush a letter warning of the domestic consequences of war. However, he continued to ignore public opinion. Actress Susan Sarandon asked: “Before our kids start coming home from Iraq in body bags and women and children start dying in Baghdad, I need to know, what did Iraq do to us?” Former US Ambassador to Iraq Edward Peck, who was also deputy director of former President Ronald Reagan’s terrorism task force, replied: “The answer is nothing. Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11,
nothing to do with Al-Qaida, its neighbours don’t think it’s a threat. Invading Iraq will increase terrorism, not reduce it.\textsuperscript{200}

The world is not against the war. It just doesn’t want it in its name. That is the individualistic, ‘me-generation’ slogan coined for this particular period of ferment in the countdown to daisycutters and B52 bombers over Baghdad. One can appreciate the alliterative cadence of the sentiment, but ‘Not in his Name’ is surely the weakest, most apologetic, unexceptionably polite and lily-livered disagreement ever to be voiced in opposition to an ugly militaristic make-over plan. Is it any surprise then that most of the anti-war lobby fully expects war to go ahead? Can one wonder that late on Friday night, just hours before London’s largest anti-war demonstration in recent times, protesters were actually ruminating on the inevitability of the War? Even in Chirac’s stridently anti-war Paris, pacifists led by Patti Smith, American rock legend, expect barely to make themselves heard above the roar of British fighter jets across the English Channel.

\textbf{Here it would be significant to mention the Euro Vision: According to the Euro Vision:\textsuperscript{201}}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>WHY</th>
<th>FOR EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacifism</td>
<td>War Kills people</td>
<td>Church groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateralism</td>
<td>War okay only with UN backing &amp; parliamentary vote</td>
<td>Labour politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolationism</td>
<td>Where’s Britain’s Interest?</td>
<td>Conservatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenery</td>
<td>War bad for environment</td>
<td>Country side lovers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Zionism</td>
<td>Attack Ariel Sharon instead</td>
<td>Muslims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leftism</td>
<td>Make Blair sweat</td>
<td>Trotskyists, communists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatism</td>
<td>War okay in principle but</td>
<td>Arabists, ex-generals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{200} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{201} Ahmed, Rashmee Z, “Has the Anti-war Slogan Turned into an Anthem of Despair?” in Sunday Times of India, New Delhi/Chandigarh, Sunday, February 16, 2003, p. 12.
It was one cry: Peace, Peace, Peace: Organisers of anti-war rallies argued that well over 10 million people jammed streets around the globe, in what could be the biggest coordinated peace protest ever seen in the world in order to oppose the United States plans to invade Iraq. The combined estimates of demonstration organisers around the world put the total of protesters at some 11.5 million, while the police and other officials estimates suggested something like eight million.

After a day of massive protests on Saturday across Asia, Europe, Africa and the Middle East, big rallies took place in the US, notably near the UN headquarters in New York. Organisers estimated the final turnout at the New York demonstration to be as high as 250,000 more than double the 100,000 expected. In Hollywood, citizens and movie stars marched to protest a possible war led by the actor Martin Sheen. Carrying a banner proclaiming “No to war on Iraq” and “No Blood For Oil”, up to 25,000 demonstrators marched along Hollywood’s celebrated Walk of Flame to Sunset Boulevard. In Chicago some 2,000 people protested against a possible war. While addressing the crowd in New York, Nobel peace laureate Archbishop Desmond Tutu said:

“You will never have true security that comes from the barrel of a gun”\(^{202}\)

Hollywood stars Susan Sarandon and Danny Glover were among speakers addressing a rally, just blocks from the UN building. Among the protesters were relatives of the victims of the September 11 attacks.

Earlier on Saturday as many as two million demonstrators, according to organisers estimates, protested in London against Prime Minister Tony Blair’s support to Washington, while Italians said a massive ‘no’ to Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, who had also backed the hardline US stance. More than two million people marched in London said, organisers. The police put the figure at 750,000 saying it was the biggest ever protest.\(^2\) Thus, the above mentioned events show that it is the non-violent approach which can save the humanity in the long run.

**Palestinians Call For Gandhian Techniques:**\(^4\)

Every day so many innocent people from both sides of Israel and Palestine are becoming the victims of brutal forces on account of to capture only power and money. Palestinian Intellectuals and Moderates have realized and urged an end to violence, a rare appeal in more than three years of Israeli-Palestinian fighting. The group ran a half-page advertisement in the Palestinian Al-Ayyam newspaper, asking Palestinians to use peaceful means of protest against Israeli occupation.

The intellectuals who signed the ad – including peace advocate Sari Nusseibeh, lawmaker Hanan Ashrawi and Abbas Zaki, a leading member of Yasser Arafat’s Fatah movement – said ‘revenge attacks over Israel’s assassination of Hamas leader Sheik Ahmed yassin would lead to Israeli retaliation and further hurt the Palestinian cause’. Their voice was ignored by the vested interests and that is why the conflict is going on rather becoming worse day by day.

**The Net Result of the War on human Kind:**

According to an American intelligence assessment, if we go for a full-scale nuclear exchange, even in the case of India-Pakistan, could kill up to 12 million people immediately and injure up to 7 million. Even a

---

\(^2\) Ibid.
‘more limited’ nuclear war – as measured in number of warheads – would have cataclysmic results. It would overwhelm hospitals across Asia and requires vast foreign assistance – particularly from the United States – to battle radioactive contamination, famine and disease, officials said. “The humanitarian crisis that would result would be so great that every medical facility in the Middle East and South-West Asia would be quickly overwhelmed.” This is just a simple calculation and the net result could go much more than expected. If we take the example of the big powers, then we can think the numbers would be uncounted.

Today, we are fully aware that the year 2002 & 2003 were years of violence, the burning of the train in Godhra, carnage in Ahmedabad, attack on the temples, deaths in Kashmir. A day after the attack on the Akshardham Temple, the then Prime Minister asked, “How long will this bloodbath and violence continue?” We can understand that this type of questions will haunt us up to our deathbeds. That people were burnt in the train in Godhra was heinous. What was worse was the anger it caused. That thousands were brutally murdered in the post-Godhra carnage was totally cruel and inhuman. What was worse, was that tens of thousands of children were witness to rape and pillage of their families. They will grow up with anger and hatred. Grief and anger that should neither be trivialized nor brushed aside nor politicized. But the cries of retaliation are already rising and will ensure that the cycle of violence will continue. Why will retaliation end the violence? How will it end the anger and mistrust? When we retaliate, are we annihilate an entire community? An entire nation? It has rightly been observed by Sanat Mohanty that, surely we must concede that such a plan of action is neither moral and ethical nor practical. Its net outcome would be to temporarily weaken the people who will later try to find out the strength to retaliate. We have already

witnessed this cycle at work in the Middle East, in Bosnia and in South Asia.\(^\text{206}\)

The result of Iraqi conflict is in front of the world, where still the US led coalition forces find it still difficult to defeat the Iraqi old forces (Saddam Hussein’s people) and they had spend the money like water in trying to capture Osama Bin Laden, but up to now he and his associates are moving freely without any difficulty. Thus, the vested interests have employed all their violent means to destroy others, but the result seems to be totally negative and destroying. Is this the cycle of violence that we want to gift to our children and coming generations?

**How to Create The Base For Non-violence And its Application?**

**Solution lies in us:**

So far we have seen that many people have followed Gandhi’s eternal principles, but right now only a few are adopting Gandhi in the real sense. The solution for the creation of the world without violence lies in our own house, i.e. in ourselves. To depend upon only on the Government policies, legislation and other means would be meaningless unless and until the things are practised in the family, in our neighbourhood, keeping in view the problems of each other.

**Role of Child and Family Members:**

A recent survey indicates that approximately fifty per cent of American parents admit to spanking their children. Parents who advocate the use of physical punishment often quote the proverb: “Spare the rod and spoil the child.” But to this, Gandhi more appropriately reflects the damage done to a physically abused child, “I object to violence because when it appears to do good, the good it does is temporary, the evil it does is permanent.”\(^\text{207}\)

---


According to Gandhi, the world is a combination of two powers, one is obtained by threats of punishment but the other arises from acts of love. The best explanation could be that when parents argue that they hit their children to “teach them”, what do they teach them? They may teach them to stop the behaviour, at least when they are around. They also teach them that violence is acceptable, in certain situations. By their action, they teach that “might makes right”. Yet, there is abundant evidence that children who are treated violently become fearful and anxious; in several cases, developing post-traumatic stress disorder. Those who are abused may develop behaviour and conduct disorders that damage their ability to learn. Consequently, such youngsters are at a high risk to become school dropouts and thereby short-circuit their life opportunities. Here also, to prevent the development of violence related neuroses we need to begin by practicing nonviolent parenting. Adults do not know how to be good parents instinctively; they will learn by the example of their own parents, and by acquiring knowledge as they develop their relationship with their children. There are many effective methods of discipline which teach self-control and self-discipline without having to strike a child. Smacking a child because she hits her brother does not really teach her not to hit, it teaches instead that violence is an acceptable way to resolve conflict.

**Discipline:**

When we use the discipline in our children through non-violence, we may be able to teach them self-control. But when we use the discipline through the violence, many times, we simply invite their resentment. Far from developing a nonviolent child, such abuse leads to a child filled with rage and anger. The children have no sense to control their own violence and aggression when they do not see their parents to control their own aggressions and violence. Through imitation and
identification, children adopt their parents’ model as their own. This internalized message can lead a child to become a bully or an abuser of others. If our homes are places where no one can physically harm another under any circumstances, then we will be a long way towards a world without violence. And it has been seen in most of the cases these days that severely abused children have been murdering their own parents. Such hostile feelings are easily displaced onto broader community, leading to high rates of physical assault and homicide. When displaced onto other nations, this rage can lead to war and genocide that is fueled by interpersonal conflicts and pathological needs. Many individuals, unfortunately, actually believe they are using violence for righteous and good causes. They are mistaken. Gandhi’s objection to violence was based on the understanding that violent means always lead to violent ends.208

When in 1932, as he prepared to start on a “fast unto death” Gandhi described the difference between the two approaches: ‘Violent pressure is felt on the physical being and it degrades him who uses it as it depresses the victim; but non-violent pressure exerted through self-suffering, as by fasting, works in an entirely different way. It touches not the physical body, but it touches and strengthens the moral fiber of those against whom it is directed.’ A half century later those words may seem even less reasonable than they did then, but this makes the truth they contain even more compelling. And its acceptance is much more necessary. Instead of continuing our present descent to total inhumanity, this world and its inhabitant must somehow be persuaded to make a significant and long overdue turning in the direction of a renewed act of faith in the humanity of every potential enemy and ourselves.209

208. Ibid., pp. 150-151.
History records not only the use of violence in the conquest of other people, but the use of nonviolent methods for liberation of the masses. Nonviolent methods not only freed India from British rule but were also instrumental for the ending of colonial rule in scores of other countries around the world. African-Americans in the United States and rights for women were won by nonviolent methods. Nonviolence in practice, is not utopian, but the ultimate effective form of power, since imposition of military force is eventually unstable and breeds antagonism and passive resistance.

At the time of Iraqi crisis, we had seen that as soon as Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait a public debate sprang up about the merits of attacks or sanctions. But from the point of view of this two-force theory, sanctions are a form of attack, may be a milder form, quite possibly in some situations a correct form, but one that is not different in kind from the force that sends plane over the air space of another state, for example if it has not been persuaded by the sanctions. We know now what hardships has befallen the ordinary citizens, and especially the innocent children of Iraq as a result of this ‘alternative’ to violence. Sanction and attack are different degrees of the power that arises from (threats of) punishment. The similar type of sanctions were imposed on India also, when it went with the nuclear tests. But what was the ultimate result, the super powers had to bend down in front of India. Section VII of the UN charter, containing the original mandate for UN peacekeeping, mentions precisely these two options, sanctions or military interposition. This ‘array’ of choices, which seems exhaustive because the two seem like polar opposites, is in reality like Dorothy Parker’s acid comment that Katherine Hepburn, in her first performance, ‘went through the whole gamut of emotions from A to B.’ It is time to explore options that do not recycle, reorganize or contain the same energies that cause conflict but
engage other energies which are inherently more likely to build up to stable peace. If ‘sanctions or force’ are options A to B, nonviolent peacemaking begins at C; D-Z are many other ways the UN and many other agencies and national states and indeed individuals could implement ‘Force Two’ in a programme of long-term stable peace. It makes sense now to begin with nonviolent interventions which could be applied in region after region and which now have experience and theory behind them, but the work will not end there. Nonviolence, as Gandhi labored to show us, is an infinitely positive and creative force. According to Norman Vincent Peale, “changed people change situations. You can change things for sure not through destructive force or an artificial substance – but through an individual spiritual experience.”

Now the choice is ours, whether we want to see future only in dreams or we want to see it in reality. If we are going to follow the violent methods blind foldly, then the humankind will not survive and the end would be very near. So we have to decide about our approach right now otherwise we will not be able to save our kiths and kins. The relevance of Gandhi’s non-violence would be there for generations to come, as non-violence is just like the light of Sun, which is the hole-sole of the universe. The efficacy of Gandhi’s non-violence is eternal and enduring but many do not try to understand and implement fully in their day-to-day lives. If it fails, the failure is not due to its philosophy, but due to failure of human mind which needs the cultivation of highest moral values and virtues like humility, patience, religious tolerance, compassion, friendliness, discipline and above all aptitude to serve the fellow human beings. Non-violence may not provide too much material dividends but it provides satisfaction, inner peace and healthy environment to live and serve the mankind.