CHAPTER – IV

Means to Realise the Ideal:

Purity of Means:

Gandhiji has demonstrated throughout his life and struggle that only moral and spiritual means is his primary consideration. Purity of means is based upon the recognition of the moral law. Hence the most radical aspect of reconsideration of Gandhism will be with regard to the concept of 'means' Gandhiji always pleads for the purity of means and, therefore, accepts non-violence as the highest duty. The discussion on the problem of means and ends in this chapter aims at justifying the ground on which Gandhian 'method of solution' of the problems of practical life is based. For Gandhiji means justifies the end and not the reverse. A corrupt means corrupts the end. Hence he wants to requiet injury with kindness. He wants to be faithful to those who are faithful and also faithful to those who are unfaithful, in order that they may be faithful.

The controversy of means and ends arises when other social philosophers think differently. Marx, for example, accepts the maxim that 'end justifies the means' and violence is justified if it helps in realizing the ideal of stateless society. He rejects the existence of spirit as distinguished and superior to matter. Hence the exploited has got the moral right to decide what type of means he will use for achieving the end quickly. So, for the destruction of the old order and establishment of a new one, violent social revolution is necessary. He, thus, least bothers about the purity of means. But Marx's approach is unsound because common welfare can hardly be established by violent mean. Since violence breeds hatred, common welfare can not stand on the weak foundation of hatred and distrust.

Marx like Stalin subscribes to the view that one cannot conquer the enemy without learning to hate him while Gandhji respects each and every individual as the expression of divinity and dreams of Sarvodaya. Marx treats the ethical
principles to be abstract but Gandhiji wants to fill those abstract principles of
traditional ethics with concrete socialist content for which he wants the human
souls to be devoid of all impurities. What matters much for human being is not
expediency and utility rather legitimacy and comprehensiveness of the result.
This can be achieved only by the purity of means.

Hedonists like wise give importance to the end-that is pleasure and it is
pleasure that man always seeks or ought to seek. What man aims at is the
satisfaction of desires that can fetch the greatest pleasure. When we are asked,

"Why we pursue any end, the only reasonable answer that can be given is
that it satisfies some demand of our nature....... what it is, that satisfies the
ultimate demands of our nature, it is very' natural to answer - 'Pleasure'.1

Of course Hedonism faces problem since when the impulse for the end
becomes too predominant, it defeats its own aim. Though Hedonism emphasizes
on the end, regarding means it says,

"Pleasure may be found by acting in the most contradictory ways. But
when we are told to seek the greatest pleasure, there can usually be one course
to follow."2

Utilitarianism also advocates the greatest good of the greatest number.
Each person desires his own happiness because it is good. Therefore, general
happiness is good to the aggregate of all persons. How ever, this theory in
making such a generalization commits the fallacies of ambiguity.

Pragmatists in the similar way attach importance on the end rather than
means. For them, whether some thing is valuable or not is determined at the
practical end of the situation. Thus, whether Hedonists or Utilitarianists or
Pragmatists, all look much of the consequence and hardly any such theory
assesses the rightness of the acts or the means.

The present theory of globalization is based on consumerism. Rush of the
countries to capture the global market has become the objective, what ever may
be the method. 'Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam' which is a part of India's global vision
has become an old adage now. There are numerous examples of terrorist
activities of hijacking the boeings with all innocent passengers, kidnapping of
important personnel with a view to pressurise the government to meet the
demands of their supporters or with the aim of glorifying their activities. It is their
evil motives that move them to act in such a way. But moral action is not an
isolated event but a system of life. End can not be separated from the means
because both of them taken together constitute the moral life. Though it is said
that ‘all is well that ends well’ yet it is the purity of means that leads to the
excellence of the end. “The means may be likened to a seed, the end to a tree,
and there is just the same inviolable connection between the seed and the tree.”³

Non-Violence:

Lord Buddha preached the value of right livelihood in the Eight Fold path
of liberation. Gandhiji, thus, holds that the moral and the spiritual means are the
most potent to revolutionise one’s environment and loosens the external
shackles. Means have got their intrinsic moral worth.

“The clearest possible definition of the goal and its appreciation would fail
to take us there, if we don’t utilize the means of achieving it ............. If we can
take care of them (means) attainment of the goal is assured.”⁴

The first verse of the Isa-Upanisada, thus, echoes the same idea when it
says “Tena tyaktena bhunjitha.” It means to enjoy all things by renouncing the
idea of personal proprietary relation with them. This entails that when man is
conscious of the unity behind the multiplicity, he becomes free from the selfish
desires. Hence self-denial is at the root of spiritual life. This purity of means is
equated with the Nishkama Karma of Bhagbad Gita where there is enjoyment
with renunciation or where Tyaga and Bhoga coincide. Gandhiji, in advocating
such purity of means, accepts truth as the goal and non-violence the means.
Ahimsa and Satya are two convertible terms. “The ‘jewel of non-violence’ is
discovered during the search for and contemplation of truth”.⁵ Gandhiji, no doubt,
has definitely achieved ends of high spiritual order like attainment of swaraj,
realization of sarvodaya, seeing God face to face etc. for the achievement of
such spiritual ends, the means he has adopted and suggested others to adopt is
spiritual and accordingly he advocates the principle of satyagraha.
Of course Gandhiji’s stress on non-violence as the most suitable means may be questioned. It may be said that non-violence is effective only for the persons possessing cleanliness of the soul (Cittasuddhi). It benefits a person more than the society as a whole. But this criticism is a misunderstanding of the Gandhiji’s view. What is advantageous to the individual can not be disadvantageous to the nation as a whole. In order to evaluate the theory of means and ends it is essential to understand Gandhiji’s view about the relation of individual to the nation. An individual is a unit in the society and it is nothing abstract. Morality being a social affair is concerned with man’s relationship with other human beings. “A talent may ripen in solitude a character only in the stream of the world.”

Again, though Gandhiji realizes that it is extremely difficult to avoid violence completely and he too accepts that “No one while in the flesh can be entirely free from violence.” He still suggests that only by freeing the soul from the bondage of the material body, one can attain self-realisation and see God face to face.

We shall argue at present that Gandhian ideal for the achievement of socialism and social justice whether for the individual or for the society is not utopian. It is within the scope of human effort to realize it. It is possible for an individual at any period history to strive for the realization of truth. Ahimsa is the means to realize it. It is possible to lead a life with total observation of the principle of bread-labour, non-stealing, non-possession and other economic, political and social principles which follow from them through non-violent means, that is in a moral way.

The ancient human society was encircled by numerous evils suppression and oppression were rampant. The biological concept of struggle for existence and survival of the fittest was in vogue. The society was a ‘struggle of all against all.’ There were inequalities of wealth and status. There were several occasions of conflicts, wars, oppression which took the form of attack and violence. For centuries India’s social organizations were confined to ritualism and orthodoxy without having any progressive initiative. Under such a grave situation the great
principle of non-violence became a solace to mankind. That was one of the most important principles, which was later on turned into a norm in social life. This principle warned men against committing any form of violence at any level and it is seen in various streams of Indian tradition as the basis of social intercourse and human progress.

In Vedas this principle is noticed in the form of ‘all life is one’. The Jainas take non-violence as a rigorous ethical system. Buddhism also prescribes non-violence as a cardinal principle for a balanced social life. Successively many classical seers and prophets recognize and preach the significance of non-violence as a moral principle. Gandhiji is one among them who express concern and try to preach and practise non-violence as an ethical principle for social reformation and spiritual emancipation of humanity. And in his own life he has tried to restate the truths, which are found in the lives of saints, for the upliftment and enlightenment of the humble rural folk. The central social problem that he tries to solve is how to find a civilized substitute for the method of warfare. While leading the social life he suggests people to tolerate and accommodate others so that society can sustain as a homogeneous whole because no life can survive smoothly without peace. And it is conflict and war that make peace impossible. This principle applies not only to social life, but to individual life as well, not only to human society but to all the living beings of the universe.

Non-Violence & War:

It may often be asked, whether non-violence can be a substitute of war or can a nation defend itself against external aggression or internal disruption by means of non-violence? War is nothing but a means of imposing the will of one community on the other by the use of force, But Gandhiji’s satyagraha is posed as a substitute for war and it aims at touching the heart not through fear but through respect evoked by the satyagraha campaign. The aim of satyagraha is building up of a new system based on justice and co-operation which could not have been possible by war. As a war needs adequate preparation, so also adequate preparation is required for defending a country through non-violence.
The foremost work in the process is to get rid of all that has been acquired through violence. The so-called enemy of war when won over by non-violence, he is made to feel that his life and property is free from danger, since there is neither a victory nor defeat in satyagraha. A question may come to the mind: can satyagraha touch the heart of Hitler-like warmongers? Gandhiji’s reply will be that it should touch the heart of such persons. But suppose that it did not touch, it may be said that the commanders are not the only persons to fight. Because they act through the ordinary soldiers who are also human beings and the appeal of satyagrahi can reach them and make them feel rationally so that the spell of their commanders on them may be broken. Even if some satyagrahis lose their lives while not resisting, that would give a kind of courage to the survivors. But the satyagrahis never surrender to the dictates of war and work as slaves. Napoleon who could reach the height of winning wars ultimately admitted that the sword will always be conquered by spirit.

"Let us give our generation peace and tranquility. If the men of later days are such fools as to come to blows, they will learn wisdom after a few years of fighting and will then live at peace with one another."8

Satyagraha:

Non-violence is a means of conducting war against injustice. It is the natural consequence of truth and strict regards for truth is called satyagraha. Satyagraha, as Gandhiji conceives, is that type of war in which both the sides are expected to arrive at an agreed solution based upon justice and fairness. As the end is a joint achievement, there is neither a victory nor defeat. The object of satyagraha is to change the heart of the opponent by means of ‘self-suffering’. A violent soldier may be brave and courageous but he is never fearless. He wants to kill but never wants to be killed which implies that he is afraid of death. But a satyagrahi is fearless and not afraid of death. In satyagraha ‘war’ there is no threat to the opponent’s life rather the door of reason is likely to be opened and respect for the heroism of the satyagrahi is sure to be awakened.
In the human world there is a tendency not of destruction but of combination for a constructive achievement. Such a combination of human beings is not a mere grouping but this collection transforms them into the higher status of society. And this transformation elevates human beings from lower level to the higher level. This possibility of elevation or creativity is possible by adopting the principle of non-violence in the practical life. It is no non-violence if we merely love those who love us. But it is non-violence only when we love those who hate us. Love transforms hatred into love. It is only love, which can make peaceful co-existence possible. The principle of non-violence is at the root of the feeling of love and it is the principle that can provide answer to the question 'whether all men can be united under one confederation and whether it can unite the sources of power together or not?'.

According to Gandhiji, a mass non-violent struggle is required to remove an unjust and immoral constitution of system. Not only is it possible to overthrow an evil government through mass satyagraha, it also is possible to overthrow an evil and immoral economic system by that method. It is better to discuss some truths about non-violence struggle in general against evil or immorality before discussing how it is possible to remove an evil system by mass satyagraha.

Satyagraha is distinguished from Duragraha. When the former means adherence to truth, the later means adherence to falsehood. Violence, therefore, is the worst form of duragraha. A duragrahi resorts to violence and assumes that the path he chooses is the only path of truth and justice but Gandhiji believes that this dogmatic belief is opposed to truth.

The equipment of satyagraha soldier consists not of weapons of steel but those of spirit. In Tulasi Ramayana, Vibhishan asks Rama as to what the real equipment of satyagrahi is, that leads to victory. Rama had 'no chariot, no armour nor any shoes to his feet', then how did he expect to win against Ravana who had all these? To him Rama replies,

"The chariot my dear Vibhisana that wins the victory for Rama is of a different sort from the usual one. Manliness and courage are its wheels; unflinching truth and character its banners and standards, strength,
discrimination, self-restraint and benevolence its horses with forgiveness, mercy, 
equanimity as their reins; prayer to God is that conqueror's unerring charioteer, 
dispassion his shield, contentment his sword, charity his axe, intellect his spear 
and perfect science his stout bow. This pure and unwavering mind stands for a 
quiver, his mental quietetude and his practice of Yama and niyama stand for the 
sheaf of arrows and the homage he pays to Brahmns and his guru is his 
impenetrable armour. There is no other equipment for victory comparable to this; 
and my dear friend, there is no enemy who can conquer the man who takes his 
stand on the chariot of Dharma. He who has a powerful chariot like this is a 
warrior who can conquer even that great and invincible enemy.9

An army how ever small of true non-violent soldier, thus equipped, says Gandhi, is likely to multiply it some day. Satyagraha or truth force includes all 
non-violent resistance for the vindication of truth. Non-co-operation and civil 
disobedience or civil resistance both individual and mass, are branches of 
satyagraha. It may be used in political and domestic affairs. Its universal 
applicability proves its performance and invincibility. Satyagraha, thus conceived, 
is not the weapon of the weak. Defeat has no place in the march of satyagarha 
movement. It is only those people who realize the superiority of the soul force 
over the brute nature in human beings can yield to it and can effectively be the 
passive register. In political field its use is based on the theory that the 
government should govern on the conscious or unconscious consent of the 
people to be governed. The use of this force requires the adoption of poverty in 
the sense that we must be indifferent whether we have the wherewithal to feed or 
clothe ourselves. For this a prolonged training of the individual soul is an 
absolute necessity, so that a perfect passive register has to be almost a perfect 
man. The greater the spirit of passive resistance in us, the better men we will 
become. The use of this force, if universalized, would revolutionise social ideals 
and do away with despotism and the ever-growing militarism under which the 
nations of the west are groaning. The education of the passive resistance should, 
therefore, be the primary education and this education should be imparted to 
meet the struggle of life, to conquer hate by love. Since there will be an army of
perfectly non-violent people, it will be formed of those who will honestly endeavour to observe non-violence. One discovers truth and the method of applying the only legitimate means of vindicating satyagraha or soul force by patient endeavour and silent prayer. It involves the pursuit of truth and in that pursuit one may even invite suffering without having ill-will towards others.

Satyagraha or non-violent non-co-operation is not a negative concept or passive state, rather it is an intensely active state, even much more active than violence and this active state of non-violent resistance forbids physical force. There is not even the slightest idea of harming or injuring the opponent, since the doctrine advocates the conquest of the adversary by suffering in one's own person. The aim of a satyagrahi is to convert the opponent but not to coerce him. This implies that in satyagraha there is only love for the opponent and hatred has no place in it. It has been accepted by satyagrahi that “Love those that despitefully use you. It is easy for you to love your friends. But I say on to you to love your enemies.” It is by way of love that one can change the opponent's heart. Hence a satyagrahi must act naturally and from inwards conviction. One should attack the evils but not the evil-doers and his aim should be to convert by gentle persuasion by appealing to mind and heart of the opponent. A satyagrahi need be fearless in trusting the opponent, since an implicit trust in human nature is the very essence of satyagraha.

**Essence of Satyagraha:**

Satyagraha is progressive in character in the sense that the more one fosters strength, the more strong he becomes. With the increase of the strength, it becomes more effective and there remains no chance of giving way. Hence a progressive use of it by proper means makes one attain his goal and this progression applies to every righteous struggle. As a satyagraha struggle progresses, other elements add strength to the current of its flow.

The basic reason for adhering to non-violence even when it seems to have failed or when it can not offer any ready answer to an immediate crisis; is because hatred can never yield good and love breeds love. He says,
"Brute force has been the ruling factor in the world for thousands of years, and mankind has been reaping its bitter harvest all along, as he who runs may read. There is little hope of any thing good coming out of it in the future. If light can come out of darkness, then alone can love emerge from hatred."¹¹

Experience shows that violence merely shifts the burden of suffering injustice from one group to another. Hence non-violence if tried in right earnest and with sincerity, it can be more effective and speedier than violent method. Though it appears to be a slow and long drawn process yet it works subtly and invisibly. Since compassion has no place in satyagraha, there should be mutual respect for different thoughts and views, the patriotic motive, which can claim for himself, must honour the opponents. The indispensable condition of success is respect for freedom of opinion. The pure fighters never go beyond the objective when the fight began even when they receive accession to their strength, nor do they give up their objective if at all their strength dwindles away. Gandhiji's conviction is that the danger appears to be greater when the victory comes nearer. No real victory has ever been achieved without a final effort more serious than all the previous efforts. A satyagrahi always has the spirit of self-surrender and it adorns satyagraha and his virtue is inherent in the principle it self. This is, "A Dharma Yudha, a moral battle in which there is no secret to be guarded, no scope for cunning and no place for untruth, comes unsought."¹²

A votary of satyagraha is a democrat and disciplinarian and he must be self-less. Democracy is naturally achieved if one willingly obeys all laws, human or divine. Willing submission to social restraint for the sake of the well being of the whole society enriches both the individual and the society. As Gandhian state is based on Lokaniti, every citizen must render support and responsibility for every act of the government. But when the acts of the government hurt the people, his duty is to withdraw his support. One has every right and it also is one's duty to stand against an intolerable wrong, but this should not be an armed one. This involves the exercise of restraint and patience. But it also requires the resoluteness of will. This method is a refusal to be a party to the wrong and to disregard every immoral state law. For he may refuse to recognize the authority
of the state, refuse to pay taxes and in doing so he never applies force nor even
resists force when inflicted upon him. This civil resistance powerfully expresses
the heart-felt anguish of the satyagrahi against an evil state.

Man being constitutively rational is endowed with intrinsic moral worth and
by his rational reflection can judge an action to be either moral or not. To rise
above the ethos of self-interest and egocentricity is spiritual. Justice is in
accordance with strict morality, that which can be claimed by way of rights and
duties. But the morality, which is not claimed but rendered voluntarily is spiritual.
It is, otherwise, called as tyaga or seva. Whenever one does some thing he
should derive pleasure out of it without expecting anything in return. Love is the
highest of spirituality. Concrete from of love is expressed in deriving pleasure out
of a man's duty only. Gandhiji, thus, feels that if a man lives rightly in his social
life trying to remove social injustices and with a constant self-effort and fraternity
feeling, then his inner spiritual life will bloom forth. Since there is a benevolent
law operating behind universal processes and mankind is progressing towards a
deeper realization of the essential unity of life, the duty of every individual is to
order his life in accordance with it. When Gandhiji says that the spiritual gain of
the society is possible by the spiritual gain of the individual, it, thereby, entails
that Gandhiji visualizes a universal soul in the individual soul.

Religion and Morality:

Gandhiji treats morality as an integral part of religion and he accepts the
Divine law, as the standard of morality. Gandhiji's acceptance of God or Divine
law is not anti-rational, rather by the manifestation of God in man the universe
attains perfection. Thus, Gandhiji's religion accepts the unseen spiritual God as
the ideal of politics, ethics and religion. Though Hinduism quenches his religious
thirst yet he acts life long for the unity of all the religions and thereby spiritualizes
the different aspects of life --political, social, religious and ethical and, thus,
brings human beings face to face with his maker. Since Gandhiji's view on
religion and morality and the unseen spiritual power is based on the realities of
life, it should not be treated as mystical.
Truth, for Gandhiji, is the highest ideal and it can be realized by Ahimsa. This presupposes loving faith. Without love the existence of morality is impossible. Since life is spiritually one Gandhiji’s application of non-violence in every sphere of life will be of some kind of transcendental value. To the question: ‘whether Gandhiji’s non-violence is an ethical or spiritual concept?’, it may be said that Gandhiji’s strong belief in the ultimate reality that constitutes his spiritual foundation plays a role in the formation of his ethical ideology. This spiritual consciousness makes him believe in his inner goodness and thus he visualizes the world soul in the individual soul. This proves that Gandhiji’s ethics is absolutely spiritual. In this sense Gandhiji’s non-violence is ethical in surface but spiritual at the base and there is nothing dogmatic in it since he has proved it by rigorously following in practical life both personal and social. Gandhiji’s non-violence is proved to be applicable to every situation in life. Thus the spiritual approach to understand the significance of life makes him believe in the purity of means and this will lay the foundation of a ‘spiritual democracy’ where ‘the wolf and the lamb shall feed together’.

Spirituality does not consist in knowing scriptures. It is rather something of heart culture of immeasurable strength. One, in order to be spiritual, must first of all be fearless since cowardice is immoral. Hence fearlessness is indispensable for the growth of the other noble qualities. One can not seek truth or cherish love without fearlessness. This position is strengthened when Gandhiji said,

"The path of Lord is the path of the brave, not of cowards. Here Lord means truth and braves are those armed with fearlessness." ¹³

As a man is not expected to do anything more than he actually can, the knowledge of one, as he is, can always do good to the people, never any harm. Every one must, remember that his most secret thoughts have an influence on himself as well as on others. He should, therefore, practise self-control so as to put all the evil thoughts out of his mind and give room only for thoughts, which are noble and great.
Mass Satyagraha:

Let us now state and examine Gandhiji’s view about mass satyagraha. The satyagrahis must not have ill will and violence in thought, words and deed towards the opponents. Nor should they have the same among the fellow satyagrahis. The satyagrahis should have the common quality of being honest. They must render disciplined heart and there need be no mental reservation. The satyagrahis should be prepared to sacrifice not only their property and possessions but even their personal liberty. Disobedience must be non-violent since it has the underlying principle to win the opponent by extending love.

Mass satyagraha struggle requires the leadership of a man of clean and ideal character so that he can take care to see that clean fighters are admitted to his party. Those who claim to lead the mass must refuse to be lead by them. In order to avoid mob law and to have disciplined progress for the country he must have his own conscience to guide him. But still he should have the capacity to continue work in spite of the withdrawal of leaders by death or imprisonment. The vigilance of spirit cultivates the valour. In a satyagrahi army, since every one is a soldier as well as a servant, discipline for him is highly essential. Every body is a leader and a follower also and so the death of one strengthens and intensifies the struggle. A satyagrahi must carry out what ever plan is laid out for him with determination without depression or excitement. The mass satyagrahis in general and the leader of the mass satyagraha in particular are required to have a full grasp of the condition of successful civil resistance before starting a mass civil disobedience. In the Indian context Gandhiji did not want to take a single step in non-co-operation until he was satisfied that the country was ready for the step. According to Gandhiji,

"Willfulness is not conscience. A child has no conscience. The correspondent’s cat does not go for the mouse in obedience to the call of conscience. It does so in obedience to its nature. Conscience is the ripe fruit of strictest discipline."14.
He also says that those who do not observe the basic five mahavrata,
i.e., Ahimsa, Satya, Astheya, Brahmacharya and Aparigraha do not have conscience.
Thus a leader must be a man who strictly follows the above disciplines.

In order to get success in mass satyagraha it is necessary to educate the
mass about how the prevalent system or organization is immoral and the
sacrifices they have to make in the process. They must have a general
knowledge, not dogma that the life of non-violence, the life of self-less love is the
highest form of life. Since a non-violent struggle is a moral struggle, it is based on
the free will of the satyagrahis. In talking about civil disobedient movement
against the government Ganadhiji expects that there should be quick and large
response in the matter of suspension of payment of taxes, but so long as the
masses are not educated to appreciate the value of non-violence even when
their holdings are being sold it is difficult to take up the last stage in any
appreciable extent. The peasants should be trained to understand the reason
and virtue of civil non-payment.

Thus education, formal as well as informal, has necessarily an important
role to play in mass satyagraha. In a mass satyagraha against an evil system,
the non-co-operation is with the whole system but not with a part of the evil
system. He says,

"I said to myself, there is no state run by Nero or Mussoline which has not
good points about it. But we have to reject the whole once we decide to non-co-
operation with the system."\textsuperscript{15}

According to Gandhiji every mass satyagraha passes through five stages-
indifference, ridicule, abuse, repression and respect. He feels that people
express indifference for a few months then victory graciously laughs at it. Abuse
including misrepresentation is the order of the day. The provincial governors and
anti-non-co-operation group heap much abuse upon the movement. Then comes
repression at its fairly mild form. Every movement that survives repression, mild
or severe, invariably commands respect. This repression, if we are true, may be
treated as a sure sign of approaching victory. But if we are true we shall neither
be cowed down nor angrily retaliate and be violent. What is required is tolerance and courage of a very high order.

Several instances of non-violent techniques of bringing about rapid economic and consequential intuitional change, which have been brought about, can be cited from Indian experience and the campaigns were organized by Gandhiji. Vaikom satyagraha may be taken as a shining example. Vaicom is a small town in south India, which was ruled by the Indian princely house of Travancore till 1947. There was a celebrated Hindu temple to which the so called untouchables were being refused admission and they were not even allowed to tread the public road adjacent to Brahmins residence. A satyagraha movement was launched to make the road public so that all including the so called untouchable will get chance to use it. Brahmins did not hesitate to commit violence. Prohibitory order was issued by the Travancore government in anticipation of the breach of peace. The satyagrahis being the civil registers defied the order and under went imprisonment. After a continuous struggle for two years it became successful and road was declared a public one. After some years the right of free entrance even to the temple was officially granted to the so-called untouchables by the state government. The struggle became successful not because of the satyagrahis' deep intention of converting the opponents by force or threat of punishment, but by penance, suffering and self-purification.

His non-violent struggle against the Rowlett Bill, Salt movement are other examples of mass satyagraha which were successfully launched by Gandhiji. The fact is that there are so many men still alive in the world shows that it is based not on the force of arms but on the force of truth and love. Therefore, the greatest and the most unimpeachable evidence of the success of this force is to be found in the fact that in spite of the wars of the world, it still lives on. Thousands depend for their existence on a very active working of this force.

Gandhian scholars differ among them selves about the place of physical force in non-violent struggle. Many people think that physical force has no place in the non-violent struggle. We shall argue that it is not necessary for a non-violent struggle to be free from the use of physical force in every situation.
For Gandhiji, the destruction of bodies of tortured creatures for their own peace can not be regarded as himsa. Similarly the unavoidable destruction caused for the purpose of protecting one’s word can not be regarded as himsa. He says,

“Taking life may be a duty, we do destroy as much life as we think necessary for sustaining our body. Thus for food we take life, vegetables and others, and for health we destroy mosquitoes and the like by use of dis-infectants etc. and we don’t think that we are guilty of irreligion in doing so......... for the benefit of the species we kill carnivorous beasts. Even man-slaughter may be necessary in certain cases. Suppose a man runs amuck and goes furiously about sword in hand and killing any one that comes in his way and no one dares to capture him alive. Any one who dispatches this lunatic will earn the gratitude of the community and be regarded as a benevolent man.”16

“When a woman is assaulted she may not stop to think in terms of himsa or ahimsa. Her primary duty is self-protection. She is at liberty to employ every method or means that comes to her mind in order to defined her honour. God has given her nails and teeth. She must use them with all her strength and, if need be, die in the effort. The man or woman who has shed all fear or death will be able not only to protect himself but others also through laying down his life.”17

For Gandhiji killing is not himsa when life is destroyed for the sake of those whose life is taken. Krishna as a charioteer and Rama as a warrior have allowed the death of number of soldiers, yet the wars they fought are Dharma Yuddha. Probably Krishna and Rama allowed violence for many reasons: (i) when Dharma declined (ii) when peaceful method failed and (iii) they did not think any body as enemy but killed them for the demand of practical ethics.

Gandhiji has accepted Varnashrama values. He would regard Krishna and Rama as the examples of perfect non-violent persons. Ram’s fighting with Ravan and Krishna’a fighting with various evil persons are the examples of non-violent fightings. According to him, a non-violent fighter has to apply force as the last resort and he has to apply force when it is absolutely necessary and to the minimum. For example, Krishna advised the Pandavas to fight only after all other
efforts to get justice failed. Krishna and Yudhisthira have no ill-will for Kauravas. Mahabharata and Ramayana wars are the examples of non-violent or moral wars. In some situation a person with full of self-less love ought to use force to prevent some evils, because its non-use would cause much greater evil. Although it would influence an evil doer morally, if a person with full of selfless love dies in preventing the evil doer from doing evil, he ought not die if his life could be used for a far better cause. Hence even a liberated person has to use force and not die for the sake of Dharma although he would happily die if Dharma requires it. However, we shall now argue that it is possible to change a capitalistic society to a socialist society by mass non-violent struggle, without using any force. It also is possible to change a technological society to a non-technological one in the same way. It is possible to remove any evil system by mass struggle because an evil system is sustained by the co-operation of the mass, which constitute it. If the mass does not cooperate, it will cease to exist. For example, if the mass does not co-operate with the capitalist, which implies civil dis-obedience, the capitalistic system will cease to exist. Gandhiji, therefore, says that without the co-operation of the poor, rich cannot accumulate wealth. If the poor are made aware of this, they would learn how to make themselves free from bondage by means of non-violence. In going to speak about the strength and possibility of mass satyagraha movement, Gandhiji says that it is possible to non-co-operates with the technological system because it is possible to lead a life based on the principle of bread labour, control over senses, non-possession, non-stealing etc., it is possible to follow these principle because it is possible for a man to lead a life of self-less love on the basis of the knowledge that it is the best form of life. Selfish man can be changed into a man of self-less love and the only way to change them is through self-less love. 'Love breeds love and hatred breeds hatred' is an empirically justifiable law of nature.

The non-violent struggle is better than the violent struggle for the following reason. Nothing enduring good can be built upon violence. Since love can not emerge from hatred, people who voluntarily undergo course of suffering out of
self-less love raise themselves and the whole of humanity by breeding self-less love even in the evil and set examples for others.

From our above discussion it is clear that before starting a mass civil disobedience against the capitalistic or technological system of production and distribution, the awareness that the system is immoral should be created among the people. After realizing this goal, those who see the life of ahimsa to be far superior to the life of selfishness, would start mass civil disobedient movement against the system. The more they sacrifice for the cause, the stronger they will become spiritually. If they sacrifice their bodies, it will strengthen their movement greatly by morally influencing the life of the selfish persons who oppose the movement. Since Gandhiji believes that man is essentially good, such a movement will never fail.

It is important to note that although according to Marx a socialist society could be founded only on the forcible over throw of the bourgeoisie, like Gandhiji he said that we must avoid force where it is possible.

**Satyagraha & Globalization:**

Today we have reached a stage where the use of the weapons of war will destroy not only this or that civilization, but the human race itself. If the nuclear warheads go off by accident, there is danger to the entire world. Having seen the danger of war, the present human civilization devised an organization to bring an end to war and after World War II some big and victorious countries established United Nations Organizations. But this too is working under the pressure of the developed and militarily strong nations. Gandhiji’s satyagraha attempts to guide the individuals as well as nations towards a goal of higher life and also at the same time to solve political and international problems. Hence at the present crucial situation when humanity stands or the brinks of ruin, Gandhiji’s satyagraha can provide the method of non-violence to settle international disputes and remove injustice.

The present global situation has become very complex because several forces of self-interests are operating. Sovereignty is the identity and life force of a
nation. The economic interests of power-crazy nations are encroaching upon the sovereignty of other nations and thus creating global problems. But peace and happiness can flourish only by a homogeneous and unitary living and the realization of that unitary whole needs the proper understanding and practice of non-violence in the individual and social life. As an individual is more secured in a society, so also a nation’s security is strengthened by being merged in one confederation. Practice of non-violence in the normative level can transform conflicts of nations into co-operation, reduce national and ideological ego, unite diversifying aspirations into one by showing the path to act in a rhythmic way towards progress and happiness of humanity as a whole. Thus, we can hope for a ‘Socialism’ of higher order where ‘social justice’ is presumed to be inherent.

Critical Estimate:

Gandhiji has often been questioned on the practicability and necessity of his satyagraha ideology and the answer also has been given in bold assertion and we have discussed about the practicality of Gandhian ideology in the first chapter in detail and at this point India’s freedom movement may be cited again as an example. Regarding its necessity it may be said that satyagraha is highly necessary because if human beings don’t adopt such an audacious measure like satyagraha then they will be instinctively involved in a rush of armaments which would bring greater moral degeneration.

It is quite right to say that satyagraha is a moral weapon to flight the evil. It also is said to have the objective of ‘change of heart’ of the opponent. But in practice, we may face a problem, which needs consideration. Gandhian suggestion to face the rich, the capitalists and the landlords, who don’t become trustees of their extra wealth, would be non-violent non-co-operation. By the non-co-operation of the labour class the rich will not be able to accumulate wealth, but if still the wealthy do not surrender, the movement is suggested to be intensified, may it take a long time. But how long the satyagrahi would go on launching the movement? It does not matter if they do it at the cost of their lives for a public cause. But how far is it ethical to torture one’s own self? Again what
would be the condition of their family; the children who need support for their sustenance? Hence one's primary duty should be to feed the members supported by him. To torture any of them or the death of any of them is immoral. Hence one's failure or denial to follow satyagraha may be said by the Gandhians to be cowardice and immoral but an inner look reveals that it is also moral. Thus there is a clash between one moral idea and the other. Suffering in one's own person, it may be replied, is the chosen substitute for the satyagrahis not because they value life low and the act is immoral but because they know that it results in the least loss of life and it enables those who lose their lives, to enrich the world for their sacrifice. In this sense it may be said that one has the right to sacrifice his own life but there should be a positive agency as we have trade union now a days to support his family. If Gandhian satyagraha presuppose such a union then the question is: from where and from whom should it collect to support satyagrahi's family? As an alternative, if it is said that the state will protect and feed them, then naturally it will apply violence on the capitalists and land lords for the mass, which goes away from Gandhian non-violence.

In reply, Gandhiji suggests the surest method of achieving economic equality by the introduction of his 'trusteeship' formula for the rich. In going to change the heart of a particular wealthy Gandhiji's aim is not to work on one or two wealthy people but to change the capitalistic system as a whole. Since one can not and should not work to resist injustice at the cost of his family life as it is immoral and there is the possibility of being thrown away and arrested by the police force, which narrows the way of satyagraha, the satyagrahi should take care to make the mass involved in the movement. The involvement of the masses need be wider and wider till the movement is strong enough to meet the challenges of the wealthy and his violent police force. Again during the period of the movement, the satyagrahis should take resort to civil disobedience. Submission to state law is the price, a citizen pays for his personal liberty. Disobedience to the law of the state becomes peremptory duty when it comes in conflict with moral law.
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