PART II

AHIMSA (NON-VIOLENCE)

AND

HIMSA (VIOLENCE): THEIR NATURE AND FORMS.
CHAPTER 5

The traditional and Gandhiji’s concepts of Ahimsa (Non-Violence) and Himsa (Violence)

a) Historical Survey

There are various theories explaining the origin of Non-violence (Ahimsa). Some psychologists hold that the origin of the principle of non-violence can be explained by referring to the instinct of self-preservation. (1) According to them, the chances of self-preservation are increased by the introduction of the principle of Ahimsa. Another theory holds that Ahimsa seems to be a reaction against the increase of violence in human interrelationship as a consequence of the invention of bronze and iron. (2)

The status of Ahimsa is peculiar in the Indian thought. It can be traced to the Vedic and Upaṇishadic period. The first mention of Ahimsa in the Indian literature can be found in the Chandogyya Upanishad where Ahimsa is mentioned as one of the five vows accepted by Krishna as a holy gift to his Guru Angirasa. (3) According to Dr. Dharmanand Kosambi, it appears from the various references at various places in the Jaina scripture that the Jaina Tirthankar Neminath was the Guru of Krishna and therefore
it can further be said that possibly Angirasa in
the Chandogya Upanishad and Neminath, the Jaina
Tirthankar, may be one person.(4) Thus Dr.Kosambi
appears to suggest that the origin of Ahimsa in
the Upanishadic tradition can be traced to the
Jaina Influence. However this point has only a
historical and cultural significance. Here the
meaning of term 'Ahimsa' is to be understood in
the restricted sense as non-killing of animals in
the Vedic sacrifice. One of the commentators
here remarks that the origin of the doctrine of
Ahimsa in the Indian thought seems to be more on
economic ground because the shepherd Aryans could
not afford to sacrifice hundreds of cattles in
'Yajna' on economic ground. Perhaps it can be
said that Krishna may have been given title
'Gopal ( the protector of the cow ) because of
his leading role in launching a campaign for
saving the animals from the Vedic sacrifices.
According to one view, it is held that the origin
of Ahimsa in the Indian thought and especially
in the Mahabharata seems to be as a reaction
against the killing of animals during the
sacrificial ritual. He tries to support this
view by showing the fact that the latter period
shows a change in the character of Yajna i.e.,
change in the oblation, change in the spirit
behind Yajna. It means Yajna in terms of physical, verbal or mental Tapa (penance) as found in the Geeta. (5) This change in the concept of Yajna can be said to be significant from the point of Ahimsa even because there appears to be a correlation between three level concept of Yajna, physical, verbal and mental and that of Ahimsa. Similarly it can further be said that this correlation between the three-level concept of a Yajna and that of Ahimsa appears to be significant from another point of view and that is, as the three level concept of Yajna is further related to the ideal of self-realization, especially in the Geeta, so the three-level concept of Ahimsa. This Indian approach (that includes Jaina and Buddha even) towards Ahimsa which considers Ahimsa in the context of self-realization is peculiar and uncommon that one does not find in the non-Indian approaches.

The doctrine of Ahimsa in the Indian thought is understood in the context of the ideal of self-realization. This view can also find support in the above referred story of Angirasa and Krishna in the Chandogya Upanishad itself where Krishna accepts Ahimsa as one of the five vows as a holy gift (Dakshina) to his Guru when he was initiated by his Guru in the Atma-Yajna. For Gandhiji also,
as it will be seen, the doctrine of Ahimsa is important in the context of the ideal of self-realization. Similarly the concept of Ahimsa in its negative form is not traceable in the West or in the non-Indian approaches even though the concept of Ahimsa in its positive form 'Love thy neighbour as thyself' exists in Christianity. I shall refer later to the difference and significance of these positive and negative forms of Ahimsa.

Even though it is true that Ahimsa is not regarded as a cardinal virtue in the early period, it appears that it acquired gradually a status of the cardinal virtue in the later period. Patanjali, the composer of the Yoga Aphorisms and Manu, the composer of the Hindu code, assigns a status to Ahimsa as one of the five cardinal vows and virtues respectively. Ahimsa is so influencing in the Indian thought that every major system of the Indian thought has given consideration to it. However it may be added that concept of Ahimsa reflects different shades of meaning at the hands of every great thinkers.

Views of the Indian thinkers about Ahimsa and Himsa.

1) The jain authority defines Himsa as असत्सृवत्याः प्राणायामरोपणं हिम्सा। असत्सृवतिर्धर्मि।

श्री जैन सिद्धान्त वीणियका प्रकाश ७ सूँ ४,५
Injury or destruction of life out of bad intention or bad intention itself is Himsa (and Its opposite is Ahimsa). (6)

2) Mahaveer also defines ahimsa

अहिंसा निजः प्रतिष्ठा सवृषभ भूषभु सङ्गके स।

दस ८ गाथा १

Life of restraint towards every living being is Ahimsa. (7)

3) Buddha defines Ahimsa as

Ahimsa means refraining from doing injury to any movable or immovable living being or refraining from doing through other person or refraining from giving consent to one committing such action. (8)

4) In Patanjali Yogasutra,

तः अहिंसा सङ्कोच सङ्कोचस्वं वानीभ्रमणः।

-पारंतब योगसूत्र भाष्य २० २०

Ahimsa means absence of enmity for all times towards everything that exists. (9)

5) The Iswar Geeta defines,

कर्मभा मनसा चाचा। सवृषभुसवधा।

वक्षेपनन्तर प्रोक्ता। अहिंसा परमोपानम॥

Not to hurt any living being either through speech, thought, and deed for all times, is regarded as ahimsa. (10)
6) The Mahabharata forbids injury either by thought, words or deeds and further states that such behaviour leads one to get oneself free from the grief. It also further enjoins that one must renunciate physical and verbal Himsa after renunciating mental Himsa. This shows that the renunciation of the mental himsa is regarded as superior to that at the physical and verbal level because it appears, and probably rightly, that the mental plane is regarded as a primary source of all other activities. (11)

7) Shankara expresses his view on Ahimsa as (12)

Ahimsaka is one who causes pain to no being and does no harm to any.

Similarly at another place, he writes,

Ahimsaka are intent on promoting the good of all.

8) Janeshwar defines it as

Tr:- Ahimsa is reflected in the physical, verbal and mental activities of the individual directed to the good of all. (13)

9) Eknath, defines,
Action of the individual done with the constant sense of Divine presence in everything that exists is Ahimsa. (14)

Thus it will be seen that the concept of Ahimsa in the Indian thought reflects both the shades of its meaning i.e., positive in the sense of charity or love towards all and negative in the sense of restraint on causing pains to any living being. The concept of Ahimsa with its negative syllable 'a', means 'non', is more related to the second meaning even though not disjoined from the first. Similarly the meaning of Ahimsa can be understood from two points of view i.e., on one hand, it can be understood in terms of the state of the individual involved in action and on other hand, in terms of its external effects.

Gandhiji’s views

Gandhiji’s concept of ahimsa reflects myriad shades of its meaning which are both positive and negative. He defines Ahimsa, in the following ways:

1) Literally ahimsa means non-killing. But to me it has a world of meaning and takes me into realms much higher, infinitely higher
than the realm to which I would go if I merely understood by ahimsa non-killing. Ahimsa really means that you may not offend anybody, you may not harbour an uncharitable thought even in connection with one who may consider himself to be your enemy. (15)

2) Ahimsa is not only non-killing or non-injury but also non-violence in thought, word and deed. (16)

3) Not to hurt any living thing is no doubt a part of ahimsa. But it is its least expression. The principle of ahimsa is hurt by every evil thought, by undue haste, by lying, by hatred, by wishing ill to anybody. (17)

It will be seen from the above expressions that Gandhiji's concept of Ahimsa is also a three level concept i.e., physical, verbal and mental with the emphasis on the last one. It also reflects a positive character. He defines,

4) In its positive form, ahimsa means the largest love, the greatest charity. (18)

5) Non-violence in its dynamic condition means conscious suffering. (19)
6) In my opinion, non-violence is not passivity in any shape or form. Non-violence is the most active force in the world. (20)

7) It (Non-violence) is a conscious, deliberate restraint put upon one's desire for vengeance. (21)

8) Ahimsa is the farthest limit of humility. (22)

9) Ahimsa is the soul-force or the power of God-head within us. (23)

From the above sentences it can be said that Gandhiji's concept of Ahimsa reflects both the positive and negative shades. Similarly his concept also reflects a synthesis of the Eastern and Western views by looking upon in Ahimsa as a dynamic force governing all social interrelationships.

**Etymological Meaning**

The word ahimsa consists of two syllables, 'a' plus 'himsa' ( a + himsa). The negative prefix 'a' means 'non' reflecting a sense of absence and 'himsa' means 'injury'. Hence ahimsa is generally translated as 'non-injury' or 'non-violence' i.e., reflecting a sense of absence of
Himsa—injury to life, body and so on. Gandhiji writes,

"Literally ahimsa means non-killing". (24)

The word ahimsa is an abstract noun reflecting the absence of himsa. Etymologically, the Sanskrit word 'Himsa' is derived from the root 'himsa' which originally was the desiderative of the root 'han' meaning to slay, kill or destroy. Hence the meaning of the word 'himsa' can be said to be a willful action of killing, destroying or injuring and therefore Ahimsa reflects its absence. It can, therefore, be said from the etymological meaning of the word ahimsa that the problem of Himsa or Ahimsa cannot be determined merely from the fact that it involves the act of injury, destruction or killing but it must be determined by considering accompanying mental factor like 'will' or 'intention' to kill, injure or destroy.

Curiously enough Gandhiji's views on the problem of Himsa or Ahimsa are consistent with the etymological meaning of the word Himsa or Ahimsa. He writes,

"The essence of violence is that there must be a violent intention behind a thought, word, or act, i.e., an intention to do harm .."(25)

He also writes,

"Ahimsa does not simply mean non-killing. Himsa means causing pain to or killing any life out of anger, or from a selfish purpose, or with the intention of injuring it. Refraining from doing so is ahimsa." (26)
Views of the Jaina authority are also similar.

It is said:

असत्यवृत्तम् प्राणस्य-रूपण रिस्सा | असत्यब्रह्मत्तत्त्वा |
- श्री जैन सबस्तृप्त दीपिका प्रकाश ७ सू० ४, ५

Tr:-

Himsa is injury or destruction to the vitality of living being with bad intention or the himsa is bad intention itself.

Even though the term good and bad is moral one and thus beyond exact definition to which I shall refer later, the above-said Jain view implies that the consideration of the problem of Ahimsa or Himsa does involve the consideration of the mental factor, and it is not merely a fact of destruction or injury.

After an attempt to understand the etymological meaning of the Sanskrit words Himsa and Ahimsa, it will also be useful to understand the etymological meaning of the words violence and non-violence. These words are used roughly for translating Sanskrit words Himsa and Ahimsa.

The etymological meaning of violence is the 'use of strength' (latin, vis) to satisfy one's desire, and as such it is coeval with the evolution of our species, man. It is significant that this Latin word 'vis' is also used in the plural for military forces and in English too. We speak of military forces - the forces of crown, etc. So
violence means physical force employed by men, force that enslaves man, force before which man's flesh shrinks away. (27) Thus the term 'violence' differs from Himsa in its etymological meaning and connotations even. So the term non-violence differs from the term ahimsa. However since the father of technique of Ahimsa uses these terms interchangeably, it can be said that their meaning is required to be understood and is being understood even in the light of this new usage and hence is used in the present research work accordingly.

Ahimsa or Non-violence:
Its special significance
in its negative expression

After understanding the etymological meaning of the word Ahimsa, it will be better to try to understand, in the words of Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, as to why 'the highest religion has been defined in form by a negative word — ahimsa.' It is generally expected that a good expression must not be in a negative form as it does not help to present positive contents of the concept.

Ahimsa means absence of himsa. Gandhiji is both an idealist and a realist. As it is said, he is an idealist because he believes in a future dimension of human existence and therefore striving for realizing it. At the same time, he is realist and practical. He, therefore, does not deny the
existence of evil and in the present context, that of Himsa. He writes in his autobiography,

"Ahimsa is a comprehensive principle. We are helpless mortals caught in the conflagration of himsa. The saying that life lives on life has a deep meaning in it. Man cannot for a moment live without consciously or unconsciously committing outward himsa. The very fact of his living - eating, drinking and moving about - necessarily involves some himsa, destruction of life, be it ever so minute. A votary of Ahimsa therefore remains true to his faith if the spring of all his actions is 'compassion,' if he shuns to the best of his ability the destruction of the tiniest creature, tries to save it, and thus incessantly strives to be free from the deadly coil of himsa. He will be constantly growing in self-restraint and compassion, but he can never become entirely free from outward himsa." (28)

Moreover Gandhiji believes that non-violence is the law of human species while violence, that of the brute, and further that human dignity is revealed in his striving to go beyond violence. I have dealt with this truth of human life that 'non-violence is the law of human species while violence, that of the brute' elaborately in my treatment of the next chapter. In the present context, it can be said that realization of Ahimsa and freedom from Himsa are reciprocal processes. Gandhiji says that the sun of Truth revealed in the law of non-violence or love is self-illuminating. That does not require any external help. Efforts are required to remove the clouds of
violence. Hence it can be said that realization of the law of love demands nothing but an incessant effort to seek freedom from the coils of Himsa. In order to emphasize this aspect of striving for going beyond violence, it appears that the 'highest religion has been defined by a negative word.'

This problem can be understood from another point of view also i.e., in the context of 'Tapasya'. I have said in the beginning of this topic that there appears to be a correlation between the concepts of Yajna (sacrifice) and Ahimsa and further between the concepts of Tapa and Ahimsa consequent upon the changes in the concepts of Yajna and Tapa. Hence it is further stated that three-level concept of Ahimsa i.e., physical, verbal and mental Ahimsa, resembles the three-level concept of Tapa accordingly. Hence it will be interesting to understand the concept of Ahimsa in terms of the concept of 'Tapa'.

The concept of 'Tapa' is a peculiar in the Indian thought. It implies a process of purification in the context of self-realization. Etymologically the Sanskrit word Tapa is from the root verb 'Tap', to heat. Therefore Tapa means process of heating one's life. As the impurities in metal are removed in the process of heating, so the concept of Tapa reflects a reciprocal process
between self-realization and freedom from the impurities of life. In the context of Ahimsa, it reflects a process of eliminating himsa, the impurity in human life. In order to emphasize this negative aspect of human effort seeking freedom from himsa, it can be said in the words of Gandhiji "The highest religion has been defined by a negative word ahimsa."(29) Further the concept of ahimsa with a negative syllable 'a' reflects a dynamic character of non-violence incessantly seeking freedom from the coils of Himsa. In this sense it can be said that Gandhiji's statement:'Non-violence is most active force in the world 'or' dynamic force in the world.' has a deeper significance.

b) Various forms of Ahimsa (Non-violence) and Himsa (Violence)

i) Religions or Spiritual and Moral

Ahimsa and Himsa as the principles of action can be classified according to their fields of practice. They are:

1) The field of universal interrelationship that includes living and non-living beings.

2) The field of living beings which include even the sub-human species.

3) The field of human interrelationship only.
One can find support to this classification of Ahimsa in the traditional Ethics in India. "In Indian ethics", observes UNTO TAHITINEN we notice two terms 'Lokahita', pursuit of the good of humanity and 'Sarvabhuta-hita', devotion to the good of all creatures. Lokhita parallels Western humanism but sarvabhutahita aims at the good of all living beings and it is a much more emphasised ethical ideal in Indian thought that Lokahita." (30) Hence ahimsa can be understood in the context of Lokahita as well as Sarvabhutahita.

This classification is made for the sake of a better understanding. It may not be misunderstood that they are like separate water tight compartments. Their interrelationship can be described like the oceanic circles ever-expanding and incessantly intermingling with one another. As the perception of Truth differs from person to person according to a difference in the evolution of the minds of the perceivers, so the practice of Ahimsa differs from person to person according to their capacity. The doctrine of 'Adhikarabheda' is equally applicable in the present context. While the practice of Ahimsa related to the first two categories is revealed in the lives of the highly advanced Sadhakas yearning and striving to seek identification with everything that exists, the
latter can be said to have been revealed in the lives of Sadhakas at the initial stage. The practice of Ahimsa related to the first two categories can be said to be a case of religious or spiritual Ahimsa as it is practised in the context of universal or cosmic interrelationship. (31) Similarly the practice of Ahimsa related to third category can be said to be a case of moral ahimsa because it is practised in the context of human interrelationship only. I have used the word 'moral ahimsa' to designate the third type of classification in view of the fact that the problem of morality is generally understood in the context of human interrelationship. Even though this classification may not be acceptable to Gandhiji in principle because many times he uses the terms spiritual, religious and moral interchangeably, he may admit them for practical purpose. In fact he himself has done such differentiation such as Ahimsa to be observed by the Ashramites and that by the non-Ashramites. To quote him, "The Ashrama holds that ahimsa should be universal in scope, and that society can be built up on the foundations of Ahimsa. It conducts experiments with this end in view, but these have not been very successful:' This does not apply of course to ahimsa as applied to politics, to which I propose to devote a separate chapter." (32) To this, a note stating
that this chapter was never written is added by Shri V.G. Desai who translated the brochure 'Ashrama Observances in Action' from Gujarathi to English. (33) Though it is said that the separate chapter on Ahimsa was never written, it clearly reflects how Gandhiji thinks on the problem of Ahimsa. In this connection, I may be allowed to state that the above statement of Gandhiji reflects how he differentiates between Ahimsa to be observed in Ashram life which has a wider field of application which includes sub-human species also from the Ahimsa to be observed in Non-ashramite life which has a field of application restricted to the human interrelationship only. Answering to a question on the scope and limitations of Ahimsa in its application, he remarks, "I was not prepared for this question. For the Congress Ahimsa is naturally confined to the political field and therefore only to the human species. Hence out-and-out non-violence means for our purpose every variety of non-violence on the political field. In concrete terms it covers family relations, relations with constituted authority, internal disorders and external aggression. Put in another way it covers all human relations." (34)

The practice of Ahimsa in the context of
religions field demands that the principle be considered in the context of cosmic existence. In the Mahabharata, Arjuna questions, "There are many unknown and very small lives those cannot be seen but whose existence can be understood by inference only. They are injured by the movements of eye-lids even. Is there any way to enable one to avoid their Himsa?" (35) Thus it will be seen from the above question of Arjuna that the problem of Ahimsa is considered since long not only in the context of perceptible living beings but in the context of non-perceptible living beings also. Not only that the problem of Ahimsa is considered in the context of living beings but it is said in the Dashavaikalika, one of the Jaina scriptures, that there is life to the five fundamental principles (earth, water, light, air and ether) also and therefore one must be very cautious in dealing with them to avoid their himsa or injury. The view that there is life even to the fundamental five principles will not be acceptable to all as it cannot be conclusively proved or disproved like any other metaphysical view. But the view reflects that the problem of Himsa or Ahimsa is considered in the context of cosmic existence.
Jnanadeva and Ekanath, who are both the mystics of a high rank and philosophers as well, express similar opinion on Ahimsa in their masterpieces, 'Janeshwari' and 'Ekanathi Bhagawat' respectively. It is to be noted that both of them did not belong to the Jaina tradition. Describing the behaviour of the non-violent person, Ekanath writes,

"Non-violent person walks cautiously and slowly for the fear that his vehement walk may cause pain and injury to earth. He will never shriek or speak in an over tone for the fear that it may cause pain to ether. (In Indian thought, the element of ether is regarded as related to the function of speech). Similarly a non-violent person will never plunge into water dashing for the fear that his plunging may burden water and cause pain to water. He will breathe slowly so that air may not be troubled. He will behave gently towards all because he knows that his violent behaviour may cause pain to the Lord within and without." (36)

Here it can be said that the view that the five fundamental principles have a life resembles 'animism.' In this connection, it can be said that it is very difficult to differentiate between enlightened pantheism and superstitious animism. As regards the charge of animism against the Jainism, (37) it is very difficult to refute it because the Jaina does not believe in God and therefore the Jain view that there is life to the five fundamental principles cannot be understood in the context of pantheism. But however as regards
the other views, it can be said that they are influenced by pantheism more than animism. However, from the pragmatic point of view, the doctrine of Ahimsa based on animism and pantheism can be understood as suggesting that the natural resources may not be exploited greedily and selfishly for the human purposes but they be used with restraint and with an attitude of respect towards them.

In his personal life, Gandhiji practises Ahimsa in the context of cosmic existence. In his autobiography, he writes,

"To see the universal and all-pervading Spirit of Truth face to face one must be able to love the meanest of creation as oneself. And a man who aspires after that cannot afford to keep out of any field of life." (38)

He also writes,

"Identification with everything that lives is impossible without self-purification; without self-purification the observance of the law of Ahimsa must remain an empty dream." (39)

Thus it will be seen from the above passages that Gandhiji's non-violence is primarily religious one because he practices ahimsa in the context of cosmic existence that includes human and sub-human living beings though not explicitly non-living beings. But his non-dualistic world view may permit one to include the so-called non-living beings in his practice of Ahimsa. (40)
The Jainas are pluralists in their world view and therefore their consideration of Ahimsa cannot be said to be based on the view of unity of life which is generally based on the non-dualistic world view. It appears that their view is based on the sacredness of life. However from the point of the practice of Ahimsa or Himsa, their pluralistic world view does not affect materially.

Gandhiji is a non-dualist in his world view. He writes,

"I believe in Advaita. I believe in the essential unity of man and for that matter of all that lives." (41)

In his autobiography, he writes,

"... underlying ahimsa is the unity of all life." (42)

However in this connection, it may not be misunderstood that the attempt is being made to derive the principle of Ahimsa from the metaphysical world-view of non-dualism. The principle of Ahimsa flows from the experience of the unity of life and not from the metaphysical view at a speculative level only. Shankara, one of the leading exponents of the non-dualistic world view, writes while commenting on the Geeta verse vi,32,

"He - the highest yogin-realizes that whatever is pleasing to himself is pleasing to all creatures and whatever is painful to himself is painful to all beings. Realizing thus, he causes pain to no being; he does not harm to any; he is ahimsaka."(43)
The Geeta verse, V.26 says of the sages that their joy consists in doing good to all beings. Shankara explains the meaning of this statement thus, "They are intent on promoting the good of all; they are non-violent." (44) Janadeva also who is an advocate of non-dualism expresses similar opinion that non-violence expresses itself through a smallest act of the realized soul. (45) It will be seen from the above discussion that the experience of the unity of life or of vital relations with everything exists is the source of the non-violent behaviour according to the some great Indian thinkers and Gandhiji also. As the experience of the unity of life can be said to be the source of the non-violent behaviour, so the sense of separateness or the sense of 'thine' and 'mine' can be said to be the source of violent behaviour. Similarly as the non-violent behaviour is directed towards the good of all, so the violent behaviour can be said to be directed towards gaining some selfish or factional good. However I shall explain the characteristics of the violent and non-violent behaviour afterwards.

All of the thinkers to whom we have referred in the above discussion hold the non-dualism as their world-view. The Jainas are pluralists in their world-view and hence the source of the
non-violent behaviour, according to the Jainas, cannot be traced to the experience of the unity of life. It appears that belief in the sacredness of life is the source of non-violent behaviour according to them. However, belief in the sacredness of life is not inconsistent with the belief in the unity of life. As the experience of the unity of life helps one to gain belief in the sacredness of life, so the living a life in accordance with the belief in the sacredness of life helps one to realize the unity of life. It is here opined that the difference is due to the difference in their standpoints. However, from the point of view of the principle, they do not affect each other materially.

In short, it can be said that when the principle of Ahimsa is practised in the context of the universal interrelationship, which includes living and non-living beings, it becomes the case of religious or spiritual ahimsa.

However, even though Gandhiji's ahimsa is primarily religious one, he, being the most practical and realist, understands the difficulty in the practice of ahimsa in a wider field and therefore restricts its field to human inter-relationship only. I have already pointed out this difference at the beginning of this topic.
Ahimsa in Ashrama observances has a universe-wide field for its application. That is why Gandhiji is insistant upon avoiding Himsa of the sub-human species even in the Ashrama life. The problems of injury to the snakes, monkey or a calf were assuming a great importance in Ashrama life. Similarly ashramites were required to be strictly vegetarian. Ahimsa in the Ashrama observances can therefore be said to be a case of religious ahimsa according to our classification. It is in the context of this wider field of ahimsa that Gandhiji says that it is not possible for the human being to get freedom from himsa so long he continues to exist in the mortal frame because the continuance of body involves such acts as drinking, eating, etc. which in turn involves injury to the life in plants or water. On the contrary, he does not expect such a stern practice in the non-ashramite life. He does not expect everybody to be vegetarian or refraining from doing injury to the sub-human species as he is in his Ashrama observances. Louise Fischer notes with great surprise that he was served with the dish of meat by the votary of ahimsa. Gandhiji writes,

"In life it is impossible to eschew violence completely. The question arises where is one to draw the line. The line cannot be the same for everyone. Although essentially the principle is the same, yet every one applies it in his or her own way. What is one man's food can be another's poison. Meat-eating is a sin for me. Yet, for another person,
who has always lived on meat and never seen anything wrong in it, to give it up simply in order to copy me will be a sin."(46)

He also writes,

"If I wish to be an agriculturist and stay in the jungle, I will have to use the minimum unavoidable violence in order to protect my fields. I will have to kill monkeys, birds and insects which eat up my crops. If I do not wish to do so myself, I will have to engage someone to do it for me. There is not much difference between the two. To allow crops to be eaten up by animals in the name of Ahimsa while there is a famine in the land is certainly a sin. Evil and good are relative terms. What is good under certain conditions can become an evil or sin under different set of conditions." (47)

On the dilemma of killing a snake, he writes,

"Raichandbhai's advice to me was that if I had courage, if I wanted to see God face to face, I should let myself be bitten by a snake instead of killing it. I have never killed a snake before or after receiving that letter. That is no matter of credit for me. My ideal is to be able to play with snakes and scorpions fearlessly. But it is merely a wish so far. Whether and when it will be realized I do not know. Everywhere I have let my people kill both. I could have prevented them if I had wished. But how could I? I did not have the courage to take them up with my own hands and teach my companions a lesson in fearlessness."(48)

Gandhiji's life reflects both of these facts: as a sadhaka Gandhiji seeking identification with everything that exists, and as a leader Gandhiji taking into consideration limitations of his followers and himself as a common man. It therefore creates a confusion if his dual role is not taken into consideration. It is another question as to
whether this dual role has any adverse effect on the sadhana of Gandhiji. This question is related to his biography to which I do not want to refer in the present context. But the point to be noted is that Gandhiji favours relaxation on the conditions of Ahimsa for a practical purpose. If morality is understood generally in the context of human interrelationship, Gandhiji favours practice of moral ahimsa in human interrelationship at least even though not practicable in wider field. He desires that himsa should be avoided at least in human interrelationship, which is very possible. He thinks that it is possible to practise moral ahimsa even though it is difficult to practise religious ahimsa.

ii) Three-level Classification of Ahimsa and Himsa: Physical, Verbal and Mental

1) A discussion on the method of classification.

The etymological meaning of the word 'ahimsa' is absence of will or freedom from the will to injure, kill or damage life or property. (non-living thing) Hence the consideration of the problem of ahimsa or himsa can be said to be bipolar. That is, on the one hand, it demands consideration by referring to the intention of the agent or mental state of the agent performing action and on the other hand, it also demands
consideration by referring to the consequences and effects of the action. Gandhiji writes,

"Non-violence is both an attitude of mind and action consequent upon it." (49)

He also remarks; Even though it is true that I had an emphasis on the intention of the individual in considering the problem of Ahimsa, it is not the whole story. Moreover, it can further be said that one's intention is reflected in one's action — Hence it becomes necessary to refer to both i.e., intention of the agent and action and its consequences while considering the problem of Ahimsa. (50) Thus it is seen that the problem of Ahimsa or Himsa is bipolar i.e., it is required to be determined, 1) from the point of view of the consequences of an action and 2) from the point of view of the motive of the agent performing action. Similarly from the point of an agent, action can further be classified at three levels, as traditionally classified in the Indian thought, as physical, verbal and mental. This threefold classification appears to have been based on the nature of the expression of the action. However, it can further be said that the former two are the outward expressions of the latter and hence consideration of the problem of Ahimsa or Himsa at the mental level is inevitable in all the cases. It is in this sense that the contention of Gandhiji: 'Ahimsa is a mental state', is significant. However
in an insane person there may not be himsa at a mental level but may be at physical and the verbal level. But this can be said to be the case of an exception. Similarly from the point of consequences of an action, a similar classification can be made according to the nature of an injury involved as physical or mental.

However the consideration of the problem whether a particular action is violent or non-violent is not so easy as it may perhaps seem from the classification made above. There are certain cases where physical injury is not involved but still they are regarded as cases of violence. Gandhi writes,

"Ahimsa is not mere non-killing. A person who remains smugly satisfied with the non-killing of noxious life but has no love in his heart for all that lives will be counted as least in the Kingdom of Heaven."(51)

Similarly there are cases where physical or mental injury is involved but still they are not regarded as cases of violence. In this connection, the story of Lame calf in Ashram is famous reflecting the same dilemma regarding violence or non-violence in life.(52) Gandhi admits this difficulty. Writing on the topic of Ahimsa in his brochure 'Ashram observances in action', he remarks, "There are problems of Truth, but it is not very hard to understand what Truth is. But in understanding ahimsa we every now and then find
ourselves out of our depth. Ahimsa was discussed in the Ashram at greater length than any other subject. Even now the question often arises whether a particular act is violent or non-violent". (53)

Gandhiji's concept of Ahimsa is a kind of a 'gestalt' (54) containing myriad factors in the situation. The gestalt of non-violence is the outcome of the myriad factors involved in the situation and hence needs a careful consideration of the relative weight of the each factor in the situation. As the emphasis on the factors in situation changes, \( \text{gestalt} - \text{form} \) of the figure, so the emphasis on the one or more factors in the gestalt of non-violence changes the form, meaning and content of non-violence. In view of this fact, I intend to undertake a critical study of the various forms of non-violence or violence one by one.

2) **Ahimsa and Himsa at the mental level**

It will be enlightening to understand that Jaina views on Ahimsa for the better understanding of Gandhiji's views for two reasons viz.,

1) It appears that the Jainas are systematic and scientific in the treatment of the topic, and

2) It appears that there is an influence of Jainism on Gandhiji. In this connection, a prominent author in Jainism remarks, "Mahatma
Gandhiji's views about Ahimsa are influenced by the Jain views. It is clear from the various sources of evidence that Gandhiji has read the views of Jain Acharyas, such as Jinabhadragnani Kasambahraman, Haribhadrasuri, Hemachandracharya, Amritchandra Suri, etc., about Ahimsa from the treatises,'Visheshavshya-bhashya', 'Purusharth-siddhyupaya'." (55) Similarly Gandhiji himself admits in his autobiography that Gujarat, his native region, was under a strong influence of Jainism. (56) However in this connection, it can be said that even though it may be true that Jainism has an influence over Gandhiji, Gandhiji's concept of Ahimsa is wider in connotation than that of the Jainas.

**The Jainas' views on Ahimsa**

In the Purushartha Siddhyupaya, the Jain Authority defines Ahimsa and Himsa as under:-

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{म्प्रादर्शिन: ब्रह्म रागाविद्व: भवत्विहिषिति} \\
\text{तेषामेवोक्तातिहिषिति जिनागमय सक्षेि:} \\
\text{पुरुषार्थ सिद्धिवृद्धि} ॥
\end{align*}
\]

**Tr:-** It is the acme of all the Jaina scriptures that arousal of the currents of attachment and other forms of passions in mind is Himsa and their non-arousal is indeed Ahimsa.
It is also stated in the Purusharthasiddhyupaya:

अभिमान, भय, जुगुण्या, हास्य, भरोत, शौक, काम, कोष, 
शाक्ति भेदालयं पयर्या॥

Sūtra ६४

Tr:- Pride, fear, detestation, ridicule, grief, 
desire, anger, etc. are other names of Himsa.

The Jainas think that Himsa is definitely-operative in a state of provocation where the 
currents of attraction and repulsion are 
dominating even though it (may or) may not 
involve injury to or destruction of any life.

It relates:

प्रयत्नं नोचो मा वा प्रावस्येय धूर्भेत रूपतं।
शुचिस्वयं सिद्धस्यूमव्याय ॥

It will be seen from the above that the 
existence of passions or Vikara is regarded as 
Himsa and freedom from them as Ahimsa. Here the 
term passion is required to be understood as a 
value-term reflecting the existence of divisive 
element in human life. But the interpretation 
of passion as himsa appears to be vague prima 
faciа unless the point is clarified as to how the 
existence of passion involves destruction. Here 
the Jaina authority, as if answering the doubt, 
relates:

पश्चात्तरस्य सन्हन्त्याम्य प्रायमस्यत্র्यामनित्त्वम्
पश्चात्तरस्य न वा हिम्सा प्रायमस्यत्र्यामनित्त्वम्

Tr:- Therefore, a provoked person first kills 
one's own self by himself even though as a aftermath
result of his provocation, it may or may not involve injury to other lives.

From the above expressions, it can be said that passions are called himsa because the existence of passions involves injury to one's own self. Thus it seems that the problem of Ahimsa or Himsa in terms of passion at mental level is viewed by the Jaina in the context of the self.

Gandhiji's views on the problem of Himsa or Ahimsa on the mental level resembles the Jaina views. He writes,

"Hate is the subtlest form of violence. We cannot be really non-violent and yet have hate in us." (57)

He also writes,

"... anger is the enemy of ahimsa; and pride is a monster that swallows it up." (58)

The subtle negative meanings of Ahimsa, according to Gandhiji, consist in the abstinence from lust and anger, greed and infatuation, pride and falsehood - the 'six deadly enemies' within us; and are constituted by the negative virtues (restraints or Yamas) of non-anger (akrodha), non-stealing (asteya), non-possession (aparigraha), non-fear (abhaya), non-taste (asvada) and finally non-killing (ahimsa). (59) Now at this stage, it will be proper to understand with special
reference to Gandhiji as to why passions are regarded Himsa.

As I have said, Gandhiji following the Indian tradition that includes Jainism even, considers the role of Ahimsa in the context of the process of self-realization. Gandhiji writes,

"Observance of the law of religion of non-violence is for self-realization or salvation only."(60)

Clarifying the concept of self-realization in terms of Truth-realization, he writes in his autobiography,

"To see the universal and all-pervading spirit of Truth face to face one must be able to love the meanest of creation as oneself ..."

Identification with everything that lives is impossible without self-purification; without self-purification the observance of the law of Ahimsa must remain an empty dream; God can never be realized by one who is not pure of heart ...

But the path of self-purification is hard and steep. To attain to perfect purity one has to become absolutely passion-free in thought, speech and action; to rise above the opposing currents of love and hatred, attachment and repulsion. I know that I have not in me as yet that triple purity, in spite of constant, ceaseless striving for it."(61)

As it is discussed, self-realization demands realization of the essential nature of human life. Inspite of the fact that there is difference of opinions on the nature of this potential dimension, it is admitted by every great religion of the world that passions act as the divisive forces in human
life which hinder or obstruct the realization of this potential dimension. Hence every great religion advocates a need to seek freedom from passions.

Here the term 'passion' needs clarification. Passions are not merely biogenic needs but are also divisive forces hindering the realization of the human nature, and hence it can further be said that existence of passions in human life kills or destroys, in a way, its potential dimension in embryo only. It kills the possibility of the realization of the 'Divine life'. Hence passions are regarded as himsa and freedom from passion as ahimsa. Hence Gandhiji's incessant attempt, till the last breath of his life, "to become absolutely passion-free in thought, speech and action" (62) and to realize "the boon of Ahimsa" (63) Freedom from passion and self-realization are reciprocal processes. Hence freedom from passion leading to self-realization is regarded as ahimsa and indulgence in passion is himsa as the indulgence in passion hinders the process of self-realization.

Mrs. Sinclair Stevenson, describing the difference between Bhava-himsa and Dravya-himsa, remarks: One commits Bhava-himsa by wishing for someone's death or by desiring harm to befall them, and even by not continuing and completing one's own education, or by not striving to improve one's own mind, or failing to exercise and discipline one's own soul, because one kills by stultifying what one might have
been. (64) Commenting on this view expressed by Mrs. Stevenson, UNTO TAHTINEN remarks, "This kind of interpretation of Bhava himsa, or mental himsa against one's own self, represents an advanced interpretation of Jaina ethics, partly based on rare sayings. It defines introverted mental himsa as 'not developing all those ethical or mental faculties which one could have developed to reach a higher ethical and mental level.' This can refer both to oneself and another person." (65) This development of all those ethical or mental faculties is, as I have shown, traditionally regarded as a problem of self-realization. Hence mental himsa or Bhava himsa is required to be understood in the context of the process of self-realization.

If Ahimsa as the life free from passion is self-realization, himsa as the life in passion is self-suicide where the term 'self' refers to the essential nature of human existence. Gandhiji writes,

"Violence is suicide." (66)

Ahimsa means freedom from passion, and passions, as it is seen, are regarded as divisive forces in life. Traditionally the ego is also regarded as the divisive force in life though in different context. Hence Ahimsa can also be said to be a state of freedom from egoity.
Gandhiji writes,

"Ahimsa is the farthest limit of humility."(67) -- a state free from egoity - a state free from the divisive element.

Egoless State:
Possibility of its realization.
Gandhiji's view.

However, at this place, it is necessary to understand and study Gandhiji's views on the possibility of realizing this egoless state in human life. Commenting upon the Sloka 17 of chapter 18 in the Geeta, Gandhiji writes,

"Meaning of the sloka cannot be said to be relevant in toto for human action because egoless state and detached reason are the attributes of Lord only. For the human being in the mortal frame, this egoless state is impossible because with the liquidation of egoity, mortal frame is likely to be reduced to ashes. Hence egoless state as a state free from the divisive forces, is impossible so long body exists."(68)

According to Gandhiji, the human activities such as eating, drinking, cooking definitely involve injury to the life existing in plants, vegetables, food, etc. Similarly so long a body exists, there is bound to be injury to or destruction of innumerable subtle living beings existing around. Therefore one cannot be completely free from the coils of himsa so long as one exists in the mortal frame. Moreover our activities such as eating, drinking reflect a sense of attachment to the body
and a subtle desire to prolong the bodily existence. And it therefore appears to be logically correct that freedom from ego or divisive elements, as said by Gandhiji, seems to be not possible so long these various types of activities such as eating, drinking are carried out for the continuance of bodily existence. However even though it is true that one cannot avoid himsa so long the body exists, it is not that there must not be an incessant attempt to be free from the coils of himsa.

A description of a non-violent sage is made by a famous Sanskrit poet as one who maintains oneself on eating mature fruits only, those too are naturally dropped down from a tree, because even plucking a fruit from a tree is regarded by the votary of Ahimsa as an act of injury to the tree. Similarly at another place, a non-violent sage is described to be so cautious in his body movements that even the tiniest creation may not be injured by his movement. It is another question as to whether such an attempt is successful or otherwise, but at least it definitely reflects an attempt to reduce the circles of Himsa.

As I have said, Ahimsa is a multi-level concept and therefore it requires to be understood from different points of view. In the present context, it can be said that the practice of Ahimsa
at such a high level belongs to the spiritual or religious level revealed in the life of a votary of Ahimsa seeking 'Identification with everything that exists.' As the perception of Truth differs from person to person according to the difference in the evolution of their minds, so the practice of Truth or Ahimsa changes from person to person according to their capacity. The doctrine of 'Adhikarabheda' is equally applicable in the present context.

Summing up, it can be said that Gandhiji's approach in the present context reflects both the trends of idealism and realism and makes the doctrine of ahimsa more dynamic because it, unlike an ultra-realist denying existence of the future dimension, makes incessantly strive for the realization of the ideal and at the same time, it, unlike the ultra-transcendental Absolutist denying the existence of evil, pain or Himsa as phenomenal, accepts them.

The View that it is impossible to be free from the coils of Himsa so long the body exists is significant from the pragmatic point of view also. It reflects a dynamic process of the human striving to go beyond divisive forces in human life even though complete freedom from the clutches of the divisive forces may not be possible. Characterising the nature of non-violence, the working paper in
the International Seminar reads: Thus it is seen that non-violence is not contrary of violence but that it goes beyond violence, a doing violence to violence. (69)

Three views about Ahimsa: A comparison.

It will now be proper to have a comparative study of the Jaina, the Upanisadic and the Gandhian views about Ahimsa. It is true that all of them accept self-realization as the Summum Bonum of life and therefore accept freedom from passion and from egoity as the freedom from the divisive and narrow elements in life. Here it can be said that all of them are in an agreement and none does negate another. But as regards the use of the terminology, it may be that it is due to their differences in the emphasis. Jainism, being a refermatory revolutionary cult against the total tradition of the Vedic rituals, which is not restricted to its part of animal sacrifice only, appears to be emphatic on Ahimsa and therefore appears to have developed the terminology of its scriptures accordingly. But so far the Upanishadic tradition is concerned, it can be said that it is not totally free from the influence of the Vedic tradition as is the case of Jainism and therefore Ahimsa could not assume the first place as in Jainism. The Geeta which is regarded as
the acme of the Upanishads, counts Ahimsa as a form of penance at the physical level only. (70) It is significant enough to suggest the position which is assigned to Ahimsa in the Upanishadic thought, even though it is true that Ahimsa is regarded as one of the five cardinal vows (रत्नास्य भिन्न हैतर्या) by Patanjali. But in Patanjal a Yoga Sutra even, Ahimsa is not described in the context of passion as is done in the Jaina views. However so far the Gandhian view is concerned, it appears that Gandhiji's terminology appears to be nearer to that of the Jaina than to that of the Upanishada even though all of them are in agreement on the factual truths of human life i.e., freedom from passion is necessary for the realization of the essential nature of human existence. This views can be supported by the fact that 'the sthitaprajna', a person who has attained an equipoised state of mind, is described as a person free from passions and hence Ahimsaka.

Positive Aspect of Ahimsa

The meaning of ahimsa is not only negative but is positive also. Gandhiji writes,

"In its positive form, ahimsa means the largest love, greatest charity." (72)

Explaining, at another place, the meaning of ahimsa, he remarks, "This is called..."
or attraction in scientific language. In the popular language it is called love. It binds us to one another and to God. Ahimsa and love are one and the same thing." (72) For Gandhiji, a positive aspect of non-violence is love. The term love is too vague and many times it is used differently by different persons and hence it is better to understand its meaning in the words of Gandhiji himself.

For Gandhiji, it can be said that love is "an active force" seeking "identification with everything that exists." (74) Love, for Gandhiji, can therefore be said as an active process of participation in the process of the cosmic existence that includes existence of society also. In this active participation, love becomes a way of life for realizing the essential nature of man - man the universal. Gandhiji writes,

"To see the universal and all-pervading spirit of Truth face to face one must be able to love the meanest of creation as oneself. And man who aspires after that cannot afford to keep out of any field of life." (75)

Hence love is said to be a way of life in the realization of truth in the sense that it is an active process of participation in the cosmic existence. Gandhiji writes,

"My life is one indivisible whole, and all my activities run into one another, and they all have their rise in my insatiable love of mankind." (76)
Such participation can be at the various levels of human existence. There can be participation at the physical, vital, mental, intellectual and the spiritual level. Partial participation at one or more levels disregarding the claims of other parts of existence sometimes degenerates into perversion. For example, participation of mates at physical level only is regarded as a carnal love. However it does not mean that spiritual love denies participation at physical level. Similarly participation at intellectual level without participation in the sorrows and problems at physical level is also regarded as a case of lip sympathy, that does not reflect a perfect love. One can find this contradiction in the lives of those leaders having slogans for socialism in public life and being bourgeois in the private life. The point to be noted is that this contradiction is a great untruth in life which ultimately leads to the distrust and chain of hatred and violence. On the contrary, Gandhiji's life can be said to be a great attempt striving to participate not only in the life process of his fellow beings but in the cosmic existence also. Out of his instiable love for humanity - an urge seeking participation in the life process of others, Gandhiji decides to be half-naked seeing that his fellow beings cannot
afford to have the minimum clothing. He was incessantly striving to give them bread by offering them employment and tried to share their sorrows and miseries at the physical and vital levels.

Thus it can be said that love is an active process of participation in the process of the cosmic existence in the context of religion and in the life of one's fellow beings in the context of morality. Even though the former does not negate the latter, the latter does not necessarily include the former. For Gandhiji, Ahimsa as applied to politics can be said to be related to the field of human interrelationship only.

Love can be said to be an existential urge in human life seeking transcendence of one's separate existence and incessantly striving to merge into the process of cosmic existence by reducing oneself to zero. This is one of the truths of human life. It is in this sense, it can be said, that non-violence is the law of our being. It is a truth of human life. The fact that a solitary confinement is regarded as the most rigorous punishment shows that it is against human nature i.e., law of love. Solitary confinement becomes a punishment because it makes one to live against human nature and therefore causes pain. Even the recluse giving up family and society does so to seek communion with his God or the Absolute. Thus
amidst the renunciation of the recluse, the urge of love seeking communion with others, seeking participation in the existence of others, exists. Even in the normal affairs of life, this urge exists. The relations between the husband and wife, parents and children, brother and brother, patriot and his father or mother-land, devotee and God are based on this urge only. It becomes an erotic love when it reflects a tendency for exclusion. The erotic love seeks the relation not with the total part of the partner's existence but with his partial part. Hence it is a partial truth.

On the whole, it appears that love is an existential urge seeking transcendence of the limitations and demanding participation in the process of the cosmic existence by liquidating one's own separate existence. This is one of the fundamental truths of human life. Jadunath Sinha writes,

"Love is the essence of our spiritual nature. It consists in living for the good of others. I can transcend the limits of my individuality, when I love others and sacrifice my narrow, selfish, private interests for them. I realize my universal nature in my relations to others, when the happiness of others becomes my happiness. Morality consists in the renunciation of the narrow, private, exclusive self, and the identification of our life with the wider spiritual life of our fellow beings." (77)

It is in this sense that love or non-violence is regarded as a moral force because it reflects a
sense of giving consideration to others and thereby reflects its critical nature also. However

**Three Aspects of human life and Ahimsa.**

Ahimsa (non-violence) is a comprehensive principle and it is expressed in human life in all its activities. Human activities are generally understood in their three aspects viz., 1) cognitive, 2) conative and 3) affective. Love as an active process of participation in the life process of others is expressed through cognitive, conative and affective aspects of man's life. I intend to understand the function and expression of this non-violent process of participation through each of these faculties in my subsequent treatment. However we cannot also ignore that these three aspects of human existence are not independent but interdependent.

**Cognitive Aspect.**

Love, when expressed through the cognitive aspect, reflects a rational element in human behaviour. I shall enter into a detailed discussion on the nature of this rational element in human life and its relation to non-violence afterwards. Gandhiji perceives a definite
correlation between the rational element and non-violence. To quote him, "Self-government necessarily means government by the free and intelligent will of the people. I add the word 'intelligent' because I hope that India will be predominantly non-violent." (78)

Love as an active process of participation at rational level reflects the process of exchanging thoughts, views and values. It is well-known how this process at the cognitive level is helping to bring humanity together. Gandhiji writes,

"I believe in thought powers .......
And if the movement that I seek to represent has vitality in it and has divine blessing upon it, it will permeate the whole world without my physical presence in its different parts." (79)

Thus the existence of rational element in the practice of ahimsa suggests that the process of participation is not a blind or imitative one but has a rational understanding of the situation. When the rational element is absent in such a process of participation, it degenerates into irrationalism and therefore violence.

**Conative Aspect.**

Love as an active process of participation, expressed through conative aspect, reflects human activity directed towards the good of the
participants. Gandhiji, therefore, writes,

"Non-violence is therefore in its active form goodwill towards all life." (80)

The English word 'Love' is generally understood in the context of feeling. It is, therefore, suggested that the Greek word 'agape' is more significant because agape means 'good will' rather than 'good feeling' carrying a connotation as love through action rather than through feeling. In this sense, non-violence means good will reflected in the activities directed towards the good of all. Shri Jnanadeva, also defines ahimsa in the same words. For him, Ahimsa means "an activity or behaviour of the individual directed to the well being of all." (12) In this connection, I feel it is true that Gandhiji's concept of non-violence in its positive form is related to action even and not only to feeling. But still it can be said that its significance in the context of the affective aspect is no less important.

Affective Aspect.

Love as an active process of participation, expressed through affective aspect, reflects a feeling of 'compassion' towards everything that exists or lives. Dr Muirhead writes most eloquently on the role of feeling of love in human life. He writes, "

"..... since mere right action is not in itself enough but the doing of it must spring from right feeling, may it not be
in love of our fellows that the reality both of ourselves and of them comes home to us most simply and vividly? Widen your idea of fellowship and take in all living things, as Gandhi does ("Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Yes, but who is my neighbour?"
To which he replies, "Everything that lives is thy neighbour") - do this and do you not come nearer the heart of things ("Nature or God") through love of them than through anything else? "He prayeth best who loveth best both man and bird and beast." (81)

Out of this feeling of compassion, one is able to widen one's consciousness which helps him to embrace everything that exists in his consciousness. Similarly it also helps to deepen his consciousness which helps the individual to transcend his narrow and divisive elements. Out of this feeling of compassion, springs of good actions incessantly flow out of his heart.(82)

Out of this feeling of compassion, one, even while hanging on cross with the pangs of crucifixion, exclaims, "Oh father, forgive them. They know not what they are doing." and suffers crucifixion with great joy. Here the golden doctrine of Satyagraha is revealed in the act of self-suffering. I am going to deal with the role of self-suffering in satyagraha and especially in non-violence afterwards.

In the present context, it can be said that role of affective aspect of human life is no less important even though it may be rather personal
in comparison to the other two parts of human existence and hence it can be said that non-violence in its positive form is love when it is expressed through the affective aspect expressing a feeling of compassion. Non-violence in this form is no less important in view of the fact that it helps to widen consciousness and build up the human personality sky-wide embracing everything that exists.

Thus the non-violence or love in its active form reflects a process of participation in the process of cosmic interrelationship which includes social interrelationship also.

**Criticism against the Indian concept of Ahimsa.**

It is generally argued that the traditional concept of Ahimsa in the Indian thought is negative and whose purpose is to control instinctive violent tendencies. An incorporation of the element of love into ahimsa is the special contribution of Mahatma Gandhi. The terms as prema, bhakti, maitri or karuna, representing the nearest words to Christian 'love' were emphasised in old days even but they were different from ahimsa. Love is now included in ahimsa and it is generally accepted by modern Indian writers that ahimsa is also positive. In this connection, it can be said that traditional concept of ahimsa is not merely a negative even
though the Jaina concept may create such an impression. I have already shown from certain commentaries on the Geeta such as that of Shankara or Jnaneshwara that the traditional concept of Ahimsa incorporates the positive meaning of love also. However as I have said, its negative expression reflects a peculiar Indian approach which considers the principle of ahimsa in the context of self-realization.

On the relation between the positive and negative meanings of non-violence, the remarks of Dr. Tewari are significant. He says, "Neither of the two above mentioned negative and positive meanings of non-violence is complete without the other. Negative and positive, are not only equal and opposite but also composite and complementary to each other. Like the electron and proton of electricity, the negative and positive charges of non-violence, when fused together, give light, and therefore life to Gandhi's concept of Ahimsa and make it a cogent and consistent, coherent and congruous, complete and harmonious whole. A balanced view of non-violence always brings the two halves into harmony. The two parts, negative and positive, abstentions and observances, like yama and nivama of the Yoga system of Patanjali, lay stress on the ethical preparation necessary
for the practice of ahimsa. We need the negative aspect of non-violence to abstain from vices and its positive facet to observe virtues. The former aims at the conquest of our baser instincts, whereas the latter at the quest for sublime sentiments." (83)

Various forms of Himsa.

Gandhiji writes,

"Himsa means causing pain to or killing any life out of anger or from a selfish purpose, or with the intention of injuring it. " (84)

There can be pains either at physical level or mental level. Hence himsa can be classified according to the field of its effects. Similarly himsa can be classified according to the mode of expression of action either through speech or action. Now the principle of Himsa and Ahimsa can be studied with the possible combinations of these forms. In all the cases of Himsa, there is a will to cause pain or injure life. But every case of injury or causing a pain cannot be regarded as a case of Himsa e.g., pains caused by the surgeon's knife or corporal punishment imposed by the parents or a benevolent teacher. Approach of the Indians to the problem of pain is not generally that of hedonism as understood in the West. On the contrary, many times it is regarded
as a transitory phase in a process of self-realization traditionally known as a period of 'Tapascharya.'

1) **Himsa through speech causing injury to the feelings of the others.**

a) Verbal Himsa can be said to be an angry speech or words that hurt the feelings of the others. Gandhiji writes,

"All the songs and speeches betokening hatred must be taboo." (85)

In the present context, malicious propaganda through newspapers or slogans or the newspaper articles full of hatred can be said to be the cases of verbal Himsa resulting in causing mental pains. It is shown how the inner world or mental life plays an important role in human interaction and therefore mental injury is more fatal than the physical injury. The proverb that the wounds of the body can be healed but not those of the heart has a deeper significance in human interrelationship. Hence as from the side of the agent mental himsa is regarded as the most effective; so from the side of the consequences, mental himsa is also most effective. In this context, the second world-war can be said to be an eternal Red Lamp. Mental himsa of the German Nation committed by the
allied Nations in the form of imposing humiliating
'Versailles Treaty' is regarded as one of the
important factors that led German Nation to
prepare for the second world war.

"To say or write a distasteful word", writes
Gandhiji, "is surely not violent especially when
the Speaker or writer believes it to be true.
The essence of violence is that there must be a
violent intention behind a thought, word or act,
i.e., an intention to do harm to the opponent so called."

He further writes,

"False notions of propriety or fear of
wounding susceptibilities often deter
people from saying what they mean and
ultimately land them on the shores of
hypocrisy. But if non-violence of
thought is to be evolved in individuals
or societies or nations, truth has to be
told, however harsh or unpopular it may
appear to be for the moment." (86)

However Gandhiji has an emphasis on Truth-
speaking and not harsh speaking as some times practised
by the eccentric advocates of the principle of truth-
speaking. In the case of the so called votaries of
Truth, many times it appears that their action is
prompted by a subtle desire to derive ego-centric
satisfaction of the moral superiority by exposing the
other party. To do so is no doubt a case of mental
himsa even. Hence Gandhiji, while laying a stress on
Truth-speaking, also expects that it be done in a gentle
manner so that the other party can be saved from untruth.
Similarly care be taken that personal omissions and
commissions besides the point are not referred to which is often done in the heat of exchange. It results in hurting the feelings of the other party unreasonably. Commenting on the Sanskrit maxim 'Satyam bruyat, Priyam bruyat na bruyat satyamapriyam', Gandhiji writes,

"In my opinion the Sanskrit text means that one should speak the truth in gentle language. One had better not speak it, if one cannot do so in a gentle way; meaning thereby that there is no truth in man who cannot control his tongue."(87)

However the point as to why Gandhiji ascribes value to the principle of Truth-speaking will be dealt with in separate topic. In the present context, the problem is considered in the context of Himsa or Ahimsa and every case of mental injury is not himsa though it is so in the large number of cases.

2) Verbal Himsa causing physical injury.

Verbal Himsa can also lead to the physical injury or killing a life. One can witness how the provoked speeches of the leaders instigate their followers to indulge them into physical violence. or how malicious advice leads one to commit a murder.

3) Physical Himsa causing mental injury.

Himsa through physical action can also result in injuring the feelings of the others.
The act of beating the drums by the Hindus in front of a mosque is being looked upon, at least in India, by the Muslims as hurting their religious feelings or in the opposite case, the act of killing a cow by the Muslims hurts the feelings of the Hindus. One can witness how these events are proved and even proving to be a trigger to fire communal disturbances in India. These are the cases of physical himsa. Now-a-days there is an Act that forbids in misuse of National flag and the emblems of any country. Definance of the Act is regarded as a criminal offence. The underlying principle is that such misuse may hurt the feelings of other and cause a disturbance.

4) Physical Himsa leading to the physical injury.

Cases of physical Himsa leading to the physical injury are well-known e.g., murder by shooting, or injury by any instrument, etc.

Ahimsa.

As it is discussed, Himsa means, for Gandhiji, causing pain to or killing any life out of anger, or from a selfish purpose or with the intention of injuring it. Therefore Ahimsa for Gandhiji is refraining from doing so. (88) Hence various forms of ahimsa can be understood in the context of those of himsa as discussed above.
A case of vocal ahimsa can be said to be a truthful and gentle speech or writings with malice towards none. It also reflects a tone of persuasion and a sense of self-restraint.

Physical ahimsa can be said to be one that refrains from doing a physical injury. The Geeta regards Ahimsa as primarily a penance on the physical level. It can be said on this classification that physical non-violence guarantees at least the survival of the earthly existence as destruction or fatal injury to the physical existence ends the earthly existence of human being. Hence the importance of physical non-violence which at least guarantee the survival of the earthly natural existence.

iii) **Unavoidable but permissible Himsa as a form of Ahimsa.**

There can be cases where violence in the form of injury to life or to feeling of the sentient being or of killing a life may have involved but such ones cannot be called cases of pure violence. However they cannot be regarded as cases of pure non-violence because firstly, the action involves injury and the agent has a will to kill or injure life. Such cases become matters of debate because their consideration involves reference to some standard other
than mere non-violence or violence. Hence there is need to study the problem.

Gandhiji himself admits that he is not so much a votary of ahimsa as he is of truth and further that he was capable of sacrificing non-violence for the sake of Truth. (89) And it is here, I feel, that it is possible to seek answer to this conundrum of violence or non-violence in the context of his respect for Truth.

I have already shown that respect for Truth reflects a reasonable attitude and it therefore becomes necessary to consider the problem of violence or non-violence according to its reasonable or unreasonable nature. However once more it is restated that the reasonable is not the logical but it reflects an attitude of impartiality and also attitude of taking into consideration all that is put before. But still there is likely to be difference of opinion because what is reasonable for one may not be reasonable for another and hence the problem needs a careful consideration which will help us to understand the scope and limitations of the doctrine.

1) Unavoidable Himsa in the context of the satisfaction of biogenic needs:

All life in the flesh, to Gandhiji, exists by some himsa. None, while in the flesh, can thus be entirely free from himsa because one never
completely renounces the will to live. Those who eat fish and those who provide it, both commit violence. So do those who eat vegetables. This kind of violence is inherent in all embodied life and therefore in human existence too. It is in this condition and in spite of it, Gandhiji believes that we have to practise a non-violence as a duty. Fishermen, fish vendors and fish-eaters are probably unaware of any violence in their action. Even if they were, they might look upon it as unavoidable. Gandhiji writes,

"I do not consider it violence to permit the fish-eaters to eat fish. It is my duty to suffer it. Ahimsa is the highest duty. Even if we cannot practise it in full, we must try to understand its spirit and refrain as far as possible from violence." (90)

Thus it will be seen from the above remarks that Gandhiji considers the himsa involved in eating, drinking and other activities of life which are absolutely necessary for the maintenance of bodily existence as an unavoidable himsa and hence it is permissible.

Curiously enough, Gandhiji's views on the relation between human beings and sub-human beings creates confusion. At one place, he writes,

"To my mind the life of a lamb is no less precious than that of a human being. I should be unwilling to take the life of a lamb for the sake of the human body. I hold that the more helpless a creature, the more entitled it is to protection by man from the cruelty of man." (91)
The above passage suggests that Gandhiji does not want to sacrifice animal welfare for the sake of human welfare. Similarly attacking the practice of vivisecting or killing sub-human life for scientific research, he writes,

"For the sake of mistaken care of the human body, they kill annually thousands of animals. They practise vivisection. No religion sanction this. All say that it is not necessary to take so many lives for the sake of our bodies." (92)

However in this connection, it can further be stated that he changed his views afterwards. Prof. Gora notes down in his famous book: 'An atheist with Gandhi' that Gandhiji gave him permission, to vivisect the frog to explain the function of heart to the medical students in Ashram on the condition that Prof. Gora opines it as absolutely necessary. (93)

Inspite of the fact that the sciences of medicine and psychology have made a tremendous progress by adopting a method which apparently promotes human welfare by the sacrifice of unwilling animals, it will be seen that this approach or attitude is not proving to be beneficial on a wider consideration. UNTO TAHTINEN remarks, "Today science is used for many destructive purposes and mankind itself has to suffer for scientific violence. If causing pain to animals in the interests of scientific research were
abolished, the very principle might have a
general influence on the application of science
in other spheres too. Rejection of vivisection
would also encourage the rejection of scientific
violence on a human level."(93) Thus according
to Dr. TAHTINEN, killing of sub-human animals in
the scientific experiments reflects an attitude
that underrates the value of a living being. And
this attitude further leads one to use science to
commit violence even in social interrelationship.

However Gandhiji being a practical realist
does not underrate the value of human life in his
practice of Ahimsa especially in the context of
sub-human species. He writes,

"My non-violence is not merely kindness
to all living creatures. The emphasis
laid on the sacredness of sub-human
life in Jainism is understandable. But
that can never mean that one is to be
kind to this life in preference to
human life. While writing about the
sacredness of such life, I take it that
the sacredness of human life has been
taken for granted."(94)

Therefore unlike the Jainas who appear to be
overkind towards the sub-human beings in preference
to the human beings, Gandhiji favours injury or
destruction of the sub-human beings to safeguard
the due interests of the human beings. He writes,

"My ahimsa is my own. I am not able
to accept in its entirety the doctrine
of non-killing of animals. I have no
feeling in me to save the life of
these animals who devour or cause hurt
to man. I consider it wrong to help
in the increase of their progeny. Therefore, I will not feed ants, monkeys or dogs. I will never sacrifice a man’s life in order to save theirs. Thinking along these lines I have come to the conclusion that to do away with monkeys where they have become a manace to the well-being of man is pardonable. Such killing becomes a duty. And a duty is an ahimsa, at least a permissible himsa. " (95)

The principle of Ahimsa when understood in the context of universal inter-relationship is a case of religious ahimsa according to our classification. In the practice of religious ahimsa, Gandhiji holds:

1) Sacredness of all life that includes human life also.

2) Minimum himsa of the plants and sub-human species for the sustenance of the earthly existence.

3) Preference to the human welfare if there arises a clash between human welfare and sub-human welfare and if there is no other way to settle.

Even though Gandhiji is a realist and admits the existence of unavoidable himsa, he, being also an idealist, remarks that a progressive ahimsa-ist will commit himsa as little as possible and only when it is unavoidable. (96)

2) Unavoidable Himsa in human life.
Judicial Himsa

Judicial violence is generally regarded as a moral because it is committed by an agent in obedience to some higher authority and has no direct intention to do harm or to commit violence. 

e.g.,

1) Violence involved in the Vedic sacrificial can be said to be a case of judicial violence because here an agent commits violence as a part of his duty in sacrifice and has no direct intention to commit violence.

Even though from the point of view of conformatory morality or legal morality, violence involved in a sacrifice can be said to be permissible; from the point of view of critical morality, it cannot be so. Jainism and Buddhism can be said to be the best examples of the revolts of critical morality against conformatory morality. However violence committed as a part of sacrifice is less serious than the intentional violence because an
element of self-control reflects in the former act of the agent while it is not so in the latter act. And it is this element of self-control that changes the quality of an action.

Similarly violence committed by any Government Officer in discharging his duty can be regarded as a case of judicial violence because the officer has no personal intention to commit violence for his own gains. It occurs as a by-product in discharging his duty. However now-a-days in the era of awakening democracy, such a view of purely legal or judicial morality is being replaced by critical morality and it is also being considered whether the officer could have been able to avoid violence or whether the officer has taken due precaution to avoid violence. The point to be noted is that the views about judicial violence are also being replaced correspondingly.

Violence committed by the soldiers in war is also regarded as a case of judicial violence because it is done by an individual soldier in discharging his duty. In carrying out the orders of the superiors, he is not free in his action and hence his action is amoral. Here the question may be raised: "Are not the soldiers free when they owe their allegiance to the higher command? Then is it not a free act and therefore moral?" The answer would be that though the act of laying allegiance is voluntary one, his subsequent actions
are not voluntary and hence amoral. But however in a case of the qualms of conscience, one can defy the authority. One can witness the case of conscientious objectors in support of the above argument.

In religion, a Jehads or Crusads can be cited as the perverted forms of judicial violence on a mass scale. Now-a-days new types of religion are rising e.g., religion of nationalism, religion of democracy, religion of communism, religion of racism, etc. and therefore judicial violence under new names is playing similar havoc. Perhaps from the point of view of comformatory morality or legal morality, judicial violence may be permissible and from the point of a single individual, it may even be right. But from the point of critical morality, it is required to be substituted. In such a substitution, the concept of judicial violence is refined and the judicial violence becomes the case of judicious violence.

3) Himsa:
   Unavoidable himsa done for the good of life suffering from pains.

Gandhiji writes,

"Non-violence sometimes calls upon us to put an end to the life of a living being. For instance, a calf in the Ashram dairy was lame and had developed terrible sores; it could not eat and breathed with difficulty. After three days' argument with myself and my co-workers I had poison injected into its body and thus put an end to its life."
That action was non-violent, because it was wholly unselfish inasmuch as the sole purpose was to achieve the calf's relief from pain. It was a surgical operation, and I should do exactly the same thing with my child, if he were in the same predicament." (97)

Even though the event in this story is related to the violent behaviour towards sub-human being, the last sentence that I should do exactly the same thing with my child, if he were in the same predicament suggests that it is also relevant to the human problem, and hence it is cited. It will be seen from the above remarks that Gandhiji regards the act of violence as non-violent because 1) it was not with selfish motive and 2) its sole purpose was to achieve the calf's relief from the pain, i.e., the action was for the good of a calf only. Gandhiji remarks, "Just as a surgeon does not commit himsa but practises the purest ahimsa when he wields his knife on his patient's body for the latter's benefit. Similarly one may find it necessary under certain imperative circumstances to go a step further and sever life from the body in the interest of the sufferer." (98)

Hence for Gandhiji, an act of killing even is non-violent if it is done without selfish interest and for the good of the sufferer. Even in usual
medical practice, a doctor's action ending the life of a patient of hydrophobia for which the medicine is not yet available is not regarded as an act of violence. Gandhiji writes,

"Should my child be attacked with rabies and there was no helpful remedy to relieve his agony, I should consider it my duty to take his life. Fatalism has its limits. We leave things to Fate after exhausting all the remedies. One of the remedies and the final one to relieve the agony of a tortured child is to take his life." (99)

4) Unavoidable Himsa on Utilitarian ground.

Gandhiji writes,

"Even man-slaughter may be necessary in certain cases. Suppose a man runs amuck and goes furiously about sword in hand, and killing anyone that comes in his way, and no one dares to capture him alive, anyone who despatches this lunatic, will earn the gratitude of the community and be regarded as a benevolent man." (100)

This illustration given by Gandhiji creates an impression that he favours violence on the utilitarian ground. But it is not so. Gandhiji is not a utilitarian seeking greatest happiness of the greatest numbers but is a Sarvodayi seeking happiness for all.

I think that the illustration given by Gandhiji appears to be misfitting for two reasons, viz.: 1) This mad lunatic with sword could have been made ineffective by some other way and not by slaughtering him. 2) At another place, he writes that mad person may not be done away with his life
but be kept under medical treatment for his improvement or be kept in asylum. (101) These political murders are always committed on the utilitarian ground. Even the murder of Gandhiji is being justified on the utilitarian ground claiming that Gandhiji's continuance of earthly existence would have been fatal to the interest of nation. However homicide on utilitarian ground differs from one where Gandhiji justifies homicide on the ground that it is done in the interest of the individual to be injured and not in the interest of any other party howsoever large it may be in number. Otherwise it is likely to be degenerated as one can witness in the totalitarian regime. In this connection, meaning of the proverb; "To call a dog mad first and then shoot it", contains deeper significance. A murder of any unwanted man is likely to be justified on the utilitarian ground. One witnesses how ingeniously these labels for the unwanted persons are prepared. Hence Gandhiji does not favour violence on the utilitarian ground but favours only on the ground that it is done for the good of the party suffering violence.

It is true that violence is resorted to on the utilitarian ground for resisting another evil or for controlling it. But in this connection Gandhiji thinks that no permanent good can come out of the use of violence (102) even though it may seem
to be useful for the time being because the cause of the evil resisted is not eradicated or some violence detected even which again erupts when the force controlling violence is removed. (103)

5) Unavoidable Himsa for self-defence

Violence for self-defence is generally regarded as permissible. But Gandhiji rather holds different opinion. Answering to a question: If the choice is between taking one's own life or that of the assailant which would you advice? He remarks, "When it is a question of choice between killing oneself or the assailant, I have no doubt in my mind that the first should be the choice." (104) Thus it appears that Gandhiji does not favour taking life of the others for self-defence also. Perhaps he may be believing in the possibility of the assailant's conversion and hence does not approve violence even in favour of self-defence. For Gandhiji, a resort to violence in self-defence even may mean amount of disbelieving in God or soul-force or goodness of human nature and accepting the supremacy of the brute force. That is why it appears that Gandhiji disfavours violence for self-defence also. Gandjiji writes,

"... whether it is a man or a woman, he or she will defy death even when he or she is unassisted; for real assistance is from God." (105)

Violence for self-defence is approved because in such cases, violence is
initiated by the other party. Thus in this case the aggressive party is more responsible than the defensive party in initiating violence. The doctrine of the sacredness of life is equally relevant in defending one's own life. However there is a faint dividing line between the act of violence done for the sake of self-defence with the sense of sacredness of life and that with the instinct of self-preservation. Most of the cases can be said to be belonging to the latter. Moreover when the sense of sacredness for all life is dawed, it is not possible most probably consistent with the Gandhiji's view, to injure life of the aggressive party. The votary may undertake suffering rather than inflicting suffering. However the difference can be explained as difference between the practice of religious ahimsa and moral ahimsa.

6) Cowardice and Himsa.

Gandhiji favours violence to cowardice. He writes,

"Violence can only be tolerated as being preferable always to cowardice." (106)

He also writes at another place,

"I do believe that, where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence. I would rather have India resort to arms in order to defend her honour than that she should, in a cowardly manner, become or remain a helpless witness to her own dishonour." (107)
He also remarks, "I would risk violence a thousand times than the emasculation of a whole race." (108)

Thus it will be seen from the above remarks passed by Gandhiji on various occasions that he prefers violence to cowardice. It will therefore be enlightening and interesting to understand in his own words as to why the votary of Ahimsa prefers violence to cowardice. He remarks, "It was manly enough to defend one's property, honour or religion at the point of the sword. It was manlier and nobler to defend then without seeking to injure the wrong-doer. But it was unmanly, unnatural and dishonourable to forsake the post of duty and, in order to save one's skin, to leave property, honour or religion to the mercy of the wrong-doer." (109) Thus for Gandhiji, the action of the coward appears to be unmanly, inconsistent with the human dignity in all respects. Similarly according to Gandhiji, the coward rejects the fundamental truth of human life viz., self-respect and resistance to injustice. The coward's desire to save skin reflects his attachment to body. And this attachment to body is mental himsa for Gandhiji because it kills the possibility of realizing soul-force or truth-force. Gandhiji writes,

"... if one has not that courage, I want him to cultivate the art of killing and being killed, rather than in a cowardly manner flee from danger. For the latter in spite of his flight docs commit mental himsa." (110)
It is seen in the beginning of this topic that cowardice or Bheeruta is regarded as one of the forms of mental himsa. This coward even though free from physical himsa commits mental himsa which is more heinous. That is why Gandhiji prefers the use of violence to cowardice but not to non-violence. Similarly at the same time, Gandhiji wants to convey that there is a difference between the non-violence of the brave and the so called non-violence of the coward even though outwardly both of them reflect an absence of physical violence. On the basis of this classification, Gandhiji differentiates between the movement of passive resistance and that of Satyagraha.

7) **Detached Himsa:**
*The Geeta and Gandhiji.*

Passionate state of mind is himsa and dispassionate one is ahimsa. On the relation between detachment and Ahimsa, Gandhiji remarks that the action of the detached person can be said to be non-violent. One can find support to this view even in the Geeta. It relates:

यथा नाहैकृतो भावो बुधिकिर्त्ययान न लिप्यते ।
हृद्यमपि व इमहिमानानु नीति न निरन्यते ।

न ० २० २०

Tri-He who is free from self sense, whose understanding is not subdued though he slays these people, he slays not nor is he bound (by his actions).
It appears from the above sloka that the Geeta permits detached violence. Vinobaji relates that Muhammad, the last prophet of Islam, was advising his disciples to undertake fighting for the cause of religion with only the detached and dispassionate state of mind. One of the stories of his disciples relates thus: He was fighting against his enemy. He cornered his enemy and was about to kill him. But the enemy spit deliberately on the face of Muhammad's disciple. This made him to loose his balance. But curiously enough the disciple of Muhammad left his enemy unkilld even though it was possible for him to kill his enemy. Afterwards giving his explanation as to why he left his enemy unkilld, he explained that he was provoked when his enemy spit on his face and further that it was not proper for him to kill enemy in a provoked state of mind because one could not act justly in a provoked state. (III) One can find support to this view at another place in the Geeta also. It enjoins: Fight without fury in a heart.

In his discourses on the Geeta, Gandhiji remarks, "He who does something without egoism may be said to be not doing it in spite of his doing it, for he is not bound by his action. Of a humble man who has reduced himself to zero it may be said that he does not kill though he kills. This
does not mean that the man in spite of his
humility may kill and yet be unaffected by
killing. For no occasion can arise for such
a man to indulge in violence." (112) Thus
it is suggested from the above view of Gandhiji
that one's consciousness remains undefiled from
the transcendental point of view because it does
not have any attachment. But on the contingent
plane, he cannot remain so because he cannot be
said to be completely free from body-attachment
and therefore from himsa. Commenting on this
sloka, Gandhiji writes,

"The meaning of the sloka cannot be
said to be relevant to the human action
because egoless state and detached
reason are the attributes of the Lord
only. For the human being in the mortal
frame, this egoless state is impossible
because with the liquidation of egoity,
mortal frame is reduced to ashes. Hence
the egoless state is impossible so long
the body works. Therefore the meaning
of the above sloka is not relevant to
the human action but it applies to God
only." (113)

Thus so far problem of human action is con-
cerned, Gandhiji writes,

"The sloka describes the ideal like the
ideal line in Euclid's geometry that can
never be drawn." (113)

Hence according to Gandhiji, human being
may strive for realizing detachment instead of
refering to the so called violent consequences
of the detached person's action.
As it is seen, the description of a detached person and that of a non-violent person is similar. A detached person even though neutral to one's pleasure or pain or one's gain or loss is described to be busy in promoting good of all. (स्वमूल्य हृदय नेरतं)
A colourless picture of the detached person or understanding of the detached person as having no soft corner appears to be perversion. Therefore Gandhiji appears to be right when he comments. "This does not mean that the man in spite of his humility may kill and yet be unaffected by the killing." (114)

Similarly according to Gandhiji, most of the battles arise from the distinction between 'mine' and 'thine'. (115) And therefore Gandhiji writes,

"When detachment governs our actions, even the weapon raised in order to strike an enemy down falls out of our hand. But a mere pretence of detachment serves no useful purpose." (116) And therefore, "No occasion can arise for such a man to indulge in violence." (117)

Thus detachment implies transcendence of attachment and further that transcendence of attachment implies the absence of a selfish motive. Similarly Gandhiji appears to be holding that selfishness is the cause of violence and therefore in a life of the detached person who has transcended narrow attachments and selfishness, there is no room for violence. Gandhiji, therefore, remarks, "The action is non-violent because it is purely from the unselfish motive." (118)
However, the term unselfish needs an explanation. A patriot committing a violence for the liberation of his country may be unselfish or reflects the traits of altruistic character. But still he may have attachment to nation and hatred against the domineering agency. Can he be regarded as unselfish? He cannot be called to be detached because he has attachment to his nation or ideology and hatred against his opponent and opposing ideology. Gandhiji thinks that such an action cannot be justified by citing the authority from the Geeta which is relevant to the ideal person only. Similarly he also lays down another condition that action must be not only for the good of the individual committing a violence which is no more than the case of a selfishness but it must be for the good of the other party involved in violence. This point is ignored by the critic. It is well-known that Gandhiji was always claiming that his fight against the British imperialism was for the good of British as well as for that of Indians. And natural corollary was the use of a technique of Satyagraha. I am going to deal with this point elaborately in my treatment of the topic 'Satyagraha'.

For Gandhiji, the perfect person of God is a detached person - a person who has realized equipoised state of mind. As I have shown, a detached person can perceive the truths of human life. Hence
Gandhiji made an incessant attempt to realize detachment in life. The attempt to realize detachment can be said to be an attempt to seek freedom from passion. And an attempt to seek freedom from passion means the practice of Ahimsa. Hence Gandhiji thinks that detachment—the perfect state—can be reached through the practice of non-violence only. Similarly practice of non-violence in its positive form means practice of love—a process of participation in the life process of others thereby liquidating one's separate or divisive existence.

Workability of the principle of Ahimsa in the world of Sadhus:
A discussion on the view:

There is also a school of thought holding a view that the world is not for Sadhus and therefore the laws belonging to the world of Sadhus cannot be made applicable to the world of common men. Non-violence may be workable in the world of Sadhus but is not workable in the world of common man.

In replying to the charge, Gandhiji reflects a dynamic character of his approach. He is both an Idealist and a Realist. His realism makes him aware of the difficulty and idealism striving towards realization of ideal. And in his striving
to Idealism, the dynamic character of his approach is revealed. On the one hand, he may admit that common man is not a Sadhu because he is a mixture of both good and evil. But he can be a sadhu after an incessant effort. And that can be done by following the laws of Sadhu revealed in the dictum: (अनेकधे अस्वेत त्यो धर्मः) This is the law of non-violence. It is Gandhiji's incessant attempt to incarnate 'The Kingdom of Sadhus' i.e., the Kingdom of non-violence on the Earth. So long it is not incarnated, those who want to bring it down may observe the laws of the Sadhus as holy undertaking or vrata till the laws become dharma - an accepted force governing human interrelationship. To deny such possibility of realizing the kingdom of Sadhus on the earth is to deny human dignity which is revealed in his capacity to progress. However Gandhiji, as a realist, gave a consent to the use of military force to counter the aggression committed by Pakistan in Kashmir. This dual role of Gandhiji creates a confusion as regards his exact position on the practice of non-violence. But this paradoxical position can be said to be due to the limitations of the human existence. But on this paradoxical position, Gandhiji has some significant remarks and observations which are often overlooked by his critics. Unlike
an ultra-realist, Gandhiji does not deny idealism and therefore consequent striving for its realization even though as a realist, he does not ignore the realities of life. Thus his real challenge is to the ultra-realist denying the silver lines or potentialities of the human existence. He writes,

"It betrays a mental laziness to think that the world is not for sadhus." (119)

The word 'mental laziness' is significant suggesting that the contention of the ultra-realists reflects an element of irrationality on their part who harps on the point of the unavoidable use of violence but never try to seek freedom from it.

Commenting upon the fact that Christ's teaching is misunderstood by his followers, Tolstoy remarks that Christ's teaching elucidates a higher view of life and therefore requires to understand by corresponding change in life. Similarly Gandhiji's doctrine of non-violence is a higher view of life and requires to be understood by corresponding changes in life. Otherwise it is likely to be misunderstood and degenerated.

To sum up, Gandhiji doctrine of non-violence is required to be understood in three ways viz.,

1) In its negative aspect and in its positive aspect. In its positive aspect, it seeks identification with everything that exists by trying to participate
in the life process of others and in its negative aspect, it tries to eliminate divisive elements which hinder this process of participation. In other words, it is required to be understood in the context of the process of self-realization as explained previously.

2) In its dynamic aspect, non-violence reflects an attempt to go beyond violence even though violence cannot be eliminated completely. Thus human life reflects both of these phases i.e., presence of violence (divisive elements) and striving to go beyond violence (divisive elements) which is a phase of non-violence.

3) In the context of its field of practice. Religious non-violence is practised in the context of universal interrelationship. Moral non-violence is practised in the context of human interrelationship. However this classification is done only for practical purposes. It is hereby stated that the practice of moral ahimsa is covered by the practice of religious ahimsa.
Chapter 6

Relation of Ahimsa (Non-violence) and Himsa (Violence) to Satya (Truth).

In the present chapter, I intend to discuss the relation between Satya (Truth) and Ahimsa (Non-violence) from two points of view viz., 1) Truth as an end and Non-violence as a means and 2) Truth and Non-violence as the two sides of the one unstamped smooth metallic disc. In the last part of this chapter and also in the last part of this part, I have attempted to study Ahimsa (Non-violence) as a principle of moral action by applying the tests of the criteria determining moral worth of any principle of action.

a) Pursuit of Truth and the practice of Ahimsa.

From the point of view of the traditional theory of knowledge, I have shown that knowledge of reality-factual truth reflects two dimensions viz., knowledge of truth within and knowledge of truth without even though the transcendental truth is the ground of both the reality within and without.

Now as regards the knowledge of Truth within, it can be said that as there is no dichotomy between knowing and being, an act of knowing Truth becomes
an act of realizing Truth which is related to the ideal of self-realization, because the self is regarded as one of the fundamental truths of human life. Similarly as it is seen, self-realization demands liquidation of the divisive forces. The divisive forces, as it is seen, are regarded as the forms of himsa and hence the process of liquidation of the divisive forces in life becomes a process of freeing oneself from the coils of himsa which means reciprocally a process of practising ahimsa. Hence it can be said that self-realization that means, perception and realization of truth within, demands the practice of Ahimsa.

The Upanishadic seer says,

"This Self-truth within is perceived by those who are masters in self-restraint (सत्यवशीलस) and who are free from all types of impurities. (स्वस्थितिवाचक)"

Similarly as regards the knowledge of the Truth without, it can be said that the conditions of objectivity in scientific method demands, in a way, freedom from passions or subjective element in the quest of Truth. In its absence, objectivity cannot be maintained and hence knowledge of Truth is likely to be prejudiced. Gandhiji expresses this truth in another form. He remarks:
"Things in this world are not what they seem and do not seem as they really are. Or if they are seen as they are, they so appear only to a few who have perfected themselves after ages of penance." (1)

In this connection, following remarks passed in a working paper for the International Seminar on 'Truth and Non-violence in Gandhi's Humanism' are enlightening. They read:

"It seems, taken all in all, that if Gandhi choose non-violence in order to rediscover truth, it is because non-violence opens the minds of men to freedom and disinterestedness allowing therefore a more sincere and objective recovery of a truth lost." (2)

However it may be pointed out that the role of a scientist and that of a religious person are not identical. A scientist who is objective and disinterested and impersonal in his laboratory may not necessarily be so out of his laboratory. Similarly every religious person who is interested in the realization of truth within may not be so objective as a scientist can be a as regards the knowledge of truth without. Hence some times, we find the amusing views of the realized souls even on the nature of outer reality.

Gandhiji is not merely interested in the knowledge of Truth without as a scientist or a
social scientist is. He is interested in its realization. He writes,

"Abstract truth has no value unless it incarnates in human beings who represent it by proving their readiness to die for it." (3)

Gandhiji believes in the unity of man and for that matter of all that lives. This is a comprehensive truth for him. It is his incessant attempt to realize this comprehensive truth. Dr. Divakar writes,

"Unity with truth, the realization of oneness by the individual with the universe was the *sumnum bonum* of life." (4)

for Gandhiji.

Process of realizing this comprehensive truth is reflected in its positive aspect as a process of participation in the life-process of others and in its negative aspect as a process of eliminating divisive elements such as militant nationalism, racism, regionalism, linguism and other forms of the divisive forces which hinder the process of participation. I have explained this point in detail in my treatment of the coming chapters.

Similarly, the importance of the role played by inner life or mental life in human inter-relationship is admitted by all. It is
the source of individual's behaviour. Individual's behaviour and social patterns of inter-relationship and inter-action are to a large extent determined by the inner life of the individuals. If himsa or divisive elements such as pride, anger, lust or values having narrow loyalties exist within, they lead to their projection without in the human inter-action and in the patterns of human inter-relationship. Hence the importance of attaining freedom from passion in the sense of a freedom from divisive elements within and thereby constantly striving for realizing the Ahimsa in the external world is great. Thus the view that demands change in the mental structure of the individual or that the practice of non-violence on the mental plane as a necessary step for changing the pattern of social inter-relationship appears to be sound from the psychological and sociological points of view also and it cannot be lightly dismissed as an appeal of the pious heart. However I have explained this point, especially in its social aspect, in my treatment of the topic: Constructive Programme.

In fine, it can be said that the knowledge and realization of Truth within and without demands
the practise of non-violence in both of its positive and negative aspects. Hence Gandhiji's view that 'Truth is an end and Non-violence is a means and further that without the observance of the law of Non-violence, realization of Truth is impossible' appears to be significant.

b) **Truth and Non-violence**:

Two sides of the one unstamped smooth metallic disc.

Gandhiji himself admits that he discovered non-violence in his pursuit of Truth. He writes,

"As a Jain muni once rightly said I was not so much a votary of ahimsa as I was of Truth, and I put the latter in the first place and the former in the second .... In fact it was in the course of my pursuit of truth that I discovered non-violence." (5)

He writes at another place:

"The more I search after Truth the more I feel it is all-inclusive. Truth is not covered by non-violence. But I often experience that non-violence is included in Truth." (6)

I have attempted to show that respect for Truth, in the sense an urge to be reasonable (not logical), demands the acceptance of the norm of impartiality. That is, the issues should be decided according to the relevant criteria and that exceptions should not be made on irrelevant grounds. In other words, an urge to be reasonable demands that
issue should be decided in the light of arguments. Similarly respect for Truth implies giving a respect for the person as a source of argument and further it implies the admittance in one's own fallibility. I think, this is nothing but a clear expression of the spirit of non-violence. Once the rule of something higher, may call it God, Soul, Truth or Reason, is admitted, an element of humility is introduced in one's personality because in the very acceptance of this rule, an extra-subjective or impersonal element is introduced in governing one's behaviour.

On the relation between Truth and Non-violence in the Gandhian view, it will be seen that Gandhiji supports his doctrine of non-violence on these grounds only i.e., the belief of one's fallibility and respect for another person as a source of an argument. As the problem is vitally important in understanding the doctrine of Satyagraha, I attempt to deal with it elaborately. Gandhiji writes,

"But my Syadvada is not the Syadvada of the learned, it is peculiarly of my own. ..... It has been my experience that I am always true from my point of view, and am often wrong from the point of view of my honest critics. I know that we are both right from our respective points of view. And this knowledge saves me from attributing motives to my
opponents or critics. The seven blind men who gave seven different descriptions of the elephant were all right from their respective points of view, and wrong from the point of view of the man who knew the elephant. I very much like this doctrine of the manyness of reality. It is this doctrine which has taught me to judge a Musalman from his own standpoint and Christian from his. Formerly I used to resent the ignorance of my opponents. To-day I can love them because I am gifted with the eye to see myself as others see me and vice versa. I want to take the whole world in the embrace of my love. My Anekantavada is the result of the twin doctrine of Satya and Ahimsa." (7)

Respect for Truth admits one's fallibility.

"..... seeing that the human mind works through innumerable media and that the evolution of the human mind is not the same for all, it follows that what may be truth for one may be untruth for another." (8)

He writes at another place,

"The golden rule of conduct, therefore, is mutual toleration, seeing that we will never all think alike and we shall see Truth in fragment and from different angles of vision..... Whilst, therefore, it is a good guide for individual conduct ....... " (9)

In his witness before the Hunter Commission, Gandhiji advocates the efficacy of the doctrine of non-violence on the same ground. It reads:

Q. With regard to your Satyagraha doctrine, so far as I understand it, it involves the pursuit
of Truth and in that pursuit you invite suffering on yourself and do not cause violence to anybody else.
A. Yes, Sir.
Q. However honestly a man may strive in his search for Truth, his notions of Truth may be different from the notions of others. Who then is to determine the Truth?
A. The individual himself would determine that.
Q. Different individuals would have different views as to Truth. Would that not lead to confusion?
A. I do not think so.
Q. Honestly striving after Truth is different in every case?
A. That is why the non-violence part was a necessary corollary. Without that there would be confusion and worse. (10)

At another place, he writes,

"Courtesy towards opponents and eagerness to understand their viewpoint is the ABC of non-violence." (11)

It will be seen from the above extracts that the origin of Gandhiji's doctrine of non-violence is in his respect for Truth, i.e., in an urge to be reasonable. And respect for Truth demands the acceptance of belief in one's own fallibility (12) and
giving respect for another person as a source of argument. (13) Gandhiji used these arguments only while supporting the efficacy of non-violence.

Now it can be said that respect for Truth reflects the spirit of non-violence. That is why Gandhiji asserts that Truth and Non-violence are the two sides of the same coin. He writes,

"Ahimsa and Truth are so intertwined that it is practically impossible to disentangle and separate them. They are like the two sides of a coin, or rather a smooth unstamped metallic disc. Who can say, which is the obverse, and which the reverse?" (14)

Thus satyagraha expresses respect for Truth and respect for Truth reflects an urge to be reasonable. Therefore it can be said that Satyagraha demands an urge to be reasonable. That is, the issues must be decided by a rational process, by referring to the arguments acceptable to all though they may not be accepted by all because of the human limitations. When it is said that the issue must be decided by reference to arguments acceptable to all, it means that arguments must have a universal significance. That is, they must not be reflections of personal indiosyncracies. This respect for Truth reflects the spirit of non-violence demanding an attitude of respect to the
other as a source of arguments and also demanding the sense of humility on one's own part. In this sense only, Gandhiji asserts that Ahimsa is the farthest limit of humility. (15) I think that this is the very basis of democracy or existence of the human society. I think that this view of non-violence in the sense of an urge to be reasonable will be acceptable to those even who are secular in their approach to the problem of human inter-relationship. And therefore it can be said that Satyagraha as a non-violent process is a rational process in the discovery of truth.

It is well-known that Gandhiji always attempts to understand the view of the other parties before initiating direct movement of Satyagraha and keeps the access open for a settlement even during the Satyagraha movement. In this sense, it can be said that Satyagraha movement is non-violent. Gandhiji explains,

"If we are the true devotees of Truth and Ahimsa, God will endow us with the requisite intellect to solve all the problems. But the devotion presupposes the will to understand our opponent's view point. We must make a sincere effort to enter into his mind and to understand his viewpoint. That is what is meant by non-violence walking straight into the mouth of violence. If we are armed with that attitude of mind, we may hope to propagate the ahimsa principles." (16)
However I am aware of the limitation of the term 'reasonable' because the element of evaluation or personal judgment is involved in reasonable attitude. What is reasonable for one may not be reasonable for others because of the difference in emphasis on the factors involved in the situation. It can however be said that this difference can be reconciled in a peaceful manner by adopting a reasonable attitude only i.e., by assessing and re-assessing the points of agreement and difference. Gandhiji is aware of this difficulty. He regards what is Truth for one may not be Truth for another and hence there is a need to adopt non-violent method in the sense as a reasonable method for its reconciliation.

However, one thing, I need repeat that is that as respect for Truth is procedural, the acceptance of impartiality as a criterion, a respect for other person as a source of argument and acceptance of one's fallibility become its derivatives. The non-violence of Gandhiji originates in his respect for Truth and it implies:

1) a respect for other person as a source of argument and

2) acceptance of one's fallibility.

It will not tell what the contents of the non-violent action are but it lays down the minimum procedural
expectation in the human inter-relationship.

**Truth and Violence:**

As non-violence is reflected in one's reasonable attitude, so it can be said that violence is reflected in one's irrational attitude. Hence violence from the point of a procedural criterion can be stated as

1) an attitude which does not accept the criterion of impartiality,

2) does not believe in one's fallibility and hence reflects a stubborn attitude and

3) hence does not respect another person as a source of an argument and similarly does not reflect a sense of consideration for the others.

**The Doctrine of self-suffering.**

The Doctrine of self-suffering can also be understood as a necessary psychological treatment in the rational process directed to the vindication of Truth even though it may sound odd at the first instance.

As it is seen, an attitude showing a ' respect for Truth ' reflects an attitude accepting the criterion of impartiality in the vindication of Truth. The term ' objectivity ' being used in the scientific method reflects this urge for impartial judgment. But so far as the knowledge
of the material world is concerned, the problem of objectivity or the criterion of impartiality is less crucial. That is why the judgments related to the material world are less controversial or in a case of controversy, they can be tested and verified in a manner which will be acceptable to all. But there is also another realm of existence viz., psychical realm where the passing of impartial judgment or maintaining objectivity is not so easy as in the case of material world. Therefore the judgments related to the psychical realm prove many times controversial. In fact, so far as the problem of human inter-relationship is concerned, this psychical realm plays a very important part and its consideration becomes essential. Social customs, habits, values are the constituents of the psychical phenomena and when they are institutionalized they can be said to be objective in some sense of the term 'objectivity' though not necessarily in the sense that their existence is independent of human thinking, feeling and behaviour. There may be difference of opinion on their ontological status. The social customs, values, habits are also the factors which influence the behaviour of the individual. Hence one is required to pass
judgments upon them. However it is very difficult to pass judgements upon them as impartially as is possible in the material world. This inability to pass impartial judgments has given rise to the difference of views on the problem of social inter-relationship.

Life does not admit watertight compartments where rational attitude in passing the judgments can remain unaffected by the other forces in life. It is possible that at the subconscious level, there may be certain subjective elements working, affecting and dictating while passing impartial judgments. We can find support to the view in the phenomenon of rationalization in daily life. It is in this sense that a proverb that man is not so much a rational animal as a rationalizing one has a deeper significance. By undertaking a conscious suffering, as opposed to blind suffering, as a conscious process of self-purification, an attempt is made by the Satyagrahi for eliminating subjective elements affecting the impartiality in the judgement. It is not known as to whether complete elimination of subjective element is possible or otherwise. Gandhiji expresses this factual truth of the human life in a rhetoric form. He asserts that it is not possible to have the
realization of the Absolute Truth so long body exists. Therefore there is no end to self-suffering.

Self-suffering is necessary for eliminating subjective element in our judgments. Suffering must be conscious. Inflicted suffering does not help unless one becomes critical of one's own position. I think that the term 'self' in the term 'self-suffering' reflects the fact that an act of suffering is voluntary as opposed to one in the case of inflicted suffering. In this connection, following remarks of C.E.M. Joad are illustrative. He writes:

"The essence of reason lies in objectivity and detachment. It is reason's pride to face reality, when the garment of make-believe, with which pious hands have hidden its uglier features, has been stripped away. In a word, the reasonable man is a man unafraid; unafraid to see things as they are, without weighing the scale in his own favour, allowing desire to dictate conclusion, or hope to masquerade as judgement.

The reasonable man, then, is detached; detached, that is to say, from the subject matter which his reason investigates.

..... The truth is that the characteristic virtue of humanity lies in the extension to the self, its passions, temptations, hopes and desires, of that attitude of objective detachment which the man of reason applies to the subject-matter which occupies the attention of the intellect." (17)

In short from the psychological point of process even, it can be said that self-suffering is a necessary
outcome of the rational attitude demanding the criterion of impartiality in the discovery of Truth.

**Self-suffering and Gandhiji**

Gandhiji also expresses a similar view as regards the rational process in the vindication of Truth. In this rational process Gandhiji opines that the belief in one's own fallibility is necessary which demands critical analysis and examination of one's own inner processes in the search of Truth. He writes,

"I have gone through deep self-introspection, searched myself through and through, and examined and analysed every psychological situation. Yet I am far from claiming any finality or infallibility about any conclusions." (18)

This belief in one's fallibility can be said to have led Gandhiji in discovering the doctrine of self-suffering as a conscious process of eliminating subjective element. He writes:

"In the application of Satyagraha, I discovered in the earliest stages that pursuit of Truth did not admit of violence being inflicted on one's opponent but that he must be weaned from error by patience and sympathy. For, what appears to be Truth is to the one way may appear to be error to another. And patience means self-suffering. So the doctrine came to mean vindication of Truth, not by infliction of suffering on the opponent, but on one's self. " (19)

Thus it can be said that self-suffering as a process of self-purification is a necessary out-
come of the rational method in the vindication of Truth. However here it is made clear that the role of self-suffering in the doctrine of Non-violence is not limited to the process of self-purification only. It has a wider moral and social significance. At present, I have discussed the role of self-suffering in the context of the process of self-purification in the search of Truth.

This doctrine of self-suffering can be said to be akin to the doctrine of 'Tapasya' in the religious field. Gandhiji also regards Satyagraha as Tapasya for Truth (20) and hence I think that the doctrine of self-suffering will be understood in a better way in the context of the doctrine of 'Tapasya.' However it must be made clear at the first instance that the doctrine of Tapasya as a process of self-realization is wider in scope than the process of self-purification as a necessary step in the discovery of Truth. While the doctrine of Tapasya is related to the total conditions of human existence, the doctrine of self-purification as a necessary step in the discovery of Truth relates to the cognitive aspect only. However the principle underlying both the doctrine is common.
The word Tapasya is derived from the Sanskrit verb 'Tap' meaning 'to heat'. Hence the meaning of the word Tapasya from the verb 'Tap' is 'heating'. In the process of heating, impurity is burnt and the residue is of the pure quality. Similarly in the process of Tapasya, impurity in the human life is burnt and the residue is pure human nature. The metaphysical theory underlying this doctrine is that the human nature is originally pure, good and benevolent, but it is somehow defiled. This element, defiling the nature, is burnt in the process of Tapasya, a process of self-purification, just as an impure metal becomes pure after going through a process of heating. Thus self-suffering has an instrumental value both in the process of Tapasya and non-violent method. Gandhiji often makes the role of self-purification clear. He declares,

"..... there is only one basis of the whole ideal of fasting, and that is purification." (21) He also writes,

"No country has ever risen without being purified through the force of suffering." (21) Dr. Joan Bondurant also remarks that Tapasya in the Indian ethos connotes certain value in suffering - that of purification and further that suffering is not valued for its own sake. (22)

It is not that the doctrine of self-suffering as a process of self-purification in the pursuit
of Truth has a significance in the life of individual only. It has also a social significance. In one of its aspects, the doctrine, it can be said, reflects a critical attitude trying to re-appraise one's own position. In such a critical attitude, one is able to perceive one's own merit and defects impartially. Thus knowledge of one's merit and defects helps one to remove the defects and realise the wider Truth. It is well-known that Gandhiji was always critical in his movement for India's Swarajya. And in his critical attitude, he was able to perceive impartially the defects in India's social life. Knowledge of these defects further helped him to formulate and develop the programme for India's Swarajya in a novel way. We can find support to this view in such items of the constructive programme as the campaign for the communal harmony, campaign for the removal of untouchability, campaign for the emancipation of women, etc. And it is this aspect of non-violence that has also made the movement for India's Independence under his leadership novel. However it may be noted that this is one of the aspects of Gandhiji's principle of non-violence.

C) **Non-Violence in terms of self-suffering**.

Gandhiji believes that the doctrine of self-
suffering as one of the forms of Satyagraha is also one of the most effective and noble means for the realization of the comprehensive truth of human life. Gandhiji regards 'the unity of life' is the comprehensive truth and further that the doctrine of self-suffering as a form of non-violence is a means to realize this comprehensive truth. The role of self-suffering so far dealt with is in terms of its effects upon the individual undertaking a self-suffering. But the role of self-suffering in a non-violent action is also important from another point of view. It is in terms of its effects upon the other party or parties. It is well-known that Gandhiji regards the action of undertaking a self-suffering for the conversion of the opponent as the core of non-violence. This is one of the distinguishing aspects of non-violence in opposition to all other traditional methods of resolving conflicts. Gandhiji writes,

"Non-violence in its positive aspect .... is the greatest force because of the limit-less scope it affords for self-suffering without causing or intending any physical or material injury to the wrong-doer." (23)

Shri Rajgopalachari also remarks, that

"...the hard core of Gandhi's teaching is
that we should avoid inflicting violence. " (24)

Man is both rational and irrational. And therefore it is not that his behaviour is always governed by the rational process. Sometimes he is also irrational. Here the term irrational is used to denote the behaviour that does not admit the criterion of impartiality or respect for the person as a source of argument, or belief in one’s fallibility. Sometimes the behaviour is dictated by selfish interests. A classic example of this irrational behaviour can be cited from the Epic Mahabharata where Duryodhana rejects the just claims of the Pandavas - his cousins - in an irrational way. He replies,

" I do know what is righteous but I do not have inclination to follow it. I do know what is unrighteous but still I have no inclination to be away from it. I am acting in persuasion of the dictates from some unknown Lord within. "

I think that this can be the classical example of what the irrational attitude can be. And here arises the need to adopt some other method for resolving the conflict.

Gandhiji is also aware of the fact that life is not governed by reason alone. And he therefore writes,
"I have come to this fundamental conclusion that if you want something really important to be done, you must not merely satisfy the reason, you must move the heart also. The appeal of reason is more to the head but the penetration of the heart comes from suffering. It opens up the inner understanding in man." (25)

Now the problem is: if the other party is not adopting rational attitude, there can only be four alternatives left viz.,

1) To give up the just claim to avoid dispute.
2) To adopt supra-rational methods for the conversion of the party.
3) Traditional method of violence i.e., by inflicting injury upon the other party for forcing him to concede the claims.
4) To inflict injury on oneself for the conversion of the party instead of inflicting injury upon the opponent as in violent methods.

Now I shall deal with these alternatives one by one to clarify the problem.

1) To adopt the first remedy is worse than the disease. It is indirectly to admit the supremacy of the brute force or irrational force. This course is adopted by the coward in guise. Like
a gospel in the hands of devil, such persons use
t Sometimes the saying of the Christ: 'Resist not
evil' to hide their cowardice. But here Tolstoy
criptically remarks that the meaning of the
Christ's teaching is that 'evil be not resisted
by evil and not that evil be not resisted at all.'
On the contrary, the life of Christ reveals an
incessant struggle or fight against evil. Gandhiji
also opines that evil must be resisted, but not
by evil. However in case of a choice between
cowardice and violence, he will not opt for the
first. Because, according to him a coward violates
his own self by avoiding external violence. Gandhiji
remarks,

"I do believe that, where there is only
a choice between cowardice and violence,
I would advise violence. I would rather
have India resort to arms in order to
defend her honour than that she should,
in a cowardly manner, become or remain
helpless witness to her own dishonour."
(26)

Even in the last days of his life, Gandhiji gave
a consent to use military force to counter the
aggression committed by Pakistan in Kashmir when
he observed that rational methods in the sense of
non-violent methods were not very much useful.

From the psychological point of view, it can
be said that to give up just claims or non-resistance to injustice is not possible. I have already shown that the element of justice is universal in human thinking, feeling and behaviour and therefore resistance to injustice is also natural though it is true that injustice prevails and is attempted by interested people to maintain it by hook or crook. But any unjust pattern of inter-relationship is bound to meet with resistance one day or other day. Gandhiji writes,

"It is unmanly to obey laws that are unjust." (27)

He also writes,

"It is contrary to our manhood if we obey laws repugnant to our conscience." (28)

From these remarks, it can be said that non-resistance to evil or injustice can be said to be unnatural to human nature and therefore untruth. Similarly it is contrary to human nature and hence impossible.

2) The Second alternative is to adopt supra-rational methods. Perhaps there may be supra-rational ways which do not negate rational ways but also are not irrational as some veteran spiritualists claim. One can find support even to this view in the Yogic literature where it is
stated that a sudden conversion was bestowed upon certain persons. Gandhiji also believes that enmity will be liquidated in the presence of a person embodied with Ahimsa and Brahmacharya.(29)

It appears that Acharya Vinobaji also advocates this view. When he was asked a question as to whether the doctrine of the change of heart through self-suffering is possible in view of the fact that user of the violence in the atomic age has no face to face relations and so that the process of his self-suffering may be out of focus to influence him. Vinobaji's answer is that the Satyagrahi who would take upon himself this task needs to develop the powers of the spirit beyond the limits hitherto explored. Vinobaji further suggests that the Satyagrahi should raise himself above the mental level and should attain to the supra-mental level of consciousness. This alone would arm him sufficiently to enable him to neutralize and then to direct constructively the powers realesed by modern science. (30)

Whatever may be the rationale of this supra-rational or supramental behaviour, it does not seem to be possible for the human beings to practise
the method due to the human limitations even though it is true that the method does not involve the use of violence. However this view certainly helps to suggest the future dimension of the Satyagraha.

3) The third alternative is to defend the just cause through violence i.e., through the use of physical force. This alternative is widely accepted. All the righteous wars were fought in the name of justice only. Gandhiji also accepts this view as the minimum inevitable if non-violent resistance cannot be offered. I have dealt with this point in my treatment of the first alternative.

However Gandhiji opines that the use of violence even for a righteous cause amounts to admit the supremacy of violence and thereby of irrational method, - the fact which is inconsistent with the human dignity. Here he regards that non-violence is the law of human species, while violence that of the brute, and therefore human behaviour to be human at all must be non-violent, that is rational. In his very acceptance of violence, he loses his distinguishing characteristics and lowers down himself to the status of the brute. One can witness how a man becomes
brute, sometimes worse than the brute, in war. Further Gandhiji opines that permanent good can never be the outcome of violence. (31) According to Gandhiji, man must adopt measures which are appropriate to his dignity, which in turn mean non-violent. And the natural corollary is to go in for self-suffering instead of inflicting suffering upon on the opponent.

4) The last alternative is to undertake self-suffering for the conversion of the so-called opponent. In violence, suffering is inflicted upon the others and in non-violence, self-suffering is undertaken. Gandhiji makes his views clear about non-violence in terms of self-suffering. He expresses the same in his celebrated book 'Hind Swaraj', "Passive resistance is a method of securing rights by personal suffering; it is the reverse of resistance by arms." (32)

He again remarks,

"Ahimsa requires deliberate self-suffering, not a deliberate injuring of the supposed wrong-doers." (33)

He also writes,

"I can consistently ask a person to give up his life for a cause and yet not be guilty of violence. For non-violence means refraining from injury to others." (34)
He also asserts that he discovered the law of self-suffering in his pursuit of truth. He writes,

"In the application of Satyagraha, I discovered in the earliest stages that pursuit of Truth did not admit of violence being inflicted on one's opponent but that he must be weaned from error by patience and sympathy. For, what appears to be Truth to the one may appear to be error to another. And patience means self-suffering. So the doctrine came to mean vindication of Truth, not by infliction of suffering on the opponent, but on one's self. " (35)

Self-suffering in opposition to the act of inflicting suffering on others is regarded as the core of the doctrine of non-violence. Martin Luther King Jr. who is regarded as 'A Gandhi of Negroes' also similarly remarks that the way of non-violence means a willingness to suffer and sacrifice. (36) C. Rajgopalchari writes,

"The hard core of Gandhi's teaching is that we should avoid inflicting violence on others." (37)

Acharya Dada Dharmadhikari expresses his views most eloquently. He remarks,

"Gandhi taught the hungry to fight against hunger by undertaking a fast. This is resistance to evil through non-violence (self-suffering). "

**Psychology of Self-suffering**

Self-suffering is the last weapon in the
armoury of a satyagrahi. Before undertaking self-suffering, the Satyagrahi exhausts all other means of resolving conflicts. By undertaking a self-suffering, it can be said that the Satyagrahi takes the process of resolving conflict on a very personal level or it can be said that the Satyagrahi begins dialogue at a very personal level i.e., from something personal of Satyagrahi to something personal of the opponent as I have already shown that the affective level is rather a matter of personal concern in its comparison with the other aspects of human existence viz., 1) cognit-ive and 2) conative. Similarly as I have shown, the affective part is responsible for the sensitivity of man towards his fellow beings and thus by undertaking self-suffering, the Satyagrahi appeals to the very core of human nature and thus lifts the battle to a different level. In explaining the psychology of self-suffering, Dr. Joan Baudrant writes,

"The self-suffering in Satyagraha serves yet another function. It is effective to the extent to which it demonstrates sincerity and cuts through the rationalized defences of the opponent. Willingness to make the sacrifice of life is the ultimate in non-co-operation just as it is the ultimate price to be paid in violent conflict. The considered
willingness to suffer in the Satyagraha approach is the step beyond the appeal to reason, which, though reason persists throughout, dominates the earlier steps of Satyagraha. Suffering operates in the Satyagraha strategy as a tactic cutting through the rational defences which the opponent may have built in opposing the initial efforts of rational persuasion. This process may be referred to as catharsis. " (38)

However in undertaking a self-suffering, it is not that the Satyagrahi begins his dialogue with the so-called opponent only but he has also an appeal in a wider field. Surinder Suri rightly points out when he writes,

"There have been several attempts at an explanation of the role of suffering in non-violence, but none of the analyses has made one basic point. It is that suffering of this kind is meaningful only in so far as it serves to make the individual or group the focal point of the emotions of the community or, in some cases, of mankind as a whole. To put it simply, in the first place suffering draws the attention of the people to the individual or group that undergoes suffering. In other words, he drew the emotions to himself and became, so to speak, a focal point of the feelings, hopes, and fears. In other words, the psychological forces were concentrated upon him, making him the galvanizing force of the society. " (39)

However the phenomenon of self-suffering cannot be said to have been related to the affective aspect only. It is required to be understood, especially in Satyagraha, in the context of other two
aspects viz., cognitive and conative also. What is important is Satyagraha is not suffering itself but the act of self-suffering where the term act makes us to think the problem not in terms of affective aspect only but in terms of the cognitive and conative aspects also. That is, the act of self-suffering demands justification as to whether it contains an element of universal significance. 

\[ a_h \]

Suffering of Satyagrahi is unable to win the sympathy if he does not prove that the cause for which he undertakes suffering contains \[ a_n \] element of universal significance. Similarly if he fails to adopt the rational attitude i.e., an attitude of understanding the view of the opponent, he is also unable to win the sympathy. In other words, self-suffering is likely to degenerate into an act of coercion because of the irrational element involved in it. However the conversion of the opponent which is the aim of Satyagraha, can be said to be the outcome of the working of these three factors. The chances of success of any non-violent method increase to the extent these three factors are involved. The process in diversion from any of these factors loses the chances of its success.
Self-suffering and Hedonism.

Dr. Joan Bandurant remarks,

"It is perhaps the element of suffering in Satyagraha which remains most obscure to the Western mind." (40)

In this connection, it can be said that the difficulty of the Western mind to understand properly the element of suffering in Satyagraha is due to their hedonistic approach in general to the problem of suffering. On the contrary, in the East, self-suffering is not generally understood in the hedonistic sense. Self-suffering is always practised for the higher cause. Gandhiji writes,

"..... the quest of Truth involves Tapas - self suffering - some times even unto-death." (41)

The Indians in general understand the role of suffering in the context of the process of Tapas where the term Tapas reflects the holy sense of joy in suffering for the higher cause. However neither the Indians nor Gandhiji holds the intrinsic value in suffering. Gandhiji writes,

"..... there is no inherent merit in the mortification of the flesh." (42)

Thus though the element of suffering exists in Tapas or Satyagrahas, it qualitatively differs from one in the hedonistic tone.

The cases of suffering for the higher cause
are not rare in the West. (43) Jesus is a prince among them. In the life of Socrates, an act of drinking a cup of hemlock for the sake of Truth is another glorious example revealing the spirit of self-suffering. There is Martin Luther and many others known and unknown to history who suffered for noble causes. Hence it cannot be said that the spirit of self-suffering is unknown to the Western mind even though it may not have been perhaps institutionalized in social life as in India, in the form of Tapas.

Thus the act of self-suffering is the act of consummation for higher cause and differs qualitatively from the suffering in hedonistic sense of the term.

**Self-Suffering and Masochism.**

It is charged that some of Gandhiji's cases of self-suffering contain the element of masochism and the element of coercion also. As regards the first charge, the following remarks of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya are illustrative. He writes,

"You are in a hurry. You must go slow. Take care that pride of Tapasya does not corrupt you. Tapasya without humility is of no avail and may even be harmful. There should be no more fasting." (44)

Even though the objection of Malaviya is in
religious terms, the meaning reflected in the above message can be said to be that Gandhiji was deriving some type of ego-centric satisfaction in his act of suffering and hence it can be said to be the case of masochism. From the psychological point of view, masochism is an abnormal phenomenon of the individual seeking satisfaction in terms of some ego-centric tendencies by undertaking suffering to oneself. In this connection, it can be said that the line between sane self-suffering and insane self-suffering is very thin and may even vary from person to person or in the same person as the line of normality and abnormality varies. And therefore it is very difficult to pass a judgment on such a personal matter where there is no full access to examine the evidence. Even Gandhiji himself expressed this difficulty in his own case in a reply to Pandit Malaviya. He writes,

"..... I hope I am not consciously proud. What I am, unconsciously and in spite of myself, God only knows fully and, to some extent, those who surround me. I am not impatient with anyone." (45)

Moreover in this connection, I humbly think that the question whether Gandhiji's self-suffering is a case of masochism or otherwise may be a problem of biographical and historical importance
but is irrelevant to the present consideration. There can be abnormal cases of masochism where the self-suffering is undertaken to derive satisfaction to the ego-centric tendencies. But every case of self-suffering cannot be a case of masochism. Hence the act of self-suffering in Satyagraha cannot be necessarily regarded as a case of masochism.

d) Non-violence as a principle of moral action:

Let us now consider the question of deciding the moral worth of non-violence as a principle of action by applying the relevant criteria which are used to decide the moral worth of any principle of action.

It has already been shown that non-violence reflects a critical spirit showing consideration for others. Similarly it also reflects a sense of respect for the others, at least, as a source of argument or as a rational being. Similarly the principle of non-violence demands refraining from doing mental, vocal or physical injury to the others. In such a spirit, it reflects spirit showing respect to other individuals. On the contrary, violence neither reflects a critical sense of consi-
deration for the others nor an attitude of respect for the others. Hence it can be said that non-violence as a principle of action holds moral worth while violence does not do so, according to the first criterion.

Similarly the principle of non-violence can be defended on the possibility of its reasonable universalization. Gandhiji writes,

"I can consistently ask a person to give up his life for a cause and not be guilty of violence. For non-violence means refraining from doing injury to others." (46)

The word consistently is important. It means that the non-violent action can be universalized. He also passes similar remark at another place which also means that the principle of non-violence can be universalized. He remarks,

"My point is that non-violence as the supreme law of our being ceases to be such the moment you talk of exceptions." (47)

This defence of non-violence on the reasonable possibility of its universalization can be supported by the third criterion of morality which enjoins: Any rule limiting the pursuit of individual good which any rational being may accept as a necessary condition for the possibility of a kingdom of rational beings holds moral worth.
Applying this criterion, it can be said that the principle of violence does not hold moral worth for two reasons viz., 1) neither it helps, as it is shown, the individual to realize his good as a rational being nor 2) does it offer a schema for human interrelationship which may help the individual to pursue their goals as the rational beings. On the contrary, the principle of non-violence does offer a schema for human interrelationship that may help the individuals to pursue their goals as rational beings. In the practice of non-violence reflecting a spirit of critical consideration for the others and respecting other person as a source of argument, it offers a schema for the human inter-relationship which is commonly known as a democratic way of life. Here one can find a schematic frame of human inter-relationship which Gandhiji visualizes in his non-violent pattern of social inter-relationship.

Justified

Violence is adopted, some times, on the utilitarian ground. It is not that utility is not a factor to be reckoned within a moral consideration. Moral consideration as a rational consideration do also consider the claims of the party to be inflicted suffering. In such a critical and
sympathetic consideration Gandhiji considers a
violent action even as non-violent one. He writes,

"Just as a surgeon does not commit himsa
but practises the purest ahimsa when
he wields his knife on his patient's
body for the latter's benefit, similarly
one may find it necessary under certain
imperative circumstances to go a step
further and sever life from the body
in the interest of the sufferer." (48)

But on the perusal of the most of the cases of
violence defended on utilitarian ground, it will
be seen that such impartial consideration is lack-
ing. As it is seen, moral consideration being a
critical one reflects a consideration that gives
similar worth for the action for any one in a
similar situation. And in a case of such impartial
consideration, Gandhiji may permit the use of
violence as a minimum unavoidable in the present
imperfect state of human existence.

Violence indefencible even on the
utilitarian grounds.

So much from the point of agent. From the
point of environment, it is generally admitted that
the use of violence does not prove useful. Martin
Luther King writes,

"Violence ....... is both impractical
and immoral. It is impractical because
it is descending spiral ending in
destruction for all. The old law of an
eye for an eye for an eye leaves
everybody blind. It is immoral because
it seeks to humiliate the opponent
rather than win his understanding; it seeks to annihilate rather to convert. Violence is immoral because it thrives on hatred rather than love. It destroys community and makes brotherhood impossible. It leaves society in a monologue rather than dialogue. Violence ends by defeating itself. It creates bitterness in the survivors and brutality in the destroyers."

(49)

In view of the immense destructive power of the atomic weapons, it is being held that the use of violence cannot be defended on utilitarian ground. Now use of violence is becoming morally condemned. Ghandiji writes,

"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 anything good coming out of it in the future. If light can come out of darkness, then alone can love emerge from hatred."

(50)

Briefly it can be stated that the situation is now changed for two reasons:

1) Due to the invention of the atomic weapons threatening the existence of the human race, and

2) Due to the means of non-violence provided by Ghandiji as an alternative to violence.

Hence in view of the changed situation, it can be stated that use of violence can neither be defended on utilitarian ground nor on the plea
that there is no other better alternative.

Moral force and Non-violence.

I have already discussed that there is a correlation between a state of detachment and the practice of non-violence. Similarly as it is seen, there is a correlation between detachment and moral force. Hence it can, therefore, be said that there is a correlation between non-violence and moral force. It is in this sense, it can be said, that Gandhiji's view that non-violence is a soul-force or moral force is significant.

Non-violence in its dynamic form is an attempt to seek freedom from the divisive forces in life. Hence an attempt to seek freedom from the divisive forces can also be said to be an attempt to liberate forces of moral worth either in individual or social life or in both. Similarly love as an active force and as a positive form of non-violence seeking participation in the life-process of others can also be said to be an effective moral force in this sense.