CHAPTER IX

NON-VIOLENCE IN PRACTICE

Non-violence in practice is nothing but Satyagraha. When non-violence takes the form of Satyagraha, it becomes a power, moral and spiritual, that cannot be resisted. In this chapter, we shall see the forms of Satyagraha, the ways of Satyagraha, Conundrums in Ahimsa, the Doctrine of the sword, the Practical Non-violence. The Sýadvad in Satyagraha, Mass Non-violence and Effective Substitute for war and lastly some Polemical problems with reference to Gandhi. Before we discuss these points, we should first know what Non-violence in Practice is.

People not knowing what Satyagraha is, equate it with non-violence and with passive resistance. Some also identify it with Sarvodaya. Gandhi coined the word 'Satyagraha' when he was engaged in the civil disobedient movement in South Africa. Formerly, Gandhi called his movement as passive resistance but on knowing that a new element had entered into it, he wanted to change its name. Some one suggested to him as 'Sadagraha'. Gandhi was not satisfied with it as it did not cognate fully what he means to say, so he called his civil disobedient movement as Satyagraha.
Satyagraha is not passive resistance. Nor it is "Militant non-violence", the term, Erik H. Erikson thinks, preferred by Martin Luther King for Erikson comments: 'it fails to suggest the spiritual origin of non-violent courage in Gandhi's "truth".' Erikson suggests that Satyagraha should be called the "leverage of truth". He suggests also: 'in addition to truth and force, I want to suggest the skillful (skilful?) use of a sensitive instrument.' It seems that he is not satisfied with his term, "leverage of truth," as he later on continues: 'A lever, I admit, is a hopelessly primitive analogy in an electronic age.' Thus, it is clear that Satyagraha has no equivalent term in English. It has its own unique meaning.

Satyagraha is not always passive; it sometimes becomes coercive when non-co-operation, boycott, strike, etc. enter into the field of Satyagraha. 'Coercion is the application of either physical or moral force to induce another to do something against his will.' But, here, there is a great difference between non-violent and violent coercion. Satyagraha allows for several stages of winning over an opponent, in which persuasion precedes the non-violent coercion.

Satyagraha is a process of educating public opinion, such that it covers all the elements of society and in the end makes itself irresistible. Satyagraha, not only as a way of life but also as the technique to fight evil, is the contribution of Gandhi not only to India but also to humanity at large. The principle of non-violent resistance, proving truth by self-suffering is as old as the first martyr, in religious history. It is
as ancient as the Greek philosopher Socrates. It is as historical as the crucifixion of Christ. The development of this simple technique into an art and science, its use on a mass scale, its successful application to conflicts domestic, economic, social and political have been the unique achievement of Gandhi. He was the author of Satyagraha and he knew its science more than anybody else and he was conscious of its importance and he consciously applied it to the problems of life.

Satyagraha is not static but dynamic. Satyagraha is not an adventure meaningless. It calls forth moral and spiritual energy of the people taking part in Satyagraha. Professor T.L. Vaswami represents Satyagraha in a very impressive manner, when he observes.

'The struggle he (Gandhi) rightly urges, must be not only non-violent but also progressive, should be not an adventure but an investment, a moral and spiritual investment, of the people.'

1. The Forms of Satyagraha

The forms of Satyagraha can be divided into the following categories individual versus the individual, individual versus the group, the group versus the Government, and the community versus the State.

1) Individual versus the Individual

Man has used this form of Satyagraha in his daily business. Gandhi used it against his teacher, his father, his wife and his neighbour, and he was never unsuccessful in it. He used it in South Africa against the guard who beat him. Gandhi. When he was
asked to go to law for the injury done to him, he refused to go to law as he had already forgiven him. In this form of Satyagraha man has to keep patience. Instead of retaliating when hurt by those he loves, he has to suffer quietly. He patiently observes for the right solution.

ii) **Individual versus the Group** -

Sometimes, man has to observe this form of Satyagraha against his community or the whole group in his office or a group of friends. Gandhi observed Satyagraha against his community when he was excommunicated for his voyaging across the seas. He kept patience and ultimately, the hatred against him was subsided.

iii) **The Group versus the Government** -

Sometimes, the particular group uses this form of Satyagraha to redress its grievances. Gandhi became the leader of the group offering Satyagraha in South Africa. He became the leader of the peasants in Champaran, in India, to redress their grievances against their masters. He became the leader of the labourers working in the mills of Ahmedabad and led the group successfully in Satyagraha against the mill-owners. Gandhi took part in the native states of India and led the groups successfully. Particularly the Rajkot incident is noteworthy. Vallabhbhai, Gandhi's colleague, became the leader of the peasants of Bardoli and led this form of Satyagraha so successfully that he was named as 'Sardar' by Gandhi.

iv) **Community versus the State** -

The whole community of India became one under the banner of Gandhi
in India and offered this kind of Satyagraha in non-co-operation movement launched in 1920 and it was extended up to 1922. He also led the whole community of India against the British Government, in the Civil Disobedient Movement which extended from 1930 to 1934. Lastly he led the whole community against the Government in 1942 and was successful to make India free from the bondage to the foreign government.

2. The Ways of Satyagraha -

The ways of Satyagraha varied. Among them the outstanding are ostracism, 'Thurna' and assertive Satyagraha. We deal with them one by one.

i) Ostracism - Ostracism is one kind of social boycott. It is a weapon used by the community to its own members who are reluctant in giving co-operation. These members in turn are non-co-operated. Here the herd instinct operates. These members non-co-operated by the community feel themselves as if they are isolated and they are cut off from enjoying the benefits of the particular community to which they belong. They are, in not giving co-operation to the community, looked at as the persons siding the enemy. Only their primary needs - shelter, food and clothing, are not meddled with. Personally, Gandhi was against this type of practice and he did not give countenance to it.

ii) Thurna - 'Thurna' is a 'sit-down' strike. Formerly, the money-lender used to sit in front of the debtor without taking food. The public used to throng round about the man who practised this way of Satyagraha. 'Sit downs' are perfect as a strike technique.
In the non-co-operative movement, a group of people used to offer 'sit-down' strikes before the Government offices and lowered the esteem of the officers in the eyes of the public. Some groups used to offer 'sit down' strikes in front of the officers and forced them to relinquish their posts. 'Bhurna' is an ancient institution of India. It is the father of all sit-down strikes.

iii) Non-Co-operation - Non-violent non-co-operation is the notable method by which we cultivate the public opinion and make the public free from fear and thus we get the public opinion enforced. Shridharan quotes in his book, War without Violence, Gandhi with reference to the efficacy of non-co-operation thus: "Even the most despotic government," Gandhi says," cannot stand except for the consent of the governed which consent is often forcibly procured by the despot. Immediately the subject ceases to fear the despotic force, his power is gone." 5 Since Gandhi's entrance into the political field of India, the minority taking keen interest in politics used to wield the weapon of non-co-operation in one way or the other. But in 1919 to 1921, Gandhi wielded that weapon in a large measure by which schools and colleges were deserted by students, litigants and the congress deserted law courts. There was non-participation in government loans. There was boycott of legislative councils considering them as impotent debating. There was the withdraw from the government service and from the army and the police. There was the surrender of all titles of honour. Again in 1930-1932 Gandhi wielded this weapon against the British Government in India and used all the above ways, with the addition of withdrawing co-operation from British insurance, banks and shipping. The British Government then were not able to sit quietly to see the non-
violent movement as they were worried much.

iv) Civil Disobedience - This term was coined by Henry Thoreau. He meant by this term that all unjust laws should be disobeyed and it is the duty of all the citizens to do so. In Gandhi's hands, this term gets orientation. It became a revolutionary weapon in his hands. In 1930, Gandhi started civil disobedient movement and decried against the obnoxious laws—the salt law, the Forest Law, and the Revenue Law. These laws affected the whole populace so Gandhi got a good backing from the public. The officialdom in India as well as in Great Britain thought those laws unjust. Even James Ramsay Mac Donald, before he became the premier, denounced the Salt Act. Then getting the wind toward him, Gandhi raised his cry against the Press Act and the statutes governing proscribed literature. Then he broke the laws as many as possible, on the strength of the public opinion both national and international.

After paralysing the British Administration in India through non-co-operation and setting the coercive agencies of the state at naught by civil disobedience, the Satyagrahis under the banner of Gandhi took part in the programme of taking over the functions of the government one by one.

v) Assertive Satyagraha - During the 1930 movement, volunteer corps were organised to work as policemen and traffic conductors. The Bombay Congress Committee worked out its own way of taxation over the co-operating citizens and fined those financial interests which came in its own way. In many villages, the Panchayat (ruled by five leading members) raj (rule) was established and in this way
the congress rooted out the Government's hold over the villages, the base of the British Raj in India.

Besides the above ways of Satyagraha, Picketing, Economic Boycott, Hizrat (evacuation of place), etc. are some of the ways of Satyagraha, which we do not discuss for the shortage of space.

3. Conundrums in Ahimsa

Conundrums are seeming inconsistencies and sometimes there lies inscrutability in them. These conundrums show that life cannot be reduced to perfect logic. There is the surd in life which cannot be made logical. Such problems require that their formula should be forged in such a way that both the sides of the problem can accept the formula. This requires the deep analysis of the point.

Let us examine a few conundrums that faced Gandhi. "How could you (Gandhi)," asks a well-known Congressman, "with your non-violence actively associate with and help the congress whose policy is based on violence in the present crisis?" Gandhi replied that there are degrees of violence as of non-violence, The working Committee has not wilfully departed from the policy of non-violence. It could not honestly accept the real implications of non-violence. This reply of Gandhi shows that there are degrees of violence and violence in degrees to be looked at. Mark that the Working Committee has not wilfully departed from the policy of non-violence. That shows that the Working Committee is not strong enough to face violence with non-violence. So far it is weak. Mark also it could not honestly accept the real implications of non-violence, as a creed. That is, the implications of non-violence, as a creed or policy, accepted by the Working Committee cannot be adhered to. Here is the surd in life. Life cannot be reduced totally to logic.
The case is not with any member of the congress but it is with the Working Committee, a very important body. This shows that non-violence in practice has to forge a formula which may suit the weakness of the party which is to work and not merely to discuss. The Working Committee is not a debating society which may discuss only. It has to shoulder the responsibility of the event in life. Gandhi further says that all that they (the working committee) had learnt truly was that they could put up a successful fight, on the whole non-violent, against the British Government. He adds further, which we should mark, that Congressmen have had no training in the use of non-violence in other fields. Thus, for example, he adds further, they had not yet discovered a sure method of dealing successfully in a non-violent manner with communal riots or goondai sm. This shows that the Working Committee has no scientific knowledge of the non-violent method. That the method, which is successful in one case, may turn out into a total failure in another case. This shows that Gandhi is not able to show one non-violent method practicable for all sorts of people, for the ills of life, particularly the remedy against the Communal riots or goondai sm.

Another conundrum runs in the following. "How do you (Gandhi) think that the masses can practise non-violence, when we know that they are all prone to anger, hate, ill-will? They are known to fight for the most trivial things." Gandhi replies that the masses though unintelligent obey the orders of their leaders who are intelligent in non-violence. The masses by having genuine belief in their leaders observe non-violence perfectly as was the case in Champaran where the ryots unintelligent observed
perfect non-violence with reference to the planters and the Government. In this case one may say that the magnetism of the leaders and the momentum of the non-violent movement played their role more effectively than the inherent strength of the masses. They may waver on another occasion under another leader.

One more conundrum, let us see. If the party fails in matching violence with another's violence, there is still non-violence. Gandhi says that in the advent of the Second World War in Europe, the Polish army of two million soldiers failed in matching violence with the violence shown by the Nazis under Hitler. The Polish were considered non-violent by Gandhi.

Besides the above illustrations with reference to conundrums, there are still more. For the shortage of space, we cannot discuss but only mention them. The monkeys having souls like ours can be killed or not if they spoil the harvest in the fields. The serpents if not caught in the Sabarmati—Ashram can be killed or not. When the calf's disease proclaimed as beyond remedy, can that calf be killed or not? If killed, can we say that it was a non-violent act? In these cases Gandhi and other persons differ in their judgment as Gandhi considers the above cases as non-violent.

4. The Doctrine of the Sword

Gandhi's doctrine of the sword is thought-provoking, as he allows under certain circumstances to use violence, though, in general, he prefers non-violence to violence. He says violence is better than cowardice and inertia. On any account,
one should defend the honour of one's dependents and that of one's country. Gandhi 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 would, in a cowardly manner, become or remain a helpless witness to her own dishonour.' Gandhi says non-violence is the law of our species as violence is the law of the brute. In case of the brutes, they cannot show non-violence as spirit lies dormant in them, thus, they know no law other than physical might.

Further Gandhi says that strength does not come from physical capacity. The ordinary run of mankind thinks it in quite reverse. Looking at the burly figure, the ordinary man thinks that that burly figure has a great strength. But this is not so in reality. An average Zulu is, in physique, more than a match for an average Englishman. But the Zulu shivers when a pistol is pointed even by an English boy to him. The Zulu fears death. That shows that strength does not come from phsyique but from an indomitable will. So in this case, the woman sometimes shows more strength than a man of stout body. So strength does not lie in giving a blow for a blow but in suffering consciously. Gandhi observes: 'Non-violence in its dynamic condition means suffering. It does not mean meek submission to the will of the evil-doer, but it means putting of one's whole soul against the will of the tyrant.' The mouse cannot show non-violence to a cat by its meek submission to her. The mouse cannot be said to forgive a cat when it allows itself to be torn to pieces. If the man, who can punish the violent man who attacks him, shows forgiveness to the attacker, there is a definite recognition of his strength. Such a man is said to show non-violence.
With conscious suffering and enlightened forgiveness, there comes a great strength in the mind and nerves of the man. No General Dyers and No Frank Johnsons can humiliate such a man as shown above. Those who feel too downtrodden not to be angry and revengeful cannot be said man in its true sense. There must be a stir in the man when he sees any outrageous injustice. Such a man can defend either non-violently or violently. So for he defends himself non-violently he is better. But if he defends violently, he is not a coward. Cowards are damned by Gandhi. Vallabhbhai, whom Gandhi called 'Sardar' once said in his lecture that a man should defend himself even by throwing a cat, if she happened to be near, against the attacker, but he should not submit meekly. That is there should be no submissive nature. Meek submission is not tolerated by Gandhi.

Gandhi says that he is not visionary when he preaches non-violence. He claims to be a practical idealist. So he allows violence to be practised under certain circumstances. But when he allows violence to be practised, he says that there should be a code of violence. When the communal riots broke out in India after her independence, the Biharis, to retaliate the Muslim riots in Noakhali in East Bengal, killed the helpless muslims in Bihar. Gandhi denounced the retaliation of the Biharis publicly and pronounced the Biharis' massacre of the helpless muslims as sheer madness, by saying that even violence has its code of ethics. If the Biharis should call themselves as heroes, they should have gone to Noakhali and would have given man to man fight. Gandhi remarks: 'To take the name of non-violence when there is sword in your heart is not only hypo-
Briefly, Gandhi wants the man to die courageously and fearlessly when the alternative is dishonour and humiliation on the part of the men and women. But by facing death, they can impress others to do so. Gandhi values non-violence as supreme importance, but he denounces inaction as rank cowardice and unmanly. He says, "Cowardice is impotence worse than violence."

The Doctrine of the Sword makes us think that mere non-violence for all the people and on all occasions will not do. This shows that non-violence should be practical. Mashruwala has shown the way which was approved by Gandhi.

5. The Practical Non-Violence

K.G. Mashruwala contributes a significant idea to make non-violence pertinent and practical with reference to the masses of the world. Let us know now he defines practical non-violence. He observes: "Practical Non-violence may thus be defined as just selfishness without malevolence and with a touch of benevolence." In this definition of Practical Non-violence by Mashruwala, we see that he talks of just selfishness. It seems to us that Mashruwala can appeal to masses more than Gandhi because the lay man cannot be without his 'just selfishness.' Mashruwala contradicts just or proper selfishness with malevolence and contradicts also benevolence with malevolence. It means that a man may have just selfishness without being benevolent. He may fight for his just claim and may not sacrifice his just claim. During this fight, his benevolence practically is suspended; no doubt he has the intention of doing bene-
violence. He makes his idea clear by his further observation.

'This (practical Non-violence) is not Ideal Non-violence, which is practically the same as anti-violence or benevolence. When a person feels keenly about his rights and wants to enforce them, he cannot afford to be benevolent, though he may be just, non-violent and after the struggle, be even benevolently generous. During the struggle benevolence seems suspended in act, though according to the definition it has to be present in intention.'

We may mark the words in the above quotation, 'after the struggle, be even benevolently generous.' This shows that the ma's proper selfishness in practical non-violence will not drive him to rank or unjust selfishness but he will be 'benevolently generous.'

Briefly, Mashruwala has given a practical step to Gandhi's Non-violence, which is Ideal non-violence. We have reason to think that Mashruwala's practical Non-violence can appeal to masses more than Gandhi's Non-Violence. But one thing is sure that both Mashruwala and Gandhi in the Principal of Non-violence agree with each other.

The discussion about non-violence in practice shows us that non-violence is not bereft of violence in certain circumstances.

6. Syādvāda in Non-Violence

The Syādvāda will give the different phases of non-violence relatively to the different circumstances. The Syādvāda, the Anekānt Vāda, the Saptabhangā-nāya are variously translated as the "Doctrine of Possibility", "Theory of manifold aspects," "Argument in seven
The translations of these terms are not giving the full and proper sense of the terms. So the translations of these terms are not satisfactory. Some have, in ignorance, taken objection against the Syād-vāda, as they think that it attributes contradictory features to an object. The word 'Syāt' in Syād-vāda is misunderstood. It has a characteristic sense according to the Jaina thinkers. Shree Harisatya Bhattacharya, M.A., B.L. Ph.D. observes about the word 'Syat' critically. 'The word, Syāt, is often translated as "perhaps" or "may be". The translation is certainly wrong, as it does not carry the sense in which the word, syat, is used by the Jaina thinkers. The word Syāt suggests also that there are other aspects or attributes equally applicable to the object, but that these, instead of being denied, are either subordinated to existence or left out of consideration, for the time being. The word Syāt, means 'in some respects.' The word syāt, is used because absolute statements are meaningless. The word syāt, makes the statement a relative one. The first predication is Syāt-asti-eva. The 'eva' is indeclinable and is sometimes dropped. The word 'eva' imports definiteness and certainty in the relationship. The word 'asti' means 'is' and is affirmative in sense. The words 'eva' and 'syat' are used in all the seven predications and their significations and usefulness are the same in all the seven predications.

The barest possible description of the doctrine of Syād-vāda can be given in this way. It yields a two-fold aspect of knowledge. In its realistic aspect, the Syād-vāda gives the factual picture of a thing under observation. And in its psychological aspect,
the Syād-vāda presents us the true way of knowing the thing. The Syād-vāda gives us the seven predications of the thing. Shree Harisatya Bhattacharya describes the doctrine of Syādvāda in nicety thus: 'The Syād-Vāda consists in an exposition of the relation of an object to one of its given modes or features and its exposition is not one or two absolute or unalterable judgments about the relation but it is constituted of seven considerations each presenting one definite aspect of the relationship. It is at once a law of understanding and a law governing all realities, psychical and unconscious.'13. The seven predications according to Syād-vāda are these:

1. Syāt-asti-eva (in a sense there is certainly),
2. Syāt-nāsti-eva (in a sense there is not certainly),
3. Syāt-asti-eva-Syāt-nāsti-eva (in a sense, there are both 'is' and 'is not' certainly),
4. Syāt-avaktavya-eva (in a sense there is inexpressibility certainly),
5. Syāt-asti-eva syāt-avaktavya-eva (in a sense, there is, but it is inexpressive certainly),
6. Syāt-nāsti-eva Syāt-avaktavya-eva (in a sense, there is not but it is inexpressive certainly),
7. Syāt-asti-eva syāt-nāsti-eva syāt-avaktavya-eva (in a sense there are both 'is' and 'is not' and also these both inexpressive, certainly).

In the case of the fourth predication, Syāt-avaktavya-eva (in a sense there is inexpressibility certainly) Shree Harisatya Bhattacharya states: 'it is not to be forgotten that "inexpressibility" is not a matter of subjective estimate but that it implies a corresponding element in the objective reality itself.'14
Gandhi likens the doctrine of Syādvāda of Jainism as he sometimes quotes the example of the six blind persons judging the structure of an elephant. By this he evades the scorching criticism of his dire opponents and satisfies by considering those critics as blind to the nicety of the problem. Let us now see Non-Violence from those seven predications given above.

1. The First Predication (Syāt-asti-eva)-----------------------------

In a sense, there is non-violence certainly. When Gandhi was slapped in the South Africa by the European in the dispute of the seating in the Victoria, Gandhi observed silence. For him it was non-violence. That may not be so in another case, if the attacked person bears revenge in his heart and suffers openly, he cannot be called non-violent.

2. The Second Predication, Syāt-nāsti-eva --------------------------

In a sense, there is no non-violence certainly. In the war, there is undiluted violence. Soldiers are killed in numbers ruthlessly. But in the case of defending the honour of one's dependents, if they are not saved non-violently, they should be saved violently. In that case violence loses much of its rigour. Practically, it is not violence. Gandhi says that any how, either by non-violently or violently, the honour of one's own country and that of one's dependents must be defended.

3. The Third Predication, Syāt-asti-eva-Syāt-nāsti eva--------------------------

In a sense, there is non-violence certainly and also in a sense there is no non-violence certainly. In the third predication,
syāt-asti-eva and syāt-nāsti-eva are not put juxtaposition; both are the moments of one and the same thing in which both lose their identities, but when they are analysed they are there. Shree H. Bhattacharya observes: 'In the third Bhanga (i.e. predication), an analytic-synthetic view was taken.' Gandhi admits: 'My non-violence does recognise different species of violence-defensive and offensive.'

4. The Fourth Predication, Syāt-avaktavya-eva

In a sense, there is inexpressibility certainly. We have noted earlier but that it is not subjective but objective. The difference between the third predication and the fourth one is noteworthy. Shree H. Bhattacharya states: 'the difference between the viewpoints of the third and the fourth Bhangas (predications) consists in this that whereas in the former, the positive and the negative constituents do not obliterate themselves in the new idea but continue to remain prominent as its background, in the latter, they are mingled up into the new idea, although analysis of the new idea may hold them up as its two constitutive elements.' The fourth predication consists in the way that we cannot say that there is non-violence or violence unless we know it with reference to the circumstances.

5. The Fifth Predication, Syāt-asti-eva Syāt-avaktavya-eva

In a sense, there is non-violence certainly, in a sense, there is inexpressibility certainly. In this predication, non-violence is merit but we cannot say that it is always and in all circumstances merit or otherwise.
Gandhi talks of the Russian girl who defended her honour against the man who came to molest her. She, in defending, tore away the skin of the man who tried to molest her, by her nails, and ultimately he was dead. There is the inexpressibility in the circumstances whether the man was killed inspite of his entreaties to pardon him.

6. The Sixth Predication, Syāt-nāsti-eva Syāt-avaktavya-eva

In a sense, there is no non-violence certainly, in a sense, there is inexpressibility certainly. In this predication, to tell a lie is no non-violence but it does not hold good always and in all circumstances.

7. The Seventh Predication, Syāt-asti-eva Syāt-nāsti-eva Syāt-avaktavya-eva

In a sense there is non-violence certainly, in a sense, there is no non-violence certainly, in a sense, there is inexpressibility certainly.

Incidentally, to understand this predication, the example can be given,- The foreign policy of our Premier, Indira Gandhi, with reference to the recent pact with Soviet Russia. In that pact, our Premier, in a sense, has maintained our Neutral Policy. In a sense, it is not maintained also, as both the countries are bound together by the pact. There is also inexpressibility as to who will have the upper hand in that pact. The circumstances, in future can only reveal it. If we become strong, says Indira, we will be happy with the pact. If the country becomes weak, the Soviet Russia will have the upper hand in the pact. Moreover,
both the countries are not bound to a contract but they will discuss on every occasion when peace either of India or of Soviet Russia is threatened.

In this predicament, non-violence is merit, but there are some circumstances in which it is not merit, for all this, we cannot say always and in all circumstances the particular act either as non-violent or violent.

The Syādvāda in non-violence requires our deep penetration to understand the particular act of Gandhi as either non-violent or violent. If it is violent, it should be understood in degrees also. As a whole, we should understand that act and all this not bereft of circumstances.

7. Mass Non-Violence, An Effective Substitute For War -

To make mass non-violence as an effective substitute for war, all political and economical causes of war, first, should be removed. Then there remain mostly the psychological causes for war. These should be dealt with psychologically. K.N. Katju says in Jarijan, 25-4-1942, that he personally thinks that the ideal of non-violence is not unrealizable. The public is loathsome to violence shown within a period of a quarter of a century in two World Wars. So if the public opinion is educated, it will go against the persons who stand for war. So to attain the goal of non-violence, there should be the whole field of education radically changed and planned. So we should begin with the child and mould the mind of the coming generation. Aldous Huxley also says, in his chapter on education in his book, Ends and Means, that to change the mind of men radically,
one should begin with the child. Half-measures are totally inadequate. There should be a complete break with the old way. There should be a firm resolve to plan a new order of society based on new principles.

To end war, rather to nip in the bud, the non-violent resister should not only end all the causes of war, but he should begin, even before ending the causes of war, a project for peace. Edwin S. Towill and T.E. Faulkner quote Richard Gregg succinctly: "War is the result of many forces and conflicts. To do away with war we must end its causes...... To secure peace we must create the things which bring peace. Even before we can be sure how to end all the causes of war, we can begin to build up the things which cause peace." 18

To overcome the violent attacker, the non-violent resister should first know the position of the strength of his opponent, i.e. his virtues so that the non-violent resister may cultivate more and higher virtues than those cultivated by the violent attacker. In war, the numbers do not count but the moral fibre of the participants in war does count. The participants in war i.e. the violent attackers have courage, endurance, strenuous action, devotion, enterprise, unity with their fellows, order, training, sincerity, and discipline. Conflict gives them another source of strength. All these virtues of the violent attackers have the full scope in the non-violent resisters, as they undergo the semimilitary discipline of the violent attackers. The non-violent resisters not only utilize the above virtues of the violent attackers but they use them on the moral plane. The conflict which gives strength is settled.
on a higher plane of synthesis in the case of the non-violent resisters. They know human nature more than the violent attackers do. The psychological warfare plays the important role both in war and non-violent resistance. The non-violent resistance resembles war in a psychological and moral aim and effect. It also further resembles war in the principles of strategy, a parallel emotion and instinct, courage, dynamic energy, self-sacrifice, chivalry, action, suffering, capacity to endure fatigue, and action. It resembles war in being positive and powerful, and in getting an opportunity for the great service for an idea and the consequent glory. The violent attacker resembles the European athlete pitted against the moral jiu-jitsu of the Japanese. Surprise plays the most important role in the case of the violent attacker as he expects the similar things from the non-violent resister but the non-violent resister met the surprise as the flanking movement. The flanking movement plays a great role in war. The non-violent resisters playing their role on psychological and moral planes make their opponents doubt the validity of their cause. The moment the violent attackers doubt the validity of their cause, they lose the field. The violent attackers have the frame of mind that they are the protectors of a noble cause, but when they think that they are sold to an ignoble cause and find that their officers err in something, their courage is broken. They are drifted away on the moral plane. Napoleon says of the relative importance of the moral plane of the to the physical plane by saying "in war, the moral is to the physical as three is to one." Marshal Saxe says that the secret of victory lies in the hearts of human beings. So by coming in contact with the non-violent resisters,
sincere, tidy, gentle, sympathetic and of loving nature, the violent attackers think and thus are unhinged in their minds for the attack is loaded by their officers. The Duke of Wellington put it forcefully: "No man with any scruples of conscience is fit to be a soldier." While the "starvation blockade" of Germany lasted, the British troops, occupying the Ruhr after the World War I Armistice, showed the slackness in their discipline and were on the point of mutiny because they had no protection of a great cause. In Hungary, in 1956, when the Soviet Russia used her army against the patriotic and noble Hungarian workers, the Soviet soldiers declined in their duty, their morale being deteriorated. So the Soviet Russia had to displace her army brought from Soviet Russia and placed in the place of that army the soldiers from the distant Asian part of Russia. The UN report suggests that they were under the impression that they were fighting against the British and French imperialists.

The sceptics of the non-violent method may pose a problem that if the leaders having imaginative creativeness are deported or imprisoned, the rank and file will not be able to continue the non-violent movement. In that case the stir and stress of the movement will create new leaders and the movement will be carried on further. In 1947 when Abul Kalam Azad of India was released by the British Government, he in his address, probably in Bombay, gave a tribute of honour to the Indians at large for continuing the mass movement against the British Raj when all the topmost leaders were arrested.

The sceptics may further pose a new query, if the leaders are killed, the effect may be that the public may be taken aback and
there will be deterioration in the morale of the mass movement. This is a wrong guess. On the contrary the movement will gather momentum and the slaughters will break their own morale by the opposition of the public opinion. The news of massacre of the Jallianwala Bagh was censored; and it reached America after eight months, after the event. But, when that news reached America, the public opinion rose against the British people. The news of that massacre was a deadening blow to the British prestige and to British self-respect throughout the world.

The sceptics may further pose a new query, if the hydrogen and atom bombs and rocket missiles may be used by the violent attackers in war against the non-violent resisters, the mass movement may come to an end. Even the ruthless soviet Government did not use them against the East German and the Hungarian rebels in 1953 and 1957. Such weapons in effect recoil upon the users. These weapons work like boomerang as the radioactivity generated by these weapons may not only encompass the opponents but the users too.

In the history of the world, the violent attacks are recorded mostly. Jenghiz Khan, Alexander the Great (who is known as Sikander), Napoleon, the Nazis under Adolf Hitler killed the persons e a m a s s e. They were the hungry lions on the battlefield. But history is not without the illustrations of the non-violent movement, if there is an eye to see them. Gandhi in South Africa led the non-violent mass movement against the British in 1906 and it lasted eight years. The then premier Smuts had to yield and the Indians won the major parts of their demands, the
abolition of the registration, etc. Though Gandhi's movement in India in 1921-22 was unsuccessful in its immediate objective, it paved the way for the success later on, when he again led the non-co-operation struggle en masse against the British Raj in India and he got freedom on the part of the Indians. In Hungary in the mid-nineteenth century, Emperor Franz Josef broke the old treaty between the Austrians and the Hungarians and wanted to subordinate Hungary to Austrian power. So he terrorized as horrible as he could. Ferenc Deak, a Catholic landowner, raised his head against the terror by his scheme for independent Hungary education, industry and agriculture and boycotted the Austrian goods. He led the mass movement peacefully. Ultimately he won his objective namely, freedom for his country. The Emperor had to capitulate, and Hungary got her constitution on February 18, 1867.

Denmark was invaded by the Nazis in April 1940. The Nazis under Hitler gave a threat to the Danish people that if the German troops were not admitted in an hour, the Danish cities would be bombed as Rotterdam was. They king and the prime minister gave in. The Danish were instigated by the British to sabotage the important places and the railway in the country, but the king warned his people not to do so. The non-violent movement lasted for two years and a half. Ultimately the warring British Government persuaded the Danish to use violence. Norway was invaded by the Nazis in April 1940. The Nazis made a pro-German Norwegian Vidkun Quisling the dictator of the country. In the momentum of non-violent resistance, a teacher living in a small town north of Oslo, whose name was Haaken Holmboe led the peaceful civilians against the terror of Quisling. Quisling deported all the teachers
of Kirkenes, thinking that the morale of the non-violent movement would be broken. But he erred in his guess. Ultimately, the unpremeditated and spontaneous non-violent movement of the Norwageons, self-respecting, self confident, self-reliant, got its objective so the Norwageons won independence. In Montgomery in U.S.A., the Montgomery Improvement Association chose Martin Luther King Jr., who read much about Gandhi's method of non-violence and was influenced also by Thoreau's Essay on Civil Disobedience, led the peaceful movement against the segregation imposed by State laws. The negroes were debarred in using hotels, restaurants, schools, housing, parks, trains, buses, street cars and all sorts of public facilities and were segregated from the white. The Negroes appealed to the United States Supreme Court. That court proclaimed that segregation on buses etc. was unconstitutional. Dr. king made a stride toward freedom with a right step. Though he is no more, his work lasts for ever. These illustrations are not few and far between. There illustrations are not few and far between. There are many and those who have interest to read more may refer to Bart. De Digit's The Conquest of Violence (1937) with advantage. Edward Glover, the British Psychologist, says that to end war, sadism and masochism, the deepprooted instincts, should be overcome.

The hope of the world is to the practical working of UN towards the peace of the world. In the part, the bague of Nations disappointed us in achieving the peace of the world. The UN now may take a lesson from the downfall of the league of Nations and may overcome its limitations. Still the UN is not working satisfactorily. On the eve of the UN Day, 'The Prime Minister,
Mrs. Indira Gandhi,' reports UNI, New York, October 23, 1970, to
day bluntly told the United Nations that the big powers were seek­
ing to direct and control its activities and urged member- countries
to breathe a new meaning and purpose into it to create an order
where use of force would defeat its own purpose.19 In the above
quotation we see clearly that Mrs. Indira Gandhi requests the big
powers not to meddle with the affairs of the UN and not to create
the difficulties on the path of UN. Mrs. Indira Gandhi is reported
by AP- 'Mrs. Gandhi told the UN to concern itself with the task of
completing the "unfinished revolution of our times."21 We may
cherish the hope that the UN will finish the revolution by the
non-violent method.

Briefly, the non-violent mass movement against war requires
self-purification, patience, the creative imagination, the
practical inventiveness and a broad heart to see both the sides of
the conflict, the part of the workers to effect resolution, in­
tegration, and sublimation, to circumvent the conflict which has
no aftermath of repugnance, disgust and contempt.

8. Some Polemical Problems -

Among some polemical problems with reference to Gandhi's non-
violence, these are note worthy, -

i) Is Gandhi absolutely non-violent ?

ii) Is non-violence a creed or a policy ?

iii) Is non-violence peculiar to India ?

iv) Is Gandhi a practical idealist ?

v) Is non-violence for the individual different ?

Let us take these polemical problems, one by one.
i) Is Gandhi Absolutely Non-violent?

Apparently, it seems that with the name of Gandhi, absolute non-violence is affixed, as non-violence is not a policy but a creed with Gandhi. In principle, it is so. But in practice, uncertain circumstances, he allows violence to be done. If a serpent in the Sabarmati Ashram in Ahmedabad was not caught, he allowed his men to kill it. When the calf’s disease was beyond repair, he allowed the doctor to kill the calf so that it might not suffer from pain any more. When the monkeys used to damage the harvests, he allowed the men to shoot at the monkeys. If one’s dependent cannot be defended by non-violence, he allowed to use violence. If India’s honour cannot be defended by non-violence, he allowed violence. He deprecated cowardice and inaction or inertia. Bart-De Ligt observes: ‘Let us not forget, by the way, that Gandhi is no more than the most part of European revolutionaries an “absolutist”, or dogmatist, in non-violence. According to him, it is better in certain circumstances, when one is not able to defend a righteous cause in non-violent ways, to defend it with arms sooner than abandon it in cowardly fashion.’

Gandhi himself admits that though he believes in non-violence absolutely, he is unable to practise it, absolutely. He takes both the principle and the circumstances in his consideration.

ii) Is Non-Violence a Creed or a Policy?

It is said that with Gandhi only, non-violence was a creed and with the congress working committee, it was a policy. This shows
that inspite of the heroic sufferings of the masses on many occasions, e.g. 'Guru Ka-Bagh Horchas' of the Sikhs, the Satyagraha of the Bardoli peasants, the Kharasana episodes, the masses could never cultivate a passion for non-violence. During those occasions the masses showed themselves a passion for non-violence. Gandhi for a time being thought that the masses had been educated to have non-violence as a passion. But, the internal feuds, namely the communal ones at Noakhali and at other places made Gandhi and others clear that the masses, who heroically suffered on some occasions mentioned above, could not continue the passion for non-violence. The pacifists do not consider non-violence as a passion or a creed. With them if non-violence fails, they resort to violence. They appeal to arms ultimately.

Gandhi allowed the serpents to be killed in the Sabarmati Ashram, when they were not caught. Did he not break his creed on this occasion? So, it is not possible for a man to observe non-violence in all circumstances. So, creed can be in principle only. So, those who observe non-violence on particular occasions unto death can be called embracing creed in their lives.

We hope that by taking non-violence as a passion or creed at least in principle one can by due practice, on different occasions, cultivate oneself into a creed in degrees for non-violence and increase the one's inner strength progressively.

iii) Is Non-Violence Peculiar to India?

Krishnalal Shridhareni is bold enough to state in the louder
state in the louder tones that non-violence is peculiar to India. He has reasons to state it. He observes: 'The Indian people, co-partners with Gandhi in Satyagraha have this three-thousand-year-old doctrine of Ahimsa as their background.'

Such a long time-honoured doctrine cannot but give privilege to Indians in the observance of Ahimsa. By giving details Shridharan further asserts: 'Therefore, in tracing the origin and growth of the ideology, one cannot possibly disregard the most outstanding and conspicuous footprints—such as the Vedas, Upanisads, Jainism, Buddhism, Asokanism and medieval mysticism of India—left by the onward march of Indian culture.'

'About the special characteristics of the Indian life and culture, Mashruwala observes: 'India is the only country in which lakhs of people have given up animal food, and where many would not kill even a snake.'

The Indian public enjoying from a long time the deep atmosphere of non-violence strengthened from time to time by the Savants of the doctrine of Ahimsa has indeed the living atmosphere that penetrated into the bones of every Indian, high or low, rich or poor, prince or peasant. So all Indians believe at least in principle in the efficacy of non-violence.

The lesson of non-violence is present in every religion but Gandhi fondly believed that perhaps it was here in India that its practice had been reduced to science. But this does not in least convey that non-violence cannot flourish in the other parts of the globe. Count Leo tolstoy and Henry Thoreau through their books touched the hearts of thousands in number with reference to non-violence. The efficacy of the Sermon on the Mount is very large and effective as Gandhi used to say, "Did Christ not say this?" The nature of the man either on one part of the globe or the other part of the globe does not in depth
Mashruwala says that non-violence is not peculiar to India. He observes: 'It is not the peculiarity of any one country, race or religion. In my humble opinion, the teachings of the Vedic religion and the attitude of the average Hindu towards the functions of government and towards enemy and crime is not fundamentally different from that of other religions and nations.' The Cardinal virtues are realized by men of different cultures and customs. So, non-violence can be translated into practice by all the persons of the mankind, with the difference being that the nation which enjoyed the atmosphere of non-violence for a very long time can practise the doctrine of non-violence, easily.

iv) Is Gandhi, a Practical Idealist?

Gandhi claims: ' I am not a visionary. I claim to be a practical idealist.' Gandhi says elsewhere that he preached nothing what he had not put into practice. So, experiments truth and non-violence with himself and then preaches. So he is right in claiming that he is not a visionary and he is a practical idealist. So far subjectively, he is right. But he is not right objectively. When he was questioned what to do in communal riots spread all over the country, he was puzzled and said that he was not a practical idealist. He contradicted himself by claiming that he is a practical idealist; then, on another occasion, he refuted it. Let us observe him critically in the talk between the correspondent and him, in the following. A correspondent writes: 'You regard yourself as a practical idealist. What is
happening to-day is inhuman. Will you tell me how your practical
act can work against these evil-doers?" Gandhi replied
"I must plead guilty to having called myself a practical idealist.
I have tried ever to practise as I have preached, be it ever so
imperfectly." In Gandhi's above reply it seems that he is a
practical idealist only subjectively and not objectively.

Gandhi says with reference to the communal riots: 'A non-
violent person's life is always at the disposal of him who would
take it.' In Ahmedabad at the time of the communal riots,
there happened Vasant Rajah incident. Both Vasant, a Hindu fellow
and Rajah, a Muslim one, sacrificed their lives in the communal
riots. Their examples were not followed then in Ahmedabad, but
that incident made Ahmedabad public more cautious and resorted
to deep thinking. That is, to make an objective effect in Ahmeda-
bad public, Vasant's and Rajah's sacrifices of themselves went in
vain. Gandhi further observes: 'He (a non-violent resister)
will, therefore, be willing to die so that the others may live.'
This is too much exacting from the masses or ordinary individuals.
The life of the individual should not be considered less important
than the lives of the others in multitude. For evolution every-
body requires life. Only in exceptional cases, he may sacrifice
himself. It is proper to say that the individual may risk his life,
that is he may live. But where there is a sheer wastage of life,
it is useless to sacrifice one's life. Gandhi says further: 'He
(a non-violent resister) will serve himself with the rest, by him-
self dying.' This shows that the non-violent resister is made a
Sheer instrument, rather than is respected as one having an
end. Gandhi affirms: "The absolutist will ever sacrifice himself." It is true that only an absolutist will sacrifice himself. We cannot expect the masses to be absolutists in a requisite way, however they may be on the path of the absolutists. In a sense, one can say that even Gandhi is not an absolutist. Only he here, in what follows now, speaks in a shrewd manner: 'Self-defence can be violent or non-violent.' And immediately he adds on the same page: 'If the capacity for non-violent self-defence is lacking, there need be no hesitation in using violent means.' Now we can say equally with Mussolini that if non-violence (of the particular individual) fails, violence will not fail.

In brief, the discussion leads us to remark that Gandhi was a practical idealist, with enthusiasm no doubt, only subjectively and not objectively. And in asking the sacrifice of the non-violent resistor's life, he should not be treated as an instrument only; he should be respected as one having an end too. One should be shrewed in this case.

v) Is Non-violence for Individual Different?

From the views of Gandhi, it seems that there is no difference between the individual or personal non-violence and the group non-violence. But, this is not always the case, as the psychological ground features more in the individual non-violence than in the group non-violence. In the case of the individual non-violence, there is the stress more on the subjective side than on the objective or external side. While in the case of group non-violence, there is stress more on the objective or external side than on the subjective side. J.B. Kripalanic observes: 'Personal non-violence is more
psychological than concerned with external or group conduct. Group non-violence, of course, does not exclude individual non-violence. But the two do not always coincide. In individual conduct the essence of human action lies in the psychic motive and the spring of action and not merely in its physical manifestation or its results in time and space; in group conduct, while motive is important, the main emphasis is upon external action resulting in external consequences.36

To conclude - with reference to the forms of Satyagraha, they show us the steps from the individual to the state. As we develop the strength, we can take the higher step in Satyagraha. The ways of Satyagraha namely, ostracism, Dharna, Non-co-operation, civil disobedience and assertive Satyagraha show us that the particular way of Satyagraha suits the particular occasion. Conundrums in Ahimsa require the penetration of intellect, the balanced thought and the practical wisdom of the man facing the conundrum. The doctrine or the word shows that on some particular occasions, bearing the principle of Ahimsa, one has to use violence in the practical affairs. Such a thoughtful degree of violence is within the scope of non-violence. The occasion demands the practical wisdom. Mashruwala's view of the Practical Non-violence if a revised copy of Gandhi's non-violence suitable to most of the people. The seven ways of looking at non-violence or the theory of syadvada in non-violence, makes us shrewd in observing non-violence on the particular occasions. The consideration of the principle without circumstance cannot help us in arriving at the true judgment of any act. So the principle, in the particular
circumstance, to be observed should be thought of. To avert war, the weapon of mass non-violence is very effective. The polemical problems, viz- Is Gandhi absolutely non-violent? Is non-violence a creed or a policy? Is non-violence peculiar to India? and Is Gandhi a practical idealist? require the penetration of intellect and the balanced thought bearing both the sides of the problems.

There is no air tight compartments between Non-violence in Theory and that in practice. Only for the sake of the facility in our understanding, they are thus separated, otherwise they are one. In view of this, the assignment of the particular points to the different chapters on non-violence (VIII and IX) may not be a strict one.