CHAPTER VI

GANDHIAN WAY OF RESISTING AGGRESSION
GANDHIAN WAY OF RESISTING AGGRESSION

It is true that Gandhi did not get an opportunity of applying non-violent technique for resisting aggression. But he had certain ideas for resisting aggression without resort to violence. This chapter examines the value and efficacy of his technique.

We have already noted that aggression involves an offensive action of a state in violating by force the rights of another state — its territorial rights or the like. However, Gandhi's non-violent technique has the potentialities of resisting this type of action. It is not correct to assume that since non-violent resistance has not been tried before in the international sphere, it can be dismissed as unrealistic or unpracticable. For, his technique is comprehensive enough to be adjusted to a new situation. Gandhi himself modified it to make it more suitable for different situations that he faced in South Africa and India. His fight against Britain was a fight against imperialism which is an international issue as it deprives a subject country of its claims and rights. The time has now come when non-violent resistance can be tried on a vast scale, since the awfully destructive weaponry, which the states now possess, does not leave any chance for success for the attainment of any goal by the victor.
Floyd Dell, associate editor of the radical American Magazine, The Masses, wrote prophetically in 1916: "The theory of non-resistance is the pre-scientific phase of a new kind of knowledge, the knowledge — to put it vaguely — of relationships. Here is a field as yet unexplored save by the seers and the poets. Its laws are as capable of being discovered as those of astronomy or botany; and the practical application of this knowledge is capable of effecting a greater social changes than the invention of the steam engine".1 Robert William Miller agrees with this approach. A non-violent resister generally believes that no man wields power for long without justification of his conscience. Thus, moral pressure cannot be ruled out as a way of resisting aggression. However, non-violent resistance has its own strategy which is different from that of violent resistance. For, the non-violent resister invites suffering rather than inflicts suffering on the opponent. Similarly, the goal of non-violent resistance is not to humiliate or defeat the opponent but to find a solution through self-suffering which is most satisfactory

---

to both the opponent and the Satyagrahi. So Gregg holds that non-violent resistance differs in one psychological respect from war, as the aim of the non-violent resister is not to injure or crush and humiliate his opponent, or to "break his will". Rather in a non-violent fight the aim is to convert the opponent, to change his understanding and his sense of values so that he will join whole-heartedly with the resister in seeking a settlement truly amicable and truly satisfying to both sides.\(^2\) However, C.M. Case and Gene Sharp do not believe that the non-violent resister only aims at a compromise or conversion of the opponent. For, according to them, though it is different from violence, it is not free from the element of coercion.\(^3\) Gene Sharp states, that in some cases of non-violent action, the opponent is not converted. He may decide to accede to the demands of the activists on the following grounds:

1) The defiance may become too widespread and massive to be controlled by the opponent's repression;


ii) The non-cooperation and defiance may make it impossible for the social, economic and political system to operate unless the actionists' demands are achieved;

iii) even the opponent's ability to apply repression may be undermined and may at times dissolve.4

In any of these cases, despite his resolution not to surrender, the opponent may discover that it is impossible for him to defend or impose his policies or system on the former. "In such an instance, the change will have been achieved by non-violent coercion".5 It can take the form of non-cooperation or refusal to pay taxes to the government. Though the action is negative in character, its consequences may be positive. However, Niebuhr called it a negative form of resistance. In his view, any resistance that enters the field of social and physical relations and places physical restraints upon the desires and activities of others, it is a form of physical coercion. Whether viewed as a negative or positive notion, Gandhi had a scheme of resisting aggression which can be properly understood if we divide it into three

stages: First, the plan of action before the invasion takes place; second, the plan to be adopted during the period of armed attack; and third, the plan for the period when occupation of the territory by the aggressor has taken place.

In the first phase, the first line of defence is persuasion and reasoning with the offender, for, Gandhi’s view of non-violence never implies that a non-violent man should bend before the violence of an aggressor. While not returning the latter’s violence by violence, he should refuse to submit to the latter’s illegitimate demand even to the point of death. “This was the true meaning of non-violence resistance.” In all humility, the non-violent man would ask the aggressor his real demands and if he is satisfied that it is something worth striving for, then he would have no hesitation in proclaiming from the house-top that the demand is just and it has to be admitted by everyone concerned. He can seek decision through arbitration or by any impartial body. He can put pressure on the aggressor by making appeal to the world public opinion. This action may create a new situation favourable to the resolution of a conflict. For, when a controversial issue is received

by a significant number of persons in any segment of an audience face to face discussion starts again which helps in sorting the mutual confusions that characterised the practical political disagreements. The determination of a non-violent man not to submit to aggression or to unjust demand and his willingness to concede the reasonable demand of the opponent creates a new psychological situation where the invader in the first instance has been subjected to a thinking process in order to find a rationale for aggression. He has been made to justify his action before the world community. In this process, some reasonable demand and arbitrary action may be eliminated. The non-violent man can also explore the possibility of settlement of disputes with the opponent through the good offices of the third State, mediation or through arbitration. The practical mind of Gandhi even envisaged a world federation which can play an important role in the peaceful settlement of disputes between nations. However, his concept of international organisation is different from the United Nations. It has the following features: 7

1) The individuals and the nations comprising the federation should be pre-dominantly non-violent.

ii) All nations be truly free from colonial rule;

iii) Equal representation to all nations without any discrimination of 'Have' and 'Haven'ts';

iv) Its membership should be purely voluntary but every nation should be willing to sacrifice itself with good faith for fellow members;

v) With regard to disarmament, it should move from 'unilateral' to 'universal' disarmament, but the initiative must come from one's own self; and

vi) It should have international police force to maintain law and order.

But this kind of a world federation cannot come into existence unless consciousness is generated throughout the world for immediate need of such an institution. Consciousness raising is a tactical process for the entire transitional period which can be divided into three stages, that is, consciousness raising, mobilization and transformation.

The first step in this direction is to build a consensus. In this connection also prospect for
consciousness raising depends on the degree to which a new conception of world order begins to attract domestic and transnational support. Gandhi's successful fight against colonial rule non-violently added credibility to the efficacy of non-violent action. The protest movements after the fatal blast of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the awareness of the scientists about the thermonuclear weaponry further generated consciousness among the masses and the intellectuals for the need of a non-violent approach to conflicts in society. As such, in Gandhi's view, each conflict is an opportunity for its creative resolution for peace and wholesome development.\(^8\)

The fundamental Gandhian idea here is that a creative and dynamic resolution of conflicts and the dawn of a predominantly peaceful life is possible only when creative understanding of conflicts is seen in the removal of motives behind a conflict. This is possible through grass-root cooperations, mutual confidence, building measures among individuals and nations alike.\(^9\) This kind of awareness is certainly very helpful in the establishment of world federation. However, in Gandhi's

---

view, a world federation must be organised on the basis of voluntary action on the part of each nation. The federation must be freed from the fallacy of domination. The working of the present United Nations does not fit into Gandhi's concept of World Federation. For, the United Nations is an instrument in the hands of great powers as the countries, which hold Veto, determine the policy of United Nations.

In Gandhi's scheme of world federation, it moves from nationalism to internationalism. For Gandhi, internationalism is possible only when nationalism is developed, that is, when people belonging to different countries are able to act as one man. This means that "the beginning of progress towards that heavenly goal must take the form at first of a willingness among races, religions and nations to unite under a single constitution, through which their unity and membership, one of another is established, the laws under which they live are promulgated after public discussion and by some form of majority decision and are enforced, where it is not voluntarily obeyed, not by war but by police force, where persuasion and example have not sufficed. As between sovereign nations the operation of a constructive non-violent spirit must lead to some form of federation. It cannot succeed until it has done
so. The proof that it exists effectively will be the appearance of a federal system.\(^{10}\) Gandhi's rationale of internationalism issuing from nationalism was that true internationalism must be rooted in the consciousness of the masses. For, he believed that internationalism resulting from the moves of the political elites would remain weak. The non-violent federation will work in its natural relationship without any hinderance because it has the consent of the masses. The collective will for living together will transform the very nature of international community. However, this world order must be brought under the control of moral and spiritual law.\(^{11}\) In Gandhi's words: "If another war has not already begun, it is because no one is ready to enter upon it. After all, men are not machines. They cannot be continually fighting without being reduced to the state of beasts. One has to hope, for the sake of humanity, that they will do some hard thinking and discover the truth that the common man, of whom the world is composed, gains nothing by cutting his fellowman's throat and that the fruits of peace are infinitely superior to those of war".\(^{12}\)

11. Ibid., March 5, 1950, p. 12.
cannot be had overnight. But Gandhi was sure that by proper training it can be achieved, if the nations have the will.\textsuperscript{13} However, he looked upon certain international ideologies such as Imperialism, Communism and Fascism and their related economic, political and military practices as barriers to world peace. As Gandhi's way to world federation does not seem to be a mere utopia. In fact, Gandhi calls himself a 'practical idealist'. For one thing, Gandhi does not commit the logical error of advocating the attainment of peace through war and force. Again, Gandhi does not seek to solve the complex problem of the peace of the world by means of any simple or piece-meal method. On the other hand, he goes to the root of the problem and starts from the regeneration of the individual. At the same time, he does not ignore the influence of the political and socio-economic institutions — of the milieu — upon the individual. As a matter of fact, he suggest a drastic remodelling and reconstruction of the political and socio-economic structure of the nations internally without (unlike many present-day enthusiasts of world peace) seeking to abolish national frontiers outright. But he recognises the independence of nations — the drift towards internationalism brought about by modern means of transport and communication — though he is an internationalist with a difference. Gandhi conceives

\textsuperscript{13} The CWMG, Vol. LXXII, p. 105.

Gandhi was well administer with the situation wherever he has to answer the practicability of non-violence (\textit{Ibid}, p. 104).
of an international organisation whose strength comes from the character of the individuals composing it, and not from armaments. In such an organisation, all nations will participate as equals not in name but in reality. The question is that, as to how humanity will move towards it, Gandhi could foresee several stages. It first demands conquest of self. In fact, Gandhi wants the man to be reformed first. For, in his view, there can be no war, no violence unless man commits it. According to Richard Beal, "Gandhian utopianism is resilient and challenging not because it can be fully realized, but because it calls upon man to rectify those existent injustices and inequities that are his doing and, therefore, subject to his undoing. By Gandhian standards much of what is wrong with the world falls into this rubric". Though Gandhi believed, that the world federation, as conceived by him, can work without the help of armed forces, he was realistic enough to include for some time the minimum role of world police force to chasten a recalcitrant member-state. We have already noted (p. 93) that Gandhi was realistic enough to

understand that the whole community or the world would not reach the highest level of non-violence. Consequently, during a transitional period some force may be visible in the action of the government or individuals.

In the absence of such a federation what is the course left to a non-violent resistor when his country is invaded? In that case, the only course open to the non-violent man is to offer resistance against it without resort to violence. In 1931, Gandhi recommended that an invading army should be met by what he called "a Second Thermophylae" that at some suitable place, men, women and children should form a living wall, thus giving the invaders the choice of marching over them or of turning back. They would tell the invader and all his forces at the frontier that the people would refuse to co-operate in any work in any undertaking. They would refuse to obey orders despite all threats and despite all punishments inflicted upon them. The denial of internal support will create a hiatus between the ruler and the ruled and had to non-establishment of cultural ties between them as a result of which no ruler can establish his authority.


* Alexander wanted to conquer the whole world. But he could not set his empire in India. The causes defines are lack of support. As his aggression confined to the battlefields. And people refused the subjection boycotting the intermixture of cultural ties.
When the non-violent opponent is determined not to submit to the will of the invader, the latter's attack becomes fruitless. For, the aggressor has always a purpose behind his attack; he wants something to be done, some object to be surrendered by the defender. Now, if the defender has steeled his heart and is determined not to surrender even one inch, and at the same time to resist the temptation of matching the violence of the aggressor by violence, the latter can be made to realize in a short while that it would not be paying to punish the other party and his will can not be imposed in that way. This would involve suffering. It is this unalloyed self-suffering which according to Gandhi is the truest form of self-defence which knows no-surrender. And yet a method of self-defence. Similarly, Albert Einstein in his speech in 1930 argued that "if only two per cent of those assigned to perform military service should announce their refusal to fight, as well as urge means other than war of settling international disputes, governments would be powerless, they would not dare send such a large number of people to jail". Einstein's prediction that resistance by only two per cent of the eligible manpower of a modern nation will incapacitate the authority is in accordance with Gandhian way of resisting aggression without resort to violence. For, it

deprives both the aggressor and the dependent states to strike by physical force.

Jeremy Bentham quotes an instance of the effect of people's refusal to fight. The King of Sweden was forbidden to engage in offensive war by the Constitution of the country. When he did so and declared an offensive against Russia which was deemed an aggressive one, a considerable part of his army refused to act, the officers actually throwing up their commissions. Hence, the king had to retreat from the Russian frontier and summon the Diet. This instance suggests that if all peoples treat their bellicose rulers in this way, few wars would ever take place. Several radical pacifists have always insisted that "wars would cease when men refused to fight". In view of the conditions in India, Gandhi argued that a fulledged unarmed war comprising crores of people and standing idle in the front of aggressor, the defensive war will never happen or it will be worthless as the people, trained in non-violent way, would offer themselves unarmed as fodder for the

aggressor's cannons. The underlying belief in either case is that even a Nero is not devoid of a heart. The unexpected spectacle of endless rows upon rows of men and women simply dying rather than surrendering to the will of an aggressor must ultimately melt him and his soldiery. 19

In each case, the bravery, in Gandhi's view, consists in dying not in killing. And in civilized nations, he adds, law of love rules the mankind. So the brutal invaders would thus have to give in or they will be condemned by the whole world. So Gandhi observed, "The army would be brutal enough to walk over them, you might say. I would then say you will still have done your duty by allowing yourself to be annihilated. An army that dares to pass over the corpses of innocent men and women would not be able to repeat the experiment. You may, if you wish, not believe in such courage on the part of masses of men and women, but then you would have to admit that non-violence is made of sterner stuff. It has never conceived as a weapon of the weak, but of the stoutest hearts". 20

Undoubtedly, the courage required for such an action is exemplary and unusual. It is possible that it may shake the aggressor when they see the opponents dying without raising their hands against their killers. But in the modern warfare such sights of non-violent men and women willing to die for a cause and commitment to truth may not be available, for, armies and cities can be destroyed by air attacks, chemical and nuclear weapons, and Inter-continental missile without the users of such weapons coming into direct contact with those against whom they are using. In such a situation they may not be able to witness the suffering their action has caused to their opponents committed to non-violence. But Gandhi was far-sighted enough to understand the role of world public opinion in determining the relations between nations in the modern times. No nation howsoever powerful can afford to isolate itself from the rest of the world by disregarding the world public opinion, which Dr. Gilbert Murray also explains in the following terms while using President Roosevelt's words, "It is the principle of "Quarantine", or "the rule of absolute non-cooperation in the crime of aggressive war. As soon as any government is convicted of committing or preparing that International crime the rest are to withdraw all
their cooperation, in whatever manner and to whatever degree may be most wise and effectual, to exclude its goods from their ports; to sell it no arms, no oils, no metals, no materials of war... No doubt, it demands a sacrifice from each nation: the economic sacrifice of losing trade and the diplomatic sacrifice of preferring the friendship of a weak nation to that of a strong.\textsuperscript{21} There is a great effect of economic sanctions in modern times in preventing aggression or in making aggressor to see reason. (We have already discussed the role of economic sanctions in Chapter IV).

Moreover, the enlightened people in the country of the aggressor may force their decision makers to avoid action that causes suffering to the people of another country. Such actions by peace activists are numerous in our times. For instance, an important confrontation which took place between the peace activists and the war mongers recently in United States when thousands of people marched on the building and when it was blocked off by soldiers, sat down at their feet for an impromptu 'Teach-in' that lasted all Saturday night and on into Sunday night. Hundreds of people were arrested and many were beaten by U.S. Marshals who tried to break the morale of the demonstrators by righteous brutality. People brought away

\textsuperscript{21} Harijan, December 10, 1939, p. 366.
different memories. Some remembered the sense of community created among strangers on the steps of the Pentagon, the sharing of food, the refusal to fight back or break ranks in the face of government aggression; others remembered best the feeling of oneness with the soldiers and they came away with the idea that soldiers were not the enemy, despite their uniforms, and that they shared many of the movement's values and beliefs and should be approached as brothers. These Pentagon demonstrations worked as later on these were supported by war resisters with the civilian help, at many places especially in Vietnam.

Non-violent resistance against an army of occupation forms the third decisive plan of action. The nature of resistance is in continuation of the resistance in the second phase. To restrain the power of invader the tactics to be applied is non-cooperation and civil disobedience i.e. complete boycott of the invader. It is valid or quite effective so far as the control on transportation, labour, etc., is concerned. The boycott will totally paralyse the functioning of communication.


* The War Resisters League enrolled such men and women with the declaration who for any reason whatsoever are uncompromisingly opposed to all war.

** In confrontation with the war-makers demonstration at the Pentagon, Washington D.C., Oct. 21, 1967. (Here also people had indifferent attitude with the non-violent tactics and they blamed it).
ammunition supplies etc. and thereby make his occupation a futile attempt. Gandhi tried these methods in India against British rulers and showed verbal relevance against Japanese, as they were feared to enter India in their battle with Britain. He was aware that non-violent action had power to reduce the violence of other party. It is complete transformation. Relatively it is worth recalling that even the spontaneous non-violent resistance campaigns in Denmark and Norway demoralised the Nazi troops so badly that they had to be frequently rotated, and that in the East German uprising some Russian soldiers refused to fire on unarmed Germans at the cost of their own lives. Since an occupation requires continual face to face contact with the subject peoples the henchmen of dictators are human, it seems conceivable that they, too, would eventually respond to types of behaviour that inhibit the use of violence and demoralise its possessors.23 The same response Gandhi got from his European friends and pacifists abroad who were influenced by his thoughts and methods. They realized the claim of the aggrieved party (i.e. India) against the occupants who were at the same time their own people (English). The commitment is still there in non-violent resistance movement working

at the global level though Gandhi is not there. But in his time, Gandhi faced the problem of the effectiveness of "soul force" when he was asked what in his opinion was the effect Pastor Niemoller could have when he was a helpless prisoner in a concentration camp, "There is no waste of energy. So we learn in the books on mechanics. This is equally true of human actions. The difference is that in the one case we generally know the forces at work, and when we do, we can mathematically foretell the resultant. In the case of human actions, they result from a concurrence of forces of most of which we have no knowledge. But our ignorance must not be made to serve the cause of disbelief in the power of these forces."

Actually, the resisting action treats the occupiers with psychological way which we use in daily dealing face to face with each other. According to Stephen King Hall, the non-violent resistance against an occupation can be an operation in the field of psychological power politics which if skillfully used, can undermine the whole position of the occupying forces. It requires an essential arrangement such as (1) Training of the nation before hand in the appropriate tactics. (2) The resistance must


This author urges that institutions such as the Imperial Defence College and the Unofficial Institute of Strategic Studies should initiate long term and comprehensive studies about the strategy and tactics of non-violent resistance or as we would prefer to all it non-violent attack, (Ibid., p. 207).
be non-violent in character. 26

Similarly, Theodore Ebert has suggested another method of non-violent resistance which is called selective resistance or non-violent positional war which is a replacement for total non-cooperation. It works as follows: "During the campaign of selective resistance, the industrial life of the country would continue as normally as possible. However, centres of production, trade unions, the administration and particularly individual members of the community would refuse to comply with any demand made by the invaders which is in conflict with their personal ideas of free democracy". 27

Gandhi's three-fold action of Satyagraha, non-violent direct action, or non-violent resistance according to Gene Sharp, are those methods of protest, resistance and intervention without physical violence in which the members of the non-violent group perform either acts of omission - that is, they refuse to perform acts which they usually perform, are expected by custom to perform, or are required by law or regulation to perform; or acts of commission - that is, they perform acts which they usually do not perform, are not expected by custom to

26. Ibid., p. 204.
perform, or are forbidden by law or regulation to perform; or a combination of both.\textsuperscript{28}

Gandhi’s programme of non-violent resistance to aggression is similar to the one put forward in 1942 by the American pacifists J.W. Hughan and Cecil Minshaw and which can be summed up as follows:\textsuperscript{29}

i) No services or supplies to be furnished to invader;

ii) No orders to be obeyed except those of the constitutional civil authorities;

iii) No insult or injury to be offered to the invaders; and

iv) All public officials to be pledged to die rather than surrender.

Gandhi thought of trying his method in the event of Japanese attack on India with a view to demonstrate to the world, the superiority of non-violence and thereby strengthening our faith in it on a large extent. He made the people aware of their conscious belief against the existing theory of ‘Might is Right’ and substantiate it with his trio-plans for peace in International politics

\textsuperscript{28} Gene Sharp, \textit{The Politics of Non-violent Action}, \textit{op.cit.}, Part I, p. 68.

not in South Africa and India alone but also in Europe.

He wrote in 1946 "If the Government had not arrested me in 1942, I would have shown how to fight Japan by non-violence". He had already written in a letter, entitled 'To Every Japanese', in July 1942, stating his intention of full resistance against the possible Japanese incursion.

In accordance with this approach he had told Americans that if India's independence was unconditionally recognized, India would be able then to offer "irresistible opposition to Japanese aggression". Though things did not happen as stipulated and we don't have a practical example of Gandhian resistance to Japanese, his ideas show the glimpse of some sort of resistance in non-violent manner.

It is also evident in his reply to Mirabehn (Miss Slade) in connection with occupation of territory. He wrote: "If the British have retired in an orderly manner, leaving things in Indian hands the whole thing can work splendidly and it might even be made difficult for the Japanese to...

settle down in India or any part of it in peace, because they will have to deal with a population which will be sullen and resistant. It is difficult to say what can happen. It is enough if people are trained to cultivate the power of resistance, no matter which power is operating — the Japanese or the British. 33

Later on, in an interview to Richard Jen, a Foreign correspondent, he cleared the impression of countering Japanese armed strength, in the following words: "Just imagine that instead of a few Indian or even a million or so, all 400,000,000 Indians were non-violent, would Japan make any headway in India, unless they were intent upon exterminating all the four hundred million". 34 Gandhi had immense faith in his non-violent resistance power and things would have been different if he had to confront the Japanese invasion himself. As he said, "Our movement will make it more difficult for the Japanese to come in. But, of course, if there is no co-operation from Britain and the allies. I cannot say". 35 Even a Congress socialist leader Kamaladevi Chattopadhyaya believed that the nature of


34. The CMG, Vol. LXXVI, p. 298 (Interview to Foreign Correspondents).

35. Ibid., Vol. LXXVI, (Interview to the "Daily Express" before July 11, 1942), pp. 286-87.
Gandhi's resistance would have been quite unique. Thus, in one of her letters she wrote to Gandhi, "We are against the status-quo. We are fighting against it for we want a change in it but our alternative is not war for we know that the real solution does not lie there. We have an alternative to offer which is the only solution of this horrible muddle and the key to future world peace. It is this which I would like to be placed before the world. It may seem today like a cry in the wilderness; still we know that it is the voice which will ultimately prevail; and it is those hands which seem so feeble before these mailed fists that will finally reshape a battered humanity, and you are eminently fitted to give voice to it".36

The success of his method of non-violent resistance can be well appreciated in 70's and 80's, because of the rise in political consciousness among the people all over the world. While it may be very costly to invade a relatively well populated country, it is far more expensive to keep a population not reconciled to such domination under continuous occupation. For, unlike in the past, people today do not accept such occupations in a docile fashion. This factor has been highlighted in Vietnam, Afghanistan.

36. Harijan, October 14, 1939, p. 301.
and various other struggles for independence. Gandhi was not disheartened when Hitler was fighting for the extension of German boundaries rejecting the way of peace and persuasion. He, even, wrote a letter to Adolf Hitler pressing upon him to desist from the violent method.

Several Western writers did not like this action of Gandhi. But he replied that there is no meaning in my appeal to Herr Hitler to adopt non-violence. He is marching from victory to victory. I can only appeal to him to desist. That I have done. But to Britain, which is just now on the defensive, I can present the really effective weapon of non-violent non-cooperation.

Likewise when a daily

---


* A classic example which if it had succeeded might have changed world history was the attempt by League of Nations to impose economic sanctions on Fascist Italy in 1935, and this would have either beaten Mussolini to his knees or perhaps forced him to make war against greatly superior military force if the sanctions had included oil.


** Gandhi was asked, "Suppose Germany wins with India not having entered the war, would Hitler leave India alone?" He replied, "If the Nazis come to India, the Congress will give them the same fight that it has given to Great Britain..... Personally, I think the end of this giant war will be what happened in the fabled Mahabharata War. The Mahabharata has been aptly described by a Travancorian as the Permanent History of Man. What is described in that Great Epic is happening today before our very eyes. The warring nations are destroying themselves with such fury and ferocity that the end will be mutual exhaustion... And out of this holocaust must arise a new order for which the exploited millions of toilers have so long thirsted. The prayer of peace lovers cannot go in vain. "Satyagraha is itself an unmistakable mute prayer of an agonised soul". Marjian, February 15, 1942, p. 40."
press published that General de Gaulle made a call for passive resistance urging all free Frenchmen in France not to help in the war against Britain. Gandhi claimed simply citing General de Gaulle's advice to his countrymen to show that the world was irresistibly and unconsciously being drawn towards non-violent action. When the question was raised as to how a person or a nation resisting the enemy with arms, could adopt non-violent methods, he answered, "Badshah Khan is a Pathan. But today he has become a soldier of non-violence. Tolstoy, too served in the army. Yet he became the high priest of non-violence in Europe. We have not yet realized fully the power that is in non-violence." It is not the power comprising arms but the power of eternal soul which needs no arms.

A non-violent resistance to aggression cannot succeed unless there is a trained army of soldiers having full faith in non-violence. Gandhi called it a 'peace brigade'. Like violent resistance, non-violent resistance demands discipline and training of very high order. The peace brigades which Gandhi referred to were not fully organised in India. Their progress was limited to primary works. Krishnanlal Shridharani has spoken of

many training centres where social servants and village
workers carried on their jobs at the time when Indians
were not engaged in direct action. "Hindustani Sevadal"
and "Khudai Khidmatgars" were two other organisations
which can be named peace brigades but their members were
one of the most warlike in the world who achieved disciplined
non-violent resistance the type of which was not available
in any part of India. 42

Impressed by Gandhi's approach, Ralph T. Templin
wrote an open letter to the latter offering his own services
for the Satyagraha army. "I think that this war has already
revealed that armed force cannot defend even the institutions
of democracy without first nullifying them and second
destroying them. Further, the very strongest military
defence force in the world has not been able to make its
nation secure in this war mad world. I am convinced that
a non-violent war against all aggression, the economic as
well as the political, not only will prove more effective
than all the armies but can very rapidly be made available,
if the non-violent of the world will but put their minds
and hearts to the matter." 43 However, Gandhi while
appreciating this offer, refused to lead any Satyagraha
army of the world. "So far as I can see at present", he

42. Ibid.
43. The CwMG, Vol. LXXII, p. 312.
said, "every country will have to work out its own programme. Simultaneous action is possible". For resisting aggression, Gandhi urged even great powers to make sacrifice, "If the mad race for armament continues, it is bound to result in a slaughter such as has never occurred in history. If there is victor left the very victory will be a living death for the nation that emerges victorious". In an non-violent struggle, according to him, there are two alternatives: either the enemy comes to terms with you, then you win without blood, or the enemy annihilates you. This last solution is not worse than what a violent war in any case brings about.

Gandhi believed that underlying most of the violent conflicts between nations or groups or preparation for war there is mutual distrust among the political leaders of various nations. It is this that leads to race for armaments among nations. In other words, they build up their arsenals with latest weapons at the cost of their welfare programme only because they are afraid of their neighbours. This fear nullifies all efforts towards effective disarmament.

44. The CWMO, Vol. LXXII, p. 314.
46. Harijan, April 19, 1942, p. 121.
As such, most significant in this context, is to create a healthy atmosphere in the relations among nations preferably at the regional level since that would only have resultant effect at the global scale. This is modelled on a ladder system quite analogous to Gandhian 3 tier defence plan. Here, most important is to change the attitude and perception of the people, towards non-violent measures, conducting defence and foreign relations of a country, because unless the very psyche of the people remain unmutated no method can prove effective in stopping or resisting aggression.