CHAPTER IV

NON-VIOLENT STRATEGIES
NON-VIOLENT STRATEGIES

The chapter dwells on Gandhian traditional non-violent methods for the resolution of conflicts which have acquired new significance and efficacy in the recent times for preventing wars and violence in society. Non-violence is now viewed as a method superior to other methods of conflict resolution in the nuclear age. It means that the destiny of man on earth depends solely on resolving international conflicts by non-violent means. This requires complete change in our attitudes and ideas. We have dealt with prevailing peace (armed) strategies in Chapter IX. But as J.C. Kumarappa points out, disarmament is no solution. For, he argues, "when two persons are intent on fighting, disarmament does not prevent the conflict. You ban the atom bomb the "big Berthas" will be there. You remove the "big Berthas" the rifles will be there. Failing these you have the bow and arrow, the dagger or the stick. Did disarmament of Germany after World War I prevent World War II?"\(^1\)

\(^1\) Herlihan, November 30, 1947, p. 441.
The positive interpretation of non-violent (unarmed) strategy means as to how without resorting to violent methods, we can attain what we consider to be our just demands against an adversary using violent methods. This is practical non-violence which Gandhi viewed, as more effective in any conflict. However, there is no universal method of non-violent struggle. Its success demands application of a suitable strategy. Gandhi devised several methods in his continuous fight against imperialism which can be used today in the dispute between nations. Some of these methods are known to mankind and have been used by several countries since time immemorial.

NEGOTIATION

"Negotiation" is a term which covers every conceivable method of direct exchanges between the parties, both verbal and written. It may be conducted at various levels, ranging from talks between subordinate officials to conferences between Heads of States. Normally, negotiations are conducted through diplomatic channels.

It is not a new device. This is accepted both by Gandhians and the non-Gandhians who seek to resolve dispute without resort to violence. Article 33 of the
United Nations Charter provides that parties to the dispute shall first of all seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration and by judicial settlement. In the Gandhian non-violent armoury, negotiation is the first device for a settlement of conflicts, since all other methods may involve suffering and hardships. Consequently, the recent attempts by the major powers for the settlement of dispute regarding disarmament negotiations leading to SALT I, II and 'Detente' squares well with Gandhiana approach.

Gandhi's priority for this technique was utmost as he adds: "I am essentially a man of compromise because I am never sure that I am right". Hence, he was always open to conviction and prepared for honourable settlement. However, his compromise would never be at the cost of the cause or principle. He further adds, "It is essential that a satyagrahi should not be interested in showing the misdeed of his opponent but try to convert and befriend him. He should evenly trust the opponent even if he

does not know him and even if he plays him false twenty times. The satyagrahi is ready to trust him the twenty-first time." So in this context the value of negotiation cannot be doubted. It diminishes the cause of mistrust which leads to war on all fronts.

Gandhi too maintains that no struggle in the world can go for ever. Sooner or later the contending parties will have to sit on the negotiating table for arbitration which is the only right course in such matters. However, when any party to the dispute refuses to agree to negotiation or arbitration the party seeking justice has no choice but to resort to non-cooperation.

**Non-Cooperation**

This method involves neutralizing violence by abandoning the support to violence or to a violent system or submission to violence which means withdrawal of cooperation to any hierarchy or system that results in the perpetuation of evil in society. It is a way of protest against any policy or system that causes or perpetuates injustice in society. Non-cooperation is

---

not limited to any part but to the whole system constituting the framework. The principle underlying it is that it is not enough to refrain from committing injustice or doing wrong to others. We are equally responsible for the prevalence or proliferation of evil, if it continues as a result of our co-operation, silent acquiescence or submission. It can take the form of strike, hartal, boycott and resignation from offices and renunciation of titles. Gandhi used these tactics in his struggle for freedom of the country. According to him the state or a social organisation or custom cannot, however, live for a moment without the cooperation of the citizens. Their non-cooperation will disperse even the most militaristic state if it is used in a sufficiently extended form against violence. As the author of non-cooperation movement in India, Gandhi explains it as follows:

"There is no state run by Nero or Mussolini which has not good points about it, but we have to reject the whole, once we decide to non-cooperate with the system." "There are in our country grand public roads, and palatial educational institutions", he adds, "but they are part of

system which crushes the nation, I should not have anything to do with them. They are like the fable snake with a brilliant jewel on its head, but which has fangs full of poison! So I came to the conclusion, he argued, that "the British rule in India had crushed the spirit of the nation and stunted its growth, and so I decided to deny myself all the privileges, services, courts, titles. The policy would vary with different countries but sacrifice and self-denial are its essential points." Einstein was laying emphasis on the same idea while arguing that all wars could stop if 2 per cent of the population constituting the armed forces of a nation refuse to fight. The practical experience of Gandhi in non-cooperation during the struggle for freedom of the country strengthened his view on this aspect of non-violent strategy. In a resolution on non-cooperation he argued, "Thus, non-cooperation in an angry atmosphere is an impossibility. I have learnt through bitter experience the one supreme lesson to conserve my anger and as heat conserved is transmuted into energy, even so our anger controlled can be transmuted into a power which can move the world." 

* Refusing to serve in war in order to chasten the State, Infra-chapter V, p. 8.
The forms of non-cooperation used by Gandhi are applicable even to social, economic and political conflicts. He quotes the following instance to confirm his stand: "An alcoholic is bound to feel when the wine bottle is snatched away from his hands, and non-cooperation is a far more serious affair for the government than the snatching away of his bottle is to the alcoholic." It acts in the same pattern to rid ourselves of the feeling of helplessness. "Even the man who trusts to his rifle must admit that faced with non-cooperation, brute force is unsavailing and the rifle ineffective. When we get the strength for non-cooperation, rifles will be covered with rust, there will be grass growing over them and our children will play where they lie buried." When one side talks of non-cooperation, the other side has no choice but to follow the course which may result in cooperation with the non-violent opponent. The outside world especially in the United States anxiously watched the results of Gandhi's non-cooperation during Indian's struggle for freedom. The Literary Digest saw in the non-cooperation movement a new method of fighting. In its opinion, "non-cooperation, a negative word describing

8. Ibid., p. 201.
9. Ibid., p. 290.
the most powerful resistance ever offered to British rule in India, has perhaps puzzled the outside world about the movement led by Mr. Gandhi, who is described by some opponents as a combination of a religious mystic and anarchic agitator. Similarly, Shasnain maintained that the British feared Gandhi more than any other man on earth — far more than they feared de Valera or Lenin, for they recognized that he was fighting with weapons which he knew how to use with consummate skill but which they did not know how to counter at all. He continued.... Bullets, bayonets, artillery, aeroplane bombs, are useless against the man who is teaching all India to despise death, even to die loving the slayer. For Gandhi insists that his followers shall not harm the British, no matter what evil they do. He treats the British as if they were children playing with a force they know not of.

Even today, non-cooperation has a potentiality of waging a non-violent war. When all efforts of persuasion fail, non-cooperative action can be imposed against powers which encourage directly or indirectly wars and violence. The boycott of persons, groups, nations, agencies producing arms and other means of destruction is also


included in this act. In this context Dr. Gilbert Hurry's appeal to all nations to come together to cherish civilization is significant "whether others join you or refuse to do so", the inescapable path for moral observer, in his opinion, "is cooperation and non-cooperation". Cooperation "with one another in the things of peace", and "refusal absolutely to cooperate with the makers of war". In Gandhi's opinion, when people refuse their cooperation, withhold their help and persist in their disobedience and defiance they are denying their opponent, the basic human assistance and cooperation which any government or hierarchical system requires if they do this in sufficient numbers for long enough, that government or hierarchical system will no longer have power. This is the basic political assumption of non-violent action.

Mahadev Desai confirmed that efficacy of non-cooperation was being realized by the European nations, too, in the forties. Commander King Hall called it a


* For example Gandhi's demand that the Indian people should refuse to pay the salt tax was both symbolic and economic in its purpose to outcast the authorities law. Similarly, the Gandhian Strike, bypassing courts and legislature is a tool for bringing about changes in foreign policies through the withdrawal of services, disrupting the communication etc.
"Passive Defence". And it is working in one way or other since then where all action is taken openly and trustingly in the Gandhian spirit. A non-violent attempt to be successful needs change of the time only, with the realization that the pattern of violence meeting violence makes no sense, and that war violates something central in the human heart. An example of this is the Czechoslovakian boycott against the invasion of Prague by Soviet and WARSAW pact troops in August 1968. The spectre of thousands of unarmed civilians lying before Soviet tanks in Wenceslas square — of Czech youths standing before machine guns to shout slogans and exhort Russian soldiers to go home — undoubtedly surprised the Russians as much as it horrified the world. The spontaneous Czech non-violent resistance did as much to undermine the Soviet position within Czechoslovakia and before world opinion, as it did to solidify the Czechs against the invader. It was a case of self-inflicted-suffering to non-cooperate the offensive action of opponent which Gandhi called the

13. Mahadev Desai begins in reference to other statesmen likewise, 'I am not writing of the non-violent non-cooperation. We had in India a short while ago and which was labelled by some of our great men and by European Statesmen as a doctrine of negation and exclusion. I am referring to the non-cooperation that is being talked of in Europe today'. (Harlian, December 10, 1938), p. 366.

'fiery weapon' for resisting injustice. Prof. Morris Jones explains, "The merit of self-suffering lies not at all in its being a weapon for the weak; indeed, its use demands unusual courage and freedom from fear. Nor does it lie merely in its 'morally enriching' effect on the satyagrahi. It lies above all in its efficiency as an instrument of social persuasion." 15

Non-cooperation as a widely spread action in one form or the other helps to build up public opinion against the manufactured nuclear weapons. These are mostly called disobedient acts. Under more extreme circumstances, non-cooperation may lead to civil disobedience.

Civil Disobedience

It implies refusal to obey the laws of the state that violates the conscience of the individual. Gandhi stresses that Satyagraha and its adjuncts, non-cooperation and civil disobedience, are new names for the laws of suffering. The former, that is non-cooperation, need not necessarily be illegal action; it can take place within legal framework. But, the latter definitely involves the breaking of law and is thus an extreme

form of direct action which especially concerns law. By this means, the Satyagrahi denies the existence of the established authority. It can take the form of refusal to pay taxes or deliberate breach of any law of the state. For instance, Civil Disobedience in 1930-31, inaugurated with the manufacture of contraband salt, signified a symbolic opposition to British authority in India.

Gandhi explains the operational meaning and scope of Civil disobedience in the following words:

"Non-cooperation in military services and service in non-military matters are not compatible. 'Definitely' military service is an ill chosen word. You are all the while giving military service by deputy because you are supporting a state which is based on military service".\(^ {16}\) You will have to extend the scope of non-cooperation from mere refusal to serve in war to the non-payment of your taxes. This means public breaking of those laws which conflict with natural right and readiness to accept the suffering of punishment. When it becomes a national movement, civil disobedience shakes trust in the power of the state and makes its juridical institutions publicly opposed to morals.\(^ {17}\)

---

The principle underlying conscientious objection observed by several groups in the west has some resemblance with that of civil disobedience. For, conscientious objection to war may be defined as a refusal to participate in military service in order to protect one's own moral integrity. A conscientious objector seeks to turn his society from unjust to just course. The well known American philosopher of 19th century Henry Thoreau explains it as follows:

"If (injustice) is of such a nature that it requires you to be the agent of injustice to another, then, I say, break the law. Let your life be a counter friction to stop the machine".  

Civil disobedience and conscientious objection, at least, philosophically represent the citizens' right to judicial review. Judge Learned Hand once wrote, "Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women, when it dies there, no constitution, no law court can save it". And in the famous case according to David Mitchell, 

"the citizen's primary obligation is to resist the unjust orders of his state, and he cites American judges at the Nuremberg war crimes trials to support his argument. He asserts that the United States is violating its own international treaties and agreements and the United Nations Charter by fighting in Vietnam. The burden rests upon each individual citizen, to decide for himself whether to lend his life to his country's enterprise, especially when that enterprise is war." 20

These writings reveal the validity of Gandhi's programme of civil disobedience to fight injustice and violence in society. Consequently, it has been accepted in the recent times as a valuable and effective method for opposing the proliferation of nuclear weapons in worldwide campaigns and actions. "This shift in opinion arose partly because of the civil disobedience campaigns of 1953-63 and the direct actions against Polaris submarines and US bases and also, partly in the seventies, because of those agitating against nuclear power plants." 21

The eighties of the present century witnessed several instances in Europe and America where the opponents of

war boycotted the government making preparations for war. For example, in California people chained themselves to fences on the property of Lockheed Missiles and Space Corporation, a major weapons contractor. Their purpose was to denounce the building of missiles for use on the Trident submarine. Others established a picket line at the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, a facility where nuclear weapons research was conducted. Their object was to prevent traffic from entering or leaving the premises. Both acts required police intervention. The disobedient acts as well as the arrest, prosecution and conviction of the participants were given major coverage in the media.  

Further, civil disobedience has won great respect because of the admiration for the symbolic witness of the strongly feminist camps at Greenham Common (with Comiso in Sicily one of the first sites for cruise missiles) and Molesworth. There are dozens of peace camps now established in Britain, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Denmark and the United States.  

---

These reveal what forms non-cooperation can take in preventing preparation for nuclear war.

Dharma

Dharma or (sit-in) is also an important method in Gandhi's scheme of non-violent resolution. It means the practice of sitting persistently at a place as protest where the opponent is performing the unjust act. The aim is to desist him from the action. Elaborating the concept, Joseph Doke, the first biographer of Gandhi, writes: "The idea of Passive resistance as a means of opposing evil is inherent in Indian philosophy. In old time, it was called to sit dharma. Sometimes a whole community would adopt this method towards their Prince. It has been so in the history of Porbander; then trade was dislocated and force helpless before the might of Passive Resistance".\(^24\)

During the freedom movement in India, it was mostly adopted to prevent the sale of liquor and foreign articles. The civil rights movement in the United States employed sit-ins to protest against the segregation of Negroes and whites. In modern times in U.K., France and especially in the United States, the weapon has proved highly effective. The success of the sit-down is due to

the fact that no industry which sells its products (directly to the public) can afford to alienate public opinion. Otherwise their sale would be adversely affected. What is more 'the men in the street' are always opposed to violence and the products which promotes violence.

**Fasting**

It is a means of resisting injustice. But it can also be resorted to by an individual Satyagrahi to make an appeal to the good sense of the opponent. Then it must be the highest expression of the prayer of a pure and loving heart. For Gandhi, it is the most efficacious weapon in the armoury of non-violence. He himself employed it a number of times to prevent the eruption of violence through his silent appeal. He was able to communicate through his silent self-suffering. However, he warned against the indiscriminate use of this method, without adequate preparation and thought. But fasting, especially fast unto death is the last weapon in the

---

* Gandhi kept five days fast in 1922 after Chauri Chaura violence and 21 days fast in 1933 for harijan cause. Thrice he observed it against imperialist government on December 2, 1932, August 15, 1933 and February 9, 1943 and 21 days fast at Aga Khan's palace.
arsenal of Satyagraha. It is gaining new significance
in present peace movements. It is of relevance, not
only to India but to other countries too as a method
of resolving disputes through the mobilisation of
public opinion against any kind of oppression. In the
countries of South-East Asia it has recently assumed
new form. In place of observing fast unto death, some
Buddhist monks have undertaken self-immolation. A
striking example of this was the 1963 Buddhist protest
in South Vietnam. The self-immolation of a Buddhist
monk was strategically timed to ensure that newsmen and
photographers — particularly U.S. newsmen — would be
present to record the event. The leader of the Buddhist,
Thich Tri Quang, wanted publicity in the U.S. press and
took pains to make U.S. reporters welcome. In a near
classic statement of the essential function of non-
vviolent resistance suffering, Tri Quang, is quoted as
saying upon learning that Diem's special forces were
soon ready to attack his headquarters at the Xa Loi
Pagoda: "Don't you think it will help our cause if some
of us are killed by Diem"? At last, the Buddhist monks
who immolated themselves — particularly the first,
whose heart preserved and displayed in Saigon's Xa Loi
Pagoda also became symbol for the resistance campaign.25

There are, of course, a number of variables in the effectiveness of suffering, the most important being that suffering must be communicated in order to be effective.

In the West especially in the United States conscientious objectors* have recently made immense contribution to the development of non-violent methods for fighting injustice and violence. The basic principle underlying conscientious objection not only seeks to end war but also directs the attention of the individuals towards social evils that generate tension in society. For, according to conscientious objectors, whatever cannot square with the conscience of the individual must be opposed. Thus, protests against segregation or arms race acquire the same place in the

* The conscientious objector is one who opposes war and refuses to take up arms.

Conscientious objection to war may be defined as a refusal to participate in a military mission in order to protect one's own moral integrity and/or effect change in the society; it is very often referred to as civil disobedience. It is known to be a purely personal moral action, which is sometimes the only resort of the principled but lonely man". (Michael Walzer's Article "Civil Disobedience and Resistance", in DISSERT (New York : Foundations for the study of Independent Social Ideas), January-February, 1968, pp. 13-15.
programmes of conscientious objectors. So in the United States the peace and Civil Rights movements do overlap. The persons who protested atomic testing also joined 'freedom rides'. The Quakers who opposed the French and Indian War in 1756 opposed slavery as well. The peace activists build up public opinion against such evils through moral and economic pressures. The main objective underlying all these methods is to build up public opinion against any injustice being perpetuated by a powerful person or a nation. (This will be taken up in Chapter V).

**ECONOMIC SANCTIONS**

Economic embargoes and economic sanctions have remained a determining factor in power politics for a long time. Awareness of economic interdependence, particularly among the nations in the organisation for economic cooperation and development, has raised its importance further in recent times. The powerful nations now can put economic sanction as a pre-condition
for observing a particular domestic* or foreign policy.

However, increasing economic dependence on powerful nations has led some nations to seek economic independence as far as possible. On the other hand, powerful nations seek economic levers that might be used to gain political influence or to deter aggressive economic policies.

This is evident from the fact that after the Vietnam war, economic sanctions have been playing a tremendous role in the arms transfer as a foreign policy. This approach possibly had its effect on Egypt-Israel peace treaty, or tanker warfare of Iraq-Iran or threat of economic impositions against Libya and South-Africa.**

The most dramatic evidence of the impact of international markets on domestic economic policy came early in the decade of the 1970's in the form of the 1972 wheat sale to the Soviet Union, the so-called "Great Grain Robbery", and the OPEC oil embargo and associated increases in crude oil prices in 1973. In each case substantial inflationary pressures were added to a domestic economy that was already suffering from a wage price spiral whose origins could be traced to the failure of timely fiscal policy during the early phases of the Vietnam war. Domestic wage and price controls proved to be an insufficient response to those pressures and illustrated the dangers of partial temporary tempering with a free market structure (Lee D. Olvey, James R. Golden and Robert C. Kelley, The Economics of National Security (New Jersey: Avery Publishing Group, 1984), p. 319.

**Recently, for instance, economic sanction against South Africa demonstrates the role of public opinion in restraining a recalcitrant country from pursuing policies that deny basic rights to a section of its population.
Fear of adverse economic situations is pushing countries for bilateral and multilateral agreements about integrated international market and arms restraints. Consequently, the officials of the United States, outside observers, academicians and spokesmen for the nuclear industry have all called for the strengthening of sanctions as a part of U.S. non-proliferation policy. Nuclear weapons proliferation has been couched in terms of checking the growth of incentives for acquiring nuclear weapons. The legislature in the United States has also taken some measures in this respect. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended in 1976 and 1977, now prohibits military and virtually all types of economic assistance to countries delivering or receiving enrichment or reprocessing equipment material or technology of nuclear weapons. Also amended in 1977 the Export Import Bank Act of 1945 precludes financial support for transactions with any non-nuclear weapons state that engages in nuclear weapon related activities. Most comprehensive, the Nuclear

* Margret Doxey defines sanctions as "confirmity—defending instruments relating to behaviour which is expected by custom or required by law". They are to serve "accepted norms of international conduct", not the particular policies of a given nation. (Margaret Doxey, Economic Sanctions and International Enforcement, (London; Oxford University Press, 1971), pp. 1,14.
27. Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, Sections 669 and 670.
Non-proliferation Act of 1978 which amends the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, requires halting nuclear exports to non-nuclear weapon states found by the president to have engaged in activities involving nuclear weapons material or of direct significance to the manufacture of nuclear weapons material or of direct significance to the manufacture of nuclear explosive devices; to have detonated a nuclear device; or to have violated, terminated or abrogated IAEA safeguards. It also calls for termination of nuclear exports to countries assisting, encouraging or inducing non-nuclear weapons states to engage in activities related to the manufacture or acquisition of nuclear weapons.29

There are also provisions for international sanctions against war and acquisition of nuclear weapons in United Nations Organisations and in IAEA provisions.

29. Recognizing that pursuit of other U.S. foreign policy and security interests might require a more flexible posture, both the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Nuclear Non-proliferation Act of 1978 allow for presidential waiver of these sanctions under specified conditions subject to congressional override (Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, Sections 669 and 670; Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by the Nuclear Non-proliferation Act of 1978, Section 129).

* Article XII(C) of the IAEA statute empowers its Board of Governors to curtail or suspend nuclear assistance (regardless of its supplier), to call for the return of nuclear material or equipment any to suspend any country from membership in the IAEA if that country violates International safeguards (Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency (as amended up to June 1, 1973) Article XII C).
As countries are dependent on foreign economic assistance including multilateral aid from the World Bank, as a source of needed investment capital, sanctions that cut off or reduce that foreign assistance, say to India or Pakistan, in all probability would lead to significant economic dislocation, particularly in economic sectors targeted for emphasis in the development programme of these countries. It may take the form of boycott of all trade transaction with the offender and isolating him from the rest of the world. This may assume Gandhi's technique of boycott at the international level. However, it does not mean that the nuclear powers are at present guided by Gandhian motives in checking nuclear proliferation.

The motives for collective human action has become important as civilization advances and relation between human groups become more involved. They undoubtedly constitute the root cause of war. But the primary purpose of threatening sanction is to deter a country from undertaking nuclear weapons related activities, and not actually carrying out that threat. Economic pressures to control the conflict should be taken as a preventive measure or to influence the perception of the party to the dispute.

To quote the bus boycott in Johannesburg in 1957 or the famous bus Montgomery boycott in U.S.A. led by Dr. Martin Luther King are the important examples of the pressure of economic sanctions in inter-group conflicts in a country. It can also work at the international level if applied by powerful nations sincerely.

Non-violence at the level of tactics and strategy is not the pure expression of love or good will; not a device for avoiding or patching up conflicts; not a magic remedy for injustice. But here it works as a peaceful measure in opposing a situation which may lead to the eruption of violence or war.

The device or strategy of economic sanction act as a disincentive and will check the growth of incentives for acquiring nuclear weapons with large bureaucratic and public support.

**UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT**

The Gandhian way of reducing tension for maintaining peace in the world involves several distinct moves and strategies. As we have already observed, it can remove several stumbling blocks that stand in its way to disarmament.
His faith in the essential goodness of every man implies that every man is capable of responding to the goodwill of his opponent if the distrust between the two is removed. It means that any step by one party to reduce arms voluntarily without waiting for the other to do it can create a favourable ground in this direction. In other words this means unilateral disarmament.

Unilateral implies one sided approach i.e. a matter concerning one party only irrespective of the opponent. It may be argued that unilateral disarmament exists only in the realm of ideas. It is sheer idealism. It is not practical. But the history of man's progress in science reveals how man has brought his ideas into the realm of reality. "In 1909 Bleriot flew the channel. Twenty five years later we are being exhorted to become 'air-minded'. In 1900 Motor cars began to come into general use. Thirty years later we are in process of becoming speed conscious, realizing but only now, that roads designed for horse drawn traffic are unfitted for Motor Traffic."31 After the 2nd World War, the whole world changed to automation. Gandhi, too, argued that man has been making steady progress towards Ahimsa or seeking solution of conflicts without resort to violence. The

---

problem which confronts today is not to be solved by
the easy generalities of the past.

Gandhi asserts that "Ahimsa is one of the
world's great principles which no power on the earth
can wipe out. Thousands like myself may die in trying
to vindicate the ideal but Ahimsa will never die. And
the Gospel of Ahimsa can be spread through believers
dying for the cause". 32

Similarly, being asked whether the atom bomb
had not rendered obsolete the weapon of non-violence,
Gandhi answered: "No", on the contrary non-violence was
the only thing that was now left in the field. "It is
the only thing", he added, "that the atom-bomb cannot
destroy. I did not move a muscle when I first heard
that the atom-bomb had wiped out Hiroshima. On the
contrary, I said to myself, 'unless now the world
adopts non-violence, it will spell certain suicide
for mankind". 33 In his view the transmission of ideas
and their internalization are more relevant for world

32. Harijan, May 19, 1946, p. 140.
33. Ibid., also in M.K. Gandhi, Non-Violence in Peace
& War, Vol. II (Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing
reform than the establishment of formal institutions for world control. In simple words when members of "World Reform Enterprises" talk in terms of disseminating their proposals among the people, they are nearer to the heart of the issue than when they discuss what type of reduction in type of weaponry e.g. ABM, ICBM requires or what type of environmental effect, will have with 'the Nuclear winter' or 'The Day After'. A social scientist points out that the unilateral disarmament is the only rational approach in the contemporary situation created by the nuclear arms race. He argues that the certainty of an internation catastrophe occurring.

* Like the Political impact of Prime Time Television: "The Day After".

According to a poll conducted by the Warner Amex Showcase Television Network only 13 per cent of 5,500 viewers surveyed following the movie believed there was no hope of avoiding nuclear war. Nor did the movie lead to a major increase in support for a nuclear freeze: 49 per cent said they "still support" nuclear arms control while 29 per cent said they "still support" "Strength through nuclear arms build up", 12 per cent said they "now support" arms control but 6 per cent said they "now support" an arms build up; and the remaining 4 per cent were "confused" or don't care.

Similarly, an overnight nation-wide telephone poll conducted at George Washington University uncovered no change in viewers' estimates of the likelihood of nuclear-war appraisals of President Reagan's job performance, feelings of political powerlessness, or support for unilateral nuclear disarmament, a bilateral nuclear freeze or decreased defence spending. This evidence led William Adams, the Director of the Poll to conclude that bonanza in additional anti-nuclear sentiment among the general public were completely wrong (The Journal of Politics, Vol. 47, No. 2, May, 1985).
should the arms race continue and the situations remain unchanged is absolute. It is also reasoned that the risk of disarmament being exploited by the Soviet Union is slight. On the other hand, this approach also embraces a moral position, a question of values, in which the Commandment "Thou shall not kill" is accorded supreme value, and the negation of violence and bloodletting is absolute. No aim, no matter how elevated, can justify murder and therefore, it would be better to suffer evil than to inflict evil, to be killed rather than to kill or, in the words of the Jewish sages: 'Let a man be always of the oppressed rather than of the oppressors'. Even if there is a risk in unilateral disarmament, its degrees are immeasurably smaller than the certainty of catastrophe inherent in the arms race. In fact, initiative for unilateral disarmament is rooted in universal human values which humanity has acquired after centuries of experiences and sacrifices.

According to Dr. Gilbert Murray, "Any nation that is determined to salvage civilization must decide, once and for all, to depend on its moral strength and for that purpose must: Disarm completely; shed its ill gotten

economic and territorial gains; apply liberally
"justice the miracle worker" (Bright) in all national
and international affairs; prepare itself in all the
arts of peace; and non-cooperate with all nations that
stands for militarism". To him, this attitude is an
essential attribute of dynamic non-violence. In his view,
waiting for the emergence of united will or nations for
achieving disarmament is a delusion.

For most of the nations, even while wishing to
end war, it is argued, become parties to war preparations
when they continue helping all those nations which are
engaged in destroying each other. Similarly, preparations
for defence in any form are as dangerous to the cause of
peace as preparations for aggression. In fact, it is
asserted that unilateral disarmament may lead to the
formation of united will for disarmament as it will
remove distrust between nations. If this step is taken
by a great power, its results in this direction will be
far reaching. It is pointed out that such a step was
taken by Woodrow Wilson after the first World War which
gave rise to the League of Nations and subsequently to
United Nations after the Second World War. But such

steps cannot succeed unless a nation upholding any such moral principles creates confidence in other nations by demonstrating that it has no selfish political motives. It must abandon its policies that result in exploitation of other nation or gaining more power. It is on this ground, Gandhi refused to endorse the Moral Rearmament Programme. He argued, "MRA means first of all a change of heart. It means admission of our responsibility for the past, a frank acceptance by nations as by individuals of the standards of honesty, purity, unselfishness and love and daily listening and daily obedience to God's direction". In other words, what the survival of humanity demands is moral rearmament, the idea mooted by Dr. Frank Buchman and endorsed by President Roosevelt. Though Gandhi did not object to the principle underlying it, he could not fully endorse it on operational grounds when he was asked to endorse the Moral Rearmament Plan. He argued: "As a member of an exploited nation I can have a different moral rearmament programme, and I may invite China to it, but how can I invite the West or Japan? And just as it would be unreal for me to invite the West, it would to some extent be unreal for the West to invite India. Let them shed their exploitation policy and their immoral gains.

The introduction of moral principles in international sphere will replace secret diplomacy by open diplomacy. The latter will eliminate international espionage, which hampers today even the movements of innocent people in the foreign lands. Open diplomacy is the employment of truth in international diplomacy. It is in conformity with Gandhian approach to political problems as Gandhi always denounced secrecy in politics. This reduced the chances of war by accident or escalation.

However, without cultivation of, and commitment to Ahimsa and Satya, it is impossible to achieve united will and open diplomacy. "If non-violence in the domestic field is successfully achieved, we shall surely see the non-violence against constituted authority revived in its purified form and it will be irresistible". And such a wonderful result in India or in world affairs would only be achieved if the country's decision not to fight or to resist invasion was based on genuine conversion to the doctrine of non-violent resistance.

Unilateral disarmament like non-violence can be applicable effectively if it is applied to one's ownself.

37. Ibid.
Non-violence cannot be imposed upon any one like United Nations membership. It has to come from within." This is further confirmed with Gandhi's stated lines when he referred to English man in regard to their pacifism. The world disarmament campaign can be successfully conducted if the nations are free from distrust and fear and spontaneously cooperate with each other. The operation of non-violence means that each nation must first apply. Non-violence on itself as Gandhi would say that non-violence starts from the individual or family. (For a non-violent person the whole world is a family). It is only when one nation is ready to adopt non-violence irrespective of consequences, it will change the course of international relations. Thus, while replying to an English pacifist, Gandhi said, "they have mental reservation that when pacifism fails, arms might be used. With them non-violence but arms are the ultimate sanction, as was the case with Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen points." No,

* An army however small, of truely non-violent soldiers is likely someday to multiply itself.

** Outlined by him in a speech before the U.S. Congress on January 8, 1918, they became the basis of the armistice between Germany and the Allies and the subsequent peace treaty signed at versailles.
someone has to arise in England with the living faith to say that England, whatever happens, shall not use arms. They are a nation fully armed, and if they having the power deliberately refuse to use arms, theirs will be the first example of Christianity in active practice on a mass scale. That will be a real miracle. 40

Now, in Britain for example, there are at least three campaigns all demanding unilateral action. There is a revived campaign for nuclear disarmament (CND) campaigning broadly for British nuclear-disarmament. Associated with this is the urgent campaign against the siting of cruise missiles in Britain. Another is the new and important campaign for European Nuclear Disarmament (END), still needing to resolve its relations with an older unilateralism, but centred on proposals 41 to free the entire territory of Europe from Poland to Portugal, from nuclear weapons, air and submarine basis. Thirdly, there is the world disarmament campaign centred on the comprehensive proposals of the United Nations. 41

40. The CNDG, LXVII, p. 76.

* This was before the war. Since the outbreak of hostilities in 1939, the figures kept mounting up at such a speed that men lost count of them. To take but two instances, Britain was reported at the end of 1941, to be spending on the war over 13 million pound per day. The British Government is spending 48000,000 pounds a day, wrote Time on Jan. 5, 1942. (Horjian, September 8, 1946), p. 298.

** END statement of which the Raymond Williams (author) was a signatory.

According to Raymond Williams, these campaigns support the cause of peace. Another exponent of Disarmament, Dumas\textsuperscript{42} holds that the unilateral arm reduction initiated by one country should, if the country acts rationally in its own self interest result in an equilibrium arms vector that involves fewer missiles and greater security for both countries. Recently, an effort has been made to put unilateralism on rational grounds by removing the risks involved in it. Prof. Osgood has prepared a comprehensive list of the things to be done in a systematic theory of initiative\textsuperscript{43}. He proposes a deliberate "peace offensive" designed to induce reciprocation by an enemy with the following criteria:

- unilateral acts must be perceived by the opponent as reducing his external threat.
- unilateral acts must be accompanied by explicit invitation to reciprocate.
- unilateral acts must be executed regardless of prior commitment by the opponent to reciprocate.


\textsuperscript{43} Charles Egerton Osgood, \textit{Graduated Reciprocation in Tension Reduction; a key to initiative in foreign policy} (Urbana, Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois, 1960), pp. 15-35.
- unilateral acts must be planned in sequence and continued over considerable periods regardless of reciprocation by an opponent.

- unilateral acts must be announced in advance of execution and widely publicised to allied, neutral and enemy countries as part of a consistent policy.

- unilateral acts must be graduated in risk potential, should they not be reciprocated or should they be exploited by an opponent.

- unilateral acts must be diverse in nature and unpredictable (by the opponent) as to the locus of application and timing in series.

- unilateral acts must not be such as to endanger our "heart land" or reduce our fundamental capacity for retaliatory second strikes.

- unilateral acts of tension reducing nature must be accompanied by explicit firmness in all areas.

- Selected actions and invited reciprocation should as far as possible, take advantage of the restraint already self-imposed by the opponent and ourselves.

- Selected actions and invited reciprocations should involve transfer of sovereignty from national to
international auspices as far as is feasible.

Selected actions and invited reciprocations should serve to foster democratic ways of life and discourage totalitarian ways as much as possible.

Osgood's criteria suggests many acts - inviting exchanges of medical information, trade or travel restrictions, voluntary arms reduction to be elaborated in many fields (economic, social, educational opportunity, information flow, etc.). Done on a large scale, with extensive publicity, the device may prove effective. The voluntary moves can be carried out in parallel with formally agreed disarmament steps.

The spirit of charity toward those who bear arms is not temporary sentiment. It is continuing with the significant development of the concept of non-violent revolution which is heightening unilateralism as a solution to stop the ruinous

* In examining past experience, the study lists a number of examples of unilateral restraint. Among them are:

- The tripartite moratorium on nuclear weapon tests of 1958-1961, which contributed to the conclusion of the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963;

- The United States initiative of 1963 to halt nuclear tests in atmosphere, which invited a constructive political dialogue conducive to negotiating the partial test-ban treaty;

- the "policy of mutual example" or "reciprocal unilateral action" in 1963-64 which led to some cutbacks in the production of fissionable material for military use;

- the unilateral declaration of China in 1964 that it would not be the first to use nuclear weapons;

- the declaration of the Soviet Union in 1982 that it would not be the first to use nuclear weapons;

- declarations assuring non-nuclear weapons states against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons (The Disarmament Fact Sheets Series No40 (New York) Department for Disarmament.
competition and wants to dump their armaments into the sea, or where their capacity for damage is destroyed. The only cure for fear, Mahatma Gandhi taught us, is faith, for suspicion sincerity and for distrust trust. Salvation lies only in unilateral disarmament.

It is in practice today to some extent. On February 28, 1986, the Delhi Six urged Gorbachev to keep on the unilateral moratorium until the next meeting he would have with Reagan. Gorbachev's response was positive and he undertook not to restart to nuclear tests until the U.S.A. did so. The U.S.A. did not impose any moratorium on nuclear tests but later on it resulted in a treaty for the reduction of weapons from both sides which shows unilateralism has the potentialities of preparing ground for a lasting peace in the world. And lately, President George Bush has declared that U.S.A. would destroy all its chemical weapon stockpiles if the Soviet Union joins in reducing its arsenal to an equal level.44

As is seen from above that apart from checking actual hostility the non-violent strategies offer ample scope for the resolution of conflict. Resting largely on the value of people and the nation, such strategies can work either way. Nonetheless, most important is the

44. The Tribune, September 26, 1989.
degree of commitment of the decision makers to absolute non-violence i.e., when they have finally resolved that they would not resort to violence in any case. For example, in Asian continent, which is highly prone to warfare point of view, like mindedness can harness peace to a greater extent despite their inherent mutual issues of discords. Once the fear of violence is removed and level of tension is reduced and more communication is received from the other side there will be increased ability to perceive the international reality, which will further reduce tension.