CHAPTER FIVE

GANDHIAN POLITICS OF NON-VIOLENT ACTION

Mahatma Gandhi, the pioneer of non-violence was born on 2\textsuperscript{nd} October 1869. His prominent role in India’s freedom struggle fetched him the title of ‘Bapu’ (Father of the Nation). The birthday of this Indian pre-eminent spiritual and political leader is celebrated as “International Day of Non-Violence” throughout the world.

Gandhi’s philosophy bears the influence of a number of sources and \textit{ahimsa} forms the basic foundation of Gandhian Thought. Apart from \textit{Bhagvad-Gita, Isha Upanisad} and Bible he was highly influenced by Tolstoy’s ‘\textit{The Kingdom of God is Within Us’}, Ruskin’s ‘\textit{Unto This Last’}, Thoreau’s ‘\textit{On the Duty of Civil Disobedience}’ and Plato’s dialogues of Socrates.\textsuperscript{1} It is aptly said that, “Non-Violence or \textit{Ahimsa} and \textit{Satyagraha} to Gandhi personally constituted a deeply felt and worked out philosophy owing something to Emerson, Thoreau and Tolstoy but also revealing considerable originality.”\textsuperscript{2}

According to Gandhi, \textit{ahimsa} is the greatest force available to humankind, “It is mightier than the mightiest weapon of destruction devised by the ingenuity of a man.”\textsuperscript{3} Though the concept of non-violence was not originated by Gandhi, he was the first person to apply it for a political purpose. Gandhi’s greatest contribution, therefore, is the use of non-violence into a successful technique for direct mass action. The concept of non-violence was not a new one. Before the teachings of Gandhi, the notion of \textit{ahimsa} finds an important place in Holy Scriptures, teachings of Gautama Buddha to Prophet Mohammad and works of various philosophers. However,
it was Gandhi who converted it into a social and political technique and super humanitarian method of resolution to all type of crisis and problems. Gandhi firmly believed that non-violence stands out as something inevitable for the reformation of politics. Gandhi was a real visionary who through the use of non-violence gave new direction to Indian freedom struggle. He objected to violence as he considered that it created more problems than it solved and the aftermath of it was sheer hatredness and bitterness amongst peoples. His non-violent resistance was a dynamic and spiritually active force, which aimed to destroy the sin and not the sinner. Gandhi was committed to follow this principle and therefore, he made every possible effort to achieve this goal with the help of non-violent action.

Gandhi was not only a political and social reformer but also a political thinker and a faithful humanist as well. Glimpses of his political and social ideas can be easily found in his autobiography ‘My Experiments with Truth’, in his letters, his writings, his interviews and addresses. Gandhi in his teachings communicated to the people concept ranging from freedom, independence or Swaraj, self-reliance, self-sufficiency to protection of distinctive social values.\(^4\) It is very correctly said about Gandhi that:

Moral values like truth, non-violence, renunciation of the pleasures of life etc., political ideas such as freedom, democracy, peace etc., social objectives such as abolition of castes distinctions, emancipation of women, unity of all religious groups and communities etc.- these were indivisible parts of his life and teachings.\(^5\)

Gandhi through his concept of truth tried to enlighten the people of his country. His spinning wheel becomes a symbol of self-reliance and rejection of foreign goods implies autonomy and striving for self-identity and human dignity. Amongst all these notable examples of his contributions, the idea and
practice of *Satyagraha* is the most important to his political thought and ethical motivation.

**(1) MEANING AND DEFINITION OF SATYAGRAHA: GANDHIAN PERSPECTIVE.**

*Satyagraha* is one of the greatest contributions of Gandhi to Indian history, in particular and world history, in general. It was coined by Gandhi to express the nature of his action against the ‘racial discrimination’ in South Africa. The technique of *Satyagraha* was used for the first time during the resistance of Indian workers of South Africa against the Asiatic Law Amendment Ordinance of 1906. He discovered the ‘Science of *Satyagraha*’ by his experiments with truth. Gandhi quoted in 1933:

> The Science of *Satyagraha* … has come to me… by scientific research. It is a result of the hardest labor a human being is capable of. I have applied to this research all the skill of a scientist.

The principle of *Satyagraha* was a most powerful and fruitful weapon used by Gandhi and his followers against the British rule in India. In India, it was used for the first time in Bihar in 1917 and after that was used number of time till 1947, when India got its independence.

The term ‘*Satyagraha*’ is a combination of two Sanskrit words, ‘*Satya*’ meaning ‘Truth’ and ‘*Agraha*’ meaning ‘determined pursuit’ or ‘holding on to truth’. The word therefore, literally means, ‘insistence on truth’. Gandhi defines *Satyagraha* as ‘a relentless search for truth and a determination to reach truth’. It is based on the principle of love and believes in ‘love for all’ and ‘suffer for all’. It excludes the use of any form of violence since it is based on the philosophy that man does not know the absolute truth and therefore, cannot punish anyone.
Earlier Gandhi used the term passive resistance for *Satyagraha* but latter he grew dissatisfied with the expression. *Satyagraha* differs from passive resistance in many ways. *Satyagraha* is based on truth and determination and rules out any form of violence or injury. Passive resistance on other hand aims to embarrass and harass the opponent and eventually to defeat them. In passive resistance loves holds no place while in *Satyagraha*, love is a prominent virtue and ill will and hatred have no room. Passive resistance is static and is a weapon of the weak while *Satyagraha* is active and is an instrument of bravest who have courage to face sufferings. Mahadev Desai wrote in *Harijan*:

“… *satyagraha* is dynamic, passive resistance is static. Passive resistance acts negatively and suffers reluctantly and in fructuously; *satyagraha* acts positively and suffers with cheerfulness because from love and makes the sufferings fruitful.”

*Satyagraha* or non-violent action means soul-force or truth-force that is it is based and is a way to achieve truth. Gandhi explained about what he means by using soul-force for *Satyagraha*:

When I refuse to do a thing that is repugnant to my conscience, I use soul-force. For instance, the government of the day has passed a law which is applicable to me. I do not like it. If by violence I force the government to replace the law, I am employing what may be termed body-force. If I do not obey the law and accept the penalty for its breach, I use soul-force. It involves sacrifice of the self.

There are three things of great importance in *Satyagraha*. These are *Satya* (Truth), *Ahimsa* (Non-Violence) and *Tapas* (Self-suffering). Let us briefly examine them one by one:

1.1) **TRUTH:**
*Satyagraha* as a movement was intended to replace methods of violence and was based entirely upon truth.\(^\text{14}\) For Gandhi truth and politics are integrally related to each other. He said:

> Some friends have told me that truth and non-violence have no place in politics and worldly affairs. I do not agree. I have no use for them as a means of individual salvation. Their introduction and application in everyday life has been my experiment all along.\(^\text{15}\)

In other words, Gandhi’s *Satyagraha* is an experiment to bring truth and non-violence into political conduct and to merge and unite them together. *Satyagraha* for Gandhi is the adherence to Truth and Truth for Gandhi means God. For him, ‘Truth alone is eternal, everything else is momentary.’\(^\text{16}\) He believed that everyone should search for Truth according to his lights and in this search for Truth he should always open himself to correction. He considered that one should seek to find truth though to find absolute truth is not possible for man. *Ahimsa* forms this means to seek truth and for him, both the means and the end are united to one another in a way as seed and tree are integrally related. In his concept of *Satyagraha* non-violence is very important. He considers that ‘while truth is the goal, *ahimsa* or non-violence becomes the necessary and only means of realizing it’.\(^\text{17}\)

### 1.2) NON-VIOLENCE:

*Satyagraha*, according to Gandhi, excludes all forms of violence since use of coercion, on one hand suppresses the development of the individuals and fails to show respect to adversary and on the other hand, obscures the vision of truth. His concept of *Satyagraha* is based on the notion that the adversary is also a human being having faculty of reasoning and goodness.
Gandhi strongly opposed violence or suppression since it went against the integrity of an individual.\textsuperscript{18} Every individual has an equal right to be respected by others as Kant also holds, and bears a moral duty to show the same respect to other people’s integrity and freedom. Gandhi said that violence can never be justified no matter for what noble cause it is used. This is because for Gandhi means and ends are inseparable. To achieve justice, one cannot force his views on others and curb their freedom. The use of violence for Gandhi not only degrades the opponent but also makes its user a lesser human being. He considered that a violent person is always at war ‘with the world and believes that the world is at war with him and he has to live in perpetual fear.’\textsuperscript{19} Therefore, the consequence of violence is always utter helplessness, isolation and it functions to create a gulf between the aggressor and the society.

Gandhi’s concept of non-violence is not restricted merely to disavowing violence; not hurting people in mind and body but it goes beyond and encompasses certain essential values of love, forgiveness and compassion.\textsuperscript{20} Ahimsa not only connotes the act of refraining from doing harm to others but it is based on positive values of

For Gandhi to practice ahimsa or non-violence one needs a proper training of strong will, patience and moral courage and all these in turn lead to transformation of mind. For this transformation an inner conscience is needed which gives an excess to truth. Each one of us have a relative truth and non-violence acts as a tool that arbitrates between these truth claims. To live a life of non-violence Gandhi asserted, one needs a training to fully arouse his inner conscience and devotion and finally one achieves knowledge of truth about the moral and physical world. Gandhi’s ahimsa
therefore, provides a political agent the sense to take right kind of political action. Non-violence in this sense becomes a sort of guide in practical prudence in search of relative truth of the political world. It gives one the power to take decisions about relative truth in socio-political life than to just contemplate about good life and other mere theoretical perspectives.

Gandhi’s strategy of non-violent action in India was not only for making constitutional demands rather it went ahead and aimed at something greater. This is so because he knew that mere constitutional changes have not shown fruitful results in first half century, and therefore, he introduce civil-disobedience movement which was an extra-constitutional strategy. The first part of the strategy was to achieve a ‘mass support’ or in other words, to make it a ‘mass movement’. This movement intended to involve everyone whether from a higher class, lower one or peasant group. The aim was not only to make the foreign rulers leave the land but to completely erase out the influence of the rulers from the mind-set of people after the Britishers left India. Gandhi, being a vibrant visionary, could easily see the consequence of colonization on the mind of the colonized people. He knew that people would remain mentally enslaved even though they became politically free. To maintain the integrity of the people of his nation he coupled non-violence with the search for truth. However, when we thoroughly observe the current socio-political situations of Indians we still find that they are in the domain of complete enslavement and politically unfree. Gandhi’s dream of freedom and non-violence still remains unfulfilled in the twenty first century.

Gandhi believed that **ahimsa** has evolved with the evolution of human civilization. The early man lived in caves and were basically cannibals
having no definite place to live. With time an agricultural society was established and man started to settled down. An evolution took place and man became from a member of a family to member of community, following laws and rules to live together in a social environment. With slow process of civilization accompanied the transformation of himsa to ahimsa or violence to non-violence. For Gandhi, this slow evolution of ahimsa with civilization of man is a fact, which he expresses, “Had it been otherwise, the human species should have been extinct by now, even as many of the lower species have disappeared.”

1.3) SELF-SUFFERING:

Satyagraha further constitutes of self-suffering. Gandhi considered self-suffering to be superior to the sacrifice of others. For him, such sense of self-sacrifice aims at a right cause and by using it causes suffering only to the person who uses it and not to others. Gandhi explains what self-suffering really meant. He said:

Non-Violence in its dynamics condition means conscious 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.

In this way, Gandhi knew the power of suffering and what Satyagraha incorporates. He made his followers, who truly believed in non-violent action, fully aware that suffering is an indispensable part of Satyagraha. He said:

“… We have to endure every hardship that we can imagine, and wisdom lies in pledging ourselves on the understanding that we shall have to suffer all that and worse. If someone asks me when and how the struggle may end, I may say that if the entire community manfully stands the test, the end will be near….That as
long as there is even a handful of man true to their pledge, there can only be one end to the struggle and that is victory.”

The doctrine of *Satyagraha* plays a vital role in controlling man’s desires and making him strong inwardly. Therefore, a *Satyagrahi* aims not at humiliating or harming the opponent but converting him to what is humane and suitable for physical and spiritual progress. Another marked feature of *Satyagraha* is voluntary self-suffering on the part of a *satyagrahi*. This creative suffering aims at affecting the conscience on the adversary thereby arousing in him ‘a sense of justice’ and also winning the support of third party and public opinion.

He strongly believed that suffering is an inseparable aspect of non-violent action. Along with fearlessness and courage, non-violent actionists need to be prepared to face the sufferings that follow. Gandhi aptly wrote, “Without suffering it is impossible to attain freedom”.

This does not imply that suffering is an inevitable aspect of only non-violent action but rather violent actions too lead to a lot of sufferings. Various forms of political violence, like civil wars, guerilla wars, world wars, or other terrorist movements of past and present involve higher risk of sufferings and causalities as we have observed. Therefore, it is wrong for the supporters of ‘violent action’ to disregard ‘non-violent action’ on the grounds of the sufferings involved. History has been incorrect in its description of non-violent movements. While in case of non-violent actions brutal events of ill-treatment met to the actionists were cited, in case of violent actions only number of causalities were mentioned and such citations are the darker sides of history. The description may be a balanced one involving equal details of sufferings in violent conflicts.
It becomes clear that suffering is likely or inevitably an aspect of both violent and non-violent actions. However, there still exists a difference in the extent and seriousness of suffering involved in both means of retaliation. The extent of suffering involved in non-violent action is much milder as compared to violent action as some examples may be given in this regard.

1) The non-violent conflicts in Indian struggle for independence though reported some causalities but its number was far times more in the revolt of 1857, which was a violent struggle against the British.

2) In the Algerian revolution, which was basically non-violent the number of causalities reported were far less as compared to the French revolution.\(^{26}\)

3) In Soviet Union during the strikes of 1953 and 1954 in its prison camps, the brutalities were much more when prisoners resorted to violence as compare to when they remained non-violent.\(^{27}\)

4) The other consequences, which follow in violent and non-violent actions, are also markedly different. In case of violent action, violence leads to counter violence there by increasing the severity of violence and the number of causalities. In case of non-violent response to violence, the severity of repression decreases and in long run there is reduction in political violence. Thus, suffering in case of non-violence leads to a break in the vicious cycle of violence. As Gregg stated:

> In the Indian struggle for Independence, though I know of no accurate statistics, hundreds of thousands of Indians went to jail, probably not more than five hundred received permanent physical injuries, and probably not over eight thousand were killed immediately or died later from wounds. No British, I believe, were killed or wounded. Considering the importance and size of the conflict and the many years it lasted, these numbers are much smaller than they
would have been if the Indians had used violence toward the British.\textsuperscript{28}

The consequence of non-violent resistance along with physical sufferings also involves economic losses. The \textit{two} best instances to be cited here are that of the American colonists’ struggles and in the Ruhrkampf:

1) In reaction to the non-violent movement in Boston, the British government closed the ports leading to a lot of unemployment, poverty and other sufferings.

2) In case of non-violent resistance in Ruhrkampf, Germany suffered a major economic disruption. As a result, infant mortality rate increased, two million people became unemployed, and inflation reached its zenith.\textsuperscript{29} However, at the same time, it would be wrong to say that such economic sufferings would not have happened if Germany had retaliated violently.

Gandhi believed that suffering met to meek and submissive is much more as compared that of a courageous non-violent resister. He even pointed out analogy between the sufferings of violent resister to a fearless non-violent actionist. He emphasized the need to be prepared for suffering in non-violent action as it usually pays for the long run. He believed that those who opt for non-violent action may determine the method of action according to their level of forbearance and tolerance. If they can tolerate little then they may either prepare more or adopt other milder forms of non-violent resistance:

The effect of willingness to suffer has various positive aspects involved. It hampers the opponent’s ability to control the situation in case of continued suffering and it also has psychological influence on the opponent, their supporters, and the third parties involved. Motilal Nehru, father of India’s first Prime Minister, rightly quoted on the day of his imprisonment in 1930, “We
have not yet paid one hundredth part of the price of freedom, and must go forward with unflinching step defying the enemy and all the cruel refinements of torture that he is capable of inventing. Do not worry for those who have been taken. See to it that every man, woman and child left behind gives a good account of himself or herself to the nation.\(^{30}\)

Thus, suffering is an indispensable aspect of non-violence that paves its way to gain success and prosperity as the dictum goes ‘no pain no gain’.

2) AIMS OF SATYAGRAHA

Gandhi used *Satyagraha* as a political weapon to fight injustice and atrocities and as a remedy for the grievances of people. He developed the technique of *Satyagraha* in order to turn the anger and resistance of individual into an active social and political force. Gandhi said:

> If the laws are unjust or oppressive and constitutional remedies are not available owing to the attitude of the rulers or majorities, *satyagraha* is a legitimate weapon of the injured individuals or groups.\(^{31}\)

The principles of *Satyagraha* basically aim to achieve solution to a conflict or in other words it aims to resolve a conflict. Conflict, for Gandhi, has a very positive role to play since it provides an opportunity to bring in unity of life and helps in creation of a superior social order and peaceful co-existence. *Satyagraha* further aims at bringing a change in the attitude of the opponent. It wishes not just to redress the immediate problem but rather aims at removing the root cause of conflict. Since *Satyagraha* aims to remove the underling cause of conflict the resolution is not something which is imposed upon the parties but rather it is something that is felt from within. It aims to affect the conscience of the opponent and then achieve the solution.\(^{32}\) Apart from resolving conflict, *Satyagraha* aims to achieve a higher degree of truth. Now since no one can achieve absolute truth and
perception of truth may vary, so in conflict resolution a synthesis of relative truth held by parties should lead towards absolute truth. All this helps us to achieve a sense of unity and awareness not only about ourselves but also about others. Apart from this, Satyagraha makes a Satyagrahi self-reliant, bold ethical agent and it shows a way to achieve justice through non-violence and tries to bring social transformation.

Gandhi considers that in resolution of conflict, three steps stand out very prominently. A Satyagrahi first needs to reason with the opponents in order to persuade him. When reasoning or logic fails self-suffering becomes the means to persuade the opponent. For Gandhi, when compassion and reasoning fail to give results the last step is civil disobedience and non-cooperation.

According to Gene Sharp, Satyagraha is a means to gain success in a conflict followed by an in increased insight into truth without inflicting harm on the opponent. It believes in persuasion and conversion of the opponent. As Gandhi once quoted to Miss Agatha Harrison, “The essence of non-violent technique is that it seeks to liquidate antagonisms but not the antagonist.”

Thus, the aim of the Satyagraha is the integration and not the suppression of the existing differences. It not merely wants to win over the opponent but promises a change. It sets a new social order which is non-oppressive, just, non-violent and is controlled by the values of love, cooperation, equality and brotherhood. As mentioned earlier, Gandhi also attaches very great importance to suffering in Satyagraha. He refers to Satyagraha as the ‘Law of suffering’ and ‘Tapsaya of truth’. Gandhi writes:
Nothing can shake me from the conviction that given a good cause, suffering for it advances it as nothing else as done.\textsuperscript{37}

Thus, all in all Satyagraha is an adherence to ‘truth’ in which the action is ‘non-violent’ but includes ‘self- suffering’.

There are numerous example of Satyagraha practiced by Gandhi in Indian struggle for Independence:

1) The Vykom Temple Road Satyagraha started in 1924 to remove the prohibition upon the use by the untouchable of road ways passing the temple is a notable example.\textsuperscript{38} This was based on the truth that every individual has the right to use a public road without any discrimination of caste or creed. The Satyagrahis endured self-suffering and held non-violent demonstration against the unjust practice.

2) The Satyagraha against the Rowlatt Bills was the first nation wide Satyagraha movement to be launched in India. This Satyagraha was against the provisions of the Rowlatt Bills. The success of Rowlatt Satyagraha leis in the great change it brought. Motilal Nehru quoted:

\begin{center}
A new force was suddenly introduced into our politics, a force with the most tremendous potentialities. India’s masses were suddenly awakened and message of Satyagraha entered the humblest home…\textsuperscript{39}
\end{center}

Other notable example of Satyagraha includes a) Salt-Satyagraha, Ahmedabad b) Labour satyagraha c) Bardoli Campaign of Peasants and so on. Briefly, Gandhi calls Satyagraha a universal principle of universal application:

\begin{center}
It is a force that may be used by individuals as well as by communities. It may be used in political as well as in domestic affairs. Its universal applicability is a
\end{center}
demonstration of its permanence and invincibility. It can be used alike by men, women and children.\textsuperscript{40}

Thus, \textit{Satyagraha} has assumed much significance as it destroys evil and not the evil doer while violence prolongs the real revolution and leads to counter violence.

\textbf{(3) FORMS OF SATYAGRAHA}

\textit{Satyagraha} is not a single faceted technique but rather is a multi-faceted means to curb society from socio-political evils. The two offshoots of \textit{Satyagraha} are non-cooperation and civil disobedience. In fact, non-cooperation and civil disobedience are the steps of \textit{Satyagraha} and may be called as the forms of it. A brief description these two forms is as under:

\textbf{3.1) NON COOPERATION:}

Non-cooperation implies the withdrawal of cooperation from a state, authority or an institution that in the non-cooperators view have become corrupt. According to Gandhi, non-cooperation is “… a protest against an unwilling and unwilling participation in evil….\textsuperscript{41}” It is, “… the expression of anguished love.”\textsuperscript{42} Gandhi believed that it is the duty of people to cooperate in the well-being of society. Therefore, state, government, or society frames laws for the people. Whether a law is just or unjust depends upon the very consequences of it. A just law propagates good results, maintains self-respect and reverence for one another and an unjust does the opposite. Gandhi held that as it is a duty of every individual to cooperate in the functioning of just laws similarly it is their moral obligation to non-cooperate with unjust and iniquitous ones. He considered the non-cooperation with the evil forces as the sacred duty for every individual. Gandhi said, “Non-cooperation with evil is as much a duty as cooperation
with good”. In this way, he did not approve of any such violent action which was done for injustice and did violate the human rights.

The underlying idea behind this non-cooperation is that the success of an unjust system depends upon the cooperation of sufferers. If the victims continue to suffer passively the evil keeps on succeeding but if they begin to non-cooperate no such system may persist. Gandhi quoted in Young India:

Even the most despotic Government can not stand except for the consent of the governed, which consent is often forcibly procured by the despot. Immediately the subject ceases to fear, his power is gone.

This means that the withdrawal of support and cooperation by the people means a complete paralysis of an evil regime. Moreover, the act of non-cooperation effective makes the wrong-doer to realize that people love, peace, justice and approve such government as it based on non-violence and justice.

Non-cooperation works in two ways. It believes that by non-cooperating with the evil a sense of moral consciousness get aroused in the evildoer which brings transformation. It also helps to boost the morale of the non-cooperators who do not accept help of any kind from unjust sources, thus making them self-reliant. Hence, this technique of non-cooperation helps to bring moral revolution. Gandhi quoted:

The primary motive of non-cooperation is self-purification by withdrawing cooperation from unrighteous and unrepentant Government. The secondary object is to rid ourselves of the feeling of helplessness by being independent of all Government control or supervision, i.e., to govern ourselves in all possible affairs; and, in fulfilling both the objects to refrain from doing or promoting injury, or any violence, to individual or property.
The self-purification of a Satyagrahi means the enormous growth in his\her moral strength, which helps to weaken the government paving its way to success. Therefore, Gandhian non-cooperation is a means to solve conflicts in a non-violent way. He once quoted to Miss Agatha Harrison:

> Although non-cooperation is the main weapon in the armory of Satyagraha, it should not be forgotten that it is after all only a means to secure the cooperation of the opponent consistently with truth and justice.\(^\text{46}\)

Non-cooperation is in fact a prelude to cooperation. Gandhi wrote in 1925:

> Behind my non-cooperation there is always the keenest desire to cooperate on the slightest pretext even with the worst of opponents.\(^\text{47}\)

His non-cooperation was a means of purgation:

> I am by instinct a cooperator, my very non-cooperation is intended to purge cooperation of all meanness and falsity, for I hold that such cooperation is not worth the name.\(^\text{48}\)

Gandhi’s non-cooperation also involves suffering to the participators. He believed that non-cooperation is a, “… measure of discipline and self-sacrifice, without which no nation can make real progress”.\(^\text{49}\) Thus, non-cooperation is a form of Satyagraha working through transformation, involving self-suffering and persuasion, based on truth and non-violence and may achieve result without any antagonism with the opponent.

As stated earlier, the example of non-cooperation includes strike, hartal, picketing, social ostracism etc. Hartal or strike is a spiritual weapon in which there is a stoppage of work as a mark of protest against an unjust regime, institution, or law. Gandhi described hartal as an, “act of self purification”. This cessation of works as a mark of disapproval should remain purely non-violent and absolutely voluntary.
Picketing as a method of non-cooperation bears the objective of transforming the opponent through persuasion and should remain non-violent. It may be organized to protest against any socio-political or economic abuse. According the objective of picketing should be the hindering of the path of the opponent but rather should be used to warn and shame the scabs. Speech is the most important armory of picketing and this method discourages the use of intimidation, coercion although fasting has a place in it. The most notable example of this method is a picketing of ‘liquor’, ‘opium’, and foreign cloth shops during the non-violent movement of 1920-22 and 1930-34.\textsuperscript{50}

Boycott, as a method of non-cooperation, involves the boycott of social, political, economic, and educational or any other institution, which according to the protestors’ point of view has become evil or corrupt. Its aim is to pressurize the opponent in order to correct them to reassess them and to realize them that they are unjust and unreliable’. In case of boycott of illegitimate institution establishment of parallel institution on non-violent model is highly idealized.

The first Non-cooperation Movement in India, as we mostly known, was started in 1920 under the leadership of Gandhi. The objective of this movement was to rectify the mistakes of Khilafat and the Punjab massacres and finally to achieve independence.\textsuperscript{51} This non-cooperation movement was planned by Gandhi to take place in four significant steps. In Young India, Gandhi mentioned the steps as, (1) giving up of titles and resignation of honorary posts, (2) calling out of Government servants, (3) the withdrawal of the police and the military, and (4) the suspension of the taxes.
In the first step latter on the development of swadeshi commodities and institutions was included. Gandhi advocated the boycott of foreign goods and he himself inaugurated their bonfires in Bombay on July 1921.\textsuperscript{52} The non-cooperation movement latter developed into civil disobedience. Gandhi wrote in 1930, “A little reflection will show that civil disobedience is a necessary part of non-cooperation”.\textsuperscript{53}

**3.2) CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE:**

It is the last and most drastic form of non-cooperation. It is an open and deliberate violation of illegitimate laws, regulations, and institutions in a non-violent manner. It comprises of two things, civility and disobedience i.e. it is the disobedience of unlawful things in a civil manner. Gandhi defines it as, “The breach of unmoral statutory enactments”.\textsuperscript{54} The term civil disobedience was coined by Henry David Thoreau and its theory was explained in his essay, ‘Duty of Civil Disobedience’. Under civil disobedience, Thoreau used the technique of no-payment of taxes against the slavery of his country. He believed that there will never be a free state until the state recognizes the individual as higher as independent power. He emphasized the need of maximum cooperation when it led towards goodness and non-cooperation when it promotes evil. Gandhi’s contribution lies in the development of civil disobedience as a means of social and political action. He believed that civil disobedience, “… a complete, effective and bloodless substitute of armed revolt”, which signifies, “… the resister’s out-lawry in a civil, i.e., non-violent manner.”\textsuperscript{55}

According to Gandhi in civil-disobedience a satyagrahi becomes an ‘outlaw’ and completely ignores the authority of the state but all this is done with without the use of violence. On the other hand, the satyagrahi in doing
so is always ready to face suffering on himself and devoted by prepares himself to work and face consequences. In words of Gandhi civil-disobedience ‘is a powerful expression of a soul’s anguish and an eloquent protest against the continuance of the evil regime.’

Civil disobedience, like non-cooperation, has been called to be the moral duty for every Indian. It was justified on the basis that obedience to immoral and unjustified laws is in itself illegal. Gandhi used the role of conscience to defend the disobedience of law. He said that civil-disobedience is the natural right of people. One is born innately with the habit to obey the laws but once in conscience the law becomes unbearable or it is against human welfare, the people not only possess the right to disobey the law but it becomes their duty to do so. Gandhi wrote in *Hind Swaraj*, “It is contrary to our manhood if we obey laws repugnant to our conscience. Such teaching is opposed to religion and means slavery.”

The aim of civil disobedience is to destroy the ill-legitimate laws, to redress wrongs and to increase the awareness amongst people about unjust attitudes and things through self-suffering. In India, it was used to paralyze the British Government and at the same time established *Swaraj*. In 1946 Gandhi said:

> A non-violent resolution is not a programme of ‘seizure of power’. It is a programme of transformation of relations ending in a peaceful transfer of power.

In the civil disobedience movement a lot of prudence is needed in the selection of the laws to be disobeyed by the *satyagrahis*. The movement should not be against any moral law and therefore, the selection of the laws to be broken may not be made by individual *satyagrahis* but by their leader. Discipline holds a paramount importance in civil disobedience. It is
necessary to make the movement effective and successful. The movement as advocated by Gandhi may be classified into four categories, defensive and offensive civil disobedience and individual and mass civil disobedience. AICC (All India Congress Committee) defined different aspects of civil disobedience as follow:

Individual Civil Disobedience is a disobedience of orders or laws by a single individual or an ascertained number or group of individuals. Therefore prohibited public meeting where admission is regulated by tickets and to which no unauthorized admission is allowed is an instance of individual civil disobedience, where as a prohibited public meeting to which the general public is admitted without any restriction is an instance of mass civil disobedience. Such civil disobedience is defensive when a prohibited public meeting is held for conducting a normal activity, although it may result in arrest. It would be aggressive if it is held not for any normal activity, but merely for the purpose of courting arrest and imprisonment.\(^{59}\)

One can find such examples of aggressive as well as mass civil disobedience are the raids on salt depots at Wadala and Dharsana in 1930 by satyagrahis.

Thus, Gandhi’s this effective method of civil disobedience has been used as a synonym to non-violence throughout the world history. There has been several example of this including the refusal of American colonial merchant to use tax stamps, the Defiance Campaign in South Africa in 1952 against the Apartheid and others to name a few.\(^{60}\) In India it has been practiced for various objectives. The aim of the movement in Bardoli was to redress the grievances of the peasants;\(^{61}\) the civil disobedience of 1940-41 was for the freedom of speech in India particularly its important places like Rajkot, Travancore, Jaipur etc. and it was, in fact, for the objective of
Also the civil disobedience of 1930-34 in India was against the Salt laws.

The civil disobedience as a method for *Satyagraha* is a quicker remedy for grievances and therefore needs to be handled with care as it involves a lot of danger. Gandhi said:

“… its use must be guarded by all conceivable restrictions. Every possible provision should be made against an out break of violence or general lawlessness. Its area as well as its scope should also be limited to the barest necessity of the case.”

The doctrine of *Satyagraha* bears enormous power because of its essentially non-violent nature. It is not only morally justified but also finds its expression and proper place in almost all the religions of the world. As a method to fight, the evils of the society it holds a lot of relevance in the modern world. The world today is suffering from the disease of ‘violence’, ‘terrorism’ and racial discrimination and *Satyagraha* here stands as an eminent, effective, promising and a great political weapon to fight these evils. Based on love, truth and goodwill, it holds a lot of promise for a better future and may lead to a world free from evils where every one would live peace, in harmony and peace. Thus, *Satyagraha* holds greater significance in the present and the future world as compared to the past and the future world as compared to the past.

(4) SOLIDARITY AND DISCIPLINE TO FIGHT REPRESSION

4.1) OPENNES AND SECRECY IN NON-VIOLENT ACTION:
The word ‘openness’ literally qualifies the ‘quality of being honest’ and ‘not hiding any information from others’. In a non-violent action, openness means that the organization backing a non-violent action should openly reveal to the public and the opponent, the identities and the future course of activities of its leaders or responsible agents. Along with this, the non-violent protestors may not indulge in any acts of deception against the opponents. This means that the opponent be informed in advance about the date, place, time of non-violent action to be taken. History is replete with such examples where openness was followed in non-violent action. The policy of openness in defiance was a prominent feature of the Russian Revolution of 1905.\textsuperscript{64} Gandhi’s policy of openness in non-violent action becomes explicit by his letter to Lord Irvin, the Viceroy written on March 2, 1930. In this letter, Gandhi declared that if his plea for political changes were not accepted by March 11, he along with his followers would resort to disobey the provisions of the Salt Laws. Soon after, on March 12 in his newspaper, \textit{Young India}, he published the names, ages, and identification of his co-participants who were to march with him to make the Salt.\textsuperscript{65} Gandhi’s such shows that while striving for a non-violent action one must do everything openly honestly.

Openness is an integral part of non-violence since non-violence itself is based on the principle of truthfulness. Keeping secrecy or restoring to the use of deception or conspiratorial behavior violates this basic principle of truthfulness in non-violence. ‘Secrecy’ and ‘underground conspiracy’ poses severe threat to the movement of non-violence. Several instances prove that keeping of secret in non-violent action hampers it functioning, which may lead to its failure and disappointment. In many situations, it has been seen
that it may never be totally possible to keep matters secret from the opponent. Through one or the other means of spies, informers or use of electronic medium the opponent gets to learn about the course of action. For example, the British government tried to keep informers and agents in strike organizations during the General Strike of 1926.\textsuperscript{66} Also in Nazi Germany, informers and agents penetrated underground groups and concentration camps making it difficult for the opposition groups to keep resistance plans secret.\textsuperscript{67} In such a situation after the secret becomes known to the opponent the plan of action collapses. If otherwise, no secrets are kept and the actions are planned openly the movement runs smoothly reaching its destination. One of the most powerful objections to the maintenance of secrecy in a non-violent action is that not only secrecy has its roots in fear but it may also enhance fear among the fellow participants. The very fear that the actions, plans, names, hide outs, identities of the participants may be discovered damps the sprit of resistance. In this regard, Gandhi believed that the maintenance of secrecy during Indian 1932-33 struggle was a most vital cause for the movement’s failure. He said:

“… the secrecy that has attended the movement is fatal to its success…”.

There can be no doubt that fear has seized the common man. The ordinances have cowed them down and I am inclined to think that the secret methods are largely responsible for this demoralization.\textsuperscript{68}

It is generally believed that there may be several other negative consequences to the use of secrecy in non-violent action. The maintenance of secrecy in a non-violent action gives an impression that the leaders or active leaders of such a protest are trying to avoid arrest or suffering. This impression of lack of courage on the part of leaders damages the morale of
other co-participants. If leaders who keep secrets are arrested, they fail to gain public sympathy and are liable to face more punishment than those leaders who openly challenge a regime. The most dangerous impact of secrecy is that it threatens the very capacity of the movement to remain non-violent. To deal with a spy or an agent of the opponent there is no concrete non-violent method and in such a situation, it is possible that the secret information may get disclosed. Use of violence to avoid this leak out of information alters the nature of the non-violent method and thus non-violence loses its very identity. It is so because of these reasons that American civil rights demonstrators, Oppenheimer and Lakey wrote in their handbook:

It (secrecy) results in inefficiency because you have to cover up much that you do from your own members, authoritarianism because you cannot tell your members what is going on, and mistrust.\textsuperscript{69}

In short, it may be said that a non-violent movement which attempts to maintain a policy of secrecy relating to its plans, actions and organization faces hindrances and problems which severely threatens its requirements for casting off fear and maintenance of non-violent discipline.

The principle of, openness on the other hand, contributes in a number of ways, in the positive development of a non-violent action. Openness relating to the intentions and plans of action helps to maintain genuine strength in the movement. As Gregg specifies that the policy of openness may encourage the wider knowledge of the existence, aims, and activities of the resistance movement. It may also make the opponent attempt at censorship and repression of news more difficult.\textsuperscript{70} The quality of openness may also help to gain sympathy from the third party, which at times may be
very crucial in gaining success. The sympathy sometimes may even come from some members of the opponent and thus openness may contribute to change the perception of people thereby weakening the opponent and his plans. As Ebert felt that alone openness in non-violent action may change the attitude of the opponent. He maintained that:

So long as the oppressor fears the resistance fighters, i.e., so long as he is not convinced of their non-violent attitude, he will be inclined to strengthen his own position. Only an open resistance organization can convince the oppressor that its professed belief and the demands which arise from it correspond to the true aim of the campaign.\(^71\)

Thus, Gandhi believed that openness in defiance breaks the submissive attitude and that the effect of a non-violent action depended heavily upon the indifference in use of measures for self-protection and willingness to take severe risks.\(^72\) He claimed that in the struggle to gain independence it was essential to behave like a free man, “A free man would not engage in a secret movement”\(^73\). He believed that openness contributes in increasing the morale of people and in enhancing their self-esteem. Gandhi stressed on several occasions on the need of openness. According to him, no secret organization, however big could do any good alone. We have to organize for action a vast people that have been crushed under the heel of unspeakable tyranny for centuries. They cannot be organized by any other than open truthful means.\(^74\) Thus, we may conclude that in most situations at least, non-violent action movement may operate openly if they have to achieve their maximum strength and advantage in the struggle.

(4.2) DENIAL TO HATE:
To hate one’s opponent and to be non-violent is not possible in a non-violent action, but at the same time the effectiveness of non-violent technique increases many folds if the activists refuse to hate. In addition to this, if apart from being non-malevolent by nature non-violent activists’ show good will to their enemies the rate of success may become even greater. Therefore, a natural corollary of denial to hate is to have love for one’s opponents. As Martin Luther King Jr., one of the great exponents of non-violence wrote:

> The non-violent resister not only refuses to shoot his opponent but he also refuses to hate him. At the centre of non-violence stands the principle of love.\(^75\)

A non-violent actionist should bear love for the evil doer and hate the evil. Loving an evil-doer does not imply helping him in doing evil but rather it means bearing no malice against him. A votary of non-violence must be free from hatred, malice, envy, lust and should have faith in reality and love of God. Gandhi reiterated it several times that, “In its positive form \textit{Ahimsa} means largest love, the greatest charity, if I am a follower of \textit{Ahimsa}, I must love my enemy.”\(^76\) Prophet Mohammad (S) believing in such principle in which one should offer love for hate and extend non-violent action based on goodwill and cooperation to curb evil and hatred attitude. The Prophet said: “Whoever suffers an injury done to him and forgives (the person responsible), Allah will raise his status to a higher degree and remove one of his sins.” (\textit{At-Tirmidhi})

The consequences of ‘absence of malice and hatred and presence of personal good will’ are very positive. This is because oppression of non-violent activists possessing a friendly attitude not only seems less justifiable but also their suffering causes greater impact on the enemies and third
parties. At times it may help to achieve conversion of the opponent or may at least lead to their accommodation i.e. opponents yield to non-violent actionist without a change of their mind set. On contrary to this if non-violent actionists bear hostility their oppression increases in its degree. The positive impact of refusal to hate and bear a good will for the opponent may be observed in all the three mechanisms of change: conversion, accommodation, or coercion. For example, even in non-violent coercion this positive relation helps to reduce the loyalty of opponent’s officers in carrying out the orders of repression.

Therefore such a great and sympathetic attitude to love ones enemy has been practiced several times in world history. Among this, the prophet of non-violence, Gandhi firmly believed in having love and compassion even for ones enemy. He gave malice and ill will no place in his non-violent campaigns. He argued that ‘… the purer the suffering, the quicker would be the result’.\textsuperscript{77} A similar attitude is seen in the discipline leaflets for demonstrations by the American and British peace groups. One of them issued in 1962 by New York City peace organizations reads as follows:

\begin{quote}
Our attitude toward persons who may oppose us will be one of understanding and of respect for the right of others to hold and express what ever views they wish. We will not be violent in our attitude, make hostile remarks, shout, or call names. If singing or chanting is indicated, it will be in a manner consistent with the non-violent spirit of the demonstration.\textsuperscript{78}
\end{quote}

Moreover, following the similar trend the discipline leaflet issued in Britain by Committee for Direct Action Against Nuclear War contains these lines:

\begin{quote}
Do not use any language or take any action which is likely to provoke violence by others. A dignified
\end{quote}
bearing and courteous determination will greatly contribute to victory for this cause. If you jeered or called names, do not shout back or jeer those whom differ from our views. Silence and a friendly smile are the best reply to hostility, as you continue (to act) as before the interruption.79

The appeal to love one's enemy also bears some negative consequences to it. Some non-violent actionists may find it hard to return positive response to their opponent’s violence. As a result of this it is possible that they may adopt violent methods in place of non-violent methods. Such efforts of inculcating love for one's enemy therefore in the long run may hamper rather than promote the substitution of non-violent for violent means.

The great exponents of non-violent action commonly believe that the positive aspects of ‘refusal to hate’ are much greater than its negative aspects. Altogether, it may be said that this positive attitude increases the effectiveness of non-violent action, decreases the degree of opponent’s repression, and leads to beneficial long-term consequences. Thus, it becomes desirable for non-violent actionists to have good will and love for their opponent in place of hatred, malice, hostility to achieve their aim with greater success.

4.3) COURAGE AND FEARLESSNESS:

Like other mentioned methods the courage and fearlessness are the necessary pre-conditions of the non-violent struggle. Gandhi considered fearlessness or ‘abhaya’ as one of the cardinal virtues. He considered fearlessness to be an inseparable aspect of non-violence and stated that, “True non-violence is impossibility without the possession of unadulterated fearlessness”.80 He defined fearlessness his own way by stating,
“Fearlessness connotes freedom from all external fear, fear of disease, bodily injury, and death, of dispossession, of losing one’s nearest and dearest, of losing reputation or giving offence and so on.” He maintained that a non-violent actionist needs only to fear God and rest all kinds of fears itself evaporates. He needs to shed of the attachment to the physical world and what remains important is the sole. Gandhi stated:

Perfect fearlessness can be attained only by him who has realized the Supreme, as it implies the height of freedom from delusions....External fears cease of their own accord when once we have conquered the body as a centre, and would therefore, disappear as soon as one got rid of the attachment for the body.

He considered the non-violence of the brave to be highest in the scale and next to it came the non-violence of the weak and finally that of a coward. According to Gandhi, non-violence of brave is perfect non-violence and it is non-violence in thought, word, and deed and pervades every sphere of life. Although it is not an easy task yet all great personalities of great human civilizations showed their strong will in practicing the ideal of non-violence. This courage and fearlessness helps the non-violent actionist to act independently and to bear the suffering, which follows. Thus, it becomes clear that one should remain fearless in his attitude to be a true non-violent resister.

As we generally know that fear bears several negative consequences. The greatest being that it leads one towards cowardice. Gandhi maintained, “Non-violence can not to be taught to a person who fears to die and has no power of resistance....”

Similarly, Gregg observed that, “There is a hope for a violent man to be some day non-violent, but there is none for a coward.” Gandhi always
disliked weak-willed and coward people and was very strong in his condemnation of cowardice:

Cowardice… is possibly the greatest violence, certainly far greater than blood shed, and the like that go under the name of violence. For it comes from want of faith in God and ignorance of His attribute.86

Fear causes arrogance and suspicion amounting sometimes to aggressiveness. Fear leads one to submit before an oppressive regime and helps in its functioning. It hinders and destroys the process of change upon which non-violence depends heavily. It leads to continuation and even increase in the brutalities of the oppressor. Gandhi believed that oppression exists because one fears the consequences of disobedience. He said, “The government takes advantage of our fear of jails”.87 Thus, here casting off fear becomes indispensable for a non-violent actionist to gain success.

On the other hand, the casting off fear helps to gain confidence and undermines the strength of the opponent. This has been proved during the bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama. Martin Luther King, Jr. reported that after the repression began:

“… a once fear-ridden people had been transformed. Those who had previously trembled before the laws were now proud to be arrested for the cause of freedom.”88

This alone proves that casting off fear leads one to gain confidence and one recognizes his power to change a situation effectively. The brave psychological aspects of human Individual leaves an everlasting impact on others and people get lessons from such strong willed and morally great persons.
There are several examples from history, which points towards the necessity of fearlessness and courage. For example, the 19th century Russian revolutionary Alexander Herzen devoted the first page of his first issue of Free Russian Press to this objective. Also Bakunin linked ‘mental liberation’ with ‘socio-economic liberation’. Jacobin Petr Tkachev who was Lenin’s source of inspiration quoted:

When the people see that terrible power that they dreaded and before they which they accustomed to tremble and to denigrate themselves, is disorganized, split and befouled, when they see that they need not fear anybody or anything, then the accumulated bitterness will break out with irresistible force.

In addition, Michael Prawdin wrote about Russian in their 1917s, “the people had lost their fear of punishment and the bogey of the state had lost its power to terrify”. Gandhi also supported a need of metamorphosis from fear and submission to fearlessness in order to gain real political freedom. Speaking to the masses of India he once said:

We have to dispel fear from their hearts. On the day they shed all fear, India’s fetters shall fall and she will be free.

Thus, the principle equipped with courage and fearlessness makes it possible to face challenges and sufferings and to continue in face of repression. It acts the as the source of strength and change and finally paves way for victory. Thus, courage and fearlessness are a practical requisite for non-violent action.

Gandhi explored the idea of truth and non-violence. He first applied the idea of non-violence for the civil rights of Indian community while he was a lawyer in South Africa. As a leader of Indian National Congress in 1921, he led several campaigns all based on non-violence to achieve swaraj
or self reliance. Through his newspaper *Harijan* he conveyed to the large masses of the world how through ahimsa people of weak nations could resist to aggressors. As a lover of humanism, his immediate reaction after the first atomic bomb destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki was:

I did not move a muscle…. On the contrary, I said to myself, that unless now the world adopts non-violence, it will spell suicide for mankind.\textsuperscript{93}

Gandhi believed that the functioning of an unjust or non-democratic regime depended on the submission and cooperation of the exploited people and thus in order to overthrow such a power non-cooperation of the mass was necessary. He believed to achieve this through non-violence and without any malice against the colonizers. His famous non-cooperation movement which started with the ‘*Dandi* salt march’ was based on this thought. Gandhi led the country during the Quit India Movement and finally paved the way out for the country’s independence through non-violence. Jawaharlal Nehru rightly said in his address to the nation after Bapu’s (Gandhi) death, “friends and comrades, the light has gone out of out our lives, and there is darkness everywhere….”\textsuperscript{94}

The upshot of the discussion is that Mahatma Gandhi is the symbol of non-violence. He is truly the man who changed the course of history and paved way for India’s victory through his indestructible weapon of non-violence and taught the world human society that only non-violent action can pave the way for peaceful co-existence, goodwill love and sympathy and can work global peace. . This *ahimsa* preached by Gandhi holds a great relevance in today’s society where the world is in the grip of crisis whether in Iraq, Afghanistan, Sri Lanka, Palestine or India and only non-violence advocated by Gandhi can helps us to solve critical problems of our times and can come
out to remove the dirty spots of terrorism, exploitation, racial discrimination, injustice and hatred from the face of humanity.

In reality, twenty-first century, most desperately needs the teachings of the great world leaders, social reformers and spiritual legends like Prophet Muhammad, Jesus Christ, Gautama Buddha, Mahatma Gandhi and the like personalities for the stability of human rights, world peace and goodwill.
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