CHAPTER-V

LITERATURE OF NON-VIOLENCE

“Gandhi was fully committed to the belief that while nonviolence had an impressive power to protest and disrupt, its real power was to create and reconstruct.” (Nagler 1997: 4)

5.1. Non-Violence: Definition, Forms and History

Non-violence has two (closely related) meanings. First, it can refer to a general philosophy of abstention from violence because of moral or religious principle and second, it can refer to the behaviour of people using nonviolent action. ‘Non-violence’ according to Oxford Dictionary is “the use of peaceful means, not force, to bring about political or social change.” And non-violent resistance (or nonviolent action) is the practice of achieving goals through symbolic protests, civil disobedience, economic or political noncooperation, and other methods, without using violence. It is largely synonymous with civil resistance. The basic principles of non-violence encompass an abstention from using physical force to achieve an aim, but also a full engagement in resisting oppression, domination and any other forms of injustice. It can thus be applied to oppose both direct (physical) violence and structural violence. (a) Opposition to direct violence Gandhi, whose ideas and actions have most crucially influenced the development of non-violence in the twentieth century, described his moral philosophy through the religious precept of ahimsa, which means in Sanskrit the complete renunciation of violence in thought and action. Non-violence is indeed usually defined in opposition to physical violence, which could be described as “the use of physical force against another’s body, against that person’s will, and that is expected to inflict physical injury or death upon that person” (Bond 1994: 62). This definition does not imply, however, that all actions without violence have to be nonviolent. Non-violence might be described as a direct substitute for violent behaviour: it implies deliberate restraint from expected violence, in a context of contention between two or more adversaries.
5.1.1. Forms of Non-violence

The forms of non-violence draw inspiration from both religious or ethical beliefs and political analysis. Religious or ethically based non-violence is sometimes referred to as principled, philosophical, or ethical non-violence, while non-violence based on political analysis is often referred to as tactical, strategic, or pragmatic non-violence. Commonly, both of these dimensions may be present within the thinking of particular movements or individuals. Love of the enemy, or the realization of the humanity of all people, is a fundamental concept of philosophical non-violence. The goal of this type of non-violence is not to defeat the enemy, but to win them over and create love and understanding between all. According to Mark Kurlansky, “all religions discuss the power of non-violence and the evil of violence.” Such principles or tenets can be found in each of the major Indian religious traditions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism) as well as in the major Abrahamic religious traditions (Judaism, Christianity). The Chandogya Upanishad, which is part of the Upanishads, one of the principal scriptures of Hinduism that dates to the 8th or 7th century bars violence against “all creatures” (sarva-bhuta) and establishes non-violence as a code of conduct for Hindus. Examples of non-violence found in religion and spirituality include the Sermon on the Mount in which Jesus urges his followers to “love thine enemy,” in the Taoist concept of wu-wei, or effortless action, in the philosophy of the martial art Aikido, in the Buddhist principle of metta, or loving-kindness towards all beings, in the principle of ahimsa, or non-violence toward any being, shared by Buddhism, Jainism and Hinduism. Additionally, focus on both non-violence and forgiveness of sin can be found in the story of Abel in the Quran; liberal movements within Islam have consequently used this story to promote Jewish ideals of non-violence. Non-violence is also part of modern pagan traditions. American author
Henry David Thoreau (1817–1862) had a major impact on the philosophy of non-violence. Leo Tolstoy, Mohandas Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr. were influenced by Thoreau.

The fundamental concept of **pragmatic** (or *tactical* or *strategic*) non-violence is to create a social dynamic or political movement that can effect social change without necessarily winning over those who wish to maintain the status quo. In modern industrial democracies, nonviolence has been used extensively by political sectors without mainstream political power such as labour, peace, environment and women's movements. Lesser known is the role that nonviolence has played and continues to play in undermining the power of repressive political regimes in the developing world and the former eastern bloc. As a technique for social struggle, non-violence has been described as “the politics of ordinary people”, reflecting its historically mass-based use by populations throughout the world and history. Perhaps the first instance of a nonviolent campaign with major political impact was the March 1 Movement in Korea, which was a catalyst for the establishment of the Provisional Government of the Republic of Korea in Shanghai in April 1919 and influenced nonviolent resistance in India and many other countries. Struggles most often associated with nonviolence are the non-cooperation campaign for Indian independence led by Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, the movement to attain civil rights for African Americans, led by Rev. Dr Martin Luther King and James Bevel, and the People Power Revolution in the Philippines. Also of primary significance is the notion that just means are the most likely to lead to just ends. When Gandhi said that “the means may be likened to the seed, the end to a tree,” he expressed the philosophical kernel of what some refer to as ‘pre-figurative politics.’ Martin Luther King, a student of Gandhian non-violent resistance, concurred with this tenet, concluding that “non-violence demands that the means we use must be as pure as the ends we seek.” Proponents of nonviolence reason that the actions taken in the present inevitably re-
shape the social order in like form. They would argue, for instance, that it is fundamentally irrational to use violence to achieve a peaceful society. People have come to use nonviolent methods of struggle from a wide range of perspectives and traditions. A landless peasant in Brazil may non-violently occupy a parcel of land for purely practical motivations. If they do not, the family will starve. A Buddhist monk in Thailand may “ordain” trees in a threatened forest, drawing on the teachings of Buddha to resist its destruction. A waterside worker in England may go on strike in socialist and union political traditions. All the above are using nonviolent methods but from different standpoints. Likewise, secular political movements have utilized non-violence, either as a tactical tool or as a strategic program on purely pragmatic and strategic levels, relying on its political effectiveness rather than a claim to any religious, moral or ethical worthiness. Respect or love for opponents also has a pragmatic justification, in that the technique of separating the deeds from the doers allows for the possibility of the doers changing their behaviour, and perhaps their beliefs. Martin Luther King said, “Non-violence means avoiding not only external physical violence, but also internal violence of spirit. You not only refuse to shoot a man, but you refuse to hate him.”

Finally, the notion of *Satya*, or truth, is central to the Gandhian conception of non-violence. Gandhi saw truth as something that is multifaceted and unable to be grasped in its entirety by any one individual. All carry pieces of the truth, he believed, but all need the pieces of others’ truths in order to pursue the greater truth. This led him to believe in the inherent worth of dialogue with opponents, in order to understand motivations. On a practical level, the willingness to listen to another’s point of view is largely dependent on reciprocity. In order to be heard by one’s opponents, one must also be prepared to listen.
5.1.2. History of Non-violence

The modern form of non-violent resistance was popularised and proven to be effective by the Indian leader Mahatma Gandhi in his efforts to gain independence from the British. The other non-violent resistance advocates include Leo Tolstoy, Mohandas Gandhi, Andrei Sakharov, Martin Luther King, Jr, Vaclav Havel, Gene Sharp, and Lech Walesa. The history of the 20th century is full of examples which demonstrate that violent resistance against unjust power systems, dictators or external occupation is likely to generate further violence (as seen, for example, in the Russian and Chinese revolutions or decolonisation wars in Africa and Asia). But it has also been characterized by many powerful non-violent struggles. Some of these are widely known (e.g. Gandhi’s struggles in India and South Africa, Nelson Mandela’s apartheid struggle in South Africa, Martin Luther King Jr.’s civil rights campaign in the US), while many others are still largely ignored by the wider public and research community. Although the power of non-violent resistance does seem weak and inefficient in the face of acute power asymmetries, it has proven to be a very strategic tool in the hand of marginalised communities to redress structural imbalance and claim rights to justice or self-determination. A question which has not been analysed extensively so far, which this article seeks to address, is in which context and under which conditions nonviolent resistance can contribute to successful and sustainable conflict transformation processes. Non-violent resistance and conflict transformation strategies share a common commitment to “social change and increased justice through peaceful means” (Lederach 995: 15). In fact, the discipline of conflict management/resolution originally arose from peace movements and social justice activism. However, one can argue that there has been since then a sharp divorce between the ‘revolutionary’ and ‘resolutionary’ camps, which seem to have grown in mutual ignorance-developing their own and distinct sets of activists and practitioners, theories and
scholars, interpretative frames and ranges of techniques, research centres and education programmes, organisations and forums, constituencies and institutional allies. This research aims to project that non-violence should instead be seen as an integral part of conflict transformation, offering one possible approach to achieving peace and justice, alongside other methods of conflict intervention focusing on dialogue, problem-solving and the restoration of cooperative relationships (e.g. mediation, negotiation, restorative justice, etc.). It is especially relevant for the early transitional stage of latent asymmetric conflicts, as a strategy for empowering grievance groups (oppressed minorities or disempowered majorities) looking for constructive and efficient ways to attain justice, human rights and democracy without recourse to violence.

Non-violence is the greatest force at the disposal of mankind. It is mightier than the mightiest weapon of destruction devised by the ingenuity of man. The first condition of non-violence is ‘justice.’ Non-violence to be a potent force must begin with the mind. Non-violence of the mere body without the cooperation of the mind is non-violence of the weak or the cowardly and has therefore no potency. Non-violence does not mean inaction or apathy. Sometimes, the consequence of one’s inaction may be as terrible as that of one’s action. Non-violence means engaging in an outgoing struggle or movement for justice, freedom and peace mindfully and compassionately. At present, non-violence is not merely ethically and morally pertinent and essential: it is the very prerequisite for human survival and environmental sustainability. Put another way, non-violence is closely related to the democratic participation of ordinary citizens in matters that affect their lives, the more an issue impacts a group of people, the more influence that group must have in influencing it. Non-violence is a crucial way to help restore meaning and substance to what we call democracy today, to constructively answer the reverberating wails or cries of suffering in the world. Before we
engage in non-violent direct action we first need to understand that violence is often the culmination of greed, hatred and delusion. Equally important, simultaneously with the cultivation of seeds of peace within, we need to envisage and struggle for alternative futures, relying on non-violence.

5.1.3. Methods of Non-violence

There are practically three facets of applying nonviolence: (a) Acts of Protest and Persuasion, (b) Noncooperation, and (c) Non-violent Intervention.

Acts of protest: Non-violent acts of protest and persuasion are symbolic actions performed by a group of people to show their support or disapproval of something. The goal of this kind of action is to bring public awareness to an issue, persuade or influence a particular group of people, or to facilitate future non-violent action. The message can be directed toward the public, opponents, or people affected by the issue. Methods of protest and persuasion include speeches, public communications, petitions, symbolic acts, art, processions (marches), and other public assemblies.

Non-cooperation: Non-cooperation involves the purposeful withholding of cooperation or the unwillingness to initiate in cooperation with an opponent. The goal of non-cooperation is to halt or hinder an industry, political system, or economic process. Methods of non-cooperation include labour strikes, economic boycotts, civil disobedience, sex strike, tax refusal, and general disobedience and fasts.

Non-violent intervention: Compared with protest and non-cooperation, non-violent intervention is a more direct method of non-violent action. Non-violent intervention can be used defensively, for example to maintain an institution or independent initiative - or
offensively— for example, to drastically forward a nonviolent struggle into the opponent's territory. Intervention is often more immediate and effective than the other two methods, but is also harder to maintain and more taxing to the participants involved.

Tactics must be carefully chosen, taking into account political, social, religious and cultural circumstances, and form part of a larger plan or strategy. Successful non-violent cross-border intervention projects include the Guatemala Accompaniment Project, Peace Brigades International and Christian Peacemaker Teams. Developed in the early 1980s, and originally inspired by the Gandhian Shanti Sena, the primary tools of these organizations have been nonviolent protective accompaniment, backed up by a global support network which can respond to threats, local and regional grassroots diplomatic and peace-building efforts, human rights observation and witnessing, and reporting. Non-violence has obtained a level of institutional recognition and endorsement at the global level. On November 10, 1998, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed the first decade of the 21st century and the third millennium, the years 2001 to 2010, as the International Decade for the Promotion of a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World. In the light of these findings the life and works of Mahatma Gandhi will be examined with special focus on his *My Non-violence* (1960), to heighten the understanding, influence, impact and the relevance of nonviolence in literature.

5.1.4 Civil Disobedience

Civil disobedience is the active, professed refusal to obey certain laws, demands, and commands of a government, or of an occupying international power. Civil disobedience is commonly, though not always, defined as being non-violent resistance. It is one form of civil resistance. In one view (in India, known as ahimsa or satyagraha) it could be said that it is
compassion in the form of respectful disagreement. One of its earliest massive implementations was brought about by Egyptians against the British occupation in 1919 Revolution. Civil disobedience is one of the many ways people have rebelled against what they deem to be unfair laws. It has been used in many nonviolent resistance movements in India (Gandhi’s campaigns for independence from the British Empire), in Czechoslovakia’s Velvet Revolution and in East Germany to oust their communist governments, in South Africa in the fight against apartheid, in the American Civil Rights Movement, in the Singing Revolution to bring independence to the Baltic countries from the Soviet Union, recently with the 2003 Rose Revolution in Georgia and the 2004 Orange Revolution in Ukraine, among other various movements worldwide.

One of the oldest depictions of civil disobedience is in Sophocles’ play *Antigone*, in which Antigone, one of the daughters of former King of Thebes, Oedipus, defies Creon, the current King of Thebes, who is trying to stop her from giving her brother Polynices a proper burial. She gives a stirring speech in which she tells him that she must obey her conscience rather than human law. She is not at all afraid of the death he threatens her with (and eventually carries out), but she is afraid of how her conscience will smite her if she does not do this. Following the Peterloo massacre of 1819, poet Percy Shelley wrote the political poem *The Mask of Anarchy* later that year, that begins with the images of what he thought to be the unjust forms of authority of his time—and then imagines the stirrings of a new form of social action. It is perhaps the first modern statement of the principle of non-violent protest. A version was taken up by the author Henry David Thoreau in his essay *Civil Disobedience*, and later by Gandhi in his doctrine of *Satyagraha*. Gandhi’s Satyagraha was partially influenced and inspired by Shelley’s non-violence in protest and political action. In particular, it is
known that Gandhi would often quote Shelley’s *Masque of Anarchy* to vast audiences during the campaign for a free India.

Thoreau’s 1848 essay *Civil Disobedience*, originally titled “Resistance to Civil Government”, has had a wide influence on many later practitioners of civil disobedience. The driving idea behind the essay is that citizens are morally responsible for their support of aggressors, even when such support is required by law. In the essay, Thoreau explained his reasons for having refused to pay taxes as an act of protest against slavery and against the Mexican-American War. He writes, “If I devote myself to other pursuits and contemplations, I must first see, at least, that I do not pursue them sitting upon another man’s shoulders. I must get off him first, that he may pursue his contemplations too. See what gross inconsistency is tolerated. I have heard some of my townsmen say, ‘I should like to have them order me out to help put down an insurrection of the slaves, or to march to Mexico; — see if I would go’; and yet these very men have each, directly by their allegiance, and so indirectly, at least, by their money, furnished a substitute.”

*Civil Disobedience* by Henry David Thoreau

One night in July, 1846, while Henry David Thoreau was living a quiet life on the shores of Walden Pond, near Concord, Massachusetts, he was jailed for failing to pay his taxes. He was released the next day because someone, probably his aunt, paid the tax. He gave a public lecture in 1848 at the Concord Lyceum to explain to his community his reasons for refusing to pay the tax. The text of that lecture was first published in 1849, under the title “Resistance to Civil Government.” The essay, now known as “Civil Disobedience,” was written to argue the moral necessity of resisting the institution of slavery, which the United States’ war against Mexico sought to extend. “Civil Disobedience” has become one of the ethical cornerstones of
nonviolent resistance movements. It is known to have been an inspiration to Mohandas Gandhi, who led the passive resistance movement for the liberation of India from British colonial rule. Thoreau’s ideas also influenced Martin Luther King, Jr.’s Civil Rights movement and the American struggle to end the Vietnam War. Thoreau did not find his identity in association with other people who shared his background. Rather, he believed his truest identity would be found in differentiating himself from the common herd of humanity, which he saw as mediocre, morally lazy, and cowardly. He was an individualist; he held that each person’s responsibility is to follow the highest leadings of personal conscience. Ultimate moral authority emanates from individual judgment, and getting “out of its way” is one of the most important things a just government can do. Civil law and the power of the democratic majority are secondary to the higher moral law as it is discerned by the individual. In cases in which civil government conflicts with personal conscience, Thoreau advocates withdrawing all support from that government immediately, without waiting to change the law or public opinion. Withdrawal of support—such as the refusal to pay taxes or to serve in the military—is likely to be met with punishment, and Thoreau advocates accepting the penalty imposed. Even if that penalty involves imprisonment, he claims that bodily confinement is trivial when compared to the spiritual liberty of thought and conscience that comes from following the higher law. Persons who obey a law or fight a war that they think is wrong become less than fully human—they lose their identities, they become machines. Thoreau’s 1849 essay “Resistance to Civil Government” was eventually renamed “Essay on Civil Disobedience.” After his landmark lectures were published in 1866, the term began to appear in numerous sermons and lectures relating to slavery and the war in Mexico. Thus, by the time Thoreau’s lectures were first published under the title “Civil Disobedience,” in 1866, four years after his death, the term had achieved fairly widespread usage.
LeGrande writes that “the formulation of a single all-encompassing definition of the term is extremely difficult, if not impossible. In reviewing the voluminous literature on the subject, the student of civil disobedience rapidly finds himself surrounded by a maze of semantical problems and grammatical niceties. Like Alice in Wonderland, he often finds that specific terminology has no more (or no less) meaning than the individual orator intends it to have.” He encourages a distinction between lawful protest demonstration, nonviolent civil disobedience, and violent civil disobedience.

In seeking an active form of civil disobedience, one may choose to deliberately break certain laws, such as by forming a peaceful blockade or occupying a facility illegally, though sometimes violence has been known to occur. Protesters practice this non-violent form of civil disorder with the expectation that they will be arrested. Others also expect to be attacked or even beaten by the authorities. Protesters often undergo training in advance on how to react to arrest or to attack, so that they will do so in a manner that quietly or limply resists without threatening the authorities. Mahatma Gandhi outlined several rules for civil resisters (or satyagrahi) in the time when he was leading India in the struggle for Independence from the British Empire. For instance, they were to express no anger, never retaliate, submit to the opponent’s orders and assaults, submit to arrest by the authorities, surrender personal property when confiscated by the authorities but refuse to surrender property held in trust, refrain from swearing and insults (which are contrary to ahimsa), refrain from saluting the Union flag, and protect officials from insults and assaults even at the risk of the resister’s own life.

Civil disobedience is usually defined as pertaining to a citizen’s relation to the state and its laws, as distinguished from a constitutional impasse in which two public agencies, especially two equally sovereign branches of government, conflict. For instance, if the head of government of a country were to refuse to enforce a decision of that country’s highest court, it
would not be civil disobedience, since the head of government would be acting in her or his capacity as public official rather than private citizen.

There have been debates as to whether civil disobedience need be non-violent. Black’s *Law Dictionary* includes nonviolence in its definition of civil disobedience. Christian Bay’s encyclopedia article states that civil disobedience requires “carefully chosen and legitimate means,” but holds that they do not have to be nonviolent. It has been argued that, while both civil disobedience and civil rebellion are justified by appeal to constitutional defects, rebellion is much more destructive; therefore, the defects justifying rebellion must be much more serious than those justifying disobedience, and if one cannot justify civil rebellion, then one cannot justify a civil disobedients’ use of force and violence and refusal to submit to arrest. Civil disobedients’ refraining from violence is also said to help preserve society’s tolerance of civil disobedience.

### 5.1.5. Civil Disobedience in India

Under the leadership of Gandhiji, the Civil Disobedience Movement was launched in AD 1930. It began with the Dandi March. On 12 March 1930, Gandiji with some of his followers left the Sabarmati Ashram at Ahmedabad and made their way towards Dandi, a village on the west coast of India. After travelling for twenty-five days and covering a distance of three hundred and eighty-five kms, the group reached Dandi on 6 April 1930. Here, Gandhiji protested against the Salt Law (salt was a monopoly of the government and no one was allowed to make salt) by making salt himself and throwing up a challenge to the British government. The Dandi March signified the start of the Civil Disobedience Movement. The movement spread and salt laws were challenged in other parts of the country. Salt became the symbol of people’s defiance of the government. In Tamil Nadu, C
Rajagopalchari led a similar march from Trichinopoly to Vedaranyam. In Gujarat, Sarojini Naidu pretested in front of the slat depots. Lakhs of people including a large number of women participated actively in these protests.

The Civil Disobedience Movement carried forward the unfinished work of the Non-Cooperation Movement. Practically the whole country became involved in it. Hartals put life at a standstill. There were large-scale boycotts of schools, colleges and offices. Foreign goods were burnt in bonfires. People stopped paying taxes. In the North-West Frontier Province, the movement was led by Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, popularly known as ‘Frontier Gandhi’. For a few days, British control over Peshawar and Sholapur ended. People faced the batons and bullets of the police with supreme courage. No one retaliated or said anything to the police. As reports and photographs of this extraordinary protest began to appear in newspapers across the world, there was a growing tide of support for India’s freedom struggle.

5.2. Life and Works of Gandhi

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi (1869-1948) was born on October 2, 1869 in Porbandar, India. He became one of the most respected spiritual and political leaders of the 1900’s. Gandhiji helped free the Indian people from British rule through nonviolent resistance, and is honoured by Indians as the Father of the Indian Nation. The Indian people called Gandhiji ‘Mahatma’, meaning Great Soul. At the age of 13 Gandhi married Kasturba, a girl of the same age. Their parents arranged the marriage. They had four children. Gandhi studied law in London and returned to India in 1891 to practice. In 1893 he took on a one-year contract to do legal work in South Africa. At the time the British controlled South Africa. When he attempted to claim his rights as a British subject he was abused, and soon saw that all Indians suffered similar treatment. He stayed in South Africa for 21 years working to
secure rights for Indian people. He developed a method of action based upon the principles of courage, non-violence and truth called Satyagraha. He believed that the way people behave is more important than what they achieve. Satyagraha promoted non-violence and civil disobedience as the most appropriate methods for obtaining political and social goals. In 1915 Gandhi returned to India. Within 15 years he became the leader of the Indian nationalist movement. Using the principles of Satyagraha he led the campaign for Indian independence from Britain. Following his civil disobedience campaign (1919-22), he was jailed for conspiracy (1922-4). In 1930, he led a landmark 320 km march to the sea to collect salt in symbolic defiance of the government monopoly. Gandhi was arrested many times by the British for his activities in South Africa and India. He believed it was honourable to go to jail for a just cause. On his release from prison (1931), he attended the London Round Table Conference on Indian constitutional reform. In 1946, he negotiated with the Cabinet Mission which recommended the new constitutional structure. Altogether he spent seven years in prison for his political activities. More than once Gandhi used fasting to impress upon others the need to be non-violent. India was granted independence in 1947, and partitioned into India and Pakistan. Rioting between Hindus and Muslims followed. Gandhi had been an advocate for a united India where Hindus and Muslims lived together in peace. After independence (1947), he tried to stop the Hindu-Muslim conflict in Bengal, a policy which led to his assassination. On January 13, 1948, at the age of 78, he began a fast with the purpose of stopping the bloodshed. After 5 days the opposing leaders pledged to stop the fighting and Gandhi broke his fast. Twelve days later a Hindu fanatic, Nathuram Godse who opposed his program of tolerance for all creeds and religion assassinated him. During his life he published many books which served as guiding force and principles for many people. Scores of other books were posthumously edited and published. The following are some of the acclaimed publications: *Wheel of Fortune* (1922), *To the Hindus and Muslims* (1942), *The Sound of
Swaraj (1943), Thoughts on National Language (1956), Towards Lasting Peace (1956), What Jesus Means to Me (1959), My Non-violence (1960), My Experiments With Truth: An Autobiography (1925). It will be a mammoth task to jot the entire publications by and on Gandhi. Some of his very best thoughts on nonviolence and peace are collected in his autobiography and My Non-violence (1960).

5.3. Non-violence as Reflected in Gandhi’s My Non-violence

In his book My Non-Violence, Gandhi assembled his principles of life. It is worth studying the book which will give us deeper insight to the present discourse. Here, he talks of non-violence as a way of life. In the opening page he strongly advocates his stand for non-violence as “I believe that non-violence is infinitely superior to violence, forgiveness is more manly than punishment” (MNV, 3). We understand therefore that to generate love, we need strength and humility of the most high. The solution to almost every conflict lies in forgiveness which requires a “mighty wave of strength in us.” During his struggle for India’s independence when three hundred million Indians were ruled by one hundred thousand Englishmen, Gandhi said that “non-violence is the law of our species as violence is the law of the brute” (MNV 4). His dream was to attain independence through peaceful approach. One finds in him the embodiment of strength and character of the highest virtue. His words are repelled with wisdom which came from a distilled mind free of pollution. His words and deeds justified him. He lived in his words. In his long struggle for freedom he came across many hurdles, at times when he was forced to switch his dogma he said, “If I take up the doctrine of the sword, she may gain momentary victory. Then India will cease to be the pride of my heart.... I believe absolutely that she has a mission for the world” (MNV 5). We cannot judge a whole country by judging the actions of a represented few. Gandhi on commenting about neighbours said, “The Afgans have no quarrel with India. They are a God-fearing
people. I warn non-co-operators against judging the Afgans by the few savage specimens we see in Bombay or Calcutta” (MNV 8). It was a time of upheaval when he made this statement. It shows the peaceful approach of Gandhi to nullify violence. His mission in life to bring peaceful solutions and create harmony is justified even in his simple speeches. He did not believe in quick ends as he said, “I do not believe in short-violent-cuts to success” (MNV 14). From his experience he said that permanent good can never be the outcome of untruth and violence. As we read further we find that Gandhi maintained a very cordial relationship with the Americans and the Europeans. He was very slow to react. He did not instigate people but rather he penned his thoughts and hoped that it will work in moving the entire nation. He believed in “thought-power” rather than in the “power of the word.” He said, “I believe in thought-power more than in the power of the word, whether spoken or written. And if the movement that I seek to represent has vitality in it and has divine blessing upon it, it will permeate the whole world without my physical presence in its different parts” (MNV 18). Ira Saxena who is a child psychologist, critic and writer of children’s books specializing in realistic stories, novels and nonfiction about the nonviolent struggle for India’s independence said, “The saga of Indian freedom is full of heroism, recounting the story of the mobilization of the inner strength and will of the masses driven by truth and ahimsa (non-violence) toward a common goal of freedom. This backdrop remains as the lives of the individuals who emerged as great martyrs, endowing writers like me with inspiring material for fiction, such as Kamala’s Story: The Saga of Our Freedom, or the stories of unsung heroes from different walks of life as in Together We Marched” (2009: 21). The acclaims of writers and thinkers prove the validity of Gandhi’s thoughts. The movement launched by him was alien to the world, many questioned the credibility of his works. When he started the non-co-operation movement and began to boycott foreign goods, he showed the people an alternative to produce local clothing. He began to spin cotton from raw products with his own hands.
Instead of going about destroying goods he resorted to peaceful way of agitation. It paved the way for small scale cottage industry. When the Americans asked him about the productivity of the spinning wheel, Gandhi replied, “The message of the spinning wheel is much wider than its circumference. Its message is one of simplicity, service of mankind, living so as not to hurt others, creating an indissoluble bond between the rich and the poor, capital and labour, the prince and the peasant” (MNV 20). He believed that if an individual is free from violence, he will sacrifice himself for his family, the family for the village, the village for the nation and the nation for the whole world. His purpose of a free India was to “see India free and strong so that she may offer herself as a willing and pure sacrifice for the betterment of the world” (MNV 21). Many of his contemporaries perceived nonviolence as an act of cowardice. But to Gandhi,

Non-violence is not a cover for cowardice, but it is the supreme virtue of the brave. Exercise of non-violence requires far greater bravery than that of swordsmanship. Cowardice is wholly inconsistent with non-violence. (MNV 34)

Gandhi very aptly brings the metaphor of a dog. He says that a dog bites when he fears. So, in the same manner he means to say that man resort to violence when they fear. And fear is a sign of insecurity. To him the advancement of the West was not awe-inspiring but rather he opines that “the superficial glamour of the West dazzles us, and we mistake for progress the giddy dance which engages us from day to day. We refuse to see that it is surely leading us to death” (MNV 43). Gandhi was a visionary. His thoughts were beyond his era. He held to the understanding that moral strength holds and governs the universe and not material development alone. Albert Einstein made a call to the people not to take part in war. But Gandhi’s opinion on war was that not participating in the activities of war alone is not enough to stop the evils of war. It should go beyond non-participation; it should take up non-
cooperation with the state of such affairs. On one occasion, when Dr. Tobias, a black American asked Gandhi: “Your doctrine of non-violence has profoundly influenced my life, do you believe in it as strongly as ever?” Gandhi replied “my faith in it is growing” (MNV 58).

When Dr. Tobias said, “Negroes in U.S.A. 12 millions are struggling to obtain such fundamental rights as freedom from mob-violence, unrestricted use of the ballot, freedom from segregation, etc. Have you, out of your struggle in India, a word of advice and encouragement to give us?” Gandhi said, “All I can say is that there is no other way than the way of non-violence—a way, however not of the weak and ignorant but of the strong and wise” (MNV 59). A thought may arise as Prof. Mays queried “Can non-violence be taught” (MNV 60). There are many doubts as how to bring out non-violence through literature. It seems an impossible task but when one delves deep into the core of non-violence philosophy, it is tangible. It is in other words innovative literature for world peace. According to Gandhi non-violence can be taught by “outward symbols.” Outward actions of love, kind words, and deeds are key elements to teach people lessons on non-violence. So, it is the life of a person itself that will propagate this noble message. On being asked to comment on the issue between China and Japan, where Chinese were on the majority, Gandhi in support of his argument referred to P.B. Shelley’s *The Mask of Anarchy*, “Ye are many, they are few”:

Stand ye calm and resolute  
Like a forest close and mute,  
With folded arms and looks which are  
Weapons of unvanquished war.  
And if then the tyrants dare,  
Let them ride among them there,  
Slash, and stab, and maim and hew,  
What they like, that let them do.  
Then they will return with shame  
To the place from which they came,
And the blood thus shed will speak
In hot blushes on their cheek. \((\text{MNV 79})\)

Gandhi was a visionary. He used appropriate quotes and references to project his philosophy. He implemented literature as a powerful weapon to drive his “truth-force.” Many people asked questions to Gandhi basing on their religious beliefs. One such person was Rev. Tema from South Africa who asked, “Do you think Christianity can bring salvation to Africa?” to this Gandhi replied:

Christianity, as it is known and practised today, cannot bring salvation to your people. It is my conviction that those who today call themselves Christians do not know the true message of Jesus. I witnessed some of the horrors that were perpetrated on the Zulus during the Zulu Rebellion. Because one man, Bambatta, their chief, had refused to pay his tax and the whole race was made to suffer. I was in charge of an ambulance corps. I shall never forget the lacerated backs of Zulus who had received stripes and were brought to us for nursing because no white nurse was prepared to look after them. And yet those who perpetrated all those cruelties called themselves Christians. They were ‘educated’, better dressed than the Zulus, but not their moral superiors. \((\text{MNV 96})\)

To Gandhi every religion must follow its creed. And every follower must show by his deed, his belief, in truth professing love. Gandhi even wrote a peace letter to Adolf Hitler of Germany, who was considered as the most tyrannical dictator. During the festive week of the Christians, on the Christmas of 1945, he wrote a letter to Hitler, the following are some lines from Gandhi’s letter:

I hope you will have the time and desire to know how a good portion of humanity who have been living under the influence of that doctrine of universal friendship view your actions. We have no doubt about
your bravery or devotion to your fatherland, nor do we believe that you are the monster described by your opponents. But your own writings and pronouncements and those of your friends and admirers leave no room for doubt that many of your acts are monstrous and unbecoming of human dignity, especially in the estimation of men like me who believe in universal friendliness. During this season when the hearts of the peoples of Europe yearn for peace, we have suspended even our peaceful struggle. Is it too much to ask you to make an effort for peace during a time which may mean nothing to you personally, but must mean much to the millions of Europeans, whose dumb cry for peace I hear, for my ears are attuned to hearing the dumb millions? (MNV 161)

From the above citations and discussions we learn that using proper words, taking right steps and proper instructions come from non-violence. Here we find respect for the other before correction. Humility and unconditional love are some of the main seeds to grow non-violence. Even after his death, Gandhi’s commitment to non-violence and his belief in simple living, making his own clothes, eating a vegetarian diet, and using fasts for self-purification as well as a means of protest has been a beacon of hope for oppressed and marginalized people throughout the world. Truth and Peace were Gandhi’s principles. To be at peace with oneself and with others Gandhi said “Literally speaking, Ahimsa means non-killing.... To one who follows this doctrine there is no room for an enemy” (1984: 138). Martin Luther King Jr. spoke in the same spirit when he said about his white opponents: “Send your hooded perpetrators of violence into our communities at the midnight hour and . . . leave us half-dead as you beat us, and we will still love you” (1958:256-57). It is worth studying the principles, influence and impact of Non-Violence. Its application in personal life and literary works is worth analyzing. Everyone needs a hero because heroes are people who make the news and are larger than life. They are the men and women of action, who think great thoughts, have
nerves of steel or who make personal sacrifices— who prompt generations upon generations to speak of them in that very special way. Mahatma Gandhi was neither the father of Indian nationalism nor particularly politically influential in the early days of the independence movement. On the contrary, he was well educated and a lawyer, he was very English in his Indian ways. And he used his in England, a country that he considered to be the centre of modern civilization at the time, to study more than the law. More as he experimented with English ways, he also became a citizen of the world. He was also motivated and inspired by the life and work of Henry David Thoreau, the great American writer and philosopher. Here is an excerpt of Webb Miller’s interview with Gandhi: when Miller saw Gandhi sitting on the floor spinning cotton, he detected similarities in Gandhi’s ideas and Thoreau’s philosophy. The first question he asked Gandhi was:

Did you ever read an American named Henry D. Thoreau?

His eyes brightened and he chuckled. “Why of course I read Thoreau. I read *Walden* first in Johannesburg in South Africa in 1906 and his ideas influenced me greatly. I adopted some of them and recommended the study of Thoreau to all my friends who were helping me in the cause of Indian independence. Why I actually took the name of my movement from Thoreau’s essay, ‘On the Duty of Civil Disobedience (1849), written about eighty years ago. Until I read that essay I never found a suitable English translation for my Indian word, Satyagraha. You remember that Thoreau invented and practiced the idea of civil disobedience in Concord, Massachusetts, by refusing to pay his poll tax as a protest against the United States government. He went to jail too. There is no doubt that Thoreau’s ideas greatly influenced my movement in India. (2006:4)

Literature inspires, moulds and encourages people for great changes both positive and negative. In the case of Thoreau, the gentle visionary of Walden Pond in *Walden* inspired a giant figure like Gandhi who turned the course of Indian history. Thoreau repeatedly mentions in his *Walden* the Vedas and other Hindu literature and says: “I… who loved so well
the philosophy of India…” (2006:5). We find a philosophical web in this statement. In Africa Gandhiji tried to practice law amid the extremes of apartheid and white supremacy. Once he returned to India, he became an advocate of non-violence and non-cooperation, and almost immediately had the opportunity to implement those ideals when he began to play centre stage in the political and economic life of India and the Raj. In his autobiography, *The Story of My Experiences with Truth*, he clearly states his position on non-violence: “There are many causes I am prepared to die for but no causes I am prepared to kill for” (2008: 456). He says; “Satyagraha is essentially a weapon of the truthful. A Satyagrahi is pledged to non-violence and, unless peoples observe it in thought, word and deed, I cannot offer mass Satyagraha.” (ibid, 456) Gandhiji’s reputation spread throughout India, especially after the famous Amritsar massacre of civilians by British troops –his response was to call for non-violence in the face of violence and non-cooperation. Here, lies the truth of the matter that violence need not always be curbed by violent ways. Although his fights against racism, colonialism and violence established his reputation internationally, the underlying reason for his actions was often overlooked. Being a very religious man, he attributed his successes to the will of God. He was inspired by a desire to grow closer to god through the purity of his deeds –that is, his simple living, vegetarian diet, celibacy, and ahimsa. His legacy is one of peace, cooperation, charity and piety. He is the model of human integrity amidst the chaos, violence and materialism of modern society. His life and works have influenced many. Amongst many, Martin Luther King Jr. and Nelson Mandela are worth mentioning. Their works and life reflect how non-violent way of approaching issues, bring about lasting, progressive and positive results. They brought great change through their peaceful approach. They both were influenced by the life of Gandhiji. At first reading, Mahatma Gandhi’s writings on nonviolence, peace, and education seem uncomfortably naive and simplistic. Those familiar with philosophical literature may be stunned by his seemingly oversimplified, uncritical, and
inadequate treatments of difficult, complex, metaphysical, ethical, cultural, and other philosophical concerns relevant to Gandhi’s views on issues of life. A difficulty in interpreting and applying Gandhi’s writings to peace literature arises from complex relations between texts, contexts, and interpretations. Much of this challenge comes from the sheer volume of writings by and about Gandhi. Although he never wrote a lengthy book, the *Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi* comes to one hundred volumes of very diverse and highly fragmented newspaper articles, correspondence, speeches, and other writings. One cannot understand Gandhi’s various concerns, specific use of language, and diverse formulations without understanding the specific economic, political, cultural, and ethical contexts within which he lived, read texts, and struggled with opponents and alternative approaches.

Gandhi found that life persists in the midst of destruction and, therefore, there must be a higher law than that of destruction. Only under that law would a well-ordered society be intelligible and life worth living. And if that is the law of life, we have to work it out in daily life. He believed in the philosophy of confronting and conquering an opponent with love. He tried to work it out in his life. Thought it did not solve all the difficulties, he found, however, that this law of love has answered as the law of destruction has never done. India had witnessed the ocular demonstration of the operation of this law on the widest scale possible. One cannot say accurately how far nonviolence has necessarily penetrated the three hundred millions, but Gandhi claims that it has penetrated deeper than any other message, and in an incredibly short time. Indians have not been all uniformly non-violent; and with the vast majority, non-violence has been a matter of policy. Even so, one finds that the country has made phenomenal progress under the protecting power of non-violence.

According to Gandhi, it takes a fairly strenuous course of training to attain to a mental state of non-violence. In daily life it has to be a course of discipline, though one may
not like it-like, for instance, the life of a soldier. The perfect state is reached only when mind and body and speech are in proper coordination. But it is always a case of intense mental struggle. Non-violence is a weapon of the strong. With the weak it might easily be hypocrisy. Fear and love are contradictory terms. Love is reckless in giving away, oblivious as to what it gets in return. Love wrestles with the world as with the self and ultimately gains a mastery over all other feelings. Gandhi said that to him “truth and non-violence are, to me, faces of the same coin.” The law of love will work, just as the law of gravitation will work, whether we accept it or not. Just as a scientist will work wonders out of various applications of the law of nature, even so a man who applies the law of love with scientific precision can work greater wonders. For the force of non-violence is infinitely more wonderful and subtle than the material forces of nature, like, for instance, electricity. The men who discovered the law of love were greater scientists than any of our modern scientists. On the 25th April 1891, Gandhiji wrote in The Vegetarian, a magazine being published from London an article titled “Holi”. While narrating the significance of the festival and the customs followed during the festivities, his discerning eyes do not fail to see the bad customs even at that young age also. This quality of an impartial observer and narrator reached its peak in the latter years. The reader is invited to glance through the following passage from the Introduction of his autobiography The Story of My Experiments with Truth.

Only those matters of religion that can be comprehended as much by children as by older people, will be included in this story. If I can narrate them in a dispassionate and humble spirit, many other experimenters will find in them provision for their onward march. Far be it from me to claim any degree of perfection for these experiments. I claim for them nothing more than does a scientist who, though he conducts his experiments with the utmost accuracy, fore-thought and minuteness, never claims any finality about his conclusions, but keeps
an open mind regarding them. I have gone through deep self-introspection, searched myself through and through, and examined and analyzed every psychological situation. Yet I am far from claiming any finality or infallibility about my conclusions. One claim I do indeed make and it is this. For me they appear to be absolutely correct, and seem for the time being to be final. For if they were not, I should base no action on them. But at every step I have carried out the process of acceptance or rejection and acted accordingly. And so long as my acts satisfy my reason and my heart, I must firmly adhere to my original conclusions. (2008: xii-xiii)

Much of the general philosophy of non-violence has ‘active’ or ‘activist’ elements, in that they accept the need for a means of struggle to achieve political and social change. Thus, for example, the Gandhian ahimsa is a philosophy and strategy for social change that rejects the use of violence, but at the same time sees nonviolent action (also called civil resistance) as an alternative to passive acceptance of oppression or armed struggle against it. In general, advocates of an activist philosophy of nonviolence use diverse methods in their campaigns for social change, including critical forms of education and persuasion, mass non-cooperation civil disobedience and non-violent direct action and social, political, cultural and economic forms of intervention.

Another towering figure who practices non-violence is Nelson Mandela (1918- ). He was born in the village of Mvezo in South Africa’s Mththa district. He did his B.A. from Fort Hare University. He was forced to leave college after leading a student boycott of the university’s policies and he objected to an impending arranged marriage. He began his political activism with the African National Congress (ANC) shortly after the 1948 election of the pro-apartheid National Party. Apartheid was legal racial segregation, with blacks having little or no rights in a government totally dominated by the South Africans. When the ANC
launched its campaign for the Defiance of Unjust Laws in 1952, Mr Mandela, by then President of the Youth League, was elected National Volunteer-in-Chief. The Defiance Campaign was conceived as a mass civil disobedience campaign that would snowball from a core of selected volunteers to involve more and more ordinary people, culminating in mass defiance. Fulfilling his responsibility as Volunteer-in-Chief, Mr Mandela travelled the country organising resistance to discriminatory legislation. He was brought to trial for his role in the campaign along with Moroka, Sisulu and 17 others. The court found that Mr Mandela and his co-accused had consistently advised their followers to adopt a peaceful course of action to avoid all violence. Mandela was prominent in developing the ANC’s Defiance Campaign and the 1955 Congress of the People. Nelson Mandela’s time in prison, which amounted to just over 27 and a half years was marked by many small and large events which played a crucial part in shaping the personality and attitudes of the man who become the first President of a democratic South Africa. Mandela’s statement in court during one of his trial is a classic in the history of the resistance to apartheid, and has been an inspiration to all who have opposed it. He ended with these words in the Rivonia trail:

I have fought against white domination, and I have fought against black domination. I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons live together in harmony and with equal opportunities. It is an ideal which I hope to live for and to achieve. But if needs be, it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die.

(www.mandela early years)

He will always be a symbol of courage and forbearance under difficult. He saw an unfair system and tried to help stop it in the face of incredible odds. He was able to use his intelligence and education to articulate strong positions, make logical arguments against the very nature of apartheid and attract the loyalty and devotion of not only a small number of
supporters in the ANC, but in his country and the entire world. In a life that symbolises the
triumph of the human spirit, Nelson Mandela accepted the 1993 Nobel Peace Prize on behalf
of all South Africans who suffered and sacrificed so much to bring peace to their land.
Mandela never wavered in his devotion to democracy, equality and learning. Despite terrible
provocation, he has never answered racism with racism. His life has been an inspiration, in
South Africa and throughout the world, to all who are oppressed and deprived, to all who are
opposed to oppression and deprivation. We find that his achievement lie in his non-violent
approach. The following are some excerpts from Mandela’s call on Gandhi’s Non-Violent
approach documented by Nita Bhala in *Mandela Calls for Gandhi’s Non-Violent Approach.*

Anti-apartheid icon Nelson Mandela joined top leaders, Nobel laureates and elder statesmen
on Monday calling on the world to reinvent Indian freedom fighter Gandhi’s non-violent
approach to solving conflicts. Mandela who spent 28 years in prison for fighting white rule
before leading South Africa to multi-racial democracy as the country’s first black president in
1994, said Gandhi’s non-violent approach which won India freedom from British colonial
rule 60 years ago was an inspiration. “His philosophy contributed in no small measure to
bringing about a peaceful transformation in South Africa and in healing the destructive human
divisions that had been spawned by the abhorrent practice of apartheid,” said Mandela. “In a
world driven by violence and strife, Gandhi’s message of peace and non-violence holds the
key to human survival in the 21st century,” said Mandela. (*Reuters*, Monday, January 29
2007:14) Nelson Mandela commented that Gandhi was as South African as he was an Indian:

He dared to exhort non-violence in a time when the violence of
Hiroshima and Nagasaki had exploded on us: he exhorted morality
when science, technology and the capitalist order had made it
redundant: he replaced self-interest with group interest without
minimizing the importance of self. India is Gandhi’s country of birth:
South Africa his country of adoption. He was both an Indian and a
South African citizen. Both countries contributed to his intellectual and moral genius, and he showed the liberatory movements .... (Time, January 3, 2000: 40)

Martin Luther King, Jr. (1929-68) was the middle child of Michael King, Sr. and Alberta Williams King. Michael King Sr. came from a sharecropper family in a poor farming community. He married Alberta in 1926 after an eight-year courtship. The newlyweds moved to A.D. Williams home in Atlanta. Michael King, Sr. stepped in as pastor of Ebenezer Baptist Church upon the death of his father-in-law in 1931. He too became a very successful minister and adopted the name Martin Luther King, Sr. in honour of the German Protestant religious leader Martin Luther. In due time, Michael, Jr. would follow his dad’s lead and adopt the name himself. Young Martin had an older sister, Willie Christine and a younger brother, Alfred Daniel Williams King. Though the children grew up in a secure and loving environment they could not free themselves from the evil of racism. Martin Luther King, Sr. fought against racial prejudice, not just because his race suffered, but because he considered racism and segregation to be an affront to God’s will. He strongly discouraged any sense of class superiority in his children which left a lasting impression on Martin Jr. Although his family was deeply involved in the church and worship, young Martin questioned religion in general and felt uncomfortable with overly emotional displays of religious worship. This discomfort continued through much of his adolescence, initially leading him to decide against entering the ministry, much to his father’s dismay. But in his junior year, Martin took a Bible class, renewed his faith and began to envision a career in the ministry. In the fall of his senior year, he told his father of his decision, which pleased his father.

In 1948, Martin Luther King, Jr. took his Sociology degree from Morehouse College and attended the liberal Crozer Theological Seminary in Chester, Pennsylvania. There he thrived in all his studies becoming valedictorian of his class in 1951 and elected
student body president. He also earned a fellowship for graduate study. But Martin also rebelled against his father’s more conservative influence by drinking beer and playing pool while at college. He became involved with a white woman and went through a difficult time before he could break off the affair. During his last year in seminary, Martin Luther King, Jr. came under the influence of theologian Reinhold Niebuhr, a classmate of his father’s at Morehouse College. Niebuhr became a mentor to Martin, challenging his liberal views of theology. Niebuhr was probably the single most important influence in Martin’s intellectual and spiritual development. After being accepted at several colleges for his doctoral study including Yale and Edinburgh in Scotland, King enrolled in Boston University. During the work on this doctorate, Martin Luther King, Jr. met Coretta Scott and aspiring singer and musician at the New England Conservatory School in Boston. They were married in June, 1953 and had four children, Yolanda, Martin Luther King, III, Dexter Scott, and Bernice. In 1954, while still working on his dissertation, King became pastor of the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church of Montgomery, Alabama. He completed his Ph.D. and was awarded his degree in 1955 when he was only 25 years old.

The Montgomery Bus incident turned the tables on his career. On March 2, 1955, a fifteen-year-old girl refused to give up her seat to a whitman on a Montgomery city bus in violation of local law. Claudette Colvin was arrested and taken to jail. At first, the local chapter of the NAACP felt they had an excellent test case to challenge Montgomery’s segregated bus policy. But then it was revealed that she was pregnant and civil rights leaders feared this would scandalize the deeply religious black community and make Colvin (and, thus the group’s efforts) less credible in the eyes of sympathetic whites. On December 1, 1955, they got another chance to make their case. On that evening, 42 year-old Rosa Parks boarded the Cleveland Avenue bus to go home from an exhausting day at work. She sat in the
first row of the “coloured” section in the middle of the bus. As the bus travelled its route, all the seats in the white section filled up, then several more white passengers boarded the bus. The bus driver noted there were several Whitemen standing and demanded that Parks and several other African Americans give up their seats. Three other African American passengers reluctantly gave up their places, but Parks remained seated. The driver asked her again to give up her seat and again she refused. She was arrested and booked for violating the Montgomery City Code. At her trial a week later, in a thirty minute hearing, Parks was found guilty and fined $10 and assessed $4 court fee.

On the night Rosa Parks was arrested, E.D. Nixon, head of the local NAACP chapter met with Martin Luther King, Jr. and other local civil rights leaders to plan a city-wide bus boycott. King was elected to lead the boycott because he was young, well-trained with solid family connections and had professional standing. But he was also new to the community and had few enemies, so it was felt he would have strong credibility with the black community. In his first speech as the group’s president, King declared:

We have no alternative but to protest. For many years we have shown an amazing patience. We have sometimes given our white brothers the feeling that we liked the way we were being treated. But we come here tonight to be saved from that patience that makes us patient with anything less than freedom and justice. (Reston 1963: 42)

King intuitively understood that using force against the existing political and social structure would be futile and only inflame the situation. He understood the importance of image, as presented by the media. If blacks, striving for their rights, were the aggressors, they would gain little sympathy from the rest of America. Further, he knew that the image of innocent and passive people, abused and beaten by the police in full view of the cameras would have a tremendous psychological effect. One of the first opportunities to practice these
combined principles came with the Rosa Parks incident and the Montgomery bus boycott of 1956. For more than a year, citizens refused to ride the buses, and downtown merchants lost a tremendous amount of business as a result. Tensions were so great that King’s house was bombed and he was put in prison. As the days progressed King realized the influence of Gandhian principle in the movement. He wrote: “As the days unfolded, however, the inspiration of Mahatma Gandhi began to exert its influence. I have come to see clearly that the Christian doctrine of love was operating through the Gandhian method of non-violence was one of the most potent weapons available to the Negro in his struggle for freedom” (ibid, 31). In the midst of his despair when the blacks were raising havoc with the police King said,

Now let us not become panicky…. If you have weapons take them home, if you do not have them, please do not seek to get them. We cannot solve this problem through retaliatory violence. We must meet violence with non-violence. (ibid, 46)

The boycott was a huge success, however, resulting in national recognition of the problems of segregation in the South and of King’s new prominence in the movement. Two particular noteworthy campaigns are the marches led by King to Washington and Chicago. The demonstration in Washington was controversial before it began. President John F. Kennedy and others used their influence to tone down the demonstration –basically to make it less critical of the role of the federal government in the civil rights movement. The demonstration was a huge success culminating in the famous speech, “I Have a Dream”, which he delivered addressing the massive crowd at the foot of the Lincoln Memorial, he said:

Even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It’s dream chiefly rooted in the American dream. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true
meaning of its creed: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all
men are created equal.” (The New York Times, August 29, 1963:29)

In Rowan’s Go South to Sorrow, he wrote “The Negroes of Montgomery seem to
have taken a lesson from Gandhi-and our own Thoreau, who influenced Gandhi” (1957: 122).
In his conduct and leadership King exhibited in every way the imprint of his mentor, Gandhi.
King was a religious man with an almost obsessive compulsion to see changes on the local
and national levels in terms of race relations and greater openness for African-Americans
throughout society. He had a quiet, deliberate and highly motivating personality, capable of
using the media and few words to make a highly effective impression on his people and on
the country at large. Many Americans were quite apprehensive about the idea that Gandhi’s
philosophy could be meaningfully adopted in the United States. But the Southern America
proved that Gandhian techniques could be imaginatively transplanted effectively. Short and
intensive workshops were conducted to explore Gandhian principles and methods of non-
violence. In these workshops the volunteers were forbidden to strike anyone back. They were
to say, “I keep my temper. I do not budge. I do not strike back. I turn the other cheek.”
(Bowles 1958: 19) In the year 1964, the Time Magazine nominated him as its choice for the
Man of the Year Award. He prodded the Black Americans to re-evaluate their self-image of
being looked down saying “Let no man pull you so low as to hate him,” (King 1967: 708) and
compelled the Whites to look into their hearts and face their uneasy consciences. He was
effective and successful as a leader because he worked the American dream in Gandhian way.
On unconditional love King wrote in his autobiography, that he initially considered Jesus’s
commands such as “turn the other cheek” or “love your enemies” as limited to individual
relationships. Only after reading Gandhi in the late 1940s did he conclude that the love ethic
had a much broader scope. Love became to him an effective principle applied to racial groups
and nations in conflict and was “a potent instrument for social and collective transformation” (1998: 24). Martin Luther King realized the importance and the effectiveness of negotiating in a peaceful manner. “Negotiation … is the purpose of nonviolent direct action. … Nonviolent action seeks to create such a crisis and establish such creative tension that a community that has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It seeks so to dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored” (King 1964: 76). Building on Martin Luther King’s description of the purpose of his struggle for racial equality in the United States, this presents nonviolence as a precursor, or catalyst, to conflict transformation. If “negotiation is only possible when the needs and interests of all those involved and affected by the conflict are legitimated and articulated” (Lederach 1995: 14), then non-violent struggle is its necessary complement, by helping marginalised communities to achieve sufficient leverage for an effective negotiation process.

Allen Douglas in his essay “Mahatma Gandhi on Violence and Peace Education” says, “Every reading of Gandhi is a rereading, every interpretation is a reinterpretation, and every formulation is a reformulation that is integral to dialogue and a complex, dynamic, open-ended, evolving process of the constitution of meaning. We are involved in a creative, dynamic, open-ended process of contestation in which we consider and argue for different Gandhian views of peace education in terms of consistency, adequacy, significance, and contemporary relevance.” (2007: 292) Gandhiji wrote, “I do believe that where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence I would advise violence, but I believe that non-violence is infinitely superior to violence, forgiveness is manlier than punishment.” (MNV, 17) No law governing body can give ‘Truth’ though they can give justice they cannot give their verdict beyond available facts. Everyone is right in their own perspective but truth goes beyond justice because it is love. Today, there is so much violence around us because everyone fights for their own rights. Love will always nullify violence. Truthful actions
always result in peaceful progress. Non-violent way of writing will greatly comprehend in the process of unification-between cultures, tribes, castes, and nations.

Gandhi wrote *Hind Swaraj* when he saw that the right-wing Hindu nationalists like Sarvarkar were spreading the cult of violence by instigating the minds of young nationalists. He perceived the wrong ideology spread by the Sarvarkars. Jolin Moolakkattu in her paper ‘Gandhian Non-violence and Communal Violence say: “Gandhi saw the tendency to engage in violence as motivated by a desire to adopt the principles and practices of the very same materialistic civilisation upheld by the British, a civilisation embedded in violence” (*Social Action* Vol 60: 2). Gandhi looked at rights through the prism of duties. For him the ensuring of minority rights is a matter of duty or responsibility of the majority community. He said: “Protection to be true has to be given in spite of the dissent, even opposition of minorities. Indeed, we must jealously guard the rights of minorities if we are to have perfect freedom of opinion in the country. Even a child must be able to express its opinion freely. The rule of majority would be a barbarous imposition, if it were utilized to crush the minority. What we want in a free India is… a variety of opinion and conduct in which the sanest will prevail by the weight and not of might but of right.” (*CWMG*, 25: 167-68)

There are diverse views on the application of Gandhi’s non-violence. “Today in India, the saffron flag with Om, Swastik and a sword mounded on it seems to provide the ultimate sign of Hindu masculinity capable of invoking fear among the Muslims. Earlier it was the symbol of values of renunciation and purity, now it has a violent imagery. This also speaks of the transition of Hinduism from faith to ideology. The Hindu fundamentalists see Gandhian non-violence as an obstacle. Violence is no longer seen as isolated individual acts for which individuals held are accountable; it is defined in terms of collective acts, obviating the need for personal responsibility for the acts. Communalism therefore gains a new respectability” (Chandra 2004:8-9). Gandhi did not promote any particular religion in his
struggle for freedom but rather he respected all religious beliefs. He did not secularize any religion. But, he rather studied and applied the good teachings of *The Gita*, *The Bible*, *The Quran* and other religious books. In all the books he wrote we do not find any instigating elements that cause tensions and riots. We see Gandhi’s appreciation of the value of studying other religions for an understanding of one’s own and the twin test of truth and non-violence. Gandhi was inspired by Leo Tolstoy. He admired Tolstoy’s biblical studies, acknowledged him as one of his teacher and called himself a ‘humble follower’ of the Russian Count. Gandhi read Tolstoy’s *The Kingdom of God Is Within You* for the first time in 1894. The book overwhelmed him. He received Tolstoy’s book as a tonic and it greatly strengthened his confidence in non-violence. *The Kingdom of God* and other religious works of Tolstoy, especially *the Harmony of the Gospels, Christianity and Patriotism, The Gospel in brief, What to do?* encouraged Gandhi to a deeper understanding of the New Testament of the *Bible*. Gandhi was imprisoned thrice in South Africa. During the first period of imprisonment, he read the *Gita* in the mornings and the Koran in the afternoons. In the evenings, he explained the *Bible* to a Chinese Christian who wanted to learn English. During his second period, he again read portions of the *Bible*, along with Ruskin, Lord Bacon, and the *Bhagavad Gita*. During the three months of his third time in gaol, he read some thirty books in all, most notable of these in English being religious books by Tolstoy, Emerson and the *Bible*.

The atomic bomb says Gandhi, has not stopped violence. Human hearts are full of violence. Hitlerism can never be destroyed by hitlerism, it only gives birth to a more powerful hitlerism. The logical consequence of the method of violence seems to be the increasing brutality of man. Education to sensitize the people towards a peaceful co-existence will be achieved through literary papers. As the matter is understood that violence does not nullify violence, but the evil is either increased or changed in form. Violence has an adverse effect, both on those who are the objects of the action and upon the acting subject himself, through
the consequence of the effects of motivation. Violence, says Gandhi, is used to defend external things; non-violence is needed to defend the *atman*, the real self. Through violence, inessential things or disvalues are preserved; evil does not then essentially decrease or good increase. Violence is not able to increase neither spiritual value nor moral goodness. Gandhi repeats many times, that cowardice is immensely much worse than counter violence. There is hope that a violent person may become non-violent, but there is no hope for an impotent coward.

As a noun Non-violence, (*ahimsa*) is mentioned for the first time in the *Kapisthalakatha-Samhita* about 1000-700 B.C. In Jainism, Buddhism and the Yoga philosophy, non-violence is considered as a necessary norm for the sake of the spiritual development of the acting individual himself. Sometimes one sees non-violence interpreted narrowly as non-killing. From early times, it has as a concept been much more than a mere question of not killing. Non-violence originally meant not hurting physically. The victim of damage was originally thought to be a physical being, but damaging by word or thought was also considered to be morally wrong. Thus, non-violence was to be observed in thought, word and deed.

Traditionally, non-violence concerned a physical living being, man or animal, and was a norm concerning the acting individual, for his own spiritual good and negative in meaning. This traditional concept is also a basis for Gandhi, although he widened considerably the concept of *ahimsa*. If, says Gandhi, we can manage to apply non-violence successfully at home, it will in its pure form become an irresistible power in the service of the state. Thus, the individual’s attitude to those people he has personal dealings with every day is the point of departure for extending the non-violent attitude. Gandhi thought that non-violence was more effective than physical power. He thus separates power from violence, and says that if he fasted in order to stir the conscience of a friend who had gone wrong, even if
his fault had been undisputed, he would not be forcing him in the ordinary (violent) meaning of the word. We must also note that the best preparation for non-violent action is a “constructive programme.” He explains that the person who believes that without the foundation of a constructive programme he can show non-violent power when the moment of trial arrives, is miserably mistaken. Positive action within the different fields of society is, according to Gandhi’s experience, the basic presupposition for the success of non-violence. Even though the definition of non-violence is negative in nature, the action qualified by it is active in its other parts. This action was often described by Gandhi with positive concepts; for example, he says, “non-violence, in its positive forms, is good will.” Gandhi often describes ahimsa as having both positive and negative side. In its active form it is goodwill towards all life. Gandhi mentions harmony, brotherhood and justice as being properties of ahimsa. It is thus clear that Gandhi extended the nature of non-violence. When, in South Africa, Gandhi was a ‘Tolstoyan’, he founded a “Tolstoy Farm” and lived according to Tolstoy’s teachings. One cannot escape the thought that through Tolstoy the Christian doctrine of brotherly love made a deep impression on Gandhi. His non-violence may be considered an amalgam of Hindu, Jain and Christian moral teaching.

According to Gandhi, non-violence must fill the whole individual or person. It should not just be applied to occasional private acts. This means, first of all, that simply as a rule for external behaviour, it can even be harmful, if at the same time, there is no agreement in thought, word and deed. It is not enough that one observes non-violence as an external rule. It must, as a mood, so fill the individual that there is no conflict between one’s desire and one’s external behaviour. Thus, non-violence becomes “a creed” – or if one does not wish to call it so, let us say, “passion” explains Gandhi and he goes on to say that the person who has this faith or “passion” expresses it in his slightest action. Non-violence which is not applied to every field of life has no practical value, Gandhi goes on to explain. Gandhi said that he did
not believe that a spiritual law functioned in its own special field. He thought that, on the contrary, it expressed itself only through the ordinary activities of life, and in this way affected the economic, social and political fields. The observation of non-violence includes both intensions, which means harmony in thought, word and deed and extension, which aims to apply it, without exception, in all fields of human life. This means the application of non-violence to politics and economic affairs, to which it brings new features in many respects.

Richard Gregg thinks that most people have been sceptical about non-violent resistant because, he says, they simply have not understood that it could function. They might be less sceptical if they could not see how the system functions and how efficacious it is. Non-violence is in theory or in principle an unshakable power. Even when it seems to have no effect, this is because of the inability or unwillingness of its supporters. In theory, non-violence even when practised by one party is sufficiently effective or has enough influence to destroy evil, if it is sufficiently pure when practically applied. From this qualitative demand, Gandhi draws the conclusion that even one completely non-violent person is sufficient to win the battle against injustice. Quality is the decisive factor; the world’s greatest men have always been alone. Vinoba Bhave describes how ideas give birth to national movements and he explains that then the structure of society changes and with it, the way of life. “The French Revolution was the result of an idea.” (Tahtinen 1979: 61)

Today, we are living in an age of mounting tensions –tensions between group and group, class and class, nation and nation. In thought humanity has advanced. Never before has the world seen the acceptance of the ideals of equality, brotherhood and World Peace but, at the same time never has humanity stood to the brink of total destruction under the menace of nuclear weapons and communal hatreds. At such a time, powerful writings are a gateway to penetrate into the hearts of people across the globe. It is no easy task for a person to write a book worthy of world-wide acceptance. But one finds that literature can portray the society in
which one lives. When we observe the life and works of Rousseau, Marx, Brown, Rushdie, Valmiki and Nasrin, one finds them being attached to a string of writers and personalities. Their lives were not isolated from the fervour of their political, social, economic and religious adversaries. Some of them acclaimed tremendous revolutionary success and made a positive impact while some of them faced hatred and triggered the tendency of violence and protests.

A nation cannot progress without philosophers. Ideas rule the world. Raskolnikov, a noted Russian thinker said that “Thinking is a form of work, and the ideas that people have had through the ages have changed the way we live. Ideas are powerful tools” (O’Donnell 2003: 7). It is the thoughts that make an individual act. This thesis does not propagate non-violence as an ideology but it is a suggestion through findings that many coarse reactions among the people can be prevented through its implementation in literature. It will add to world peace and advocate love amongst the people from different nations. It will neutralise the elements of terror, violence, fear, hatred, and protest. Literature can be a tool to educate the masses on mutual respect for people hailing from different class, caste, tribe, creed, nation etc. It can bring out measures to settle problems peacefully without using brutal forces.

Gandhiji’s patience and his endurance resulted in progressive education. Albert Einstein, the noted scientist gave the following comment on Gandhi in a United Nations radio interview “Taken on the whole, I would believe that Gandhi’s views were the most enlightened of all the political men of our time. We should strive to do things in his spirit: not to use violence for fighting for our cause, but by non-participation of anything you believe is evil”(www.Albert Einstein on ‘nonviolence’ New Jersey, 1950). People are realizing his dream of a non-violent world and “his many experiments and reflections finally led to his Wardha Scheme of Education, formulated at the educational conference held on October 22–23, 1937, in Wardha, and this became known as the Nai Talim or New Education of Gandhi.
The most emphasized part of this New Education was Gandhi’s Basic Education, which focused on the eight years of elementary education. The New Education was an essential component of Gandhi’s famous Constructive Programme, which presented his positive moral and spiritual vision for a new independent India” (Douglas 2007:293). Gandhi offers many valuable insights on education. Educators can benefit greatly by studying his formulations of the true goal of education as liberation: providing a means for service to meet the needs of others, for liberation from all forms of servitude and domination, and for one’s ethical and spiritual liberation. Gandhi presents challenging insightful formulations of basic and new education with regard to character building as the goal of education, the centrality of work and productive manual labour, the focus on real needs and simple living, the development of nonviolent relations, and a holistic approach that involves the integrated training of body, mind, and spirit.

Gandhi’s approach to education emphasizes both the multidimensional nature of violence and the structural violence of the status quo. Educational violence cannot be separated from linguistic, economic, psychological, cultural, political, religious, and other forms of violence. These many dimensions of violence interact, mutually reinforce each other, and provide the subject matter and challenge for peace education. For example, language, inside or outside the classroom, can serve as violent weapon used to control, manipulate, humiliate, intimidate, terrorize, oppress, exploit, and dominate other human beings. Gandhi repeatedly emphasizes that intellectual approaches with rational analysis often have no transformative effect on the other, but approaches of the heart, involving deep personal emotions and feelings, often have profound relational and transformative effects. If I refuse to strike back and am willing to embrace sacrifice and suffering, this can disrupt the expectations of the violent other, lead to a decentring and reorienting of an extremely violent
situation, and touch the other’s heart. Albert Einstein on Gandhi’s 70th birthday commented, “Generations to come, it may well be, will scarce believe that such a man as this one ever in flesh and blood walked upon this Earth” (www.goodreads.com/452888-on-the-occasion-of-mahatma-gandhi-s-). Throughout his writings on satyagraha and other methods for resisting and transforming violence, Gandhi proposes numerous ways for relating to short-term violence and moving toward a conflict resolution grounded in truth and non-violence.

Violence, terror, exploitation, and war are not independent, eternal, absolute, or inevitable. They exist within a violent phenomenal world of impermanent, interdependent relativity. Historical, psychological, economic, social, religious, and other forms of violence are caused and conditioned, and they themselves become causes and condition other violent consequences that then become new violent causal factors. The path and goal for peace education involves focusing on the means that allow you to de-condition such violent causal factors and conditions and to introduce nonviolent causes and conditions; this will lead to more nonviolent results that will then become new causal factors. The means-ends relation involves mutual interaction, since the adoption of non-violent ideals as ends will also have a causal influence on the shaping of appropriate means.

Today the world is so sensitive that one can say, it awaits only matchstick to go ablaze. From the clubs of the primitive warriors men came to bows and arrows; bows and arrows led to fire arms; fire arms called for the invention of artillery and that in turn created the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb. In the midst of these weapon power and cold war, a wrong interpretation of the religious texts and biasing actions by the privileged will result in chaos the world over. We need to subdue the violent actions with peaceful approaches. The world need wisdom today far exceeding the knowledge it has acquired so far. Comprehensive vision is the need of the hour where knowledge and wisdom need to comprehend. As we
know literature is a mouthpiece of society, there lies immense power in the printed pages. Today we need a Gandhian non-violent revolution in literature. The different aspects of our society can be effectively portrayed by avoiding instigating elements. One can present a constructive plot where developmental and affirmative consensus of varying issues can be projected. We know that the world in which we live is a diverse one. Non-violence as discussed in our present discourse is not a recent invention. Martin Luther said that “Non-violence is not a 20th century invention and there are some scholarly accounts of early uses of its techniques, starting with Jewish and Christian civil disobedience towards the Roman Empire.” (www.stanford.edu/group/King/liberation_curriculum)

However, it only appeared as a strategic and conscious method of collective political action with Gandhi’s satyagraha campaigns in South Africa (1906-1914) and India (1919-1948). His methods have subsequently been emulated and adapted to various national contexts, and have achieved worldwide success through the productive demonstration of “people power” on all continents. In recent years, nonviolent struggles have reached global attention owing to the so-called “colour revolutions” in South Eastern/Eastern Europe and Central Asia, where massive street protests followed disputed or rigged elections and led to the resignation or overthrow of leaders considered by their opponents to be corrupt or authoritarian. These events closely followed each other, and were strongly influenced by a spill over or imitation effect, as the strategies employed in the peaceful revolution in Serbia in 1999 were emulated a few years later by activists in Georgia, Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan, Belarus and Lebanon. Earlier, “Gandhian campaigns in South Africa and India had greatly inspired black American activists in the US Civil Rights movement, and pro-democracy protests in Chile were influenced by the 1983 film Gandhi and the Polish workers’ movement Solidarity” (Ackerman and and Christopher Kruegler 2000: 291). The development of new
decentralised communication technologies has also accelerated these dynamics, “by facilitating the spread of information and permitting direct communication between activists within and between countries” (Schock 2005: 18).

No one can use force to bring the entire population into one umbrella be it religion, political or economic. But one can bring it through the art of writing by manifesting the good side of an individual or a place or an issue. Gandhi is revered by many around the world for his tolerance and peaceful approach that led millions of Indians to refuse to comply with colonial law, eventually forcing Britain to leave India after around 300 years of occupation. The unanimous adoption by the United Nations General assembly on 15th June 2007 to celebrate Mahatma Gandhi’s birthday on second October as “International Day of Non-Violence” in 2007 proves that non-violence is an antidote to all kinds of evil that prevails in our world. This resolution adopted by UN to honour and popularise Gandhi and his gospel of ‘non-violence’ will counter the ever-growing global terrorism and the increasing violence and violations of rights against nations and the marginalised sections of society. If we look at the history of nonviolence we find that it has been marginalised and relatively few people have a sense of the rich history of it. Gandhi is a world-historical figure. Though he refused to formulate a religious or philosophical system, he did stand, throughout his life, for certain ideas, which are nothing if not of universal significance. With Gandhi the Indian National Congress became a people’s party. At any rate, it ceased to be confined to upper and middle educated classes. Gandhi widened the scope of nonviolence. He universalized the scope of Indian politics, emphasizing the world-historical character of the Indian struggle as representing the struggle of the oppressed and the exploited against all oppressors and exploiters. He thought of himself as fighting for a better world-order and not simply for a free India. Indeed, until comparatively late in his political career, he did not emphasize so much the freedom of India, as he did a reformed British Commonwealth in which India could be a
self-respecting and valuable partner. In his own view, the Indian movement was not national but universal-human—one global in scope and paralleling the Marxist movement. Gandhi changed the nature of Indian politics by spiritualizing it. Gandhi stood for the substitution of Power politics by Goodness politics in terms of his doctrine of the integrity and symmetry of ends and means. Gandhi repudiated the idea that morality is simply an individual affair; on the contrary he emphasized the idea that a moral and spiritual social order was indispensable for human life at its proper level. Accordingly, he firmly believed in and straightforwardly advocated a socio-economic order and a political system based on the traditional virtues: *Satya* (Truth), *Ahimsa* (Non-violence), *Aparigraha* (non-possession), *Asteya* (Non-covetousness), and *Brahmacharya* (Self-control of the senses and the sex impulse particularly).

The significance of Gandhian revolution can be felt through the life changing social movements and literature. Through the advocacy of truth as the core principle in all religions, and by extending political thought and action from the classes to the common people, the peasantry, he modified in a major way the nature of both Indian Nationalism and Hindu revivalism. He thought of non-violence and truth as the foundation of State as well as of social order, interpreting these as universal spiritual principles independent of all formulated religions. The idea, however, led him ultimately to the theory of a stateless society—a development that paralleled the Marxist theory of the withering away of the state. Though Gandhi was never a Marxist, this parallelism is not a mere chance convergence: it is inherent in all universalization of politics.

5.4. Influence and Impact of Non-violence
People have been engaging in non-violent action for centuries, and today there are millions participating in rallies, boycotts, strikes and a host of other actions. Some participants think long and hard about how to make their actions more effective; some try to develop sets of ideas for understanding these actions, while others gather evidence. Gandhi made several lasting contributions to non-violence research. His personal example and his leadership of the Indian independence movement provided inspiration for activists and intellectuals alike, a process of inspiration that continues today. Also vitally important was Gandhi’s conceptualisation of non-violent action and its deployment as a planned method for social change. People had used methods of nonviolent action long before Gandhi. He, more than anyone else, combined theory and practice. Gandhi was committed to non-violence on ethical grounds, an approach now commonly called principled nonviolence, though he had a astute eye for what would work in practice. Gandhi produced a vast amount of writing, but did not systematise his ideas. But his works motivated lives and gave vision to the hopeless. He inspired many to research and work on the principles of nonviolence. It opened wide scope for future generations and venture into new arenas in literature. Richard Gregg was one of Gandhi’s many followers and admirers. Spending some time working with Gandhi, he took on the task of expounding Gandhi’s ideas and practice for other audiences. Gregg’s book *The Power of Nonviolence*, first published in 1934, is an impressive exposition and interpretation of Gandhi’s methods, aimed at Western audiences, augmented by Gregg’s own insights. He covers examples of non-violent action, the effectiveness of mass non-violent action, non-violence as a substitute for war, non-violence and the state, and non-violence training. Gene Sharp is widely recognised as the world’s leading non-violence researcher. Among his many contributions are the documentation and classification of hundreds of different methods of non-violent action. He also spelled out a framework for the dynamics of non-violent action, with a series of typical stages: laying the groundwork for non-violent action; making
challenges, which usually brings on repression; maintaining solidarity and discipline to oppose repression; achieving success through conversion, accommodation or non-violent coercion; and redistributing power. Sharp is relentlessly thorough in his work and, most distinctively so in his epic book *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (1973). Sharp’s classification of methods of non-violent action uses three main categories - symbolic action, noncooperation, and intervention - various subcategories, such as strikes and boycotts as types of noncooperation, and then numerous specific methods such as farm workers’ strikes and traders’ boycotts. For each method, Sharp provides brief historical examples plus references.

In modern times, non-violent methods of action have been a powerful tool for social protest and revolutionary social and political change. There are many examples of their use. Fuller surveys may be found in the entries on civil resistance, non-violent resistance and non-violent revolution. Here certain movements particularly influenced by a philosophy of non-violence include Mahatma Gandhi leading a decades-long non-violent struggle against British rule in India, which eventually helped India win its independence in 1947, Martin Luther King’s adoption of Gandhi’s nonviolent methods in the struggle to win civil rights for African Americans, and Cesar Chavez’s campaigns of non-violence in the 1960s to protest the treatment of farm workers in California. The 1989 “Velvet Revolution” in Czechoslovakia that saw the overthrow of the Communist government is considered one of the most important of the largely non-violent Revolutions of 1989. Most recently the non-violent campaigns of Leymah Gbowee and the women of Liberia were able to achieve peace after a 14-year civil war. This story is captured in a 2008 documentary film “Pray the Devil Back to Hell”. In an essay, “To Abolish War,” evolutionary biologist Judith Hand advocated the use of non-violent direct action to dismantle the global war machine. Non-violence is a weapon to bring change effectively.
Non-violence in literature will produce a change in the participants, correcting their lack of self-confidence as former subordinates, and, through the “development of self-reliance and fearlessness, giving them a sense of power-over-oneself” (Burrowes 1996:117). The recurrent label “power of the powerless” refers to this capacity of non-violence to enable oppressed and disadvantaged communities to take greater control over their own lives. The emblematic leaders of principled non-violence, Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr., held a positive view of conflict, seeing it as an opportunity to meet the opponent, “to transform society and the self” (Weber 2004: 94). For instance, Gandhian theorists envisage conflict as a temporary, but necessary disruption which enables deeper inter-party unity and cooperation in the future. While winning is not totally rejected (after all, Gandhi wanted his immediate goal of freedom for India to prevail), “the final aim is to reach mutual gains where there is no sacrificing of position, no lowering of demands, but a higher level of adjustment” (ibid, 206).

Violence begets violence. Martin Luther realised the full potential of non-violence in his campaign. He found that it paid off in his struggle with apartheid. King in his speech “Justice Without Violence” (1957), said that non-violence “does not seek to defeat or humiliate the opponent but to win his friendship and understanding…. The aftermath of non-violence is reconciliation and the creation of a beloved community.

(www.stanford.edu/group/King/liberation_curriculum/justicewithoutviolence)

This vision of non-violence bears striking similarities to problem-solving theories where parties must work towards mutual gains and integrative outcomes, and where final victory is less important than the quality of the process that produces it. Great writers of the past have their part to play in the development for the future away from the one-sided views of man towards a building of the citizens of the world. As I. Fetscher puts in his essay ‘The young man and the old Marx,’ “It becomes a question of life and death to replace… the partial individual, the bearer of a partial social function, by the totally developed individual, for
whom different social functions constitute successive modes of activity” (1967:38). People have an inherent fear of what they don’t know or what is different. Discrimination arises based on standards such as origin, race, and appearance. Although it is clear that racism and various forms of hatred are rampant in society, the origins of such strong emotions are varied and unknown in many cases. The wise must continue to spread positive messages and never give up. History has been in favour of passive resistance. Those who practise nonviolence show dignity. When violence is utilized in response to racial tension, terrible consequences arise. Those who have been successful in battling prejudice would agree that no matter how adamant the opposition or hopeless the situation, one must be resolute and eventually hate in the form of racism and other prejudice can be vanquished. So, violence only breeds violence. There is no humanity in violence. It deems the inflictor and subjugates the victim. On the other hand, Non-violence is power. If the twentieth century demonstrated the failure of violence, it also gave rise to historical movements demonstrating with increasing persuasiveness that politically there is “a force more powerful” non-violence. Mohandas Gandhi, Martin Luther King and Nelson Mandela come quickly to mind. Each of these major figures either emerges within the Christian tradition or then, as in the case of Gandhi, is deeply indebted to the practice and teachings of Jesus. But literally dozens of other people and movements, although less conspicuous on the world map, have also established the successes of nonviolence. Non-violence is cooperative, participatory power. It is relational-“power with” as opposed to “power over” (Hartsock 1985: 45). It is a force in partnership with others as opposed to domination over others. To cite Gandhi “In politics, its use is based upon the immutable maxim that government of the people is possible only so long as they consent either consciously or unconsciously to be governed” (Sharp 1973: 83-4). Nonviolence is not foremost a call to something we are forbidden to do, i.e., not to be violent-a call that too easily results in a stance of non-action. Gandhi responded to the difficulty of overcoming the
passive connotations in nonviolence by coining the term *satyagraha*, literally “adhering to the truth.” Woven into the very fabric of justice, nonviolence is assertive action that constitutes a whole program. If we want to remove violence we must remove injustice.

From a structural perspective, nonviolence is linked with justice: that which lends dignity in the personal, social and cultural realms; which offers sufficiency in the physical realm of food and shelter; which politically and developmentally elicits both individuals and the community to participate in their own destiny; and in the socio-political realm takes a stance of vulnerability vis-a-vis the governing authorities (both religious and secular) accompanying those whose well-being is threatened. Non-violence is life-generating instead of life-threatening. It constitutes an entire cultural milieu to which the non-violent community dedicates its life. Beyond the bounds of voluntary cooperation, the boundaries of non-violence are “that which is life-enhancing.” Non-violence (that is, power) is legitimated on the basis of “action” in concert with speech. “This revelatory quality of speech and action comes to the fore where people are with others . . . in sheer human togetherness . . . . Without disclosure of the agent in the act, action loses its specific character and becomes one form of achievement among others” (Arendt 1958: 180). The world needs peace literature that can give happiness and constructive influences. The following are some Literature on Non-violence: Gene Sharp’s *Making Europe Unconquerable: The Potential of Civilian-Based Deterrence and Defence* (1985) is a book on a provocative new policy to meet Western Europe’s security needs. This book looks beyond military technology to deliberately refine and use the power of a society’s people and institutions to resist attackers. Donald Wood’s *Biko* (1978) is a personal testimony to a truly remarkable man who became South Africa’s leading Black Consciousness spokesman- a gifted leader destroyed in his prime. It is an indictment of a monstrous system and its gestapo tactics, and the story of a friendship that transcended race, class, and politics.
Adolfo Perez Esquivel’s Christ in a Poncho: Witnesses to the Nonviolent Struggles in Latin America (1983) presents an invaluable introduction to non-violence in Latin America. Adolf Holl’s The Last Christian: A Biography of Francis of Assisi (1980) is an early revolutionary non-cooperator with violence. Renny Golden and Michael McConnell’s Sanctuary: The New Underground Railroad (1986) describes the movement of North Americans giving sanctuary to Central Americans fleeing for their lives. Each chapter begins with a refugee’s story. Jim Forest’s Love is the Measure (1986) is a book is about the story of Dorothy Day, one of the most remarkable women of our century: journalist, ardent socialist, and Christian radical. She was co-founder of the Catholic Worker movement, which opposes all forms of militarism and lives in close solidarity with the marginalized of society in America. Walter Wink’s Violence and Nonviolence in South Africa (1987) is a powerful and provocative work where Wink demonstrates that rather than counselling either violence or passivity, Jesus offered a systematic and strategic Third Way of non-violent resistance. Literature could help expose the deficiencies of an older order and prefigure a better, fuller life to come; it could also alter man in subtle ways and prepare them for altering society. In the light of the discussed works on non-violence one finds the need for a literary twist towards a new genre so as to bring change, to unite people.

5.5. CONCLUSION

This chapter has presented the theory and practice of non-violence as a necessary component of conflict transformation and the influence of literature. It is particularly appropriate at the early stages of latent conflicts rooted in structural violence, as a tool in the hands of marginal or disenfranchised communities to struggle effectively for justice and democracy. While the limits of nonviolent strategies in extremely violent situations such as
mass slaughter and genocide need to be acknowledged, in most contexts of oppression and exploitation it might well be the only way to struggle for justice and democracy in a peaceful and constructive way. Non-violence has capacity for simultaneously transforming power relationships and human relationships which makes it unique as a method of political action, literary discourse through its dual process of dialogue and resistance-dialogue with the people on the other side in order to persuade and inspire them and resistance to the structures in order to compel change. Although it involves activism and advocacy of a particular point of view, it is deemed highly consistent with literary efforts at conflict resolution and consensus building, by providing means of waging conflicts that would at the same time suppress direct and structural violence, and prepare the society for positive (behavioural, attitudinal, structural) peace. However, in practice, nonviolent struggles seldom lead by themselves to win-win solutions and post-settlement cooperative relationships across the conflict lines—the ideal conditions that would enable such a dialectic process are all too rarely present. Conflicts involve highly polarised communal groups opposing over non-negotiable issues, positive peace does not automatically emanate from the achievement of relative power balance, and nonviolent struggles are not always effective at preventing interparty misperceptions and hatred. In such situations, negotiations and process-oriented conflict resolution remain necessary so as to facilitate the articulation of legitimate needs and interests of all concerned into fair, practical, and mutually acceptable solutions. Here arises the need for literature to dispense peaceful means through writing. Therefore, non-violence and literature should be seen as complementary and mutually supportive strategies which can be employed together, consecutively or simultaneously, to realise the twin goals of justice and peace in the world. Highly polarised conflicts whether physical, political or communal discrepancies can only be transformed through multiple forms of intervention, from negotiation, bridge-building (e.g. grassroots dialogue encounters), literature portraying elements of peaceful external mediation
to nonviolent activism and cross-border advocacy. In the field of conflict transformation and securing world peace, the present discourse will encourage scholars, and visionaries to think more comparatively across the spectrum of conflict intervention strategies through literature. It will envisage new literary lovers to pay more attention to the phenomenon of non-violent resistance through writing. Possible research questions include for instance: which conflicts are “unripe” for resolution by traditional negotiation or mediation approaches; and, conversely, at which stage of a non-violent campaign does negotiation become possible and desirable? Can the same third-party actors combine the roles of impartial facilitator and pro-justice advocate? Although some conflict transformation trainers have started to recognise the need to support constructive conflicts alongside trust-building and dialogue they have not yet given “enough credit to the whole range of methods available for waging conflicts creatively” (Clark 2005:17). Finally, researchers and practitioners alike should integrate the identification of structures of oppression and power asymmetry, legacies of nonviolent resistance and local self-empowerment strategies into their conflict mapping exercises and intervention scenarios, in order to design and support more sustainable and home-grown peacemaking and peace-building processes. There is soul in literature which is felt by its readers. Like music to the ears, peace through literature is the need of the day.