

CHAPTER- IV

NON-VIOLENCE IN GANDHIAN THOUGHT

The concept of non-violence gets its present import due to the teachings and movement of M. K. Gandhi, also known as the father of the Indian nation. In a narrow sense Gandhi's non-violent movement can be seen as a strategic war against the British rule which reigned over India for two hundred years. However, Gandhi's non-violence is something more than this. Non-violence, for Gandhi, is the ethical principal that should guide a human being in all aspects of his or her life. Political freedom is only one of the many implications of non-violence. Infact, it may also be seen that non-violence can never be considered as a mere means for reaching some ulterior goal; non-violence is an end in itself. It is impossible to understand Gandhi's concept of non-violence in isolation and without reference to his other concepts of love, Satyagraha, trusteeship, God and above all his concept of truth. Before entering into exploring the Gandhi's concept of non-violence it will be helpful for us to review in brief Gandhi's eventful life.

M. K. Gandhi: Early life and background

M. K. Gandhi, the preeminent leader of Indian nationalism and the prophet of non-violence in the 20th century, was born, the youngest child of his father's forth wife, on October 2, 1869, at Porbandar, the capital of small principality in Gujrat in Western India under British suzerainty. Gandhi's father, Karamchand Gandhi also known as Kaba Gandhi, who was dewan of Porbandar, did not have much in the way of a formal education, but rich experience of his practical affairs stood him in good stead in the solution of most intricate questions and in managing hundreds of men.

Gandhi's mother, Putlibai, was completely absorbed in religion, did not care much for binary and jewellery, divided her time between her home and temple, fasted frequently, and wore herself out in days and nights of nursing whenever there were sickness in the family. Gandhi grew up in a home steeped in Vaiṣṇavism worship of Hindu god Viṣṇu-with a strong tinge of Jainism, a morally religious Indian religion,

whose chief tenets are non-violence and belief that everything in the universe is eternal. Thus Gandhi took for granted *ahimsā* (non-injury to all living beings), vegetarianism, fasting for self-purification and mutual tolerance between adherents of various creeds and sects.

The educational facilities at Porbandar were rudimentary; in the primary school that Gandhi attended the children wrote the alphabet in the dust with their fingers. One of the terminal reports rated him as “good in English, fair in Arithmetic and weak in Geography; conduct very good and bad handwriting.” In his childhood, one of the most remarkable incidents was happening, which basically talks about the honesty or truthfulness of Gandhi. Later we will focus about it, when we will discuss the relation between non-violence and truth.

The Indian classics, especially the stories of *Shravana Pitribhakti Nātaka* (a play about Shravana’s devotion to his parents) and *Mahārājā Harischandra*, had a great impact on Gandhi in his childhood. Gandhi, in his autobiography admits that it left an indelible impression on his mind. Gandhi’s early self-identification with Truth and Love as supreme values is traceable to these epic characters.

Gandhi, a different child, was married in the age of thirteen to fourteen years old Kasturba and thus lost a year at school. Recalling the day of their marriage he once said, “As we did not know much about marriage, for us, it meant only wearing new clothes, eating sweets and playing with relatives.” In 1887, Gandhi scraped through the matriculation examination of the University of Bombay and joined Samaldas College in Bhavnagar. As he had suddenly to switch from his native language—Gujrati to English, he found it rather difficult to follow the lectures.

Meanwhile, his family was debating his future. Left to himself, he would have liked to be a doctor. But besides the Vaiṣṇava prejudice against vivisection, it was clear that if he was to keep up the family tradition of holding high office in one of the states in Gujrati, he would have to qualify as a barrister. This meant a visit to England, and Gandhi, he was not too happy at Samaldas College, jumped at the proposal. His youthful

imagination conceived England as “a land of philosophers and poets, the very centre of civilization.” But there were several hurdles to be crossed before the visit to England could be realised. His father had very little property; moreover, his mother was reluctant to expose her youngest child to unknown temptations and dangers in a distant land. But Gandhi was determined to visit England. One of his brothers succeeded in raising the necessary money and his mother’s doubt were allayed when he took a vow that while away from home, he would not touch wine, women and meat. Gandhi disregarded the last obstacle, the decree of the leaders of the Medh Bania caste, to which the Gandhi’s belonged, who forbade his trip to England on 4th September, 1888. Ten days after his arrival he joined the Indian Temple, one of the four London Law colleges.

Gandhi in England: Gandhi stayed in England from the year 1888 to 1891. But during the three years he spends in London his main pre-occupation was with personal and moral issues rather than with academic ambitions. His vegetarianism became a continual source of embarrassment to him; his friends warned him that it would weak his studies as well as his health. Fortunately for him he came across a vegetarian restaurant as well as a book providing a reasoned defence of vegetarianism, which henceforth became a matter of conviction for him, not merely a legacy of his Vaiṣṇava background. The missionary zeal he developed for vegetarianism help to draw the pitifully shy youth out of his shell and gave him a new poise. He became a member of executive committee of the London vegetarian society, attending its conferences and contributing articles to its journal. Some of the vegetarian he met were members of Theosophical Society, which had been founded in 1875 to further universal brotherhood and which was devoted to the study of Buddhist and Hindu literature. They encouraged Gandhi to join them in reading the *Bhagavat Gītā* both in translation and as well as original.

Gandhi was called to bar on 10th June, 1891. Painful surprises were in store for Gandhi when he returned to India in July 1891. His mother had died while he was in London and that his family had kept the news from him. In his autobiography, Gandhi refers to that climate that, in April, 1893, he accepted a year-long contract from Dada

Abdulla and Co., an Indian firm, to a post in the Colony of Natal, South Africa, than part of the British Empire.

Gandhi in South Africa: In South Africa Gandhi faced the discrimination directed at Indians. In a Durban court, Gandhi was asked by the European magistrate to take off his turban; he refused and left the courtroom. A few days later, while travelling to Pretoria, he was unceremoniously thrown out of a first class railway compartment and left shivering and brooding at Pietermaritzburg Station; in the further course of journey he was beaten by the white driver of a stage-coach because he would not travel on the footboard to make room for a European passenger; and finally he was barred from hotels reserved “for Europeans only.” These humiliations were the daily lot of Indian traders and labourers in Natal who had learned to pocket them with the same resignation with which they pocketed their meagre earnings. These events were a turning point in Gandhi’s life.

Gandhi was not the man to nurse a grudge. On the outbreak of the Boer War on 1899, he argued that the Indians, who claimed the full rights of citizenship in the British crown colony of Natal, were in duty bound to defend it. He raised an ambulance corps of 1,100 volunteers, out of whom 300 were free Indians and the rest indentured labourers and accountants, artisans and labourers. It was Gandhi, task to instil in them of spirit of service to those whom they regarded as their oppressors. The editor of the *Pretoria News* has left a fascinating pen portrait of Gandhi in the battle zone:

“After a night’s work which had shattered men with much bigger frames, I come across Gandhi in the early morning sitting by the roadside eating a regulation army biscuit. Everyman in (general) Buller’s force was dull and depressed and damnation was heartily invoked on everything. But Gandhi was stoical in his bearing, cheerful and confident in his conversation and had a kindly eye.”ⁱ

In 1906, the Transvaal government promulgated a new act compelling registration of the colony’s Indian population. At a mass protest meeting held in Johannesburg on 11th September that year, Gandhi adapted his still evolving methodology of Satyagraha

(devotion to the truth) or non-violent protest, for the first time. He argued Indians to defy the new law and to suffer the punishments for doing so. The community adapted his plan, and during the ensuing seven-years struggle, thousands of Indians were jailed, flogged or shot for striking, refusing to register, burning their registration cards for engaging in other forms of non-violent resistance. The government successfully repressed the Indian protesters, but the public outcry over the harsh treatment of peaceful Indian protesters by the South Africa government forced South African General Jan Christian Smuts to negotiate a compromise with Gandhi. Gandhi's idea took shape, and the concept of *Satyagraha* matured during this struggle.

Gandhi as a religious man: The term 'religion' Gandhi using in its broadest sense, meaning thereby self-realization or knowledge of self. The influence of his mother and of his home at Porbandar received a great impetus after his arrival in South Africa.

Gandhi's religious quest dated back to his childhood, from the age of seven to sixteen at school, he was being taught all sorts of things except religion. The faith of religious aspects Gandhi was taught by his an old servant of his family, Rambha, she suggested as a remedy for fear, the repetition of *Rāmanāma*. Gandhi had more faith in her remedy and so at tender age he began repeating *Rāmanāma* to cure his fear of ghosts and spirits. Gandhi was also encouraged from one of his cousin to reading of *Rāmāyana* that laid the foundation of his deep devotion to the *Rāmāyana*. Gandhi regards the *Rāmāyana* of Tulasidas as the greatest book in all devotional literature. Not only *Rāmāyana* Gandhi was greatly influenced by *Bhagavat Gītā*. The impression has ever since being growing on him with the result that he regards it today (Gandhi's lifetime) as the book per excellence for the knowledge of truth. Earlier Gandhi did not regarded Christianity as a good religion, but when he met a good Christian from Manchester in a vegetarian boarding house and he gave him Gandhi a *Bible* and told him 'please read the *Bible*.' Gandhi had started to read the *Bible*; the *New Testament* produced a different impression on him, especially the *Sermon on the Mount*, which went straight to heart. Gandhi compared it with *Gītā*. The verses, "But I say unto you that ye resist not evil; whosoever

shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any men take away thy coat let him have thy cloak too.”ⁱⁱ The young mind of Gandhi tries to unity the teaching of the *Gītā*, *The Light of Asia* and *Sermon on the Mount* that the renunciation is the highest form of religion.

Raichandra, a brilliant young philosopher, who becomes Gandhi’s spiritual mentor convinced him of “the subtlety and profundity” of Hinduism, the religion of his birth. Gandhi purchased Sale’s translation of *Quran* and began reading it; he also obtained other books on Islam. One of his Christian friend, Edward Maitland, sent him *The Perfect Way* and *The New Interpretation of Bible*, these two books seemed to support Hinduism. Tolstoy’s *The Kingdom of God Is within You* overwhelmed Gandhi; it left an abiding impression on him.

Gandhi as the leader of Nationalist India: From 1915 to 1918, Gandhi seemed to hover uncertainly on the periphery of Indian politics, declaring to join any political agitation, supporting the British war-effort in World War I, and even recruiting soldiers for the British Indian Army. But in 1920, Gandhi was the dominant figure in the political stage, commanding an influence never attained by any political leader in India or perhaps in any other country. Gandhi’s message was simple: it was not British guns but imperfections of Indian themselves that kept their country in bondage. His program of non-violent non-cooperation with the British government included boycott not only the British manufactures but of institutions operated or aided by the British in India: legislatures, courts, offices, schools. This program electrified the country, broke the spell of fear of foreign rule and led to arrests of thousands of Satyagrahis, who defied laws and cheerfully lined up for prison. In February, 1922, the movement seemed to be on the crest of a rising wave, but alarmed by a violent outbreak in Chauri Chaura, a remote village in eastern India, Gandhi decided to call off mass civil disobedience. This was a blow to many of his followers who feared that his self-imposed restraints and scruples would reduce the nationalist struggle to pious futility.

In March 1930, he launched the Satyagraha against the tax on salt, which affected the protest sanction of the community. One of the most spectacular and successful campaigns in Gandhi's non-violent war against the British Raj, it resulted in the imprisonment of more than 60,000 persons. A year later, after talks with Lord Irwin, Gandhi accepted a truce, called off civil disobedience, and agreed to attend the Round Table Conference in London as the sole representative of the Indian National Congress. The conference, which concentrated on the on the problem of the Indian minorities rather than on the transfer of the power of British, was a great disappointment to the Indian nationalist.

In 1934, Gandhi resigned not only as the leader but also a member of the Congress Party. He had come to believe that its leading members had adopted non-violence as a political expedient and not as the fundamental creed it was for him. In place of political activity he now concentrated on his 'constructive programme' of building the nation 'from the bottom up'--educating rural India, which accounted for 85% of the population; continuing his fight against untouchability; promoting hand spinning, weaving, and other cottage industries to supplement the earnings of the under-employed peasantry; and evolving a system of education best suited to the needs of the people. Gandhi himself went to live at Sevagram, a village in central India, which became the centre of his program of social and economic uplift.

The last phase: With the outbreak of World War II, the nationalist struggle in India entered its last crucial phase. Gandhi hated fascism and all its stood for, but he also hated war. A new chapter in Indo-British relations opened with the victory of Labour Party in 1945. During the next two years, there were prolonged triangular negotiations between leaders of the Congress and Muslim League under M. A. Jinnah and the British government culminating in the Mountbatten Plan of June 3, 1947, and the formation of the two new dominions of India and Pakistan in mid-August 1947.

It was one of the greatest disappointments of Gandhi's life that Indian freedom was realized without Indian unity. Muslim separatism had received a great boost while

Gandhi and his colleagues were in jail, and in 1946-47, as the final constitutional arrangements were being negotiated, the outbreak of communal riots between Hindus and Muslims unhappy created a climate in which Gandhi's appeals to reason and justice, tolerance and trust had little change. When partition of the subcontinent was accepted against the advice, he threw himself heart and soul into the task of healing the scars on the communal conflict, toured the riot-torn areas in Bengal and Bihar, admonished the bigots, consoled the victims, and tried to rehabilitate the refugees. In the atmosphere of that period, surcharged with suspicion and hatred, this was a difficult and heart-breaking task. Gandhi was blamed by partisans of both of the communities. When persuasion failed, he went on a fast. He won at least two spectacular triumphs; in September 1947 his fasting stopped the rioting in Calcutta, and in January 1948, he shamed the city of Delhi into a communal truce. A few days later, on January 30, while he was on his way to his evening prayer meeting in Delhi, he was shot down by a young Hindu fanatic. The worship of non-violence was the victim of violence.

Influence of Indian tradition on Gandhi: In the rich fabric of Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence, practically every strand of thought present in the Indian tradition may be found under a new synthesis. *Ahimsā* to Gandhi means love and service for the whole creation. It means the attainment, through complete selflessness and the spirit of service of a state of equilibrium, equanimity and perfect harmony in relation to the universe. *Ahimsā* is the cultural heritage in our country.

As a matter of fact, *ahimsā* (Non-violence) has been considered as the highest virtue and recommended by the Indian teachers of morality and religion. The *Gītā*, *Rāmāyana*, *Mahābhārata*, and Hindu, Islam, Christian traditions as well as Jainism and Buddhist traditions have formulated various theoretical bases for its practice. The great teaching of non-violence and friendship towards all human beings and all other creatures as a corollary form the world-view contained in the "*Īsopaniṣad*", the '*Gītā*', the '*purāṇas*', the '*Yoga Sūtras*' etc., which have influenced Gandhi a lot. For example, the '*Īsopaniṣad*' teach us that one who views all beings as belonging to the '*Ātmah*' and also

sees the *Ātmah* in all the beings, such a person cease to have hatred towards any being. Gandhi had learnt in his childhood from his mother, Putli Bai and his neighbour's two Indian maxims: "There is nothing higher than Truth" and "Non-violence is the highest virtue" (*Ahimsā Parmo Dhārmah*).

The influence of Bhagavat Gītā, Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata: The *Bhagavat Gītā* had an indelible impact on Gandhi's mind so far the making of his notion of non-violence was concerned. Gandhi writes in '*The Message of The Gītā*', "even in 1888-89, when I was first become acquainted with the *Gītā*, I felt that it was not a historical work, but that under the guise of physical warfare, it described the dual that perpetually went on in the hearts of mankind, and that physical warfare was brought in merely to make the description of the internal dual more alluring. Preliminary intuition becomes more confirmed on a closer study of religion and the *Gītā*."ⁱⁱⁱ It is hard to account for the allegorization of the *Gītā* by Gandhi in terms of Theosophical influences. It will be helpful to recognize that the allegorical interpretation of the *Gītā* is a logical corollary to the Gandhian claim that the *Bhagavat Gītā* preaches non-violence. It could be maintained that Gandhi interpreted the *Gītā* allegorically because of his commitment of the doctrine of non-violence. And if he adopted the doctrine of non-violence under either Jaina or Christian influence than the allegorization of the *Gītā* might be traced to these influences, though at one remove. As a matter of fact, on the more specific issue of *Bhagavat Gītā* and *ahimsā* with which we are concerned here; Gandhi clearly stated, his non-violence interpretation of the text notwithstanding, "Not that actual physical battle is out of the question. To those who are innocent of non-violence the *Gītā* does not teach a lesson of despair.....Better than cowardice is killing and being killed in battle."^{iv}

The second chapter of Edwin Arnold's '*The Song of Celestial*', an interpretation of *the Gītā*, made a deep impression on Gandhi's mind. He wrote: "The book struck me as one of priceless worth. The impression has ever since been growing on me that with the result I regard it today as the book per-excellence for the knowledge of truth."^v Therefore, it gave him invaluable help in his moments of groom. By 1903, the *Gītā* became an

infallible guide of conduct for Gandhi. 'It become', he said, "My dictionary of daily reference. I turned to this dictionary of conduct for a ready solution of my troubles and trails. Words like *Aparigraha* (non-possession) and *Samabhāva* (equability) gripped me."^{vi} It must be kept in mind that these two are the constituent elements of non-violence. He set to thinking how to cultivate virtues like equability and non-possession.

As like *Gītā*, Gandhi was also greatly influenced by *Rāmāyana*. At his age of thirteen Gandhi had deep devotion to the *Rāmāyana*. Gandhi regards that the *Rāmāyana* of Tulsidās as the greatest book in all devotional literature. Actually the *Gītā* and the *Rāmāyana* greatly moulded his thought. He stated that *Gītā* opened to him 'a new view of life'. It gave him the light he needed. It made him to act as a practical person in every sphere of life. Determination, firm conviction, righteous action and above all, other virtues necessarily for a good human being were learnt by him through these scriptures.

There are stories, fables and maxims in support of non-violence scattered throughout the *Mahābhārata*. Non-violence is extolled as the right form of religion. *Bhiṣma*, the old hero and the statesman, exalted non-violence in his consolatory preaching to Yudhirṣṭhra, "Non-violence is the highest religion. It is the highest penance. It is also the highest truth from which all duty proceeds."^{vii}

The influence of Islam: We must keep it in our mind that apart from the *Gītā* and the other religious scriptures, Gandhi was also very much influenced by the teachings of Islam and it too had a considerable role in the formation of complete Satyagraha. For Gandhi, Islam is not religion of violence, and neither is violence integral to it. The word 'Islam' is in the negation of the concept of violence. Islam means surrender to the will of God on the one hand and establishing peace on the other'. The word peace in Arabic is 'salaam'. When Muslims greet each other, they invoke peace – *Salamalaikum* (peace be on you). Not only Muslims, all human beings could be greeted with these words. Violence and mercy and violence and compassion cannot go together. One who is merciful and compassionate cannot issue any commandment for needless violence. A compassionate being could permit violence at best only to remove suffering and injustice.

The compatibility between Islamic teachings and Gandhi's concept of non-violence finds one of its most concrete manifestations in the life and struggle of Khan Abdul Gaffer Khan, the Frontier Gandhi. He writes: "There is nothing surprising in the Muslim or a Pathan like me subscribing to the creed of non-violence. It is not a new creed. It was followed fourteen hundred years ago by the prophet all the time he was in Mecca and it has since been followed by all those who wanted to throw off an oppressor's yoke. But we have so far forgotten it and when Gandhi placed it before us, we thought he was sponsoring a novel creed."^{viii}

The influence of Christianity: But what about the Christian influences? When we go into the background or the influence of Christianity, we find that Gandhi had read Bible at the insistence of 'a good Christian from Manchester in a vegetarian boarding house'. He plodded through the book of the *Old Testament* which sent him invariably to sleep. What about the New Testament? In Gandhi's word: "The New Testament produced a different impression, especially *the Sermon on the Mount* which went straight to my heart. I compared it with the *Gītā*. "But I say unto thee, that ye resist not evil: but whoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any take away thy coat let him have thy coat cloak too,"^{ix} delighted me beyond measure and put me in mind of the Gujrāti poet Shamal Bhatt's poem-

"For a bowl of water give a goodly meal;
For a kindly greeting bow thou down with zeal;
For a simple penny pay thou back with gold;
If thy life be rescued, life does not withhold.
Thus the words and actions of the wise regard;
Every little service tenfold they reward.
But the truly noble know all men as one,
And return with gladness good for evil done."^x

Christ's non-violence is more positive than that of Mahāvīra or than the Buddha's. Gandhi's non-violence appears to be more comprehensive in as much as it embraces all

spheres of activities: social, economic, political and religious. The scope of Christ's non-violence has got to be necessarily limited for he lived in different political and economic outlook. Non-violence being the expression of love is a universal virtue and not the peculiarity of any race, creed or country.

The influence of Jainism: There are also some other religions and philosophical teachings like Jainism and Buddhism that has influenced Gandhi to a considerable extent. Out of all religions in the world, Jainism has laid greatest emphasis on non-violence. It has been included among the five cardinal virtues of Jainism, viz., *Ahimsā*, *Satya*, *Asteya*, *Bhahmachārya* and *Aparigraha*. Accordingly, *ahimsā* occupies the first place and the four other principles are subservient to it. Thus, non-violence becomes the fountain head of all other principles and theories of Jainism. Three things of Jaina system influenced Gandhi's outlook most. These are *ahimsā* on the religious side, *Anekāntavāda* or *Syadvāda* on the philosophical side and the institutions of vows on the ethical side.

Gandhi had grown up under the influence of the absolute non-violence of Jainism. To him, Lord Mahāvīra (the last of the Thirthankaras of Jainism) was an incarnation of compassion and non-violence.

Ahimsā has been extreme essence of Jainism. There were no differences of opinion between Gandhi and Jainism on the question of non-violence. It has been the source of inspiration of the principle from the individual level to the collective level and thereby changing its traditional value. Gandhi himself stated that he derived much benefit from the Jaina religious works. Dr. R. N. Dandekar, the top most Vedic Scholar and well known Orientalist has observed: "I sometimes think that if Gandhi has not become involved in politics, he would have become a Jaina Muni. Incidentally, I may mention that in Europe and America, I have met several educated persons who actually believed that Gandhi was a Jaina."^{xi}

Dandekar also expressed the view that Jainism influenced Gandhi in his emphasis on non-attachment (*anāsakti*) in the interpretation of the *Gītā*. Jaina doctrine of *asravasamvaranirjara* is akin to his emphasis on non-attachment rather than on

disinterestedness (*niskāmatva*). The word '*Sarvodaya*' which has been traced to a Jaina work towards the society of the Middle Ages has been given more connotations by him than it did in those days.

The influence of Buddhism: Along with other religions, Gandhi was also influenced by Buddhism. In fact he was very much impressed by the motto of Buddhism, "*Charaha Bhikkhaya Charikam Bahu-janhitaya Bahu-jansukhaya.*" It was the social side of Buddha, a man and a teacher, not a God or a Saviour, a man concerned with sorrows of men, eager to enter their lives, heal their injuries and spread his message for the good of many, that held special message and meaning for the Gandhi. The synthesis embodied in his discovery of the "Middle Path". Buddhism is a religion of kindness, humanity and equality. The keynote of Buddha's character and preaching was compassion (*Karunā*), which was meant for the welfare of 'sentient being'. The friendliness (*Maitri*), compassion pure joy (*Mudita*), and forgiveness (*upeksā*) are the necessary ingredients for the tranquillity of mind. For the attainment of equanimity of mind and virtues life the inculcation of truth, virtue, non-violence restraint and control was enjoyed.

Gandhi was highly impressed by the life and the teachings of Buddha. His preaching and series of actions viz., ethical life as a path of salvation, movement against caste, sacrament, dogmas, cosmic view of salvation as against one's own salvation etc. are reminiscent of the famous teaching of Buddha. Like Buddha, Gandhi believed that everyone has to be converted into a colleague. Buddha's famous saying "Hatred is never eliminated by counter hatred, but only by Love" was an inspiration to Gandhi.

Gandhi endorses the eight-fold path of Buddhism for the salvation of mankind He gave new and wide connotations to *ahimsā* as a synthesis of Vaiṣṇava and Jaina-Buddhist view. He has been highly called the apostle of non-violence. Buddhism teaches Gandhi the egoless bliss of service to our fellow beings.

Influence of Raichandbhai and Gopal Krishna Gokhale: According to Gandhi three modern thinkers left a deep impress on his life and captivated him. Raychandbhai by his living contact; Tolstoy by his book "*The Kingdom of God is Within You*"; and

Ruskin by his "*Unto This Last*".

Gandhi himself writes about Raichandbhai's influence on him as follows: "Though I was then groping and could not be said to have any serious interest in religious discussion, I still found his talk of absorbing interest. I have since met many a religious leaders or teachers. I have tried to meet the heads of various faiths, and I must say that no one else has ever made on me the impression that Raychandbhai did. His words went straight home to me. His intellect compelled as great a regard from me as his moral earnestness and deep down in me was the conviction that he would never willingly lead me astray and would always confide to me his innermost thoughts. In my moments of spiritual crisis therefore, he was my refuge."^{xii}

Gopal Krishna Gokhale, the rare gem among contemporary moderate political leaders welcomed Gandhi as if they were renewing an old friendship. Gokhale seemed like the Gangā to Gandhi where one could have a refreshing bath in the holy river. Gokhale embodied the goal of spiritualizing (value of life) in politics and Gandhi steadfastly adhered to it by enriching it. It is significant to remember that Gandhi has devoted numbers of pages exclusively to Gokhale in his Autobiography. Finally in his return from South Africa to India in 1915, Gandhi looked upon Gokhale as a sure guide whenever Gandhi was in difficulty and that took a great load of Gandhi's mind.

Influence by Western thought: Apart from Indian heritage, Gandhi was also influenced by Socrates, Lord Jesus and in modern times by Tolstoy, Ruskin, and Henry David Thoreau and so on. We shall now discuss the impression of modern thinkers on Gandhi's life.

Influence of Tolstoy: Tolstoy of Russia was the only one with whom Gandhi had some prolonged correspondence. Both Tolstoy and Gandhi were influenced by same thinkers and books- i.e., *Light of Asia* (Buddha's life), Socrates, Mohammed, *Upaniṣads*, and *Gītā*. Both of them were not mere philosophers but teachers of humanity who endeavoured hard to practise what they preached. Gandhi described himself with characteristic candour as Tolstoy's disciple in his letter to Tolstoy. Tolstoy wrote to

Gandhi emphasizing the almost pivotal significance of Gandhi's Satyagraha in South Africa. Tolstoy was a prophetic figure of the latter half of the nineteenth century and Gandhi of the first half of the twentieth century. Finally Tolstoy's "*The Kingdom of God is within You*" overwhelmed Gandhi. It left an abiding impression on Gandhi. Tolstoy manifested independent thinking, profound morality and truthfulness.

Influence of Ruskin: Ruskin, the English thinker, was perhaps the most powerful source of inspiration when Gandhi himself described Ruskin's book "*Unto This Last*" as "the magic spell". Gandhi was offered Ruskin's book by Gandhi's intimate friend Mr. Polak and Gandhi read it on his train journey from Johannesburg to Durban. The book gripped Gandhi so much that the teaching of the book appealed to Gandhi instantaneously and Gandhi paraphrased it into Gujrati as '*Sarvodaya*' (The welfare of all). Gandhi learnt the teachings of the book to be:

1. That the good of individual is contained in the good of all;
2. That a lawyer's work has the same value as the barber's in as much as all have the same right to earning their livelihood from their work; and
3. That a life of labour, i.e., the life of tiller of the soil and the handicraftsman is the life worth-living.

According to Gandhi, "The first of these I knew. The second, I had dimly realized. The third had never occurred to me. '*Unto This Last*' makes it as clear as for me that the second and the third were contained in the first. I arose with the dawn, ready to reduce these principles to practice."

Influence by Henry David Thoreau: Gandhi was greatly influenced by the words and actions of Thoreau, a rare American in whose breast raged a conflict between conventionalism and idealism. The philosophies of these two great thinkers were analogous, if not identical. They were not identical, for Thoreau had decidedly and forcefully approved of violence as a way out of the tyranny of the majority if the peaceful and non-violent way failed. John Reid, therefore, constructed it a mistake to rake soil

around Walden Pond to find the seeds of Satyagraha. But Reid also admitted that Gandhi's spirit and outlook were akin to Thoreau. The 'peaceable revolution' through civil disobedience and other like methods leavened the mind of Gandhi but he could not sanction violence ordinarily for it constituted the very antithesis of peaceable revolution.

Gandhi's concept of non-violence

In the very primitive epochs of human evolution there is no basis of to hold the view that the Neanderthal man, the Cro-Magnon man and the Crimaldi man were influenced by moral considerations. In the early stages of the evolution of man, violence was an important factor. In the ancient stages of human civilization in Egypt, Sumer and the Indus Valley, we find no evidence of ethical judgements sanctifying non-violence as a guiding canon. It is only with the rise of monistic philosophy of Upaniṣads and the ethical teachings of Buddhism, Jainism and Christianity non-violence has been accepted as dominant criteria of human conduct. The Schools of Sophists, Marx and social Darwinism and the supporters of imperialism advocate the triumph of struggle, force, survival and domination. On the other hand, some other sociologists and the political philosophers have emphasized the importance of sympathy, co-operation, fellow-feeling, reciprocal aid, friendship, sense of community and sense of right. So far as human history is concerned it is, no doubt, force and violence have played a determinant role. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the sentiments of justice, concord, co-operation and mutual aid have also been important factors in human governance. In many religious scriptures and ethical teachings, the concept of non-violence and active love have been praised, and it is also significant that in several schools of thinking, the gradual replacement of coercion by persuasion and substitution of force by pacific techniques of settlement of disputes has been considered as the goal in the evolution of humanity.

The principle of non-violence is not a new concept. It has been preached from times immemorial. In the history of man we come across many sages like Socrates, Jesus, and Buddha who preached and practiced non-violence. Gandhi had been inspired by their life and teachings and tries to apply the technique of non-violence to every walk of life.

Etymologically *ahimsā* is composed of three words: a (not) *hims* (to kill or injure) and a (nominal suffix). So the literal meaning of *ahimsā* would be non-killing of living beings. In ancient times it also means refraining from inflicting physical injury even though mere injury does not cause death except in extreme cases. It's original meaning not to injure. This is more general than the literal meaning of non-killing.

Negative aspects of non-violence: The usual meaning of *ahimsā* is non-killing. Most often its meaning is made broader by emphasising that non-killing is merely one example of *ahimsā*. *Ahimsā*, then, is conceived as non-injury. In any case, *ahimsā* is conceived as the opposite of *himsā*. Gandhi accepts this and adds much more to its content. He also accepts that *himsā* means causing pain or killing any life out of anger, or from a selfish purpose, or with the intention of injuring it. Refraining from doing all this is *ahimsā*.

Violence, according to Gandhi, was committed not only by actions but by thought also. In this world, all living beings are equal, to hurt anyone of them is violence even a thought of hurting them is an act of violence. Most of the people believe that not harming anyone is *ahimsā* but according to Gandhi, it is only an apparent meaning of it, *ahimsā* is much more comprehensive principle. Malicious thought is violence, hastiness is violence, and false speech is violence and so is hoarding an object request by the majority. The root meaning of violence comes from the Latin word 'violentia', meaning vehemence, a passionate and uncontrolled force, the opposite of a calculated exercise of power. Traditionally the word meant "to prevent some object, natural or human, from its natural cause of development" and "to exceed some limit or norms". Political theories of eighteenth century- like Locke, Rousseau, and Montesquieu--agreed that violence could not regenerate people or society and unlike later political philosophers, set limits to the justifiable province of violence.

Violence can be of many types such as: technological, economic, business, political, radical and police violence. Sexist, racial, ethnic, personal, anomic, and psychogenic, assassination, terrorism and political murder are some of the different kinds

of violence.

Men committed violence on the basis of some reasons. First of all personal interest: the violence committed in the process of eating etc. has personal interest because it provides strength to our body. And the second is violence committed for the betterment of an individual if a wound is aggravated, then a doctor will operate it to cure the infected part. This cannot be termed as violence as the doctor has operated the infected part so that this infection does not spread to other parts of the body.

Among these mentioned cases, the first case is of violence necessitated by needs. If one leaves eating so that he becomes non-violent or leaves violent animals alive to move about freely, then it will be a problematic situation. But in the last case, there is no violence. As the alleged 'violence' committed has no interest to the person who committed it. On the contrary, violence is committed to provide relief to the individual.

Positive aspects of non-violence: Besides these negative aspects of *ahimsā*, Gandhi describes it as active love and extensive pity. Romain Rolland has described it as infinite patience and unlimited love. From this point of view anger, hatred, revenge etc. are alien to the concept of *ahimsā* because all these are indirect forms of violence. Together *ahimsā* and hatred cannot find place in our heart. In this emotional interpretation of *ahimsā* which incorporates Buddha's pity and compassion, Mahāvīra's compassion and happiness and Hinduism's stress on mercy towards creations. Every religion accepts the existence of soul in all living beings, thus any type of violence is irreligious. Love in the form of *ahimsā* is the genesis of all virtues. The arising of compassion, sympathy, benevolence, tolerance, pity etc., lies in love only. So *ahimsā* is a positive state of love, of doing well even to the evil-doers. But it does not mean helping the evil-doer to continue the wrong or tolerating it by passive acquiescence. On the contrary, love—the active state of *ahimsā* requires you resist the wrong-doer by dissociating yourself from him, even though it may offend him or injure him physically.

Gandhi does not approve of non-violence in the sense of non-killing merely. Hatred, he affirms, is wrong at anytime and anywhere. He repudiates the principle of

clinging to life in all circumstances. This implies a stranger sense of hierarchy of the life than is demonstrated by the Jainism. Gandhi's non-violence is not essentially regard for all biological life; it is rather the non-exploitation of sentient creatures. The concept of 'creature' is thus a rule limited to those beings who are able to suffer and thus have a complex enough nervous system.

Gandhi understands non-violence as the essential mental behaviour. It means the absence of ill-will. This negative conception of harmlessness includes a positive or rather, dynamic notion, namely, that of actively resisting wrongness. Resistance implies dissociating oneself from evil activities, it well out the root of structural violence and isolate evil for sheer lack of co-operation. Besides this active sense of non-violence, there is another positive meaning to it: one should serve one's immediate neighbours. Non-violent activity can be intensified by serving a limited group. This positive activity cannot be due to human limitations, be extended to all sentient creatures. Non-violence can be universal mainly in the negative sense of non-exploitation but this larger concept has as its nucleus the more limited, if not local, concept of active service.

Gandhi's greatness as a leader and thinker lay in his transformation of the individualistic message of non-violence into a successful technique for direct mass action. Violence is a comprehensive category and is manifested both at the personal and the institutional level. Evil thoughts, sentiments of revenge and brutality, verbal pugnacity and even accumulation of unnecessary things represent examples of personal violence. Falsehood, trickery, intrigues, chicanery and deceitfulness are also norms of violence, according to the comprehensive connotation given to the term by Gandhi. Physical punishment, imprisonment, capital punishment and wars represented examples of violence committed by government. Economic exploitation and strangulation of others are also manifestations of violence. Non-violence is hence, necessarily, equally comprehensive and represents, the total neutralization of violence in all forms.

Ahimsā is not mere the negative acts of refraining from doing offence, injury and harm to others but really it represents the ancient law of positive self-sacrifice and

constructive suffering. Gandhi interpreted it as signifying utter selflessness and universal love. The ultimate aim of *ahimsā* is even to love the so-called enemies or opponents. It even implies the cultivation of gladness and felicity involved in suffering for others. *Ahimsā* is implicitly latent in all human beings because all are sharers in the divine spiritual reality and its culmination is the negation of self-subsistent particularity and a realization of the feeling of love and substantive unity with the whole of creation. It is the substitution of arrogance, antagonism and alienation by love. Hence, Gandhi wrote in his Autobiography, "I must reduce myself to zero. *Ahimsā* is the farthest limit of humanity." *Ahimsā* is thus conceived by Gandhi, is a power of profound social import. Aristotle had said that friendship (*philia*) is the cohesive bind of communities. Gandhi also pleaded for brotherly ethic and believed that *ahimsā* has, almost an obligatory and compelling power to bring peace and unity to the world. *Ahimsā* is the attitude of harmlessness even to the wrong-doer. Gandhi goes a step further and says that it implies positive love even to the wrong-doer. But this does not mean rendering any help to the wrong-doer in the prolongation of his wrong.

The practice of *ahimsā* requires faith in the reality and compassion of God and deep self-introspection. The votary of non-violence has to cultivate acquisition of freedom from envy, hatred, malice, lust, cupidity and uncharitableness. This leads to the acceptance of an elevated standard of virtues. The code of vows (*vratas*) has to be followed by the non-violent Satyagrahi and has to become the standard for cultivations by others. The acceptance of the norms of non-violence would thus almost amount to a moral transvaluation of values. The law of love, if courageously practiced, is bound to lead to the elevation of the accent, quality and character of politics and civilization.

It was the experience of Gandhi that the solutions of all the problems of human relations live in *ahimsā*. *Ahimsā* is more powerful than the *himsā*. *Ahimsā* led towards love and respect for each other and impairs to treat all human beings as equal. Gandhi considered *ahimsā* as world's most active strength. For him, *ahimsā* was the sum total of social virtues. Truthfulness, forbearance, fearlessness--these virtues are closely associates

with *ahimsā*. In a society, all humans have good faith for each other than no individual or group will commit any injustice. The society will build on this basis will have peace, balance and uniformity. This is the ideal society of Gandhi.

For practicing *ahimsā*, Gandhi provides another helpful suggestion: distinction between agent and his actions. Hate the sin and not the sinner. Gandhi finds that one's inability to make such distinction "leads to the poison of hatred spread in the world". He knows that it is a precept easy to understand, but difficult to practice. In Gandhi's words, "Man and his deed are two distinct things". Whereas a good deed shall call forth approbation and wicked deed disapprobation, the doer of the deed, whether good or wicked, always deserves respect or pity as the case may be. Gandhi's appealing for the respect and empathy for the doer of the deed, whether good, bad or ugly underlines his compassion which is in many ways similar to the antidote of 'loving kindness' as applied for subduing personal hatred in Buddhism. He takes on the challenge of equability in reaching out to his opponents in India and South Africa. Non-violence practised in thought, speech and action. For one who follows the principle of non-violence, there is no room for enmity in his thinking. This implies that for the full play of violence, only the party need believe in it. The principle to be followed in action is universal. One has to apply the same rules to a wrong-doer as to one's own father or son.

The method of non-violence is not a passive or inactive method. It is an active force, much more active and powerful than the use of deadly weapons. A person who wields deadly weapons gets tired after some time and he long for rest so he will be inactive for some time in a day. Whereas a person who uses the method of non-violence will never retires since non-violence is not an eternal weapon.

Non-violence leads to *Sarvodaya* type of society. Non-violence is opposed to the philosophy of utilitarianism. Utilitarianism is a theory of the greatest happiness of the greatest number. According to this theory some people are bound to be neglected. Even the least man in society should be given utmost care. Non-violence leads from *Antyodaya* to *Sarvodaya*. So the final goal of non-violent society is *Sarvodaya*.

It is in this context that we have to examine that efficacy of non-violent techniques. We may accept the ultimate ideal of society based on non-violence and the resolving of group and social problems by this technique, yet we may be tempted to ignore this methodology of change if we are not convinced that non-violent technique can bring about rapid social, economic and consequential institutional changes. For many of us violent techniques stands on their own right and claim sort of self-justification to bring about rapid changes. It is generally believed that quick change cannot be brought about without the use of violence. Therefore, in the common mind revolutionary movements are generally associated with bloodshed. Violent methods have an appeal because of their so-called dramatic manifestation. Secrecy associated with violent movements keeps them mystic.

But in spite of the supposed efficacy of violent methods one can point out several instances of the failure of such movements in the attainment of objectives that the leaders of these revolutionary movements had kept before them. The French Revolution raised the slogans of Liberty, Fraternity and Equality. But violence and bloodshed has not brought France nearer these goals. The goal of the Russian Revolution was the withering away of the State. The Russian society is far away from this ideal. It may not be an exaggeration to state that just the reverse of the ideal is clearly visible and the state is becoming omnipotent and omnipresent in that great country.

Several instances can be given of rapid changes because of non-violent acts. Indian religious scriptures are full of instances of rapid, rather immediate, conversion of individuals to new values and new modes, which revolutionaries their lives. We learn that Valmiki, the renowned poet was a confirmed dacoit and maintained himself and his family by looting others. But once he realized that sin of earning his livelihood in this manner, he not only gave up this mode but undertook great penance and became a disciple of God. Similarly, we read about the conversion of Angulimal, a noted criminal, when he came in contact with the Buddha. Such instances from religious scriptures of

different religions can be multiplied. No one will be foolhardy to deny the possibility of such conversions.

The critics are sceptic about non-violent techniques succeeding in dealing with group and social problems with such rapidity. The success that was attained by various movements led by Gandhi disproves this thesis completely. Several satyagrahas were organised during his lifetime with remarkable success.

These instances clearly reveal that if tried in right earnest and with sincerity non-violent techniques can be more effective and speedier than violent methods. Gandhi asserted' "The existing structure of economic society will not last for twenty four hours if my weapon of Satyagraha can be gripped by the people."^{xiii}

Success depends upon several factors. One essential condition is a faith that non-violence can be organised on a mass scale effectively. Nonviolence, however, is not a cloistered virtue confined to the hermit and the cave dweller. Bring soul-force; it is capable of being practised equally by all, children, young, man and women and grown-up people, by individuals as well as groups. Even the masses can practise non-violence. Gandhi, who claimed to be a practical idealist demonstrated that given proper guidance. It is possible to run a Satyagraha campaign with people who have no faith in non-violence as a creed provided they sincerely and implicitly follow the rules as a discipline and work under the leadership of unadulterated non-violence.

We must not forget that what Gandhi did was an experiment in the use of non-violence. Never before in history had this method tried to solve problems of society. Gandhi was trying to evolve a new methodology. To quote Gandhi, "*Ahimsā* is the world's great principles which no power on earth can wipe out. Thousands like myself may die to vindicate the ideal but *Ahimsā* will never die. And the gospel of *Ahimsā* can be spread only through believers dying for the cause."^{xiv} Let those who believe in non-violence as the only method of achieving real freedom, keep the lamp of non-violence

burning bright in the midst of the present impenetrable gloom. The truth of the few will count; the untruth of millions will vanish like chaff before a whiff of wind.

Conflict is a part and parcel of human life. It is an on-going phenomenon since the advent of human civilization. One of the nineteenth century biologists, Charles Darwin propounds that species evolve through a process of mutual selection by which nature eliminates the undesired elements. There happens to be a consistent "struggle for existence" that gives birth to new variety of species. Applying this biological finding to the arena of Sociology of human behaviour, Darwin stated, "This injurious variation, I call natural selection". Struggle is, therefore, the fundamental law of the universe.

But Darwin's explanation of struggle bears partial truth only. He uses the term 'struggle' in an extended and metaphorical sense. He stresses on the process of conflict only and completely ignored the unifying aspects of struggle as a factor in the evolution of species.

On the similar line, Heraclitus feels that evolution in the universe is solely due to its conflicting elements, procreating new things in term. He concludes: "War is the father of all things". Again Hegel and Marx both have interpreted history in the dialectics of class struggle. Bondurant writes: "Hegel discovered reason in things themselves, equated real with rational and understood the progress of history in terms of the dialectical as a method of logic".^{xv} Marx also considers the history as the result of class-conflict. He, while striving for an empirical approach allows the dogma of class struggle and the absolutism of his philosophy of history to strangle the development of dialectics at a level where it could enter into a technique of action. But the dialectics of both Hegel and Marx are partial and do not represents the whole of the problem of social and political conflict.

It has been a proved fact that conflict is essential for the evolution and progress of the society but only to a certain limitation. Beyond that point there would be every possibility of dismantling of the society itself. If society is to survive it has to resolve the conflicting situations. Therefore, men search for the different methods and techniques to resolve the conflicting phenomena. Gandhi has a very distinct identity among the thinkers

who have interpreted conflicts and have come out with various resolutions. Since Gandhi claims to be a practical idealist, he defined conflict and the techniques to resolve it on the basis of his personal experiences. Gandhi admits that there are repulsions enough in nature. But he differs radically from Darwinism, Hegelian and Marxist theories in his explanations of conflict in the physical and human world. He stands in sharp contrast from those who regard struggle as the fundamental law of creation. On the contrary, he believes that it is not conflict rather than mutual love and co-operation that have made human existence possible. He writes: "Though there are repulsions enough in nature, she lives by attraction. Mutual love enables nature to persist. Man does not live by destruction. Self-love compels regards for others."^{xvi}

In fact, Gandhi does not regard a conflict as an antagonism between two opposing parties, individuals or classes. For Gandhi, it is the fault of the system that compels them to fight. That's why Gandhi despises the sin and not the sinner. Hence, he works to evolve ways and means to change the system itself where there would not be any conflicting tendencies and situations. In order to change the system in that direction, the conflicting parties should bring about to a process of social and constructive intercourse rather than exhausting their energies in trying for mutual elimination.

The social thinkers came out with various theories and means explaining how to resolves these conflicts and thereby how to establish peace and harmony. Like Marx, Gandhi also believed that injustice in the mother of all conflicts. Marx maintains that peace could be served as the international principle of the new communist society only. On the other hand, Lenin describes communism as the society of "universal prosperity and enduring peace".

How does this creative resolution of conflict come about? Certainly, Marxist way of class struggle will not be able to resolve the conflict in creative way. It is because peace brought through violent means could not be eternal and enduring. So Gandhi evolves a unique alternative of the methods of techniques of conflict resolution. A conflict can be creatively resolved only when peace is taken to be a positive concept, i.e.,

removing the existing disparities among nations and establishing equality between man and man. Gandhi does not believe in the negative concept of standard western formulation of peace.

Hence, in the Gandhian sense of conflict-resolution would mean not merely the elimination of mal-adjustment, but also progressing towards a better and more meaningful adjustment. When violent relationship is transformed into a non-violent one and the energies of the opponents are integrated to achieve a higher goal, more sublime and enduring, a creative resolution of conflict may be said to have been achieved.

It has been a lifelong conviction of Gandhi that mankind and its civilization could be saved from destruction only through non-violence. There is no deliverance from injustice either for India or for the world through clash of arms. He rules out retaliations altogether and feels that human dignity best be preserved by following not the 'Jungle Law', but the 'Law of Love'. Gandhi writes: "Not to believe in the possibility of permanent peace is to disbelieve in godliness of human nature. If recognized leaders of destruction were wholly to renounce their use with full knowledge of the implications, permanent peace can be obtained."^{xvii} This could be possible only through voluntary renunciation of the desire to multiply wants.

Religions play a very significant role in formulating the methods of resistance for Gandhi. But it is not only his own Hinduism. Jainism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam too have great impact on the evolutions of Gandhi's mind. Earlier we had discussed about it. Before Gandhi, truth and non-violence were highly private affairs for the attainment of salvation. Gandhi's contribution in this field is unique, because of his application of truth and non-violence as means of mass mobilization. He shows the whole world that truth and non-violence could be used as techniques in Indian freedom struggle. Gandhi's entire effort to achieve Indian freedom has been a part of the larger endeavour for non-violent peaceful social transformation that could be attained only through non-violence. Similar to Newton's Third Law, violent means can bring on an equally violent social system based on inequality and exploitation. Rajmohan Gandhi writes: "Violence would be more of itself;

non-violence or love likewise".^{xviii}

Now the question arises as to why peace and harmony should be preferred to conflict? What could be the methods and techniques to attain peace? In the reply he explains, the way of peace insures internal growth and stability. We reject it, because we fancy that it involves submission to the will of the rulers who has imposed only so-called and through our unwillingness to suffer of life or property, we are party to the imposition, all we need to change that negative attitude of passive endorsement. He thus, prescribes that society's growth and stability depends solely on peace. And the way of peace is the way of truth and non-violence.

Gandhi's thought grew up in close touch with their practical applicability in the social, political and economic field. This pragmatic approach was guided by ancient religious ideals applied in contemporary life. There was a 'feedback' between spiritual religious ideals and their pragmatic application. Gandhi sometimes called himself ' a practical idealist'. Pyarelal, in his book, '*A Nation Builder at Work*' refers to this, saying that he showed how goodness could be made effective, how good ethics must be good economics and vice-versa, and that what was moral was also practical.

During his long career as a nationalist leader Gandhi almost daily met people of prominence. They posed questions which he had to discuss, free counter-arguments, charity and correct his previous opinions. Attention was mostly, as in case of Buddha, down to specific situation. Articles were also selected and presented to him for reply. All these provided a philosophical method in the form of dialogue. Gandhi resorted, in the last analysis of his own intuition in answering the problem of specific situations. Gandhi explains that in the ticklish question of *ahimsā* each one of us should be his or her own authority. Using western contemporary terminology this philosophical method may be described as 'phenomenological', to which must be added a pragmatic testing out of the theories of hypothesis.

Non-violence and War from Gandhi's perspective

Like Rousseau, Gandhi thinks that the growth of the military art and the display of the military liberty by the soldiers is a sign of decadence and not of progress. The cult of armament and preparedness is the indirect testimony to the wide prevalence of fear, distrust and suspicion. Hence, Gandhi wanted freedom to preach non-violence as a 'substitute' for war. He considered war as an absolute evil and would not accept even the plea of defensive war or a just war. He would have absolutely repudiated the notion of an anticipatory war. He feels that there is always some party which is guilty of initiating a war. It is not correct and adequate to state that war is the mechanism of devil or of uncontrollable forces. He said that behind the hand that hurls and sward there is always the brain and the mind that prescribed the use of the sword. Leo Tolstoy also recognized the clamouring contradiction between the profession of Christianity and the simultaneous acknowledgement of the necessity of armaments for national security. Gandhi thought the absoluteness of peace and had even visualizes universal disarmament. His *ahimsā* provides an ultimate vision of universal fraternity and he hoped that in world politics there would be the increasing resort to consultation and arbitration in place of armed conflicts.

Although, according to Gandhi, all war is unjust from the standpoint of *ahimsā*, still the aspiration after freedom would distinguish between the aggressor and the defender and render all moral support to the latter.

Sometimes a contradiction has been felt to exist between Gandhi's non-violence and his participation in some forms of war. During the time of Boer War, in 1899, he raised a Volunteer Ambulance Corps. In 1906, he raised a stretcher-bearing party of twenty Indians at the time of Zulu Rebellion. In 1914, he raised a Volunteer Ambulance Corps in London consisting chiefly of Indian students residing in London. In 1918, he nearly killed himself by strenuous activity for the requirement of Indian soldiers for a war on the British side. While Tilak wanted to help the Allies through recruitment only on certain conditions being fulfilled, Gandhi was for unconditional military support. Hence

it is asked that if Gandhi was a votary of absolute *ahimsā* why he participated in any way in a war. When he was helping recruitment in 1918, was he not aiding in planning the killing of German soldiers? But Gandhi had defended his action on the ground that so long as he was a subject of British Empire it was his duty to help it in times of crisis. He says in his *Autobiography*, "When two nations are fighting, the duty of a votary of *ahimsā* is to support war. He who is not equal to that duty, he who has no power of resisting war, he who is not qualified to resist war, may take part in war. I had hoped to improve my status and that of my people through the British Empire. Whilst in England I was enjoying the protection of the British Fleet, and taking shelter as I did under its armed might, I was directly participating in its potential violence. Therefore, if I desire to retain my connection with the Empire and to live under its banner, one of the three courses was open to me: I could declare open resistance to the war, and in accordance with the law of Satyagraha, boycott the Empire until it changed its military police; or I could seek imprisonment by civil disobedience of such of its laws as were fit to be disobeyed; or I could participate in the war in the side of the Empire and thereby acquire the capacity and fitness for resisting the violence of war. I lacked this capacity and fitness, so I thought there was nothing for it but to serve in the war. I make no distinction, from the point of view of *ahimsā*, between combatants and non-combatants. He, who volunteers to serve a band of dacoits, by working as their carrier, or their watchman while they are about their business or their nurse when they are wounded, is as much guilty of dacoity as the dacoits themselves. In the same way those who confine themselves to attending to the wounded in battle cannot be absolved from the guilty of war"^{xix} But it may also be pointed out that in the course of Second World War, he categorically refused to adopt a position similar to the one adopted in 1918.

In 1927, when the *Autobiography* was published, Gandhi was 58 years old. There were still many non-violent struggles to be fought e.g., Hindu-Muslim unity, abolition of caste based untouchability, advocacy of home-spun Swadeshi clothing's and above all gaining India's independence from the British rule. His *Autobiography* provides insights

into shaping of core beliefs on which his non-violent instrument of political action, Satyagraha or truth force was later founded. On his concept of *ahimsā* Gandhi writes: "*Ahimsā* is the comprehensive principle. We are helping morals caught in flagration of *himsā*. The saying that life lives on life has a deep meaning in it. Men cannot for a moment live without consciously or unconsciously committing outward *himsā*. The very fact of his living-eating, drinking and moving about - necessarily involves some *himsā*; destruction of life is it ever so minute. A votary of *ahimsā* therefore remains true to his faith if the spring of all his actions is compassion, if he shun to the best of his ability the destruction of the tiniest creature, tries to save it and thus increasingly strives to be free from the deadly coil of *himsā*."^{xx} Such an individual will then constantly grow in self-restraint and love for others.

Gandhi's idea of *ahimsā* is not wholly based on Vedic concept of *ahimsā*. He ruled out all exception in the application of *ahimsā*. He derived his *ahimsā* from the ascetic sources and it was this ascetic (*sramanic*) concept which he applied, for the first time, to politics and economics. Gandhi felt that political non-violence as introduced by him in South Africa and also presented to the Indian National Congress, with in both cases an expedient. In the former case it was more successful, because the resistance was small in a compact area and hence could easily be controlled. In the latter case, however, there were countless people in a huge country and consequently control and education were difficult to achieve. Yet the result were 'a marvel' although far from the ideal. "The practice of *ahimsā* may full sort of the ideal which is perfect. However, the incapacity to practise non-violence can be removed step by step. In practice' the ideal can never be reached, because the goal ever recedes for us. Victory lies in full effort".^{xxi}Peace is an outcome of the application of social and economic non-violence, when they materialise sufficiently. Mankind can avoid military violence only through non-violence.

Non-violence and other related notions in Gandhi's philosophy

Mahatma Gandhi was an apostle of non-violence. His concept of non-violence is intimately related with his other notions like, love, truth, God and Satyagraha. All of

these notions are closely associated with non-violence. So is very difficult task to discuss these notions separately. By the way, first of all we shall discuss how the concept of non-violence is related to love and then we consequently discuss truth, God and Satyagraha related to non-violence.

Non-violence and Love: Earlier, we discussed the positive and negative forms of non-violence. The negative form of non-violence is represents abstaining from wrong doing. But in the positive form of non-violence, it is purely love and not anything else. Non-violence is a positive force though negative in expression. It is a force of love. One should love all in order to be non-violence. Even though the adversary is violent, a non-violent fighter should respond with love. The words of the Bible ‘love thy enemies’ is very pertinent in understanding the practice of non-violence. Gandhi has insisted that no one should be considered an enemy in this world.

This is closely associated with the Buddhist concept of *Maitri* (friendship), one of foremost Brahmabihāra. *Maitri* is also considered as you should love not only of your friends, but you unconditionally love of your enemies. Love, the active state of *ahimsā* requires you resist the wrong-doer by dissociate yourself from him, even though it may offend him or injure him physically. Thus if my son lives a life shame, I may not help him to do so by continuing to support him; on the contrary my love for him requires me to withdraw all support from him although it may mean even his death. And the same love imposes on me the obligation of welcoming him to my bosom when he represents. But I may not by physical force compel my son to become good.

In its positive form of *ahimsā* means love, the greatest charity. If I am a follower of *ahimsā* I must love of my enemy. I must apply the same rules to the wrong-doer, who is my enemy or stranger to me, as I would to my wrong-doing father or son. The active *ahimsā* necessarily includes Truth and fearlessness. As man cannot deceive the loved one, he does not fear or frighten him or her. Gift of live is the greatest gifts; a man who gives it in reality, disarms all hostility. He has paved the way for an honourable understanding. And one who himself subject to fear can bestow that gift. He must,

therefore, be himself fearless. Only he who has experienced such love can know what it is. As the hymn says:

‘Only he
Who is smitten with the arrows of love,
Knows its power.’ (*Autobiography*, p-20)

This was for Gandhi an object-lesson in *ahimsā*. When such *ahimsā* becomes all embracing, it transforms everything it touches. There is no limit to its power. “It is no non-violence if we merely love those that love us. It is non-violence only when we love those that hate us. I know how difficult it is to follow this grand law of love. But are not all great and good things difficult to do? Love for the hater is the most difficult of all. But, by the grace of God, even this most difficult thing becomes easy to accomplish if we want to do it.”^{xxii} When Gandhi was fighting the British for the Independence of India, he always made a distinction between the British Imperialism and the individual English man. He emphatically said that he was fighting against evil of British Imperialism but not the Britishers. He considers every Britishers his fellow-man and friend. He wanted all the Indians to love the Britishers as fellow human beings in order to be truly non-violent. When Gandhi wanted to return India, the people of South Africa gave him a condition that if any difficulty arises you must come back. And Gandhi accepts this difficult condition, because the love that bound him to the community made him accept it.

That is to say, in describing love, Gandhi combines the working definitions of love with the positive and the negative elements of *ahimsā* insofar as integration of the responsibility of self and communal realisation is necessary for the realisation of truth. Love for the self is as significant as love for the other and for the community as a whole.

Gandhi’s choice of the term ‘Love’ is interesting because of its intensity. Rather than discuss care or responsibility, which are open to interpretation of scope and passion. Love denotes a very particular, albeit indefinite, depth and zeal that incorporates near extreme elements of care and responsibility. Nonetheless, its definition is not limited to these elements. As Kierkegaard describes from the Christian tradition, in his *Works of*

Love: “There is no word in human language, not one single one, not the most sacred one, about which are able to say: If a person uses this word, it is unconditionally demonstrated that there is love in the person. On the contrary, it is even true that a word from one person can convince us that there is love in him (sic), and the opposite word from another can convince us that there is love in him also. It is true that one and the same word can convince us that love abides in the one who said it and does not in the other, who nevertheless said the same word.” (Kierkegaard 1995, p.13)

Kierkegaard insists that the emotion of love is best expressed through action, yet he does so without ever providing a steadfast definition of love. Combine the indescribable yet value-laden emotion love with Gandhi’s idea of God and Truth, and the use of the term love to describe Truth in action becomes apparent. Truth as love underscores the all-embracing nature of Absolute Truth.

Further, the first aspect of Gandhi’s concept of love could be traced in its association with truth. In fact, Gandhi stressed on connecting humility with service. As humility itself is a high moral value and one of the superior characteristics of human beings, it is necessary that in service through humility love for all living beings, and particularly for humanity remains intact. It is also necessary for the reason that sacrifice is inevitable in life; in it, priorities remain for others’ pleasure and prosperity, even readiness to sacrifice one’s life for others. Particularly, in the context of humility Gandhi has put forth, “A life of service must be one of humility. He, who would sacrifice his life for others, has hardly time to reserve for himself a place in the sun.’ (*India of My Dreams*, p.63) Gandhi’s conception of love is the basis of peace. In other words, pathway to peace goes through love. There is a broad concept in its root and without a doubt it could be connected to Gandhi’s commitment to *ahimsā*. Moreover, those who are familiar with Gandhi’s idea they well know that he sees *ahimsā* in love.

For Gandhi love was both a spiritual and a social power. As a spiritual force love presented the means to experience God, of truth. Loving others or practicing *ahimsā*, is the highest virtue, treating all beings as oneself. Truth for Gandhi was God that pervaded

all beings and unified them through love. To love God is to love the beings through which God is incarnate. When you want to find truth as God the only inevitable means is Love, i.e., non-violence.

On a social scale, love provides moral principles about how to live. “Unfortunately for us, we are strangers to the non-violence of the brave on a mass scale.....I hold that non-violence is not merely a personal virtue. It is also a social virtue to be cultivated like the other virtues. Surely society is largely regulated by the expression of it on a larger, national and international scale.”^{xxiii} Love encourages honest relations between people and urges care for the needy and sick. Gandhi was looking for a more mature love based upon positive appreciation for the divine that exists within each of us. He promoted a spiritual form of love: “Man as animal is violent, but as spirit is non-violent. The moment he awakens to the spirit within he cannot remain violent. Either he progresses towards *ahimsā* or rushes to his doom.”^{xxiv}

This mature love enables human beings to transcend bodily need and develop an intimate relationship with God. God is not only infinite truth and infinite love. The commandment to love is at the heart of the Judeo-Christian tradition and of other major religions. Gandhi believed that a commitment to service and compassion for others is the path of divine truth. “I know that God is found most often in the lowliest”, he said. Compassion is the act of entering into another’s condition, the crossing of boundaries to help those who suffer or are less fortunate. Christ ministered to the lame and the poor, to sinners and outcasts. The call to help the needy is a core message of the Bible. Take out the biblical passages on the needs of the poor, and the Bible is a tattered, incomplete shell. “All faith traditions have a similar commitment to helping the downtrodden. Gandhi embraced these universal religious concepts, truth, love and justice and turned them into pathways of revolutionary social change. He had what Wolpert describes as an undying, passionate faith in the powers of love and its other divine side, truth.”^{xxv}

Hence, love is the ornament of life and simultaneously an unambiguous and practical way to human unity. That is why; Gandhi said in *Young India*, ‘We shall go

from love to love and peace to peace'. For, until at least cores from all the corners of the world are covered with that love and peace for which, the whole world is hungering. So love multiply many folds, because 'love breeds love'; and leads human beings towards their true union.

Non-violence and Truth: Throughout his life Gandhi remained a seeker of truth. Since his childhood, he had a strong conviction that morality is the basis of things and that truth is the substance of all morality. For him, truth is the sovereign principle for executing his morality. This truth is not only truthfulness in word, but truthfulness in thought also, and not only relative truth in our conception but the Absolute Truth, the eternal principle that is God. So Gandhi uses the term truth in two ways, namely Truth as Absolute and truth as relative. While the significance of Gandhi's uses the term Truth reflects the importance of the term in many Indian philosophical and religious traditions, the relation between Absolute Truth and relative truths is more sufficiently described through the Buddhist paradigm of truth.

Generally speaking, the Buddhist understanding of truth differentiates between the Absolute Truth, that is the transcendental truth and the conditional truth that relies on the Absolute Truth. Both of these forms of truth include factual and scientific truths; however, Gandhi understands and application of truth in formulating his philosophy is primarily concerned with morality and social relations.

Absolute Truth is characterised by its fixed and unalterable nature. For Gandhi, Absolute Truth is the only fundamental truth. He uses the term interchangeably with God and maintains beyond truths there is one Absolute Truth is total and all embracing. But it is indescribable because it is God. Gandhi did not simply uses the term God for pragmatic purposes. His faith and devotion to his religion, together with the religions he studied informed his interpretation of Truth to an overwhelming degree. God becomes an embodiment of the idea of Truth. If God accepted as an external force, with an omniscient role in the entire cosmos, the use of the title is effective. If however, God is

understood in a physical form or even as the divine creator of destinies, the descriptor does not capture that which is attempting to illustrate.

Yet, Truth is not identified only with God. Gandhi also equates Love to Truth. Truth and Love intertwined describe Truth as an emotion, an expression, and an act, yet also leaves much to interpretation. Love is also understood as Truth itself.

Hence, Gandhi established Truth as a guiding principle in our existence as it provides principles to spiritual, emotional and active elements of “this-worldly” life. Truth’s all-embracing nature is best articulated through an understanding of the use of Truth in Indian languages. The word ‘*Satya*’ (Truth) comes from Sat, which means ‘to be’ or ‘to exist’. To live through Truth is ‘to be’ or ‘to exist’ in wholeness.

Gandhi’s Truth is the search for Universal Absolute. Such definition of God has in it a belief about spiritual unity, that Divine permeates everything in this universe. God’s names and forms may vary, but same divinity is in all. The oneness towards all creeds in all lends comes natural to Gandhi. His spiritual quest for the Universal Absolute in this sense comes close to the Vedantic notion of Brahman which points that everything in the universe originates from Brahman (Absolute), exist in Brahman and upholds through it, and ultimately dissolves in Brahman.

Apart from the Absolute Truth, there is also relative truth. The inattainability of Truth does not diminish its importance. Instead, Gandhi stresses the need for the use of relative truths to strive for Truth. Relative truths are those definitive ideas that provide guidance to our thoughts and actions, yet are not static. They change and morph to provide guidance in versatile situations. These truths maintain as their guiding principle the idea of Absolute Truth and therefore, *ahimsā*.

Relative truths are describable and definable. It is the relationship of relative truths to Absolute Truth that is at the core of Gandhi’s argument. Relative truth becomes the form of truth that is attainable in the human condition or the temporal world. In Gandhi’s word: “But as long as I have not realized this Absolute Truth, so long must I hold by the

relative truth as I have conceived it. That relative truth must, meanwhile, be my beacon, my shield and buckler. Though this path is straight and narrow and sharp as the razor's edge, for me it has been the quickest and easiest. Even my Himalayan blunders have seemed trifling to me because I have kept strictly to this path. For the path has saved me from coming to grief, and I have gone forward according to my light."^{xxvi} Relative truth is that which is defined by Absolute Truth: it is this relationship that will acquire *mokṣa*. Truth characterised by God, Love and *Ahimsā* must be manifested through action in order to attain *mokṣa*.

The discussion of Absolute Truth and relative truth can also be seen as a discussion of means and ends insofar as relative truth is the means and Absolute Truth is the end. This logic, however, confronts yet another form of dichotomy whereby a mean cannot be an end in itself. Gandhi insists that this is not the case. The relationship of means and ends in Gandhi's thought is most apparent through his insistence on characterising Absolute Truth rather than defining it. His characterisation is a means to the achievement of the end and an end in itself.

Hence, to make reference to means and ends as two distinct entities is somewhat incorrect. Truth understood solely as a means or as end leaves the breadth of Gandhi's *ahimsā* at the surface. The benefit of acting through *ahimsā* is retained for oneself. The existence of a better society/community and the realisation of *mokṣa* are not engaged. That is to say, one's social responsibility is denied if Truth is treated as a means only. Truth understood as a means and as end implies that Truth is the means to defining relative truths and is also the ultimate end. Using the end as a guide for the means without diminishing its role as the ultimate end is the truest expression of *ahimsā*. As a means and an end, Truth engages the individual and the community insofar as it defines the individual and the community as a whole: it is that which allows one to see his/her community as an extension of his/herself.

Furthermore, it is no mere coincidence that Gandhi uses the same word, namely, truth for what I have interpreted as the means and the end. Gandhi's two uses of the term

truth express both means and ends exclusively, and means and ends conterminously. *Ahimsā* is the means and Truth is the end. *Ahimsā* and truth are so intertwined that it is practically impossible to disentangle term. Means and ends work together in Gandhi's paradigm for the realisation of Truth.

Gandhi considered truth as his life's only ambition and means to achieve this goal was non-violence. In enunciating his principle of non-violence, Gandhi was influenced by the teachings of different religious seers. His understanding of non-violence is based on a unique philosophy of means and ends wherein he gave importance to both. Gandhi also stipulated a number of conditions in order to practise non-violence, which in turn, enables him to attain truth. Gandhi was not an academic philosopher, nor did he exhibit any interest in logical and epistemological problems. However, his *Autobiography: The Story of My Experiment with Truth* shows that he considers himself a seeker of truth and ready to share his experiences with others but claiming no finality for his own conclusions.

Truth and non-violence are the basic principles for the understanding of Gandhi's ideal. These are two sides of the same coin. Gandhi abhorred the idea of comparing truth and non-violence. This is because of Gandhi himself said, "*Ahimsā* and Truth are my two lungs. I cannot live without them."^{xxvii}

Ahimsā is not the goal, Truth is the goal. But we have no means of realizing Truth in human relationship except through the practice of *ahimsā*. A steadfast pursuit of *ahimsā* is inevitably bound to truth not so violence. Truth comes naturally and *ahimsā* required after a struggle. Gandhi says: "*Ahimsā* is my God, and Truth is my God. When I look for *ahimsā* Truth says 'Find it out through me'. When I look for Truth *ahimsā* says 'Find it out through me'."^{xxviii} According to Gandhi, *ahimsā* is a necessity for seeking as well as, for finding truth. He calls Truth and *Ahimsā* two sides of a smooth unstamped metallic disc'. Gandhi said in his *Autobiography*, "It seems to me that I understand the ideal of truth better than that of *Ahimsā*, and my experience tells me that, if I let go my hold of truth, I shall never be able to solve the riddle of *Ahimsā*. The ideal of truth

requires that vows taken should be fulfilled in the spirit-that as well as in the latter.”^{xxix} Gandhi’s non-violence was not a weapon of the weak and cowardly. It was meant for the fearless and the brave.

When Gandhi went to Pretoria, he faced a difficult situation. He was thrown by first class compartment because he is an Indian and he has no right to travel in the first class compartment and he thought: “Should I fight for my rights or go back to India, or should I go on to Pretoria without minding the insults, and return to India after finishing the case? It would be cowardice to run back to India without fulfilling my obligation. The hardship to which I was subjected was superficial-only a symptom of the deep disease of colour prejudice. I should try, if possible, to root out the disease and suffer hardships in the process. Redress for wrongs I should seek only to the extent that would be necessary for the removal of the colour prejudice.”^{xxx} So Gandhi follows bravery and not cowardly in his whole life-struggle. One cannot be non-violent unless he sticks to truth and discards falsehood. These words have wide connotations and do not refer to same metaphysical concepts. Exploitation, unfair practices, misuses of authority etc. are all manifestations of untruth and cannot be preserved, defended and retained; except by methods which are not in social interests. So also non-activity and surrender to and compromise with what is untruth as explained above is violence in terms of Gandhi.

Truth and non-violence are generally considered to be the two key ingredients of Gandhian thought. But when we go through his *Autobiography*, in the last chapter, we do not find that non-violence is the sole means of attaining truth. Gandhi wrote: “.....if every page of this chapters do not proclaim to the reader that the only means for the realization of Truth is *Ahimsā*, I shall deem all my labour, in writing these chapters, to have been in vain”.^{xxxi} Truth is an integral and fundamental concept of metaphysics and ethics, and has an inclusive connotation. *Ahimsā* on the other hand, is only a moral concept and a technique evolved by man and is applicable, appropriate and suitable, only to the human and not the cosmic realm. Nobody blames the fire or lightning for the violence it may cause. But fire and lightning are also aspects of truths in the sense they

are or have existence (*Sat*). Furthermore, nobody talks of the misuse of violence in the intra-human realm. The serpent and the tiger are not condemned for being violent. Thus, non-violence has limited applicability. But truth, as an all pervasive, all-inhabiting, real substance cannot exclude any stratum, mode or aspect of reality from its comprehension and sway. It is infinite, all-exclusive and immanent. There must, therefore, be several paths for its realization. Hence, logically we do not see that non-violence is the only means for the realization of truth as God. Truth is too momentous a substance to be grasped and recognized solely by *ahimsā*, although the moral concept of *Ahimsā* is an important means for the realization of truth. According to the *Prithivi Sukta* of the *Atharvaveda*, truth regarded as a factor that upholds the earth. Truth as an entity or being is timeless, speechless, and immense. But the evolution of man is a phenomenon about two million years old. Hence, any moral concepts, proposition or ideal evolved by man who has appeared so late on the stage of the universe cannot comprehend the immeasurable propositions of timeless truth. Furthermore, the theory of non-violence is based on acceptance of a spiritual teleology and may not appear realistic to a sceptic or to an agnostic or to a materialist.

Ordinarily we understand Truth simply as that as far as possible we ought not to resort to tell a lie. That is to say, Truth does not merely assert the saying “Honesty is the best policy”. It also implies that if it is not the best policy we may depart from it. Here it is conceived that we have to rule our life by this Law of Truth at any cost. In order to clarify this saying, Gandhi has drawn upon the celebrated, illustration of the life of Prahlad.

Truth, for Gandhi, is a concrete principle, the one reality. It is concrete because the one reality is not an abstract principle negating completely the reality of the many, but it is a concrete whole comprehending the many within its fold. In other words, there is unity with the reality. There is unity with transcendental Truth and this is something to be experienced and realized within one’s own inner being, especially with its manifestation in the form of living beings and man. The reality could be experienced through love,

which is another name for the experience of the identity, identity of being and identity of interest. Identity can be expressed only in terms of relationship with living beings and with man on the basis of love. The least that a man in search of Truth can and ought to do is to abstain in thought, speech and action (*mansa vacha karmana*) from injury to his fellow beings. This is where Gandhi finds a plane of existence where the transcendental implications of the term Truth can be given a non-metaphysical and even a mundane manifestation.

The transcendental aspect of reality was a Truth of inner experience. But its realization in every day experience is of immediate and paramount importance to him. That is why, the Truth of daily life, its experience through his own perception, observation and contemplation. The individual had no other way of realizing the Truth of totality of reality (Transcendental cum immanent) except through social life and relationship with others. Thus the terms God (Reality) and Truth does not mean two different entities. Here both these expressions are being used rather interchangeably. Truth, for Gandhi is inseparably connected with God (reality). In metaphysical context a distinction between Truth (God) and reality is maintained. For Gandhi even such a distinction is unnecessary.

Even so, Gandhi does make a mention of such exclusively religious practices as prayer, surrender to God's will by subordinating one's body and mind to the call of truth, self-sacrifice, renunciation, love and tolerance etc. Truth is the ideal of life. It is the goal towards which we must strive. But what would be the nature of this striving? What would be the approach to truth? According to Gandhi, *ahimsā* is the means; we cannot attain truth by any other way.

Non-violence and God: Truth and non-violence are intertwined with each other. Non-violence is the way for the realization of Truth and Truth is Absolute, that is, God. The word '*Satya*' is derived from *Sat*, which means 'being'. Nothing is or exists in reality except Truth. That is why Truth is perhaps the most important name of God. In fact, it is more correct to say that Truth is God, then to say that God is Truth. But as we cannot do without a ruler or a general, such names of God as 'Kings of King' or 'The Almighty' are

and will remain generally correct. On deeper thinking however, it will be realised that Sat or *Satya* is the only correct and fully significant name for God.

And where there is Truth, there is also knowledge which is true. Where there is no Truth, there can be no true knowledge. That is why the word *Chit* or knowledge is associated with the name of God. And where there is true knowledge, there is always bliss or *Ananda*. And even as Truth is eternal, so is the bliss derived from it. Hence we know God as *Sat-chit-ananda*, one who combines in Himself Truth, knowledge and bliss. The three together make one word. Truth is knowledge. It is life also. You feel vitality in you when you have got Truth in you. Again it gives bliss. It is permanent thing of which you cannot be robbed. You may be sent to the gallows, or put to torture; but if you have Truth in you, you will experience an inner joy.

Being a member of a vaiṣṇava family, Gandhi was closely touched with prayer and faith of divine power and his faith on God was comes from mother's teaching. And he realises and examines truth for dedicating of his whole life.

In his early youth Gandhi was taught to repeat what in Hindu scriptures are known as one thousand names of God. But these one thousand names of God where by no means exhaustive. We believe-and Gandhi thinks it is the truth-that God has many names as there are creatures and, therefore we also say that God is nameless and since God has many forms we also consider Him formless, and since he speaks to us through many tongues, we consider Him to be speechless and so on. And so when Gandhi came to study Islam he found that Islam too had many names for God. He would say with those who say God is Love, God is Truth. But deep down in him, he used to say that though God may be Love, God is Truth, above all. If it is possible for a human tongue to give the fullest description of God, Gandhi has come to conclusion that for himself, God is Truth.

But two years ago, Gandhi went a step further and said that Truth is God. You will see the fine distinction between the two statements, viz. That God is Truth and Truth is God. And Gandhi comes to that conclusion after a continuous and relentless search after Truth which began nearly fifty years ago. He then found that the nearest approach to

Truth was through Love. But he also found that love has many meanings in the English language at least and that human love in the sense of passion could become a degrading thing also. He found to that love in the sense of *ahimsā*, had only a limited number of votaries in the world. But Gandhi never found a double meaning in connection with Truth and even atheists had not demurred to the necessity or the power of Truth. But in their passion for discovering Truth the atheists have not hesitated to deny the very existence of God from their own point of view rightly. And it was become of this reasoning that Gandhi saws that rather than say that God is Truth he should say that Truth is God.

This Gandhian insight can be profoundly liberating, especially for those of us who are sceptical about conventional anthropocentric conceptions of God. When pastors or religious teachers assert “God is Truth”, we stumble over the meaning of the first part of the sentence. Who or what is God? Reversing the order of the sentence makes all the differences. Truth we can try to understand. God is unfathomable. Focusing on the search for the former offers a way of reaching towards the latter of grasping the imponderable.

In the movie *Sleeper*, Woody Allen’s character is asked whether he believe in God. “I believe there is intelligence in the universe”, he quips, “except for certain parts of New Jersey.” An ultimate intelligence seems to guide the universe, despite the glaring irrationalities of daily life. But this higher intelligence is unknowable or our limited human understanding. We can gain only a simple glimpse of the divine through the search for truth. It is in this striving toward truth that we come closer to God. Charles Bradlaugh delighted to call himself an atheist, but in Gandhi’s point of view he is never regarded as an atheist, because in Gandhi’s word: “Mr. Bradlaugh, you are Truth-fearing man, and so a God-fearing man.” Gandhi would automatically disarm his criticism by saying that Truth is God. Add to this the great difficulty that millions have taken the names of God and in His name committed nameless atrocities.

Non-violence and Satyagraha: The word Satyagraha was coined for use in the South Africa campaign in 1908, and is made up *Satya* and *Agraha*. But what does Satyagraha mean? *Satya* means truth, which is very similar to love. Both truth and love

are elements of the soul. *Agraha* means firmness or force. This implies the activity of resistance of struggling against. Satyagraha may therefore be characterized as Soul Force, Love Force or Truth Force. It is a clinging to truth, no matter what. Under no circumstances can the Satyagrahi hide or keep truth from the opponent. Such a one is obligated at all times to be honest, open, and frank in dealing with opponents. One can demonstrate the power or force of truth only if she indicated herself to truth. No matter the cost, one must follow the truth, even as he endeavours to be truthful.

The Gandhian technique of Satyagraha which inculcates *Agraha* or moral pressure for the sake of truth is a natural outcome of the supreme concept of truth. If truth is the ultimate reality, it is imperative for a votary of it to resist all encroachment against it, and it is his duty to make endless endeavours for the realization of truth through non-violence. A votary of God, that is the highest Truth and the highest reality, must be utterly selfless and gentle and should have an unconquerable determination to suffer for asserting the supremacy of spiritual and moral values. Thus alone can he vindicate his sense of devotion and loyalty to truth. Satyagraha also implies an assertion of the power of the human soul against political and economic domination, because domination amounts to a denial of truth since he takes recourse of falsehood and manipulation for maintaining itself. Thus, Satyagraha is the indication of the glory of human conscience. Conscience reinforces the non-violent battle for the victory of truth. Gandhi said: “Satyagraha is essentially a weapon of the truthful. A Satyagrahi is pledged to non-violence and unless people observe it in thought, word and deed, I cannot offer mass Satyagraha”^{xxxii}

His campaigns of non-violent resistance or Satyagraha as he preferred to call them, were effective weapons in his hands, and have been emulated elsewhere. In order to essence the usefulness and limitations of Satyagraha it will be helpful to examine the degree of acceptance which Satyagraha received among Gandhi’s supporters; the way in which the concept of Satyagraha developed, and the theoretical and the practical basis of Satyagraha. This will indicate the significant connections between ‘Western and

Christian' sources and Satyagraha, and the interaction of Hindu and Christian ideas which was involved in the technique.

Gandhi had been immensely influenced by the story of King Harischandra enshrined in Indian legends. Harischandra's absolute and perfect loyalty to truth was accepted by him as the vindication of a great norm. Prahlada is a great example of perfect Satyagraha. Socrates and Jesus Christ also practised this law of suffering for truth.

Gandhi, in his writings, often used the words 'Satyagraha' and '*ahimsā*' interchangeably, presumably because it appeared to him that Satyagraha was simply the application of the ancient idea of non-violence which is *ahimsā*. In what follows the Gandhian was of using these two terms is continued. Strictly, however, *ahimsā* should be used to refer to the Hindu, Jaina and Buddhist concepts of non-violence; whilst Satyagraha, a word coined by Gandhi, should be used for the technique of non-violent action applied to social and political situations.

The technique of Satyagraha was moulded by Gandhi in South Africa, where he went as a remarkably raw and untried barrister to represent the interests of an Indian business concern in 1893. It came as a shock to Gandhi to realise how disadvantaged Indians were in the South Africa at that time. When the initial case for which he had gone to Africa was over, Gandhi stayed to organise Indians in opposition first to the Bill which sought to deprive Indians of the right to elect members to the Natal Legislative Assembly, and later to other disabilities under which they laboured. This work kept Gandhi in South Africa for the most of the intervening period until 1914, and it was during this time that the word Satyagraha was invented and the technique it described began to evolve. Satyagraha campaigns can be dated from 1906, when Gandhi and his fellow Satyagrahis began a campaign against an Ordinance of the Transvaal Legislative Council.

On returning to India after his long exile Gandhi quickly became involved in Indian Congress politics and campaigns to secure better conditions for peasant-farmers, mill-workers and others. Through these activities his national reputation grew. His

concept of Satyagraha continued to develop, and his ideas on this and other subjects became increasingly well-known. His Satyagraha campaigns included that against the Salt Tax in 1930, which was perhaps the most trenchant example of the combination of Satyagraha and civil-disobedience on an issue carefully selected to achieve maximum publicity, embarrassment to the Government, and national interest and support for the movement as a whole.

Sometimes Gandhi's Satyagraha is confused with the Passive Resistance advocated by Quakers. Passive resistance also, generally includes the movement of the suffragettes and the resistance of the Non-conformist. Gandhi has cited three examples of Passive resistance in his Satyagraha in South Africa. (i) The opposition offered by the Non-conformists against the Education Act passed by British Parliament; (ii) the opposition offered by the suffragist movement; and (iii) the techniques of confrontation of the spirit fighters of Russia. But there are three vital differences between the western theory and practice of passive resistance and Gandhi's Satyagraha. To begin with Satyagraha is a more dynamic force than passive resistance because it contemplates prolonged mass action in resistance for injustice.

Secondly, passive resistance may be compatible with internal violence towards the enemy. But Satyagraha stresses continuous cleansing of the mind and has no place for hatred. It emphasizes even inner purity. In the chapter "Satyagraha vs. Passive Resistance", in his Satyagraha in South Africa, Gandhi points out that passive resistance may be offered alongside of arms. But Satyagraha and physical violent resistance are absolute antagonists.

Satyagraha goes beyond passive resistance in its stress on a spiritual and moral teleology because the final source of hope and consolation of the Satyagrahi is God. Hence Gandhi wrote: "Satyagraha differs from Passive resistance as the North Pole from the South. The latter has been conceived as a weapon of the weak and does not exclude the use of physical force or violence for the purpose of gaining one's end, whereas the former has been conceived as a weapon of the strongest and excluded the use of violence

in any shape of form.”^{xxxiii} It must, however, be maintained here that in the early days Gandhi himself called his movement as ‘passive resistance’ and his workers as ‘passive resisters’.

The ethics of Gandhi’s non-violence requires a different response. If the victim is a Satyagrahi, and thus has been trained in the discipline of non-violence, he should willingly and lovingly submit, and endure the vicious attack with Soul-force and be willing to forgive his attacker, even as Jesus forgave his persecutors. The faith of the disciple of non-violence should be in God, who will provide the power and strength needed to endure the unearned suffering.

Satyagraha is the opposite of passive resistance. It involves direct, non-violent action by an individual or group. The Satyagrahi wishes to rid society and the world of its social evils by way of Love-force rather than by violent means. Proponents depend upon God for their power and strength. Once they catch the spirit of Satyagraha they are willing to die at the hands of opponents rather than defend themselves. Non-violence is active and not passive, in the sense that it directly confronts evil-doers and evil social structures. It is also dynamic in the sense that the disciple of non-violence is always engaging in mental and spiritual training in order to be prepared to do what Soul-force requires.

In addition, non-violence has redemptive qualities. Gandhi himself made this point. “The man who adopts the weapon has to direct it against the evil, not the evil-doer, a very difficult thing to do without a continuous process of self-purification. At the same time, he has to see that it does not inflict violence on the other side, but is content to invite suffering on himself. Suffering, deliberately invited in support of a cause which one considers righteous, naturally purges the mind of the Satyagrahi of ill-will and removes the element of bitterness from the antagonist.”^{xxxiv}

So after a long discussion on non-violence and other related concepts we have observed that for Gandhi, Truth, Love, God, Soul and Non-violence are almost synonyms. Non-violence leads one to realise one’s self and self-realization can be

achieved by Love. You cannot be non-violent unless you are filled to the brim with love. Love means, of course, love for all living beings, not love for the mundane things of life. Commenting upon what a writer in *The Statesman* said, Gandhi wrote, “And the strongest is his denial of non-violence or love as law of the human race....I cannot undertake, and least of all through a newspaper articles written during moments snatched from the daily routine, to prove that love is the source and end of life. But I venture to make some relevant suggestions which may pave the way for an understanding of the law. All the teachers that have ever lived have preached that law with more or less vigour. If love was not the way of live, life would not have persisted in the midst of death. If there is a fundamental distinction between man and beast, it is the former’s progressive recognition of the law and its application in practice to his own personal life.....When the practice of the law becomes universal, God will reign on earth as He does in heaven.....But victories of physical science would be nothing against the victory of the Science of life, which is summed up in love which is the Law of Being. I know that it cannot be proved by argument. It shall be proved by persons living it in their lives in utter disregard of consequences to themselves.”^{xxxv}

Gandhi preached the gospel of *ahimsā* both for the East and the West. But in there different situational contexts *ahimsā* implied somewhat different things for them. For India, *ahimsā* as a social and political technique meant a pooling together of the energies of the people for the work of national liberation. It implied the elimination of petty local jealousies and group, caste and communal discriminations and persecutions and notions of regional superiority. It is also signified the notion of the realization of a national community based on suffering, tolerance, self-abnegation and the neutralization of fissiparous trends. For the Western world, the Gandhian philosophy of *ahimsā* mainly appeared as a gospel of the renunciation of power of politics. In 1947, Gandhi wrote that if Europe was to save itself from suicide, something along the lines of non-violence had to be adopted. Non-violence applied in international politics, signified a spiritual substitute for struggle and war and the consequent repudiation of ‘blood and iron’ and

‘the mailed fist’. It thus, meant the negation of the cults of power, stratagems, exploitation, enslavement, economic imperialism and war. But it was to be only a moral substitute for war and not the tame acceptance of status ego. In face of the advancement in nuclear energy, Gandhi stood for the resort to techniques of love because he was deeply concerned with the survival of man.

As a spiritual and ethical idealist, Gandhi believed in the moralization of public administration to make it patterned, more and more, on the basis of non-violence. He wanted to reform the structure of modern political life. If *Swaraj* could be achieved by non-violence then the *Swaraj*-policy had to be increasingly based on the principle of *ahimsā*.

The stress on *ahimsā* represents the emphasis on the creative role of the moral mind and heart as factors in human evolution. It implies that the evolution is not automatic, dedicated by the progress of objective forces, but it influenced by the rational and moral powers of man. In sociological terms, *ahimsā* represents social co-ordination, mutual adjustment and socio-mental correlation and integration. Consequently, in place of tension, conflict and antagonism it stands for accommodation and co-operation. It wants increasing co-ordination and mutual relationship between the different groups, classes, races and nations into which humanity is apparently divided. It pleads for the replacement of imperialism by the dynamics of creative love. Hence, the triumph of *ahimsā* would necessarily signify the victory over brutality, mutual rapacity and pugnacity. *Ahimsā* is removed from passive acquiescence in or conservative adulation of status quo, because it does imply the dynamization of love for the extirpation of social evils. The Gandhian notion of the progressive realization of *ahimsā* in social and political life gets confirmation from the theories of the Russian sociologist, Jacques Novicow, who believes in the replacement of the physiological, economic and political struggle of man by a form of bloodless intellectual competition. Auguste Comte, the French sociologist and champion of positivism also hoped for the supremacy beneficence and universal consensus in human affairs.

Gandhi was sure that eventually, the force of violence would be replaced by the overpowering authority of justice, truth and peace. To this extent, his view is analogous to the views of Kant, Spencer, Cobden and Bright who generally believed that the progress of reason, individuality and right will lead to the nullification of power politics and the realization of the ethical state based on peace. But the failure of the hopes of the eighteenth and nineteenth century optimists of liberal humanism, peace, progress and cosmopolitanism makes the sceptical of those plans and formulas which wants the battle of peace to be won in the hearts of human individuals. The human heart is not an isolated factor in the world but is one variable in a complex web of several mutually related factors. The role of objective social, economic and political forces is immense. Hence, I think that the battle of peace has to be fought not only in the individual human soul but deliberate attempts have also to be made to transform that defiled and polluted political structure which exploits the human heart by means of domination, constraint and propaganda. The ending of poverty and the imperialism is imperative. The change of human heart has to proceed simultaneously with the change of the social and political structure.

The Gandhian *ahimsā* is morally a more demanding concept than the ‘General Will’ as propounded by Rousseau, because the latter only accepts the voluntaristic conception of will for the public good, while Gandhi prescribes a conscious moral training for the growth of the power of universal love. “The Rousseauic general will require for its triumph the mutual cancellation of the ‘pluses and minuses’ of selfish wills and the adequate provision to the assembled populace of the necessary relevant information regarding public issues. But the vindication of *ahimsā* depends on long years dedicated adherence to the great moral vows like truth, celibacy and God-fearingness.”^{xxxvi} *Ahimsā* as the thought by Gandhi is also a higher concept than the ‘Real Will’ of Bosanquet. Bosanquet identified the real will of the individual, the general will of the society and the political will of the state. Even at its highest levels, this real will is only the will to accept voluntarily, the social norms, canons and conventions and the

accumulated cultural heritage of the national community, while the Gandhian *ahimsā* as a political force pleads for universal fraternization. While Bosanquet regarded the nation-state as the guardian of moral values, Gandhi believed in ethical universalism and cosmopolitanism.

Furthermore, *ahimsā* is a more spiritual conception than the notion of socialization, responsiveness, accommodation, etc., popularized by the western sociologist, because it is more sincere in its belief in the power of spiritual *Sadhana* and suffering. Being a believer in the evolutionary revolution brought about by the 'matchless weapon' of *ahimsā*, Gandhi prescribes the energization of the faculty of positive suffering as a technique of social change. Conflicts and animosities are solved in his theory not by superior acceleration of force, but by a deliberate, conscious act of self-abnegation.

For the realization of the non-violent society which will be a thoroughly transformed society having transcended power-politics, there is no necessity, according to Gandhi, for a biological transmutation. Gandhi would have reacted with horror to some of the suggestions of the geneticists. Gandhi's new man is not a biologically new type, but is the embodiment of the moral truths of love and purity. He is to be a perfect Satyagrahi and *Sthitaprajna*. In place of the improvement of the human species through genetic solutions, Gandhi adopts the constructive moral approach. His approach is more in the Christian tradition than in the dialectical materialistic.

Is Gandhi's non-violence categorical? Now the question is that, Gandhi's concept of non-violence categorical or not? To answer this question it is essential to point out Jainas tradition of non-violence, because which is very much related to this portion. In fact, in conceiving *ahimsā* Gandhi seems to be influenced by Jainism which recommends the practice of *ahimsā* in thought, speech and action. According to it, even thinking ill of others is *himsā*. Not only this, Jainism demands that one should not only commit *himsā* himself, he should not cause *himsā* or permit *himsā* to take place. Gandhi's negative requirements of *ahimsā* are not as rigid as that because Gandhi is aware that it is

not possible to observe non-violence in as strict and rigid manner as Jainism demands. He is aware that in certain cases *himsā* is unavoidable, as for example, in the processes of eating, drinking, walking, breathing etc. It is impossible to sustain one's body without injuring other bodies to some extent. Gandhi in fact, openly recommends killing under certain circumstances. He says, "Taking life may be a duty. We do destroy as much life as we think necessary for sustaining our body. Thus, for food we take life, vegetable and others, and for health we destroy mosquitoes and the like by the use of disinfectants etc., and we do not think that we are guilty of irreligion in doing so.....for the benefit of the species we kill carnivorous beasts.....even man-slaughter may be necessary in certain cases. Suppose a man runs amuck and goes furiously about sword in hand, and killing anyone that comes in his way, and no one dares to capture him alive. Anyone who despatches this lunatic will earn the gratitude of the community and be regarded as a benevolent man." (Young India, 4-11-26) He makes this point still clearer when he says in Young India again, "I see that there is an instinctive horror of killing living beings under any circumstances whatever. For instance, an alternative has been suggested in the shape of confining even rabid dogs in a certain place and allow them to die a slow death. Now my idea of compassion makes this thing impossible for me. I cannot for a moment bear to see a dog or for that matter any other living being, helplessly suffering the torture of a slow death. I do not kill a human being this circumstanced because I have more hopeful remedies. I still kill a dog similarly situated, because in its case, I am without a remedy. Should my child be attacked with rabbies and there was no helpful remedy to relief this agony, I should consider it my duty to take his life. Fatalism has its limits. We leave things to fate after exhausting all the remedies. One of the remedies and the final one to relieve the agony of a tortured child is to take his life." Thus it is apparent that Gandhi considers it almost a virtue to take life under certain conditions. In fact, he feels that under conditions similar to the examples given by him, continuing to live itself is pain and that, therefore, non-killing amounts to prolonging pain and agony.

As a Vedantist and a Vaiṣṇava, Gandhi regarded all life as sacred and precious.

Hence, he had deep faith in the sanctity of the right to life. He would not kill even a snake. He said, "God alone can take life because He gives it". The believer of *ahimsā* would regard even the lives of the opponents as worthy of reverence. In an article, in the *Harijon* Gandhi wrote: "You are no Satyagrahis if you remain silent or passive spectators while your enemy is being done to death. You must protect him even at the cost of your life." He accepted the supremacy of the right to life not merely because man as an individual is the subject of social and political rights but because in his inmost essence man is a soul. Hence, like Tolstoy Gandhi accepted the immutability and obligatory character of the law of love. For himself, he regarded the law of *ahimsā* as absolute, and considered it as an infallible weapon, mightier than the force of arms.

There are some liberal thinkers in the west who prescribed a political and institutional solution to the malady of the world. They pointed out that if an adequate institutional set-up, for example, a world parliament or a world system of republics could be built up, humanity will have an era of freedom and progress. But Gandhi was not happy with a mere institutional formula. He felt that humanity was passing through the crisis and it could be cured only by a restoration of the moral vows of truth and non-violence. Gandhi would have empathically declared that behind the political crises lay the crisis of moral values. He taught the absolutism of *ahimsā* which implies the activation of the sentiments of mutual loving considerations, harmony, peace moral autonomy and non-constrained trend towards accommodation and which has, as its political goal, the cultivation and realization of the unity of mankind. He believed in the moral purification of man to be achieved through self-suffering, non-covetousness and a spirit of loyalty to truth. Gandhi, thus, advocated a meta-political approach to the solution of the maladies of modern civilization. The law of *ahimsā* cannot be implemented by any institution, it must come from within. Nevertheless, Gandhi seems to believe like Socrates that *ahimsā* (virtue) can be taught and his life itself is his teachings.

-
- ⁱ *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (in 30volumes), Vol.7, p 876
- ⁱⁱ M. K. Gandhi, Trans. Mahadev Desai, *The Story of My Experiment with Truth*, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmadabad, 1927, p 51
- ⁱⁱⁱ Dr. Manish Sharma, *Non-violence in the 21st Century: Application and Efficacy*, Deep and Deep Publications, Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi, 2006, p 37
- ^{iv} Arvind Sharma, *A New Curve in the Ganges, Mahatma Gandhi Interpretation of Hinduism*, D. K. Print world (p) Ltd. New Delhi, 2005, p 83
- ^v *Non-violence in the 21st Century: Application and Efficacy*, p 39
- ^{vi} *Ibid.*, p 40
- ^{vii} *Non-violence in the 21st Century: Application and Efficacy*, p 39
- ^{viii} *Ibid.*, p 43, as it is found Pyarelal, *Mahatma Gandhi, The Last Phase*, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmadabad, 1997, Vol. X, Part-II, p 124
- ^{ix} *'A New Curve in the Ganges, Mahatma Gandhi Interpretation of Hinduism*, p 85
- ^x *The Story of My Experiment with Truth*, p 25
- ^{xi} [Http// www. Vpmtone.org](http://www.Vpmtone.org)
- ^{xii} *Non-violence in the 21st Century: Application and Efficacy*, p 45
- ^{xiii} Prof. J. S. Mathur, *Contemporary Society: A Gandhian Appraisal*, Gyan Publishing House, New Delhi, 2010, p 161, as it is found in G. Ramchandran, *Truth and Non-violence*, UNESCO Symposium on Gandhi, p 173
- ^{xiv} *Contemporary Society: A Gandhian Appraisal*, p 166-67, as it is found, *Harijan*: 19.5.1946
- ^{xv} Rakesh Kumar Jha, *Sociology peace and non-violence*, Northern Book Centre, New Delhi, 2005, p 22, as it is found J. V. Bondurant, *The Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict*, N. J., 1958, p198-99.
- ^{xvi} *Ibid.*, p 22-23, as it is found *Young India*, 2.3.1928
- ^{xvii} *Ibid.*, p 4, as it is found *Harijan*, 20.7.1935
- ^{xviii} *Ibid.*, p 25, as it is found Rajmohan Gandhi, *The Good Boatman: A Portrait of Gandhi*, New Delhi, 1995, p 35
- ^{xix} *The Story of My Experiment of Truth*, p 264
- ^{xx} Balwant Bhaneja, *Understanding Gandhi's Ahimsa (Non-violence), Reflection on an Autobiography: The Story of My Experiment of Truth*, Book Review, Articles, 2006, ISSN-1886-5860
- ^{xxi} Unto Tahtinan, *Ahimsa, Non-violence in Indian Tradition*, Rider and Company, London, 1976, p 122, as it is found M. K. Gandhi, *My Philosophy*, p 39
- ^{xxii} *The Selected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, vol vi, *The Voice of Truth*, Shriman Narayan, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmadabad, India, 1968, p 155

^{xxiii} R.P. Misra and K. D. Gangrade (edited), *Gandhian Alternative: Non-violence-in-Action*, (vol 2), Concept Publication Company, New Delhi, 2005, p 62

^{xxiv} *Ibid*, p 66

^{xxv} Divid Cortright, *Gandhi and Beyond: Non-violence for an Age of Terrorism*, Viva Books Private Ltd.,New Delhi2007, , p 17 as it is found, Wolpart, *Gandhi's Passion* p 151

^{xxvi} *The Story of My Experiment of Truth*, Introduction, p xi

^{xxvii} Joy Kachappilly, *Gandhi and Truth: An Approach to the Theology of Religions*, Akansha Publishing House, New Delhi, 2000, p 11

^{xxviii} U. S. Mohan Rao (compiled and edited.), *The Message of Mahatma Gandhi*, Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Govt. of India, 1968, p 9 as it is found *Young India*, 4.6.1925

^{xxix} *The Story of My Experiment of Truth*, p 345

^{xxx} *Ibid*. P 82

^{xxxi} V.P. Varma *The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi and Sarvodaya*, Bharati Bhawan,Patna,1994, p 142

^{xxxii} *The Story of My Experiment of Truth*, p 355

^{xxxiii} *The Story of My Experiment of Truth*, p 355

^{xxxiv} Mahadevan and Ramachandran (edited),*Gandhi: His Relevance for our Times*, Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi, 1967p 121

^{xxxv} *Gandhian Alternative*, p 39-40, as it is found *Harijan*, 26.9.1936

^{xxxvi} *The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi and Sarvodaya*, p 150