

GANDHI LITERATURE

	Rs. A.
Gandhi Diamond Jubilee Number	... 1 0
<i>By Mahatma Gandhi</i>	
Satyagraha in South Africa	... 4 8
Young India—I (1919-22)	... 4 0
Young India—II (1924-26)	... 4 0
A Guide to Health	... 0 12
Neethi Dharma	.. 0 8
Indian Home Rule	... 0 8
<i>By Mahadev Desai</i>	
Gandhiji in Indian Villages	... 2 0
Gandhiji in Ceylon	... 1 4
<i>By Richard B. Gregg</i>	
Economics of Khaddar	... 1 8
<i>By Rajendra Prasad</i>	
Gandhiji in Champaran	... 2 8
<i>By Krishna Das</i>	
Seven Months with Mahatma Gandhi	... 3 8

S. Ganesan, Triplicane, Madras, S. E.



Library

IIAS, Shimla



00013573

THE PSYCHOLOGY AND STRATEGY
OF
Gandhi's Non-violent Resistance

BY
RICHARD B. GREGG
Author of Economics of Khaddar



S. GANESAN,
Publisher, Triplicane, Madras.

1929

301.1530954
G861P



**INDIAN INSTITUTE OF
ADVANCED STUDY
SIMLA**

Abdul Majid Khan.

THE PSYCHOLOGY AND STRATEGY
OF
GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

PART I

DATA ENTERED

CATALOGUED

THE PSYCHOLOGY AND STRATEGY
OF
Gandhi's Non-violent Resistance

BY
RICHARD B. GREGG
Author of Economics of Khaddar



S. GANESAN,
Publisher, Triplicane, Madras.
1929



301.153 0954
GSBIP



Library IAS, Shimla



00013573

P R E F A C E

This is a part of a larger book I am writing on the subject of non-violent resistance or *Satyagraha*. It is my attempt to put into Western terms the result of part of what I learned during three and a half years in India. It may possibly be of interest to Indians as well as to my own countrymen.

Although the book is only partly completed, I am sending what is done as a present to Gandhiji on his sixtyfirst birthday, with my love.

BOSTON, MASS., U.S.A., }
Sept. 14, 1929. }

RICHARD B. GREGG.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I The Psychology of Non-Violent Resistance ...	1
II The Psychology of Non-Violent Resistance (<i>continued</i>) ...	40
III The Psychology of Non-Violent Resistance (<i>concluded</i>)	71
IV Non-Violent Resistance as a Method of War	91
V The Efficiency of Non-Violent Resistance as a Weapon of War ...	117

I
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF
NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

Any clear understanding of conflict requires a careful examination and understanding of the dynamic aspects of the psychology of fear and anger, and of the courses of action known as violence and non-violent resistance.

Most of the books on general psychology contain definitions of fear and anger, but the two most illuminating descriptions I have found are in A. F. Shand's *The Foundations of Character*¹ and in E. J.

1. Macmillan Co., London, 1914, at pp. 214, 216-17, 250, and Chap. 3, sec. 1.

2 GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

Kempf's *The Autonomic Functions and the Personality*.¹

The essence of their ideas on these subjects, for our purposes, may be stated as follows:

Fear and anger are very closely allied. They both have the same origin or purpose—to separate a person or animal from an object or person or force or situation considered by it to be painful, threatening or dangerous to its comfort, well-being, the easy action of its instincts, or its very existence. If the person or animal feels that it is stronger than the threatening object or situation, the emotion is anger; while if it estimates the danger as stronger than itself (including its skill), the emotion is fear.²

1. Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Co., New York and Washington, D.C., 1921, pp. 79, 80, 82.

2. Cf. in accord the "dominance-compliance," concept in *Emotions of Normal People*, by Wm. M. Marston, International Library of Psychology, Philosophy and Scientific Method, Kegan Paul, London; and Harcourt Brace, New York, 1923.

"In anger the removal may be effected by driving it (the threatening object) from the environment, destroying its consistency, or, if it is a threatening posture in another animal, the removal may consist of merely changing the aggressive posture of the opponent into a submissive one." (Kempf.)

The desire is either to remove the danger or to get away from it. The form of the emotion depends on the apparent relative strength of the opponents.

Hate may be described as a sort of deferred or thwarted anger. The hated person or force is too strong to be removed or destroyed, and yet not strong enough to cause flight or abject submission. Therefore, the person puts up with it, wishing all the time to destroy or harm it but not quite daring to do so, waiting for an opportunity to weaken or destroy it, but restraining his anger from blazing forth into open combat.

It seems from this that fear is always a *fear of losing* something considered valuable—such as comfort, health, easy

4 GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

functioning of the instincts, safety, bodily wholeness, economic security, social position, honour, an opportunity for pleasure or advancement, a treasured object or loved person, life itself, the welfare or interests of one's family, friends, community, race, or nation, etc., etc. Always a loss or separation of some sort is threatened. So a sense of impending or possible loss is always the basis of both fear and anger. If that threat is wholly removed, the fear and anger also disappear.¹

With this clearly in mind, let us now proceed to analyse the psychology of a simple attack with physical violence by one man on another, but without the use of guns or other long distance weapons. This does not pretend to be an exhaustive analysis of every element of the situation; nor is it, I hope, a biased or unfair selection of only such items as might prove a

1. Cf. also G. W. Crile—*Origin and Nature of the Emotions*: W. B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia, 1915.

case, with complete disregard of such elements as would disprove the argument. It is a selection and arrangement of psychological factors, many of which have been hitherto overlooked or whose relationships have been insufficiently considered, so as to put the whole discussion on a new and perhaps more useful basis. It is hoped that there will be searching criticism. It may seem at first that the discussion is over-simplified. But the complexities and difficult cases will be considered later in due course. This order is merely for clarity of discussion.

If A attacks B with physical violence and B reacts also in like manner, the attacker, A, because of the manner of B's response, immediately feels that his anger and ill-will toward B were fully justified. B, by his ill-tempered violence, has proved that he is an evil fellow and should be punished and rendered less able to harm others as well as A. It has given A a certain reassurance and support by show-

6 GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

ing at least that B's scale of moral values in regard to violence as a mode of settling questions is the same as A's. A mere display of either fear or anger by B is sufficient to have this effect. A feels sure of his *savoir faire*, of his choice of methods, of his knowledge of human nature and hence of his opponent. He can rely on B's acting in a definite way. A's conscience is now at rest, his morale is sustained, his sense of values is vindicated. His confidence in his general mode or method of dealing with B is reassured. He continues his attack with whole-hearted energy. All doubts as to the validity of his own cause, if he had any before the attack began, are now at an end. His indignation seems to him wholly righteous and worthy of public support. B's violent opposition has been a great moral support and vindication for the attacker, A. This holds true to the very end of the combat, whether A proves to be victor or vanquished.

Generally also, if A has been reasonably foresighted and has prepared the minds of chance onlookers or the general public, they give him their approval and moral support. B's violence indicates to them that he at least is reasonably able to take care of himself and therefore that A's attack was not unfair. They may even suspect that B had done something before, while they were not looking, which was injurious to A, and therefore that A's attack was not really unprovoked. Or if B's violence is particularly hearty, the outsiders may well feel that his malevolence is quite reprehensible. In any event, the circumstances prior to the attack were all so uncertain or unknown, and the possibility of hidden motives and events is so much a part of common experience, that the onlookers cannot feel sure which party was originally in the right or whether both were not partly in the wrong. Therefore, in the absence of policemen, the onlookers do nothing to

interfere with either A's or B's sense of righteousness and inner conviction of moral worth and perspicacity. In general, the crowd approves both A and B, or each of them gets encouragement from some of the onlookers, at least. This usually continues, no matter what the upshot of the affray is, whether A is victor or vanquished. Both parties feel that they have at least proved their courage and manhood to the world. Even the defeated one's honor seems to him for this reason, not wholly sullied.

So much for the emotions and assurances of the combat. What of the after-effects?

The original attacker, A, now a victor, we will suppose, wins public applause for his courage, skill and strength in fighting, and perhaps also support for his original contention, whatever it may have been. He feels that he has frightened and overawed B, and has proved his superiority over him and com-

pelled him to acknowledge it. A has acquired prestige and glory. Perhaps some of the onlookers flatter him by indicating a wish to associate with him. They want to gain some of his glory by reflection. His pride, vanity and self-satisfaction are increased. His original contentions and assumptions are now wholly proved and validated in his mind. He feels morally superior. He feels more secure than formerly. He has made his will effective and gained his own way. He has "settled" a question. His friends tend to feel as he feels, and support him.

The victim B, however, has been humiliated. He has had to admit A's superiority for the moment, but he vows vengeance. His resentment seeks satisfaction as soon as possible. His original anger, repressed by circumstances, becomes hatred and longs for revenge and retaliation. He nurses his grudge. Perhaps in some cases, forgiveness or a chance realization of the situation intervenes

10 GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

and all around, satisfaction and settlement is obtained. As often as not, however, this does not happen. Or if not, he may "take out" his anger on some innocent third party. His family or friends sympathize and may make his case their own. Perhaps, a feud or vendetta develops. There have been many instances of feuds lasting many generations. International enmities in Europe have lasted for centuries. Retaliation provokes counter-retaliation. The original evil or damage is vastly multiplied, and absorbs an enormous amount of time and energy away from useful occupations. Often no solution is ever found which satisfies either both of the original parties or their sympathizers and abettors. These sets of emotions and results come about, no matter which party is victor.

This wider and slower-acting effect of revenge and retaliation and resentment is usually overlooked or minimized by

the militarists and glorifiers of war and physical force. It holds true whether the struggle is between two individuals, between one person and a group, or between two or more groups, whether the groups be small or large. It holds true in varying degree whether the original combat ended with no permanent injury to either side, with some injury, or with death. It runs through all forms—the spanking of a child, a fight, a criminal arrest and imprisonment, capital punishment, a lynching, a strike or riot, piracy, a military raid or “punitive expedition,” a civil or international war. Rarely is a peace settlement a true case of full satisfaction, forgiveness and solution of the entire original conflict, so that both parties feel thoroughly happy and ready to go ahead without suspicion or resentment.

But now let us suppose that A gets angry against and attacks with physical violence a different sort of person, C.

12 GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

The attitude of C is fearless, calm, steady, unusually good-humored and kindly; and because of a different belief, training or experience he has much self-control. He does not respond to A's violence with counter-violence. Instead, he accepts the blows with smiling cheerfulness, but also with good-tempered reasoning, stating his belief as to the truth of the matter in dispute, his belief that A's idea is mistaken, asking for an examination of both sides of the opposed interests, and stating his readiness to abide by the truth. He opposes resistance to A, but only in moral terms. He states his readiness to prove his sincerity by his own suffering rather than by imposing suffering on A, through violence. He accepts blow after blow, showing no signs of fear or shrinking or resentment, keeping steady, good humored and kindly in look of eye, tone of voice, and posture of body and arms. To A's violence he opposes non-violent resistance. If A wants to take something

away from C, he lets him have it with every expression of kindness.

At this point, the reader may say that such a person as C is wholly ideal, or, at least, not found once in a century, and that therefore a discussion based upon such an assumption would be wholly unreal and futile. But as a matter of fact, many thousands of such persons were discovered in all countries during the Great War, and thousands more developed in South Africa before the war, and in India after the war.

It is true that non-violent resistance requires a strong control and discipline of the elemental instinct of pugnacity and the elemental emotion of anger. But on the other hand, war requires an equally strong control and discipline of the equally elemental instinct of flight and emotion of fear. We may say that courage is also instinctive and aids in the discipline of war, thus making it feasible. But courage seems to grow out of either a

14 GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

perception of superior strength, skill, endurance or security, or the superiority of the instinct for race preservation over that of individual self-preservation, as where a mother sacrifices herself for her offspring.

But perhaps it is conceivable that in the case of non-violent resistance there is another sort of courage, growing out of a different type of strength, skill, endurance or security ; or perhaps here, too, there may be a factor operating for the preservation of the race—a more far-seeing factor, as it were. Let the reader kindly suspend judgment, at least until we examine the evidence.

Of course, the race has had more experience with discipline of war than with the discipline of non-violent resistance ; but that does not affect the question of the intrinsic difficulty of creating and maintaining the latter discipline, once the matter is fully understood. Of course, the new discipline would probably be, so

to say, quantitatively more difficult, because it involves control of both fear and anger; but not qualitatively or intrinsically more difficult, because both these emotions are similar in origin and ultimate purpose, namely, race-preservation through individual self-preservation. And it seems that now the human race has perhaps developed enough knowledge and intelligence for a larger number of its leaders to begin to grasp the possibilities of this novel discipline.

The possibility of altering the expression of pugnacity and creating this new discipline will be readily appreciated by students of psychology by reference to Pavlov's researches on "conditioned reflexes."¹ Without attempting to explain conditioned reflexes, it may be stated that Pavlov has again and again, at will, been able to alter a dog's response to a destructive or painful stimulus from one of

1. I. P. Pavlov *Lectures on Conditioned Reflexes*—International Publishers, New York, 1928.

anger or defence to one of assimilation. Or, to put it in other terms, he caused the reflex of flowing of digestive juices to stop appearing in the presence of food, and instead to appear upon feeling pain from an electric shock or a burn of an acid on the skin. The reflex was reconditioned to a new stimulus which has just the opposite sort from what could be expected.

Since Pavlov talks of "the reflex of purpose" and "the reflex of freedom," we may feel free to consider war or ordinary combat as a conditioned reflex. J. B. Watson's experiments¹ proving that a new-born baby has only two fears—that of falling, and of a sudden loud noise—suggests that all other and more complex fears are conditioned reflexes. This would tend to support the idea of war as a con-

1. J. B. Watson—*The Heart or the Intellect*—Harpers Monthly Magazine, Feb., 1926. Also, J. B. Watson—*Behaviourism*—People's Institute Publishing Co., New York, 1925.

ditioned reflex. If it is such, it may be altered and re-conditioned, just as much as any other. Or, if friendly behaviour or kindness can be considered a conditioned reflex, we may re-condition it to respond to hostile treatment.

Such considerations as these may help us to realize that the discipline of non-violent resistance is wholly feasible and practical, once we come to understand it and see its usefulness.

The question as to how non-violent resistant characters occur or may be developed, or the difficulties or probabilities of developing such abilities in ordinary people will be discussed at various places in subsequent chapters. Let us therefore first try to see how non-violent resistance would work, and later consider how such persons might be developed. Our willingness to try to develop such self-control or discipline might depend somewhat on whether we believe it would be effective.

What would be the effect of C's non-violent tactics upon the attacker, A?

The first feeling of A will be surprise, because such a reaction as C's to violent attack is so unusual and unexpected. A's first thought may be that C is afraid of him; that C is a coward, ready to give way and acknowledge defeat. But C's look and posture show not fear but courage. His steady resistance of will, as shown by his words and posture, shows no subservience. His steadiness under pain is startling.¹ A is constrained to pause in wonder. If he was inclined at first to be scornful or contemptuous of C, those feelings soon become displaced by curiosity and wonder. Shand says (p. 448 of his book before cited), "Wonder tends to exclude Repugnance, Disgust and Contempt in relation to its object."

1. "All observers agree that it is easier and requires less courage to attack than to withstand fire without retaliation." F. C. Bartlett—*Psychology and the Soldier*—Cambridge University Press, 1927, at p. 175.

A becomes dimly or subconsciously aware that C's scale of values is strangely different from his own and from most people's. C's fortitude under punishment and his steady goodwill makes A suddenly admire C's courage and uncertain of his own valuations and methods. He vaguely realizes that C has taken and maintained the moral initiative. C's persistent kindness and offers of a settlement in terms of truth and fairness tends to make A realize that perhaps he was not going to lose anything after all; that all his fierce exertion was unnecessary, wasteful and a little foolish. If he has taken an object away from C, he now realizes that C would have given or shared it with him, and that C is not miserly or exclusive at all. If there are onlookers, A perhaps begins to feel a little undignified in their eyes—even ineffective and ludicrous, perhaps. By contrast with C's conduct, he begins to feel himself less generous and a little brutal

or unfair. He somewhat loses his inner self-respect—has a slight sense of inferiority. He, of course, doesn't want to acknowledge it but his feelings betray themselves in his hesitance or decreasing firmness of manner, speech or glance. The onlookers perceive it, and he himself senses a loss of public support. C's fortitude and self-control make A realize that he (A) has failed to demonstrate any superior skill, strength, endurance or self-control. That hurts his pride, his anger flares up and he strikes or wounds C again. But C's response continues kindly and he continues to offer other means of dignified settlement of the matter. C realizes that any show of contempt on his part would only arouse A's rage still further. But C does not even feel contempt, for he has such interest and goodwill toward A's potential good nature and abilities.

A dimly realizes that C's courage is higher than mere physical bravery or recklessness—that it is somehow a clearer

and stronger realization or understanding than his own of human nature or perhaps of some ultimate powers or realities in the background of life. He realizes perhaps that C's attitude toward property is finer and more generous than that of most people. This dumbfounds and troubles A and fills him with self-distrust.

Yet C continues in an attitude of respect toward A, and appeals to A's better nature and finer instincts. Strangely, he seems even to trust A. This trust, like financial credit, is stimulating and creative. A's fear of humiliation goes, and thereby his anger fades. He sees that his original fear of loss which lay behind his anger prior to his attack on C, has no grounds. He realizes he made a mistake, but cannot rouse more resentment or ill-feeling toward C because of the latter's unmistakable attitude that it was all merely a very natural mistake, that he bears no ill-will toward A and wants only to find a fair and honorable way out of

the difficulty. C's sincerity is patent and incontrovertible, for he has maintained his decent and kindly manner under the severest provocation. Plainly C is a man to be trusted. He shows great consideration for A's interests and personality. He reiterates his desire to settle matters only in accordance with the complete truth. Apparently C is not self-seeking. He does not shout for help or threaten to tell the police. A feels that even after he relaxes his belligerent actions and attitude, he need not fear that C will bear malice or resentment or revengeful feelings towards him. A has no more grounds for suspicion of C.

If at the start, A had any romantic notions that he was going to show great daring and heroism, that he was going to be a defender of others or going to risk his life or safety in a glorious adventure, all that glamour fades away. His morale crumples. He realizes that he has lost prestige. Probably he will talk angrily

and boastfully for some time, and go through many subterfuges to "save his face" and to regain, if possible, his lost dignity, prestige and self-respect or self-esteem. But C is so consistently decent that A cannot again attack him or even continue long to vent angry words upon him. Sooner or later the steam blows off. Perhaps poor A's anger even turns on himself and he may go so far as to feel shame and remorse. His desire for action seeks an outlet in pity for C's injuries or wounds, and he (A) seeks to repair the damage forthwith and thus regain some part of his self-respect.

All this ebb and flow of feeling and action by A may take place in different order from what is above described. Its temper, intensity, tone or flavour, so to speak, would vary according to the circumstances and character of the persons involved. It might take a considerable time to work through. As between sensitive persons, the course of feelings and

actions might be almost instantaneous. With a very proud or self-deceiving person, or a hardened soldier or policeman as attacker, the actual violence might be severe and repeated and lasting before the change of attitude or heart of the attacker would come about. Yet even among such attackers, the surprise and wonder would be so great as often to cause a far quicker face-about than might be expected.

But what is the psychology of the affair, if A is filled with the sort of cruelty or greed, pride, insolence, bigotry, lust or hardness that seems to grow on what it feeds on?

Shand shows most interestingly¹ how cruelty is a complex of fear, anger and pride.

"When fear restrains the impulse of anger in a mind capable of reflexion and foresight, it tends to render anger deliberately cruel....."

"What is meant by cruelty implies enjoyment

1 Loc. cit. at pp. 268 and 269.

in inflicting pain, and the intention or desire to inflict it..... For this anger that is successful in attaining its end has the enjoyment of success, and when this success coincides with the subjection of another, the enjoyment of pride.

.....“When fear restrains the impulse of anger, it tends to render anger at first more painful, and afterwards revengeful and cruel: as if there were a desire of inflicting suffering in revenge for the pains of fear..... But when the initial and painful stage of anger is prolonged, when it is restrained by the most painful of all emotions, fear, so humiliating to pride, we can understand how the coward who dares not attack his enemy openly, or without superior advantages, broods over his revenge, and how his revenge becomes deliberate, implacable, and cruel. And thus it is that cowardly men are so often cruel, because the same circumstances that tend to arouse their anger tend also to arouse fear, so that there arises a constant interaction between these emotions.”

Greed and lust are really desires for security and completion, though badly mistaken as to method, means and material. In a sense they are a fear of lack. Pride is another mistaken sense o

divisiveness, as will be further considered in a subsequent chapter. Bigotry is an obstinate, narrow, religious pride.

The prouder a person is, the less willing he is to admit that any one else, especially one to whom he feels superior, can teach him anything. Therefore, the only way you can teach such a person is by example. The only way he will learn is by unconscious imitation. The minute he becomes aware of his change of conduct, he tries to cover up the imitation by all sorts of excuses, pretences, explanations and rationalizations.

In all such instances, the tendency of non-violent resistance is to remove fear, anger, any foreboding or dread of loss or sense of separateness, and to give instead a feeling of security, unity, sympathy and goodwill. In the light of the above analysis, we see that this operates to remove cruelty, pride, lust and hardness.

All support is removed from the attacker for any divisive emotions or senti-

ments in relation to the victim, fear, anger, hatred, indignation; pride, vanity, scorn, contempt, disdain, disgust, anxiety, worry, apprehension. It is not that such feelings are balked or suppressed; they merely no longer have a cause or basis.

In some difficult cases, non-violent resistance can operate but slowly, but its pressure is nevertheless sure and inevitable. You may exclaim impatiently—"But while it is taking so long to act, the victim gets killed or starved!" I must ask you to consider that event with me in a subsequent chapter. Let us try here merely to see whether and how a certain set of forces will act if time and space exists for them. If the psychological principle is correct we will discuss the physical circumstances in due order.

It may be said further on this point that probably in most cases of apparent failure of non-violent tactics the victim showed either fear or anger or lack of discipline. When a whole group or

community was involved there may also have been defective leadership, a failure to understand or fully trust to non-violence. There must be present *moral* resistance—an active, bold and confident courage, protest, reasoning and indication of other means of settlement.

Remember that at this point we are discussing only an encounter between two people. Attacks by police or soldiers under military orders will be considered in the following chapters. Killing will be discussed later also. If the reader is inclined to doubt whether this description is a true statement of the actual psychological course of events, let him suspend judgment until the end of this chapter. If he feels there would be exceptions to the rule, let him please withhold them until later.

If there have been onlookers or friends, or a public aware of these events, the effect on them of the non-violent resistance shown by C is also interesting.

When the onlookers see C's courage and fortitude, his generosity and goodwill toward A, and hear his repeated offers to settle the matter fairly and peaceably and in the open, the public sympathy and support shifts slowly or perhaps suddenly all to C. If there are partisans of A in the crowd, they find themselves in a minority. The crowd is also filled with surprise, curiosity and wonder at such unusual conduct by C. If they have been wholly hostile to him before, they at least pause to think. His good humor and fairness and kindness toward A makes them, too, trust him. If they had feared him they now lose their fear. He may suddenly win their hearty applause and complete support. His offer to seek settlement in public and his appeal to fair play perhaps tempts the onlookers to take part and exert their powers in an interesting situation. A's friends feel compelled to acquiesce or may even begin to doubt their hero. And if C

maintains his goodwill, good temper and fairness throughout the subsequent discussion and adjustment, A and his friends will be won over to admiration and friendship. If intelligence is used, a settlement can almost always be found, or a start of a means of settlement which will grow and develop and settle one item after another. The spirit in which it is undertaken, if maintained, will make for both mutual consideration and concession and for successful integration of opposing interests so that the desires and energies of both parties will find satisfaction. No resentments or feelings of fear, suspicion or revenge remain.

When a satisfactory settlement has been found, A's relief is apt to be enormous. From early in the conflict he was having misgivings and division within himself. He secretly hated the friction, the waste of energy, the loss of self-respect and public prestige. Now the way is clear whereby he can regain both

self-respect, doubly assured, and also public respect and even prestige once more. With no more internal conflict he can now put all his energies to constructive use that is beneficial to all. His happiness is thereby immensely increased, together with his enthusiasm for the new channel of action.

Just as in the first case we examined where B's reaction to A's attack was violent, so also here where C's reaction is non-violent, the effect of friends, onlookers or other third parties upon the contestants is important for a full understanding of the matter. Both opponents feel a desire and need for the approbation of others. Social approval and opprobrium are very strong forces. They act through and are a part of the herd or gregarious instinct which is so strong in mankind.

Kempf, at pages 93, 94 and 95 of his book before cited, says:

....." In modern civilization, man having so

32 GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

thoroughly mastered his environment through his mechanical inventions, the individual's great struggle in life is not so much a problem of self-preservation in a physical sense as it is one of attaining social approbation and potency..... As society increases its care for the individual, and the individual for society...the individual grows more and more to need social esteem in order to feel safe and comfortable. One of the most persistent causes of anxiety and depression is the fear that he has lost prestige through a blunder or a vicious indulgence."

The tremendous pressure of social approval or dislike is well brought out in W. Trotter's *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*.¹ Competent observers have stated that fear of social disapproval was the strongest of all the motives to enlistment in the armies in the Great War.² The desire for approval of outsiders to a conflict was strikingly shown

1. Macmillan, London and New York, 1916.

2. See Clive Bell, *Civilization*, pp.221, 222; Chatto and Windus, London, 1928; also *The Motives of the Soldier* by T. H. Proctor, 31 International Journal of Ethics, p. 26, Oct., 1920.

by the great efforts devoted to propaganda by all the parties of the Great War. Again, it is demonstrated in labor strikes and lockouts in which both parties are at great pains to win public support and sympathy. All politicians recognize the force of public opinion.

Now in this combat between A and C, as soon as the onlookers perceive C's bearing and conduct, they too are surprised and struck with wonder. They admire C's courage and dogged endurance. They doubt the validity of A's reasons for attacking C. A seems unreasonable. Their sympathy switches to C. Perhaps some of the timid ones vaguely fear that A might attack them next, as he seems to incline to attack wholly inoffensive persons without apparent provocation. Surely a man with such proven goodwill as C would not have hurt A before the battle began! The crowd begins to think A is a bully, brutal, unfair. It may express its feelings and thoughts by words or

hisses. Some persons in the crowd, more aggressive than others, may desire to assert themselves and interfere. They are curious to learn more about this fellow, C. They dislike A's conduct and make him feel their attitude. A does not withstand the crowd, for his own inner conviction is now wavering and doubtful as a result of C's conduct. A seizes his first opportunity to patch up a truce with what honor or dignity and safety for himself he can find. C makes this easy for him by his continued offers of fair settlement. C's conduct has won public approval as well as chastened A and altered his inner disposition.

If anyone feels inclined to doubt the above described reaction of the outsiders against A's violence, let him recall what happens in time of a labour strike, if any striker loses his temper and destroys property or attacks any person. Immediately the employers blazon the news in the press and try to make it appear that all

the strikers are men of violence and that public safety is threatened. They play on the fears of the public and then persuade the mayor to call out extra police or soldiers. Public opinion, swayed by the press, reacts strongly against the strikers and their cause is lost. Violence opposed not by violence but by courageous non-violence like C's, if it is in the open, is sure, sooner or later, to react against the attacker. The burden of justification rests heavily on the violent one and the presumption is against him. What happens if the occurrence is hidden will be discussed later. (I do not mean to say that the usual attitude of employers in a strike is really non-violent or necessarily even courageous. We will consider such cases more fully later.)

Thus the combat ceases. But something further happens. If A is at all a decent fellow, he will be contrite and willing to surrender much more of what he formerly considered his "rights" in

making a settlement with C. But C has not lost his temper and wants a final wholly satisfactory settlement, so that he may no longer be annoyed by A. Furthermore he has experienced with his own body the fact that A is a very energetic person. Why not use as much as possible of that energy in the settlement, and, if possible, have A as a friend and good citizen hereafter, using his energy for the common welfare instead of in noisy brawls? C therefore seeks a settlement which somehow or other will gratify as much as possible of the essence of A's original desires or what lay behind them. A is so pleased to have C's friendship instead of enmity or resentment, to find himself or at least his "better self" and potentialities respected instead of humiliated, to find the essence of his desires satisfied after all, or else so illuminated and transmuted that in their new form they may more easily be satisfied, to find C showing and

inviting him to take a dignified way by which he (A) may quickly regain his *amour propre* and public esteem, that he is apt to be very friendly toward C and to help him in any way he can. A's relief to find an approved line of action may be so great as to result in actual gratitude to C. Since A has been provided with a satisfactory road for action, he is not left with any "balked disposition" as Graham Wallace calls it.¹

You may say at once, "This may be the way it happens sometimes, but there have been countless exceptions, so many that the exceptions are the rule." I grant the death of Jesus and the Christian martyrs, the tortures of Albigenses, negro lynchings, the innocent thousands slaughtered by Jenghis Khan and Tamerlane, by White Guards in Finland, Russia, and countless other instances elsewhere. Those will be discussed in later chapters. Here it suffices to say that some of them,

1. Graham Wallace—*The Great Society*.

like many soldiers, won or established their causes even though they lost their own lives. Hence neither they nor their methods were any more "futile" than those of all soldiers. Perhaps most of them, however, did not show true non-violent resistance. They were undisciplined and fearful or poorly led, and were killed and partly wasted, just as any undisciplined troops would be in war.

Let me ask your patience to consider those situations later. At this point we are considering the psychological workings of non-violent resistance. There have been many cases of its effective use, as will also be shown later. But let us understand first *how violence and non-violence work* before we estimate the probabilities of their use. Most people hitherto have pooh-poohed the effectiveness of non-violent resistance, simply because they could not understand how it possibly could work. Modern psychology has now made it possible to understand

the emotional, mental and moral mechanisms involved. So let us analyse the matter and pay attention to one part of the problem at a time, as all scientists should.

II THE PSYCHOLOGY OF NON- VIOLENT RESISTANCE

(Continued)

FROM all the foregoing analysis we see that non-violent resistance acts as a sort of moral jiu-jitsu. The non-violence and goodwill of the victim act like the lack of physical opposition by the user of physical jiu-jitsu, to cause the attacker to lose his moral balance. He suddenly and unexpectedly loses the moral support which the usual violent resistance of most victims would render him. He plunges forward, as it were, into a new world of values. He feels helpless and insecure

because of the novelty of the situation and his ignorance as to how to handle it. The principle of surprise, so potent in warfare, has made him lose his poise and self-confidence. The victim not only lets the attacker come, but, as it were, jerks him forward by kindness, generosity and goodwill, so that the attacker quite loses his moral balance. The user of non-violent resistance, knowing what he is doing and having a more creative purpose and perhaps a clearer sense of ultimate values than the other, retains his moral balance. He uses the leverage of a superior wisdom to subdue the rough direct force or physical strength of his opponent.

Another way to state it is that between two persons in physically violent combat there may appear to be complete disagreement, but in reality they conduct their fight on the basis of a strong fundamental agreement that violence is a sound mode of procedure, in ex-

tremity, at any rate. Hence if one of the parties eliminates that basic agreement and announces by his actions that he has abandoned the method used generally by his forefathers back almost to the beginning of animal life, no wonder that the other is startled and uncertain. His animal instincts no longer tell him instantly what to do. He feels that he has plunged into a new world. Here is something as new, apparently, as an airplane to an Eskimo.

To show how similar the situation is to an encounter in jiu-jitsu, let me quote briefly from *Jiu-Jitsu* by Uyenishi:¹

"Don't resist when your opponent pushes you ; rather increase your pace in that direction and pull him a little at the same time, or *vice versa*, should he be pulling you. Don't let him ever get the 'strain' on you, but go with him, if anything, a little faster than his pull would cause you to. By following this precept you are—if I may describe it so—almost

¹ Athletic Publications, Ltd., London. See also quotation from Prof. Jigosa Kano in *Modern Review* (Calcutta), for Nov. 1922, pp. 637-8.

catching your balance before he wishes you lose it, while he is practically losing his and is without the aid of your resistance on which he has been more or less depending to help him regain *his* balance. Thus in an easy and simple manner you neutralize his efforts to get you off your balance, and at the same time create a favourable opportunity of effecting a throw, by keeping him off his.....

".....Knowledge of balance, and how to disturb it, is the 'mystery' which enables the jiu-jitsu man so easily to throw stronger and heavier opponents without any great effort or without using strength (in the common acceptance of the term)."

It may clarify our thinking somewhat to remember that we are not considering two static entities, an angry person *vs.* a kindly person. We are rather dealing with two natures and an environment which are all mobile and changing, each constantly acting on the other—*influencing, changing, then responding to the new condition thus created.* The psychological doctrine of "circular response," so ably explained by Miss M. P.

Follett in her *Creative Experience*,¹ is that response is not to a fixed environment; it is rather a response to the relation created. Or, as she says, (p. 62) "my changing activity is a response to an activity which is also changing.....My behaviour is a response to the new situation which I, in part, have created". As a reviewer of her book explained,²

"The great significance of all these aspects of circular response is to make clear the thought that a process of mutual consideration and of forward-looking co-operative planning may itself so change the elements of the situation as to point the solution. ...An attitude of mind that is constantly inventive may go along with a process of conflict and may often use the process, as Hegel believed, for reaching a larger result than would emerge without it."

Moreover, in this process of mutual

1. Longmans Green, New York, 1924. Cf. also E. B. Holt—*Ethics of the Freudism Wish*—H. Holt & Co., New York, 1915, Chap. III, and his *The Concept of Consciousness*.

² J. H. Tufts in 35 *International Journal of Ethics* 189.

interacting influence, the non-violent person is apt to be the stronger character of the two. And the very fact that he keeps cool, presently gives him more energy than the other. Undoubtedly anger at first gives a great access of physical and sometimes mental energy.¹ But it also consumes energy very rapidly, both physiologically and nervously, and if long sustained it may completely exhaust the person feeling it.²

Thus the non-violent resister gains an advantage over the violent attacker and has a stronger chance of influencing the latter into his way than of being influenced into the way of rage and violence.

One event of the Great War was

1 W. B. Cannon—*Bodily Changes in Pain, Hunger, Fear and Rage*—D. Appleton & Co., New York and London, 1927.

2 G. W. Crile—*Origin and Nature of the Emotions*—W. B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia and New York, 1915, especially pp. 30, 52, 61. Also W. E. Hocking—*Morale and its Enemies*—Yale University Press, New Haven, U.S.A., 1918, at pp. 53, 54.

illustrative of another aspect of the influence of the non-violent resister, C, upon his violent attacker, A.¹

Soon after the Russian Revolution, the Russian army melted away and the Bolsheviks entered into negotiations with the Austro-German generals and diplomats at Brest-Litovsk, to draft terms of peace. The Bolsheviks had no power of resistance left, but they shrewdly knew of the weaknesses of the Central Powers, the seething discontent and disillusionment of the Austrian and German masses at home. A peace on the Eastern front was of immense importance to the Central Powers and indeed to the Allies, and the negotiations were given wide publicity in the German and Allied press. Boldly and cleverly the Bolsheviks argued and haggled, in reality using the negotiations to

1. *The Proletarian Revolution in Russia* by N. Lenin and L. Trotsky. Ed. by Louis C. Fraina, The Communist Press, New York, 1918, at pp. 353-362.

Also, *Lenin* by Leon Trotsky—Minton Balch & Co., New York, 1925.

blazon forth to the German proletarian malcontents a call to rebel and mutiny against the German government. Trotsky forced the angry and over-eager General Von Hoffman to reveal undisguised the falsehoods and annexationist purposes of the German government, and thus still further disillusioned the German and Austrian workers and weakened the unity and morale of the Central Powers. The call was indeed addressed to the workers in all countries. It resulted in a German naval mutiny and strikes among some German and Hungarian munition workers, and a general deterioration in morale freely admitted later by Generals Von Hoffman and Ludendorf.

In similar fashion the kindly appeals of an individual non-violent resister work in the personality of the violent attacker, A, arousing A's more decent and kindly motives and putting them in conflict with his fighting, aggressive instincts. Thus A is made to have a divided per-

sonality. The appeals, like commercial advertising, may require considerable repetition before they are effective, but the result is pretty sure. They act on the psychological principle of "summation of stimuli."

This suggests that perhaps the whole western world, with its fondness for violence, and yet its knowledge of Christian and Buddhist ethics, is in a state of inner conflict and disintegrated personality, and needs a sort of psycho-analysis and suggestion to free it.

The surprising conduct and attitude of C presents suddenly a new idea to A.¹ He pauses to wonder over it, to try to understand it. Shand says (loc. cit. pp. 430 and 448), "The effect of surprise is to make us attend to the event that surprises us. . . . Wonder tends to arrest and de-

1. Cf. W. E. Hocking—*Human Nature and its Remaking*—2d ed. at p. 374.—Yale University Press, New Haven, U.S.A., and Oxford University Press, London, 1928.

tain the attention on the thing which excites it. . . ." A is at the moment in a most receptive and suggestible state, and the conduct of C acts on him by subconscious suggestion. Several of the conditions are present under which suggestion acts most potently. Baudouin, one of the leaders of the Nancy school of psychologists, in his book *Suggestion and Auto-Suggestion*¹ gives at p. 143 the two following "laws of suggestion."

"1. Law of Concentrated Attention: The idea which tends to realize itself in this way is always an idea upon which spontaneous *attention* is concentrated.

"2. Law of Auxiliary Emotion: When for one reason or another, an idea is enveloped in a powerful *emotion*, there is more likelihood that this idea will be suggestively realized."

The new ideas or suggestions seem to be that the dispute can be settled calmly and amicably, that calm conduct is more dignified, more decent, more useful, more

1. Translated by Eden & Cedar Paul,—Dodd, Mead & Co., New York and London, 1921.

efficient, more worthy of respect than violence, that there are some values and imponderable forces in the world known to C and perhaps even more powerful and desirable than physical force.

Rivers says,¹ "suggestion is essentially a process of the unconscious." Trotter also, in his book previously cited, says (p. 82) that sensitiveness to folk environment is instinctive and therefore subconscious. It is well known that subconscious suggestions are both powerful and lasting. The spectacle of bravely endured suffering along with all the surprises and uncertainty of the situation creates plenty of emotion in A. If there is a crowd present, this tends to heighten A's suggestibility. These suggestions tend to change the inner attitude of the attacker.

Non-violent resistance is in effect a sort of language, a means of communica-

1. W. H. R. Rivers—*Instinct and the Unconscious*—Cambridge University Press, 1920, p. 93.

ting feelings and ideas. It uses the expression of the face, glances of the eyes, tones, intensities and modulations of the voice, movements and postures of the limbs and body—just as in all personal communication. In prolonged situations it may also use writing and printing. Its means of expression are as ample as those of any language. Even in situations where words can be used little or not at all, conduct alone may be a very rapid, accurate and efficient means of communication.¹

Nevertheless, of course, the ideas to be conveyed are so unusual that the understanding of them by the recipient may be slow or incomplete. But the understanding will be more emotional than intellectual, a matter of inner attitude, at first,

1. Cf. W. B. Pillsbury and C. L. Meade—*The Psychology of Language*, p. 6.—D. Appleton & Co., New York and London, 1928.

Also E. S. Bogardus—*Fundamentals of Social Psychology*, p. 114—Century Co., New York and London, 1924.

anyhow. Therefore, the success of the communication does not in the slightest degree depend upon the extent of formal or book education of either party to the conflict. The idea itself is no more complex than that of war, for war involves a discipline of fear, and non-violent resistance involves a discipline of anger; and both anger and fear are elemental and very similar emotions. There is both an emotional and an intellectual element to be transmitted—both feelings and ideas. There will be difficulties arising from the unusualness of the feelings and ideas in such a situation, but no more difficulties from inadequacy of means than in the case of any other sort of language.¹ It is to be remembered that boycott or non-co-operation, which may accompany or

I. See C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, *The Meaning of Meaning*, 2d ed. rev. Kegan Paul, London; Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1927, especially chapters on "Sign Situations" and "Symbol Situations."

Also, I. A. Richards—*Principles of Literary Criticism*, Ch. 21,—Ibid. 1926.

be a part of non-violent resistance, also are a sort of language or means of communication of ideas. Often the communication is singularly effective.

The new idea in the astonishing situation tends strongly to stimulate the attacker's imagination. The speed of operation of the imagination varies, of course, greatly between different people. And if the contentions of the Nancy school of psychologists be true (cf. Baudouin) in regard to the relationship between imagination and will, we gain further light in this matter. They maintain that imagination and suggestion together are much stronger than conscious will power, so that if a person consciously wills and thinks he desires to accomplish a given purpose but all the while his imagination is filled with ideas as to his inability to accomplish it or as to some contrary desire, then he will surely fail in the task. Baudouin states it as the "Law of Reversed Effort".

"When an idea imposes itself on the mind to such an extent as to give rise to a suggestion, all the conscious efforts which the subject makes in order to counteract this suggestion are not merely without the desired effect, but they actually run counter to the subject's conscious wishes and tend to intensify the suggestion." ¹

Also, "When the will and imagination are at war, the imagination *invariably* gains the day."

If this be so, it may be that the ideas thus suggested to the attacker and playing on his imagination, gradually capture his imagination and conquer his will to defeat the victim, C, by violence.

This concept is somewhat similar to that of the Freudians who show how tremendously more powerful a repressed wish is than an opposing conscious desire. Possibly a suggestion acting in the subconsciousness is as powerful as a repressed wish.

1. See C. Baudouin—*Suggestion and Auto-Suggestion*, above cited. Also Ibid—*Educating the Will*—Century Magazine, New York, July, 1929.

Another reason why A is compelled to think is the powerful demonstration of C's conviction. As some writer said, "To be willing to suffer and die for a cause is an incontestable proof of sincere belief, and perhaps in most cases the only incontestable proof." Strong conviction of any sort is very contagious and stimulating.

Another mechanism affecting the attacker is unconscious imitation. Imitation is, of course, an exceedingly powerful force. By it we learn to walk, learn skilled manual trades, pick up gestures and postures of our elders, follow our leaders—a limitless range of conduct. As Royce says in his *Psychology*,¹

"It is by imitation that the child learns its language. It is by imitation that it acquires all the social tendencies that make it a tolerable member of society. Its imitativeness is the source of an eager and restless activity, which the child pursues for years under circumstances of great difficulty,

1. Macmillan & Co., New York, 1903, page 276.

56. GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

and even when the process involved seems to be more painful than pleasurable. Imitativeness remains with us through life. It attracts less of our conscious attention in our adult years, but is present in ways that the psychologist is able to observe even in case of people who suppose themselves not imitative."

Rivers remarks at pp. 91-92 of his book above cited that "Unwitting imitation is the most effective."

Ross remarks¹ that "Motor impulses appear to diffuse themselves with great facility," citing the infectiousness of marching rhythm, yawning, gestures, and modes of speech. Also "The feelings are more contagious than the appetites." . . . "Emotions spread more rapidly than ideas or opinions." . . . "Volitions are extremely communicable."

Kempf, in his book previously cited

1. Edward Alsworth Ross—*Social Psychology*—Macmillan, New York, 1909, at pp. 120, 126, 130, 136. Cf. also Gabriel Tarde—*The Laws of Imitation*—Chap. 6—Trans. by E. C. Parsons, Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1903.

(at p. 30), after giving numerous examples of conscious and unconscious imitation, says, "The influence of associates upon the personality is a physiological mechanism and occurs unconsciously, or at least begins unconsciously." Later (p. 78) he partially adopts Holt's theory that "thought is latent course of action with regard to environment," that is to say, "the preceding labile interplay of motor settings." This suggests the reason why pupils learn better by personal discussion with the teacher than by reading a book. They can imitate unconsciously the postures, tones and play of motor settings of the teacher and thus follow and understand the thought more clearly and surely. Such a mode of influence would be both subtle and powerful. May it not help explain the change in the attacker's attitude? May it not be that as soon as he attentively watches his victim and comes to respect his courage, be it ever so little, he begins uncon-

sciously to imitate him, and hence the attacker's wrath tends to subside? Whatever truth there may be in the James-Lange theory of the emotions would add weight to this conjecture. For reasons already considered, the non-violent contestant is less apt to be influenced by suggestion and imitation, to adopt violence, than the violent person to be influenced toward non-violence.

If one doubts the existence of imitation in time of conflict, let him remember the words of the great theorist of war, Von Clausewitz, "War is a constant state of reciprocal action, the effects of which are mutual."¹ Again Lieut.-General Von Cæmmerer, in his *Development of Strategical Science*,² says, "Every action in war is saturated with mental forces and effects. . . . War is a constant

1. Von Clausewitz—*On War*—Trans. by Col. J. J. Graham. Kegan Paul, London 1911, Vol. I, p. 99.

2. Translated—Hugh Rees, Ltd., London, 1905, at p. 78.

reciprocal effect of action of both parties".¹

This factor of imitation also helps explain the futility of violence as a means of solving conflicts. If A attacks B, and B responds with violence, while part of B's response is purely instinctive and defensive, part of it also is unconscious imitation of A. Then the two act like front and back logs in a fire. The heat of one log is reflected across to the other, which then fires up and sends more heat to the first. The heat is reflected back and forth, steadily increasing and consuming the material (latent energy) of the wood. So anger, resentment, hatred and revenge, in the process of reciprocal imitative violence, mount higher and enter into more and

1. Perhaps further light may be thrown on all this by further study of unconscious mental processes and their relation to the conscious. Cf. *The Psychology of Emotion* by John T. MacCurdy—Kegan Paul, London, and Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1925.

more of the personalities of the combatants, consuming all their energies, to the point of utter exhaustion or destruction.

Von Clausewitz, above quoted, says at p. 102,

"A hostile feeling is kindled by the combat itself ; for an act of violence which any one commits upon us by order of his superior, will excite in us a desire to retaliate and be revenged on him, sooner than on the superior power at whose command the act was done. This is human, or animal, if we will ; still it is so. We are very apt to regard the combat in theory as an abstract trial of strength, without any participation on the part of the feelings, and that is one of the thousand errors which theorists deliberately commit, because they do not see its consequences."

The psychological nature of non-violent resistance may well be considered a form of what Rivers calls "manipulative activity." In discussing different modes of reaction to danger, he says, ¹

1. W. H. R. Rivers—*Instinct and the Unconscious*—Cambridge University Press, 1920. page 54.

“In the presence of danger, man, in the vast majority of cases, neither flees nor adopts an attitude of aggression, but responds by the special kind of activity, often of a highly complex kind, whereby the danger may be avoided or overcome. From most of the dangers to which mankind is exposed in the complex conditions of our own society, the means of escape lie in complex activities of a manipulative kind which seem to justify the term, I have chosen. The hunter has to discharge his weapon, perhaps combined with movements which put him into a favourable situation for such an action. The driver of a car and the pilot of an aeroplane in danger of collision have to perform complex movements by which the danger is avoided.

We may say that C's non-violent resistance is a sort of moral manipulative activity in which the factors used and operated upon are largely psychological.

What must be the character of the non-violent resister in order that he may use his weapon effectively? What must be in his mind and heart?

He must have primarily that disposi-

tion best known as love—an interest in people so deep, and determined, and lasting as to be creative; a profound knowledge of or faith in the ultimate possibilities of human nature; a courage based probably upon a conscious or subconscious realization of the underlying unity of all life and eternal values or eternal life of the human spirit; a strong and deep desire for and love of truth; and a humility which is not cringing or self-deprecatory or timid but rather a true sense of proportion in regard to people, things, qualities and ultimate values. These may sound very philosophical and rare, but in fact they are all quite common human traits — love, faith, courage, honesty, and humility. They exist in greater or less strength and clearness in *every* person. The problem of developing them to use in non-violent resistance will be considered later. If you protest that you cannot love your enemies, please patiently postpone this

objection till Chapter VII, where it will be discussed with many other queries.

The most important of all these factors is love. It may almost be considered the origin of all the others. If the name "love" in such a context seems to you as too impossible or repulsively sentimental, call it a sort of intelligence or knowledge. It must be strong and clear-sighted, not mawkish or silly-sentimental. It does not hint or imply in a priggish or superior manner that it is going to "do good to" the other person, nor does it make a parade of itself. It must be patient and full of insight and understanding and imagination. It must be enduring, kind and unselfish. We have all seen such love in many mothers of all ranks, classes, nations and races, also in the best teachers. It is wonderful but it is not super-human or exceedingly rare. Its creativeness in these instances is well-known.

The creative aspect of love was well

expressed by that very original philosopher, Charles S. Peirce—"Love, recognizing germs of loveliness in the hateful, gradually warms it into life, and makes it lovely."¹ W. E. Hocking also finely describes it on pages 374-75 of his *Human Nature and its Remaking*.²

"And the persistent refusal to criticise or to retaliate.....must mean that the self which has defects or which does injury is seen to be other than the real self; and the non-resistance constitutes an appeal from the apparent self to the real self, or from the actual self to the self that may be. In this case, it is not injustice, but it is justice to the living and changeable...Greek justice, distributive or retributive, took men statically, as they presented themselves. This type of justice refuses to take a man at his own estimate of himself; it insists on the self of a more nearly absolute estimate, the self that *must* be, and which this resolve of the non-resisting will, will help to bring into being. It is a justice done, for the first time to the

1. Charles S. Peirce—*Chance, Love and Logic*—Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, and Kegan Paul, London, 1923.

2. Yale University Press, New Haven (U.S.A.) and Oxford University Press, London, 1923.

plasticity and responsiveness of human nature toward our own wills; it is an absolute or creative justice."

Again, if by your love for your enemy you can create respect in him, a respect or admiration for you, this provides the best possible means by which your new idea or suggestion to him will become an auto-suggestion within him, and it will also help nourish that auto-suggestion.

Still another aspect of this creativeness of love was described in an article by G. F. Barbour, called *Force and the Conquest of Evil in Christian Ethics*.¹

....."The dynamic of love, of trust, and of an appeal to the sense of honour, though its action may be slow and uncertain at the outset, acts permanently, if it acts at all, by passing over into the heart and the character of its object. This principle..... has seldom found finer expression than in the words of Spinoza :—

"He who chooses to avenge wrong with hatred is assuredly wretched. But he who strives to conquer hatred with love fights his battle in joy and

1. 15 Hibbert Journal 464. at p. 470.

66 GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

confidence; he withstands many as easily as one, and has very little need of fortune's aid. Those whom he vanquishes yield joyfully, not through failure, but through increase in their power.' "

The creative power of love often acts as follows. When X has been indifferent to Y and then suddenly discovers that Y loves him, he (X) is at first ashamed—perhaps because Y was the more magnanimous and the first to love. Further, X is ashamed to accept Y's love. These two phases may last a relatively long time. But when Y makes X feel that he is needed, and shows X how he can help Y, how he has abilities that can be useful, then X's stubbornness and pride melt fast and he begins to love Y and to help him. Very few people can bear merely to accept love. In order to be comfortable, they must be shown how they can return it.

Anger, as well as love, can be creative, for both are expressions or modes of energy. But love contains more energy than anger. Love as a sentiment is more

inclusive and attracts to itself more energies than anger. Love involves the very principle and essence of continuity of life itself. Love is more lasting. If considered as an instrument, it can be more efficiently and effectively wielded, has better aim, has a better fulcrum or Point of vantage than anger. Love gains a stronger and more lasting approval from the rest of mankind. The probabilities in favor of its winning over anger in the long run are strong.

Please note that at this point I am not saying that everyone has or will have a feeling of love for his opponents. I am merely saying that such love is essential for completely successful individual non-violent resistance. It is the mode of action of that method which we are now trying to understand.

If, as a matter of fact, however, one party to a contest cannot develop any such creative attitude toward the conflict or toward his opponent, he should certain-

ly be honest and true to himself. As Hocking says, ¹.

"Unless I am, in fact, so much of a seer to be a lover of my enemy, it is both futile and false to assume the behaviour of love: we can generally rely on the enemy to give such conduct its true name."

De Madariaga expresses detestation for "the person who goes about feeling like Bismark and speaking like Jesus Christ."² Gandhi said in reference to such a situation, "If you have a sword in your bosom, take it out and use it like a man," meaning, of course, that if you really wish to injure your enemy physically, then do it courageously. Christ disliked hypocrisy exceedingly, and perhaps this explains the fact that he did not explicitly forbid war itself. As long as men have uncontrollable anger and enmity in their feelings, it is better to ex-

1. Loc.-cit. p. 376.

2. Salvador de Madariaga—*Disarmament*—Conraed—McCann, Inc., New York, 1929, p. 362.

press it honestly and courageously than to be hypocritical and refuse to fight out of cowardice. Christ was searching for a change more profound and important than immediate external acts. He told men to get rid of fear and anger and greed, knowing that if this took place, war would disappear.

Not to use violence because you are afraid is worse than to use violence. He who refrains from fighting because he is afraid, really hates his enemy in his heart and wishes that circumstances would change so that he could hurt or destroy his opponent. Hence the energy of his hate is only suppressed because he does not use it. But he who has courage to fight and yet refrains, is the true non-violent resister. Because the coward fears he cannot love, and if he cannot love, he cannot be wholly successful in non-violent resistance. The psychological reason for that will appear as we go along.

As to whether and how men may learn to love their enemies despite an initial instinctive anger, we will discuss hereafter. The practice of non-violent resistance by groups will be considered in Chapters V and VI. The matter of non-violent resistance to theft or economic oppression will also be carefully discussed in a subsequent chapter.

III
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF NON-
VIOLENT RESISTANCE

(concluded)

We may now consider why a psychologically sounder method of solving a conflict is found in non-violent resistance than in reciprocal violence.

The first reason is partly physiological. It is because anger, hatred, rage and fear are such an enormous drain on our energy.¹ Hatred eats up our energies and our feelings and imaginations. If you hate a man sufficiently, you cannot get

I. Cf. Crile and Hocking previously cited.

him out of your mind, you are attached to him, you are his slave. The thought of him is an obsession ; it wastes most of your time. Anger is highly inefficient in both method and results.

If you would conquer another man, do it not by outside resistance but by creating inside his own personality an impulse too strong for his previous tendency. That is to say, reinforce your suggestion by making it become auto-suggestion in him, so that it lives by his energy instead of by yours. And yet that new impulse is not to conflict directly with his former urge, but to divert and blend with it and absorb it, so as to use the full psychological energy of both impulses. That is the wisest psychological dynamics and moral strategy.

The non-violent resister does not want a passive compliance from the attacker, such as would be secured by using successful counter-violence against him. He wants the full energy of the

attacker's active help. Therefore, he tries to make it easy and pleasant for the attacker to join forces in the new programme. He knows that the pattern of a peaceful stimulus to the violent one is more harmonious, more "voluminous," and therefore more potent and efficient than a violent, i. e., intense and painful, stimulus would be.¹

The non-violent resister has to expend much energy, but he applies it more intelligently than does the violent man. He selects the really important forces in the environment and seeks to alter them.² The angry and violent man is short-sighted. He puts too much emphasis on immediate objects and too little on the ultimate impelling forces behind them. Or, if he considers impelling forces, he does not analyze them sufficiently or go

1. See Wm. M. Marston—*Emotions of Normal People*—Kegan Paul, London, and Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1928, especially pp. 160-169, Chap. 13, and pp. 377-379.

2. Cf. Marston, above cited, Chap. XVII.

far enough back. He has to waste much energy because, as it were, he uses too short leverages in attempting to move or divert the opposing objects or forces. The non-violent resister, by using longer psychological leverages, may have to move more slowly sometimes, but the work is more efficiently done and tends to be more permanent.

W. A. White, a well-known American psychiatrist, in his book, *Mechanisms of Character Formation*,¹ speaking of conflicting desires or tendencies within an individual person, says (p. 274),

" It follows from all this that the symbolization of the conflict, either in the dream or in the symptoms of the neurosis or psychosis, will contain elements representative of both factors, and also that no solution of the conflict can come about except by the satisfaction of both these diametrically opposed tendencies. It follows, too, that no conflict can be solved at the level of the conflict.

1. Macmillan, New York, 1916. See also pp. 73 and 278.

That is, two mutually opposed tendencies can never unite their forces except at a higher level, in an all inclusive synthesis which lifts the whole situation to a level above that upon which the conflict rose."

Although Dr. White is here speaking of a conflict within the individual personality, it would hardly be disputed that the words would also apply to a conflict between two persons. You have the same clash of opposing streams or centres of energy. A solution which involves repression of one stream of energy would result, as all Freudians and people of wide experience agree, in trouble sooner or later. The repressed energy, the thwarted or defeated person, sooner or later, will find an outlet, a sort of revenge. It may be very indirect and not recognizable in its ultimate form. But it will come as surely as the laws of energetics hold true.

There is great wisdom in his two statements:

"No conflict can be solved at the level of the

conflict. That is, two mutually opposed tendencies can never unite their forces except at a higher level, in an all inclusive synthesis which lifts the whole situation to a level above that upon which the conflict rose."

Mutual physical violent struggle is an attempt to solve a contest "at the level of the conflict." The defeat of either party results in suppression or repression of the energy of the wishes or will of the defeated party. That inevitably results in waste and friction, often in revenge. Whereas non-violent resistance, followed up with moderate wisdom, bids fair to find a solution which will give satisfactory scope for the energies of both parties. Often it will enhance their energies, as a result of the subsequent good feeling. New associations will open up new channels for pleasurable and fruitful activity. A synthesis of both energies is similar to what the Freudians call a "sublimation."

It is substantially what Miss M. P.

Follett calls "integration." In her very thoughtful book, *Creative Experience*,¹ she has the most thorough and interesting discussion I have seen of the psychological principles involved in making wise settlements of conflicts. Discussing settlements of conflicts, she shows that either voluntary submission of one side, struggle and victory of one side over the other or a compromise, are all highly unsatisfactory and productive of further trouble. She then explains a fourth way, "integration."

Integration is arrived at by first analyzing the expressed desires or intentions of the opponents into their elements and more fundamental meanings. For instance, to take a simple case, an insistence on having a table in a certain place in a room might really mean a wish to have light on one's writing while working at the table, together with an inability to see how it could be secured

1. Longmans Green, New York, 1924, p. 157 et seq.

in any other way. The desire of Russia to control the Dardanelles may really mean a desire for security in free trade. Insistence upon a given kind of trade may mean a need for employment, a desire for money, and a desire to satisfy pride. An insistence upon political control of a certain territory may mean a need for food and industrial raw material and a desire to satisfy pride, and an inability to see how the satisfaction of these needs can be made wholly secure in any other way.

The integration consists of inventing and working out a wholly new solution, perhaps involving very different activities, which satisfies all or most of the fundamental desires and needs of both parties in the situation, and utilizes freely and fully the energies of both without balking or suppression. One can imagine how a need for food or security which has been stated and exercised in one set form, involving constraint of the

freedom of a certain person, might be attained in another way which would release that person's energies entirely and still guarantee the fundamental security of the other. Science has helped us to see that there are many possibilities in any situation. The integration requires preliminary analysis, then an invention of a new solution which gives free scope to the energies of all parties concerned. Inevitably the solution is satisfying all around.

She faces the fact that it takes much creative intelligence and ingenuity to find integrations, and admits that not all differences can be integrated immediately. Temporary compromises could be made, however, pending the further search and alterations due to passage of time, ending in an ultimate integration.

At page 171 she continues:

"The confronting of diverse interests each claiming right of way leads us to evaluate our interests, and valuation often is evolved into revaluation.....

in any other way. The desire of Russia to control the Dardanelles may really mean a desire for security in free trade. Insistence upon a given kind of trade may mean a need for employment, a desire for money, and a desire to satisfy pride. An insistence upon political control of a certain territory may mean a need for food and industrial raw material and a desire to satisfy pride, and an inability to see how the satisfaction of these needs can be made wholly secure in any other way.

The integration consists of inventing and working out a wholly new solution, perhaps involving very different activities, which satisfies all or most of the fundamental desires and needs of both parties in the situation, and utilizes freely and fully the energies of both without balking or suppression. One can imagine how a need for food or security which has been stated and exercised in one set form, involving constraint of the

freedom of a certain person, might be attained in another way which would release that person's energies entirely and still guarantee the fundamental security of the other. Science has helped us to see that there are many possibilities in any situation. The integration requires preliminary analysis, then an invention of a new solution which gives free scope to the energies of all parties concerned. Inevitably the solution is satisfying all around.

She faces the fact that it takes much creative intelligence and ingenuity to find integrations, and admits that not all differences can be integrated immediately. Temporary compromises could be made, however, pending the further search and alterations due to passage of time, ending in an ultimate integration.

At page 171 she continues :

" The confronting of diverse interests each claiming right of way leads us to evaluate our interests, and valuation often is evolved into revaluation.....

The revaluation of interests comes about in various ways. Consider what influences a change of opinion in regard to the League of Nations : (1) Changes in the situation which make me see my interests differently, (2) changes in myself caused by the situation, (3) other things which may give me a deeper understanding of this situation, (4) values when put together look different from the same values considered separately, for in the act of comparison there is a simultaneous view of all values in the field which register themselves in their relative claims, they acquire perspective. Values depend largely on relation. Certain values emerge as values when we are thinking of joining the League of Nations which we should not have considered if that question had not arisen."

In this connection it is well to remember the importance of love. Love for an opponent makes possible the sympathetic appreciation of the real meaning and value of the opponent's contentions, positions, and desires, and gives a willingness to approach them open-mindedly, and thus creates the right atmosphere for an integration of both sets of interests to a

higher plane of action. Also it induces a frame of mind in the opponent which leads him to understand *your* needs, contentions, etc. And it shows the opponent that you are so appreciative of his side of the case that he can safely trust you. In the psychological jiu-jitsu, love is needed to guide matters to a successful issue.

Miss Follett's idea of integration indicates that non-violent resistance, as an attitude or method, by itself does not necessarily settle all the conflict. It may be said to solve most of the emotional part—the fear, anger, pride, etc.—while the rest of the conflict may have to be solved by keen and perhaps prolonged intellectual exploration, with the new emotional attitude always at its elbow to help over the tight places.

These quotations from White and Follett also make it clear, why love is the most important factor in the attitude of the non-violent resister. We may state it somewhat as follows:—

If we are to find something which will overcome anger and fear, it must be in principle the opposite of them and stronger than they are. Usually we think of courage as the opposite of fear. But really courage is only a partial antithesis. Courage implies a readiness to fight, to risk oneself, to match strength against strength, intelligence against intelligence. Courage, like anger, implies an attempt to end the threat of the opposing force or person by driving it away, making it submissive or destroying it, but does not usually imply rising above it and utilizing its energy in a higher synthesis. That is to say, courage implies willingness to engage in conflict on the same plane in which the threatening force is found, perhaps because of an estimation of superior strength or perhaps because of a consciousness of or faith in a higher security, and this means trying to suppress the energy of the force opposed. But love involves not only a willingness to take

risks and face the threatening force, but also a desire and usually an ability to lift the conflict to a higher plane, and in that higher plane *utilizing* the energy of the opposing force in a higher integration or sublimation. Love is stronger than fear and anger; for one reason, because it is able to manipulate and guide their energy. It is more intelligent and far-seeing, as it were. It is also stronger because it is a more inclusive sentiment than fear or anger or hate, as has already been explained. Love means using in the moral sphere the principle of the resolution of forces, known to every schoolboy who has studied physics, instead of the wasteful principle of direct opposition and consequent waste of energy and unsatisfactory and only temporary results. Love does something better than conquer, for conquest implies destruction, submission and suppression. But love is more intelligent and tries not to allow any energy to go to waste.

In so far as life is made up of a flow

of energy, any principle is sound which increases the flow of energy, and makes possible the joining and mutual re-enforcement of two or more channels of energy. An increase of life energy gives power and joy.

So love is a great principle in moral mechanics. It does not suppress or thwart the energy behind fear and anger but uses it, and finds ways to steer it into channels desirable to both parties to the conflict. Fear and anger both involve, as we have seen, an idea of separation, a flight or a driving away or extinction. Love, on the other hand, involves the idea of unity and attraction. It is therefore the true opposite, the sound principle by which to eliminate fear, anger, pride, and all other divisive emotions and attitudes. This makes it clear, perhaps, why it has been said that "Perfect love casteth out fear."

From all this, it seems fairly clear that from a psychological and long-time

point of view, non-violent resistance is socially and politically desirable because of its *efficiency*.¹

When we come to consider the history and evolution of the instinct of pugnacity, we find further assurance of the validity of the method of non-violent resistance.

Hocking, in his *Human Nature and its Remaking* already cited, has at pp. 188-191 an exceedingly interesting discussion of this point which may be summarized as follows:—

In its original and crudest form pugnacity requires the destruction of its object. But with the higher animals and man destruction results in a partial defeat of one's total wish. The conqueror has enough interest in the survival of his opponent to want to see its chagrin and its acknowledgment of him as victor. The feeling 'I want destruction' becomes 'I want revenge.' But revenge likes to

(1) Cf. John Dewey—*Force and Coercion*—26 International Journal of Ethics 360-367. April 1916.

nurse itself and persist, and this tends toward prolonging the vanquished's life so as to enjoy his discomfiture to the utmost. And the intensity of hatred in the victims of ruthless revenge becomes a danger. So revenge develops into punishment. Punishment tries to inflict pain but without permanent injury. It discriminates between the *evil* of will of the opponent and the will itself, just as revenge distinguished between the will and the life. Punishment tries to get rid of "an evil element in the will of another while retaining the integrity of, and the regard for that will as a whole." The next step was a sort of therapeutic improvement, a discovery of a better way to cure an evil or defective element in an opponent's will. Punishment always resulted in some degree of bitterness or hatred, which interfered with the cure of the will. It was discovered that kindness and friendliness induce a desire in the opponent's own mind and heart to get rid of the

defect of difficulty, a sort of auto-suggestion which was most efficient. Thus long-continued experience has brought the shrewdest men to realize that the earlier and cruder expressions of pugnacity and anger "are not what the human being, on the whole, wants." What a person really wants is the richest and fullest possible expression of its energy, and to attain that completely there must be an equally rich and full expression of energy by all other persons. Such is the evolution of the instinct of pugnacity.¹

W. Trotter, in his *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*,² after describing the usual prejudices against non-violence and the idea that it would create

1. It is interesting to compare this evolution of the instinct of pugnacity with the evolution of the weapons of warfare as described in Col. J.F.C. Fuller's—*The Reformation of War*—Hutchinson & Co., Ltd. London, 1923. He argues strongly for the use of poison gas in warfare on the ground that it causes the smallest possible amount of destruction of life and property consistent with imposing one's will upon the enemy.

2. Macmillan, London and New York, 1916.

degeneration and disaster, goes on to say (p. 125):—

“The doctrine of pacifism is a perfectly natural development, and ultimately inevitable in an animal having an unlimited appetite for experience and an indestructible inheritance of social instinct.”.....

And at p. 123 :

“Altruism...is a characteristic of the gregarious animal, and is a perfectly normal and necessary development in him of his instinctive inheritance... The biologist...is aware that altruism...is the direct outcome of instinct, and that it is a source of strength because it is a source of union.”

And much more to the same effect, with comments on how these developments are always received with obloquy and derision and often by persecution by the more short-sighted members of the herd. Apparently certain instincts are of more use to the herd at an early stage of its development than at a later stage.

In all the preceding discussion, we have been thinking of a conflict between only two persons, in order to simplify and thereby better understand our prob-

lem. In subsequent chapters we will discuss its application to the rearing and education of children, the care of lunatics and irresponsible people, instances where killing takes place and where greater matters are at stake ; conflicts between an individual and a group, or between groups, complex encounters such as strikes, class war, lynching, judicial trial and punishments, civil war, international war.

But in any event, the discussion of these chapters seems to suggest that perhaps the East, as expressed by Buddha, Hindu ethics, the Jainas, Lao Tsu, Christ and Gandhi, has studied psychology and "behaviourism" more profoundly than any modern Westerners have yet succeeded in doing. The terminology may be different, but that does not make the conclusions less wise. The dense populations and prolonged ages of intense social experience of India, China and other Asiatic civilisations brought about an insight and realization of the psychologi-

cal validity of non-violent resistance. Modern development of swift means of communication and transportation, the shocks and suffering of the Great War, and the researches of Western psychology are perhaps tending to have the same effect as the dense population and long-sustained experience of the East ; thus, maybe, preparing the Western mind to realize the same truth.

IV

NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE AS A METHOD OF WAR

ALL the great authorities on the art and science of war agree that the ultimate object of war is to impose one's will upon the enemy.

Thus Von Clausewitz in his famous treatise, *On War*,¹ says (Vol. I, p. 2).

“War therefore is an act of violence intended to compel our opponent to fulfil our will...Violence, that is to say, physical force...is therefore the *means*; the compulsory submission of the enemy

1. Translated by Col. J. J. Graham, Kegan Paul, London, 1911.

to our will is the ultimate object. In order to attain this object fully, the enemy must be disarmed, and disarmament becomes, therefore, the immediate object of hostilities in theory."

Again, Marshall Foch, Commander-in-Chief of all the Allied forces in the Great War, in his book, *The Principles of War*,¹ says at page 311: "Modern war, to arrive at its ends, imposes its will upon the adversary."

Nor have the lessons and developments of the Great War altered this belief. For instance, Col. J. F. C. Fuller, D. S. O. in his book, *The Reformation of War*,² although he is strongly in favor of using the newest devices of war, such as disabling gas, airplanes, tanks and a mechanized army, nevertheless agrees with Clausewitz and Foch as to the ultimate goal and objective of war. It doesn't

1. American ed. Trans. by Major J. de Morinni H. K. Fly Co., New York, 1918 (reference is to pages in American ed.) English ed. trans. by H. Belloc. French ed. Bergar Levrault, Paris, 1917.

2. Hutchinson & Co. Ltd. London, 1923, at page 95.

make any difference what the war is "about," the ultimate purpose is the same. In proof of this it is interesting to note that the above statements are agreed to by Leon Trotsky, the organizer of the Russian "Red" Army,¹ and by Sun Tse, the old Chinese authority on war who wrote his treatise 2,400 years ago.²

Marshal Foch, in his book above cited, also shows very clearly that the method of war is primarily psychological, or what he calls "moral." At page 314 he says:—

"Where shall we find the method whose existence is now evident? Will it consist in the number of enemies killed? Is it a question of doing more harm by having more guns and more rifles, or better guns and better rifles than the enemy? Is superiority found merely in material advantages, or does it come from other causes? We must seek the answer in an analysis of the psychological phenomenon of battle."

1. L. Trotsky—*The Defence of Terrorism*—pp. 51-52. Allen & Unwin, London, 1921.

2. Sun Tse on the *Art of War*—Trans. by L. Giles: Luzac & Co., London, 1910.

After giving numerous examples he concludes:—(p. 316).

"Proofs and instances could be given indefinitely of that great importance of morale in war. Von der Goltz himself tells us that: 'It is not so much a question of destroying the enemy troops as of destroying their courage. Victory is yours as soon as you convince your opponent that his cause is lost.' And again: 'One defeats the enemy not by individual and complete annihilation, but by destroying his hopes of victory!'"

Marshal de Saxe said: "The secret of victory lies in the hearts of human beings."¹ Napoleon said, "In war the moral is to the physical as three is to one." Von Caemmerer, speaking of Von Clausewitz's book on war, says ² "As he pictures war, the struggle between the spiritual and moral forces on both sides is the centre of all."

Thus we see that war is, in both pur-

1. Sir Ian Hamilton—*The Soul and Body of the Army*—p. 134, Edw. Arnold, London, 1921.

2. Lt. General Von Caemmerer—*The Development of Startegical Science*—Translated. Published by Hugh Rees, Ltd., London, 1906.

pose and method, ultimately psychological, or what Foch calls "moral." Hence it would seem that non-violent resistance is perhaps in this respect more like war than we had imagined. Though war uses violence, the effect it aims at is psychological. Non-violent resistance also aims at and secures psychological effects, though by different means.

Are there any other resemblances between war and non-violent resistance? Let us see.

Von Clausewitz's principles of war have been summarized¹ as follows :

"Retaining the initiative, using the defensive as the decisive form of action, concentration of force at the decisive point, the determination of that point, the superiority of the moral factor to purely material resources, the proper relation between attack and defence, and the will to victory."

Other authorities state them somewhat differently, Foch, for instance,

1. See article on *Air Power* by A. A. Walser in *The 19th Century* for April 1923, p. 598.

laying more stress on the offensive. Nevertheless, Von Clausewitz is still regarded as one of the master minds in the art of warfare.

When we examine the above principles of grand strategy, we see that they all apply to non-violent resistance as well as to war. Let us discuss them.

We have seen in the previous chapters that the non-violent resister begins an entirely new line of conduct. He seizes and maintains the moral initiative. He uses the principles of surprise most effectively. Foch says of this,¹

"The way to destroy the enemy's morale, to show him that his cause is lost, is therefore surprise in every sense of the word, bringing into the struggle something 'unexpected and terrible', which therefore has a great effect. It deprives the enemy of the power to reflect, and consequently to discuss.

"It may be some new engine of war, possessed of novel powers of destruction, but that cannot be created at will."

We will let Foch have his terror be-

I. Loc. cit. p. 318.

cause he is talking of violent war, but we submit that the rest of the quotation applies equally strongly to the practice of non-violent resistance; and may not non-violent resistance be regarded as a "new engine of war?" Furthermore, all through the course of the encounter to the final settlement, we have seen that the non-violent resister is using tactics which maintain his initiative throughout.

Lord Nelson said,¹

"The measure may be thought bold, but I am of opinion the boldest are the safest."

And in the Prize Essay of the Royal United Service Institution for 1928, by Lt. Commander J. D. Prentice, we find the following passages: ² (p.235.)

"The introduction of new and untried manoeuvres has always been looked upon with distrust; yet it is only by some such introduction that a tactical surprise can be brought about.

1. Letter of Mar. 24, 1801—Nelson's Letter & Dispatches, Vol. IV, p. 295.

2. Journal of Royal United Service Institution, May 1929, Whitehall, London.

(p. 237.)

"In order to attain surprise of whatever kind, security must be disregarded to a certain extent ; risks must be taken. Whether it be the risk of pinning your faith upon some new and untried weapon, or of executing some apparently dangerous manoeuvre in the face of the enemy, or of weakening your forces in one part of the world in order to bring about a surprise concentration in another, that risk must be accepted. The greater the outward appearance of that risk, the greater will be the advantage gained by the resultant surprise.

(p. 239.)

"The best way to attain surprise is to do something which is apparently too risky, something which is, in the eyes of the enemy, an abandonment of security."

How apt all this is, in principle, to the surprise obtained by non-violent resistance! The surprise of non-violent resistance is effective partly because it is unexpected and partly because the opponent is so bound by his violent habits that he is ill-prepared to utilize the new tactics himself. He is like a wrestler

using European methods pitted against a Japanese using Jiu-jitsu.

This item from the principles of sea fighting suggests that the psychological advantage gained from the adoption of non-violent resistance is analogous to that derived from a sudden change of land base in naval warfare. The moral base of non-violent resistance is very different from that of violence.

Napoleon stated ¹

"It is an approved maxim in war, never to do what the enemy wishes you to do, for this reason alone, that he desires it. A field of battle, therefore, which he has previously studied and reconnoitred, should be avoided, and double care should be taken where he has had time to fortify and entrench. One consequence deducible from this principle is, never to attack a position in front which you can gain by turning."

Non-violent resistance acts fully in accord with this principle. Your violent opponent wants you to fight in the way to which he is accustomed. If you utterly

1. Napoleon's *Maxims of War*—Maxim XVI.

decline, and adopt a method wholly new to him, you have thereby gained an immediate tactical advantage. Again, non-violent resistance is not a direct counter-attack of force directly opposed to force. It is more of an indirect or flanking movement. Even in a mechanical resolution of forces, a way may always be found to turn a direct opposition into several lines of force at a different angle. Flanking movements have achieved successes all through the history of warfare. They are very sound strategy. So much for the principles of initiative and surprise.

As to "using the defensive as the decisive form of action," the non-violent resister in his external actions agrees with Von Clausewitz; but in respect to his psychological energies, he agrees with Foch; he is constantly "attacking," as it were, that is, energetically seeking the psychological road for a truly satisfactory solution of the conflict. His energy is

not used so much in opposition as in trying to open new and adequate and wise channels for the energies of both his opponents and himself to unite in and flow on together, and in removing defects from his own position. The resistance of non-violent resistance is not directed against the *energy* of the opponent's desires but merely against their immediate form or method. It seeks to discover for him a new and wiser channel for his energy.

Yet this does not mean reducing the conflict to a tame debating society. Although sometimes a safe and easy issue of the conflict may be found, the non-violent resister may feel assured of a fair probability that he will sooner or later have to suffer physically, in hardships anyway, and perhaps by wounds, imprisonment and sometimes death. We assume, you see, that he is really in earnest, really believes in his cause, is ready to sacrifice for it, and is no more a

coward than any soldier is. He must take risks. This is a real adventure—no parlour make-believe for softies or pretenders or boasters.

But non-violent resistance differs in one psychological respect from war. The object is not to make the opponent believe that he is crushed and beaten and humiliated, but to persuade him to realize that he can perhaps attain security, self-respect, comfort or whatever else his ultimate desire may be by easier and wiser and surer means than he saw formerly. The effort is furthermore to help him work out such new means, not rigidly or on any *a priori* plan, but flexibly in accordance with the deepest growing truth of the entire situation in all its bearings. The opponent's courage is not destroyed, but merely his belief that his will and desire must be satisfied in *his* way alone is altered, and he is led to see the situation in a broader, more fundamental and far-sighted way, so as to

work out a solution which will satisfy or more nearly satisfy both parties.

One might say that non-violent resistance is, externally, a warfare of position, like most of the Great War, while internally or psychologically it is warfare of movement, like earlier wars.

Does the non-violent resister "concentrate his force at the decisive point," and is he active in "the determination of that point?" He certainly is. He decides, with Marshal de Saxe, that "The secret of victory lies in the hearts of human beings," that is, that it is a matter of psychology. Therefore he concentrates upon the psychological forces in the situation, and deals with them as efficiently, subtly, and powerfully as he possibly can. And in so far as concentration means bringing strength to bear against weakness, he does that also, for in this moral or psychological field he is far more prepared and stronger than his opponent.

We need not dilate further upon the

belief and action of the non-violent resister in respect to the principle of the "superiority of the moral factor to purely material resources." He acts more sincerely upon that principle than did any soldier ever yet born.

"The proper relation between attack and defence" has been very searchingly considered by the non-violent resister. He knows that the best relation of all between these two energies is not one of opposition but of resolution, integration and sublimation. He thus enables both sides to win, and conquers both his own possible short-sightedness of aim and that of his enemy at the same time. The result is not a triumphant victor on the one side and a despondent, repressed vanquished on the other. Both sides are happy in the joint victory of their more important selves and the common defeat of their mistakes.

Does the non-violent resister have the "will to conquer" which Foch calls

"the first condition of victory?"¹ He surely does. Indeed, he must have an indomitable will to victory in order to endure the suffering put upon him. Moreover, he has a stronger incentive to win this way than the ordinary soldier has for war, for by this new way the final result is *sure* and settled permanently, and with a great release of energy and happiness for all concerned. No aftermath of resentment, hatred, bitterness or revenge. No necessity for further threats or force.

One principle of war that Foch stresses is that of economy of forces. Non-violent resistance is in accord, for it conserves and utilizes more of both physical and emotional and intellectual force or energy than do the methods of anger and physical struggle. It tends to immobilize the enemy who relies too much on physical force or terror, while preserving its own freedom and initiative.

Admiral Mahan said that "Com-

I. See his *Principles of War*, p. 316.

munications dominate war," and some modern authorities lay great stress on the importance of "intelligence," i.e., information, in war. But in the psychological realm, it may be said that non-violent resistance depends far less on communications and detailed information about your enemy's movements than does violent war. Non-violent resistance operates more in a non-spatial realm of ideas, attitudes and feelings, and therefore does not so much require constant communications in Mahan's sense of the word. The non-violent resister already has available the most important information of all, namely, as to how the human heart and mind work. He can rely on that to carry him very far.

Other writers would add mobility and endurance as important principles of military strategy. The mobility of the non-violent resister is both physical and psychological, chiefly the latter. It lies mainly in his active searching and

exploring constantly for new and better roads for the adjustment and settlement of the given conflict. His imagination and practical inventiveness are constantly on the alert. He is not fixed or dogmatic in regard to the details of any settlement. He keeps an open mind and is as ready to adopt his opponent's suggestions as his own or anyone else's for the settlement, provided they are compatible with the whole truth of the situation.

That he exercises endurance and takes steps to provide for it, goes without saying after all our previous discussion.

Those to whom non-violent resistance seems too purely defensive or passive to permit its being considered a method of war will do well to remember how the Russians defeated Napoleon by passively retreating into the heart of their country.

As Lt. General Von Caemmerer points out,¹

1. *The Development of Strategical Science.* (Trans.) Publ. by Hugh Rees, Ltd., London, 1905, p. 108.

108 GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

"The greatest success which the defence has ever secured was gained in this way in 1812 ; the *complete* annihilation of the truly enormous offensive army commanded by the most powerful and at the same time most experienced and most determined representative of strategic offensive was here the reward of such a method. Napoleon's world-empire, as a matter of fact, was wrecked by the *strength of the defence*."

Of course such tactics entail some great losses. Von Caemmerer, in the same paragraph also says,

"The farther back the point is situated on which the defence strives to bring about a favourable turn of affairs, the more territory, it is true, falls meanwhile into the hands of the assailant, and has to bear all the miseries of war : but then also the greater will be, of course, the consequences of the victory gained by the defence, and the more terrible will be the reverse for the assailant who has moved so far away from his own country."¹

We may say that in an encounter against non-violent resisters, the violent attackers get further and further away

1. See also Von Clausewitz *On War* in regard to defensive as an important part of strategy.

from their moral base, their self-respect (founded on truth) and the respect of others for them: and the non-violent resisters come closer and closer to the ultimate truth about themselves and their own cause, which is, so to say, the heart of their country. People who regard this analogy lightly will do well to remember that it was the imponderables which really won the Great War.

It might be urged that none of the above analogies can be valid because we have transferred the psychology of a conflict between two individuals to the case of a conflict between groups or between an individual and a group, and that such a change of conditions would wholly alter the psychology of the situation. There would, of course, be some alteration, but not enough, I think, to invalidate the analogies, for the following reason. The psychological factors upon which non-violent resistance works in the individual are such as are common to all mankind.

110 GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

They are to a much slighter extent those in which there is great variation between persons, such as matters of taste or book knowledge, etc. Hence I believe they operate with both groups and individuals.

If all these things above set forth be so, does it not help to make non-violent resistance seem as reasonable and sensible as war?

One interesting difference between war and non-violent resistance may here be noted. War proceeds upon the principle of "divide and rule." The superficial successes of that principle are to be seen all over the world, but they have not ended or adequately used the untold energies of hundreds of millions of people, in *every* country.

For this reason those successes are only superficial and only temporary. The suppressed energies will ultimately break out by reason of the inescapable psychological principles so clearly demonstrated by Freud and hundreds of other psychia-

trists. But if the principles of "divide and rule" are believed in by one party, the only way to win a lasting victory over him is to use the contrary principle of "unite and live co-operatively" employed by non-violent resistance.

We have spoken of non-violent resistance as a new and more efficient weapon of warfare. Let us examine that idea a little further.

"The leading masters of military science all agree that the larger principles of war are unchanging but that the methods of applying these principles are liable to change. If we examine records of past campaigns, we can find numerous instances which illustrate the danger of ignoring the modifications rendered necessary in the art of war by the discovery of a new weapon on the evolution of new tactics." ¹

Col. Fuller's whole book, above referred to, is built around the idea that new and highly effective weapons have recently been devised by science, such as poison

1. A. A. Walser—*Air Power*—19th Century, April, 1923, p. 598.

gas, airplanes, tanks, etc., and that the tactics of war must be radically altered in accordance therewith.¹

He argues (at pp. 28 and 29) that in war a nation should seek to impose its will on the enemy with the least possible ethical and economic loss. He points out that a nation which uses foul tactics degrades itself and loses prestige and the trust of other nations. Also that the destruction of the enemy's economic resources means the destruction of possible markets after the war is over. Hence the smaller the losses, the greater the victory. Killing is also an economic and moral loss. Killing the enemy's troops is only a means for the breaking of his will. But military minds have concentrated on this means until they have become obsessed with it. The passions of battle have enhanced the obsession until in the last war the parties nearly destroyed themselves in their effort to destroy each

1. See also his article on *The Progress of War* in the 19th Century for October, 1926, p. 481.

other. The post-war exhaustion has been so great that an effort should be made to devise a way of compelling an enemy to change his policy by bloodlessly defeating his army. He shows very forcibly that disabling and lethal gases are a tremendously powerful weapon of demoralization, and argues that they are far less destructive of life than bullets, shells and bayonets.

We would accept his logic almost throughout, except for his statistics of gas casualties on which he bases his conclusions. There is some doubt as to the accuracy of all statistics of gas casualties in the War because of the difficulty of differentiating in the field those dying from the effects of gas alone and those killed only by bullets, shells or other weapons than gas. Also the gases in future wars will certainly be far more severe in their effects than in the past, for the military mind clings to the idea of killing and the chemists have

114 GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

been working very industriously on the problem.

We would urge that the weapon that can demoralize without killing, is not gas, but non-violent resistance. We have indicated the reasons for our belief that this is the most efficient means for the ultimate aim that lies behind that purpose, namely, the altering of the enemy's will and the securing of a satisfying peace.

With that one alteration in regard to the final step, Col. Fuller's book is one of the strongest and most clearly reasoned arguments in favor of non-violent resistance that we have found anywhere. And coming from a military realist who is anxious to have warfare catch up with science—including the science of psychology—it should carry weight. In this connection Marshal Foch's warning may be pertinent—

“The military mind always imagines that the next war will be on the same lines as the last.

That has never been the case and never will be."¹

Mr. Walter Lippman, editor of the *New York World*, wrote an excellent article in the *Atlantic Monthly* ² for August 1928, on *The Political Equivalent of War*. After quoting from William James' essay on *A Moral Equivalent for War*, he said (p. 181),

"It is not sufficient to propose an equivalent for the military virtues. It is even more important to work out an equivalent for the military methods and objectives. For the institution of war is not merely an expression of the military spirit. It is not a mere release of certain subjective impulses clamouring for expression. It is also—and I think primarily—one of the ways by which great human decisions are made. If that is true, then the abolition of war depends primarily upon inventing and organizing other ways of deciding those issues which have hitherto been decided by war.....

p. 182.

"Any real program of peace must rest on the

1. See his *Principles of War*, previously cited, at p. 203.

2 Boston, Mass., U.S.A.

116 GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

premise that there will be causes of dispute as long as we can foresee, that these disputes have to be decided and that a way of deciding them must be found which is not war.".....

Such a way has been found. We have described its psychological mechanisms in Chapters I, II and III. It has actually been put in effect on a large scale. Corporate or mass non-violent resistance has actually been practised with excellent success, although certain inadequacies of news dissemination have not made the facts very widely known throughout the world. We will tell briefly of these instances in a subsequent chapter, but here we are merely concerned with the reasons why non-violent resistance is a new and efficient weapon of war. We have seen that it is strikingly like war in several important respects. Now let us look into the question of its efficiency.

V

THE EFFICIENCY OF NON-
VIOLENT RESISTANCE AS A
WEAPON OF WAR

HOW could non-violent resistance possibly be as effective as war?

One reason for the superior efficiency of non-violent resistance comes, as Col. Fuller suggests,¹ after we reflect upon the words inscribed under the statue of General Sherman in Washington—"The legitimate object of war is a more perfect peace." If the peace after the war is to

1. See his article, *The Progress of War*, in *The 19th Century* for October 1926, at pp. 483, 492 and 493.

be better than that which preceded it, must not the psychological processes of the conflict be such as will create a more perfect peace? You can't climb a mountain by constantly going down hill. Mutual violence inevitably breeds hatred, revenge and bitterness, a poor foundation for a more perfect peace. Is it then silly to say that the method of non-violent resistance, where there really is resistance, so as to bring all the issues out into the open, and a really new settlement worked out as nearly as possible in accord with the full truth of the issues at stake—is it silly to say that this will not bring a more perfect peace? Is not non-violent resistance then more effective than violence?

The second reason for the efficiency of non-violent resistance grows out of the object of war as stated at the beginning of Chapter IV, namely, to demoralize the enemy, to break his will, to destroy his confidence and enthusiasm.

As Hocking points out, "Morale is, at the bottom, a state of will or purpose." ¹ It seems to rest largely upon such factors as the individual soldier's confidence in himself, in his comrades, in his army, in his leaders, in the methods used, in the cause for which the war is being waged, in his government, in the civilians of the nation behind them all. It also contains such elements as a sense of being merged into the larger unity of the army, habit, tradition, humour, an appreciation of risk and a relish for adventure. ²

Suppose a group of non-violent resist-

1. W. E. Hocking—*Morale and its Enemies*—Yale University Press, New Haven, U.S.A. 1918, p. 151.

2. See Hocking—*Morale and its Enemies*; F. C. Bartlett—*Psychology and the Soldier*—Cambridge University Press, 1927; Lieut.-Col. L. C. Andrews—*Military Manpower* (Psychology of Military Training)—E. P. Dutton & Co., New York, 1920; H.G. Lord—*The Psychology of Courage*—Luce & Co., Boston, Mass., 1918; Sir Ian Hamilton—*The Soul and Body of the Army*—Edw. Arnold, London, 1921. Also an article by Bt. Lt.-Col. L. V. Bond, R. E., General Staff, on *The Principles of Field Service Regulations* in the Journal of the United Service Institution of India for July, 1921, Simla, India.

ers were opposed to a company of soldiers in the case of the strike, or some non-violent Philippinoes against United States soldiers, or Indians against British soldiers. Suppose also that the soldiers attempted some clubbing tactics or bayonet work. Let us assume also that the civilians had been non-violent from the start so that there is no shooting by the soldiers. (For the moment we will defer the case of a massacre due to the commander of the troops losing his head or using undue terrorism. That will be discussed later.) But suppose some violence by the soldiers, and arrests of the civilians. Also that the cause is strong enough so that as fast as any are arrested, others come to take their places. What, presumably, would be the effect on the morals of the soldiers?

To a certain extent the effect would be the same as that described in the preceding chapter where an individual person violently attacks a non-violent resister.

But the discipline and habits of the soldiers would largely prevent this from happening at first. The individual soldier's will has become merged with the general will of the army, and wholly subordinated to that of the commanding officer. He is used to rough tactics and is not at all squeamish about inflicting pain and injury on others.

Nevertheless, "one of the chief results of military training is to increase the suggestibility of the private".¹ Of course, as Rivers points out, this suggestibility is chiefly in relation to the officers, but no doubt the soldiers would also be very suggestible in relation to the acts and conduct of their opponents or "enemies," because such acts and conduct are the whole object toward which the morale of the soldiers has been built up. This

1. Rivers—*Instinct and the Unconscious*, p. 219, also 211-212. During the War, Rivers was on the staff of a British hospital for treating shell shock and other nervous diseases of soldiers.

is also indicated by the remarks of Von Clausewitz and Von Caemmerer previously quoted in Chapter II:—"War is a constant state of reciprocal action, the effects of which are mutual." "Every action in war is saturated with mental forces and effects. . . . War is a constant reciprocal effect of action of both parties." This fact then would presently tend to offset a little the discipline and hardness of the soldiers.

Undoubtedly the conduct of these civilians would cause surprise in the individual soldier and thus start him thinking. Frederick, the Great, wrote "If my soldiers began to think, not one would remain in the ranks." As soon as a soldier begins to think of certain sorts of things, he begins to be an individual, to separate himself from the mass mind, the will and personality of the army. One surgeon in the British army wrote, "The whole army training is designed for this one purpose of merging the

individual into the mass."¹ If, then, the soldier is made to think for himself in the midst of a conflict, it is the opening wedge for the disintegration of his morale. I do not mean to say that modern soldiers do no thinking at all, but it will be conceded that in these days of the printing press a very large proportion of all people do very little thinking for themselves. And among soldiers, this is still more true over a still wider range of affairs.

As the struggle proceeds, suppose the non-violent civilians maintain their discipline and keep cheerful but also keep stating their side of the case earnestly and in all sincerity. Sooner or later it is going to cause the soldiers to talk about it among themselves while off duty. The total absence of retaliation or vindictiveness of even looks or tone

1. T.H. Proctor—*The Motives of the Soldier*—31 International Journal of Ethics, p. 26 (Oct. 1920). In accord see Rivers—*Instinct and the Unconscious*, pp. 210, 211, 213.

of voice on the part of the civilians will be seen in contrast with the harsh or stern commands of their officers. The situation will tell on the nerves of both officers and soldiers. This sort of thing is new to them. They do not know just how to treat it. These civilians seem wholly inoffensive and harmless and honest. What is their crime? Why were we, soldiers, called out for such a job? We are for war work, but this is peace. Thus they will question in their minds and perhaps among themselves. They will begin to fraternize openly or surreptitiously with the civilians and prisoners, and learn more about the dispute or situation in which they are engaged. It will no longer appear to be a clear-cut case of right *vs.* wrong, but the opponent's case will appear to have more elements of reason in it.

If the officers forbid them to fraternize with these people, the soldiers will tend either to think that the order is

stupid or that the officers are afraid of something. This would lessen respect for their officers and lower the morale.

If there really is solid truth in the position of the non-violent resisters, the soldiers will presently begin to question the validity of the cause for which they have been called out. They may become somewhat slack in obeying orders. They will see no good to be gained by their being there, and no evil or danger to be averted. "When doubt comes, morale crumbles."¹ The Duke of Wellington put it even more forcefully—"No man with any scruples of conscience is fit to be a soldier." One of the important elements in a soldier's morale is his consciousness of being a protector.² If he is deprived of that, he feels useless and perhaps a little absurd. It is possible that matters

1. H. G. Lord--*The Psychology of Courage*, p. 150, above cited.

2. Hocking--*Morale and its Enemies*—p. 99, previously cited.

may even get to such a pass that the soldiers will feel that somehow the authorities or their officers have morally "let them down" or "sold" them. In such an event, their morale will go quickly.

Meanwhile the situation is very unpleasant for the officers too. If they make any serious mistake, they are apt to lose the respect of the private soldiers as well as of the general public. If they order any shooting, there is almost sure to be a wave of public indignation against them. They know how to fight, but they feel that this situation is "a mess." As Lt. Col. Andrews says,¹ "Officers naturally dread riot duty, with the uncertainties as to how to handle the many delicate situations." While there is no rioting here, the situation is felt to be just as delicate nevertheless, perhaps even more so. Soldiers are trained for action. This encounter is nearly all quiet. In-

I. *Military Manpower*, p. 175, above cited.

action is notoriously hard on a soldier's morale.¹

But you may object that non-violent resistance is so largely defensive, so passive, that it would be fully as hard on the morale of those using it as on that of the soldiers opposing them. Not so, however. The conduct of the non-violent resister is not one of mere passive waiting or edurance. Toward his opponent he is not aggressive physically, but his mind and emotions are exceedingly active, wrestling constantly with the problem of persuading the latter that he is mistaken, seeking proposals as to a better way out, examining his own cause and organization to see what mistakes or short-sightedness there may be in them, thinking constantly of all the possible ways of winning the truth for both sides. And among his own group he is ceaselessly

1. F. C. Bartlett—*Psychology and the Soldier*—Cambridge University Press, 1927, pp. 172-175; Hocking—*Morale and its Enemies*, p. 159, previously cited.

active in strengthening their organization, perfecting their discipline enlightening their understanding, helping them to remove every possible cause of reproach. He is as busy as any top sergeant of a regiment.

Most private soldiers are bored with monotony and irresponsibility. The conduct of these civilians will be new to them and will elicit their interest and attention all the more because of their previous boredom. It will be a relief and diversion to have something new to think about.

The courage and persistence of the non-violent resisters will tend to call forth the admiration of the soldiers and onlookers or general public. All parties begin to feel that the wrong method has been chosen by the authorities. They tend to feel that this is a matter for a court or arbitration or discussion of some sort. This feeling makes rifts between privates and officers and the higher command or civilian authorities.

If the situation should drag on for several weeks, the officers will tend to get even more restive. It is undignified to have to proceed thus against harmless, decent, defenceless people. They begin to feel themselves in a ludicrous position—unfairly treated. Neither the officers nor the privates can feel that they are protecting anyone or any property. That consciousness tends to lower self-respect.

Perhaps there has been a great campaign afloat to make this group of non-violent resisters seem very low in public esteem. They have perhaps been accused of bodily uncleanness, dirt, disorder, illiteracy, ignorance, bad manners, mental and moral degeneracy ; they are said to be “beyond the pale,” “barbarous,” “beneath contempt,” etc., etc. We all know that method of bolstering up one’s own pride and self-esteem. It is easy to find faults in a stranger, or differences that seem like faults ; and a little unconscious Phari-seeism helps immensely to increase one’s

morale and salve one's conscience. But the soldiers in immediate contact with them find that in fact they are clean, orderly, well disciplined, determined, intelligent, "very decent" in behaviour, and very courageous. It is impossible to be disgusted, disdainful, scornful or contemptuous of such men. And when respect begins, the instinct for fair play asserts itself. And by that time, morale is not very prominent. That such things can happen even in far more unlikely circumstances is proved by the fraternizing between the German and Allied troops on the first Christmas of the Great War.

Perhaps one of the officers loses his head, or believes in "making an example" and teaching by terror, and orders the soldiers to fire on the unarmed non-violent civil resisters, and many are wounded and killed. The effect is indeed electrical. The immediate beholders may be terror-stricken for a short time. But the news will spread inevitably, and the

public indignation and disgust toward the officer and those soldiers will be absolutely overpowering. Witness the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy in India. Those hundreds who died did more by their death in that manner to lower British self-respect and British prestige in every country, and to further the cause of Indian political freedom than could the deaths of thrice that number in violent rioting or attack upon the army. There have undoubtedly been similar cases of violence by American troops, French troops, troops of any and every nation which likes to consider itself a "trustee" for other nations, tribes or races. A similar case occurred in the United States in the winter of 1929, when Pennsylvania Coal Company police killed a miner on strike. Such deeds are not peculiar to any nation but only to a particular purpose and set of beliefs. The point to be emphasized, however, is that non-violent resistance, even in the extreme case where its users are killed, has a far higher pro-

132 GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

bability of weakening the morale of the violent opponents and of promoting the aim sought for than violent resistance would have.

As we are trying to be realists, let us also see what might happen where the soldiers use poison gas, either of a disabling or lethal kind, or bomb attacks by airplanes. This would not be a frequent occurrence, as the previous non-violence would not be apt to incite such an act from the soldiers. But it has happened. In such an event, there would temporarily cease to be direct effective contact between the soldiers and the non-violent resisters. Therefore, the morale of the soldiers would probably not be weakened. But I venture to assert that such an attack would add so many sympathizers to the ranks of the non-violent resisters from among their own people, that a very complete and effective trade boycott and "strike" of domestic or industrial work for all of the people on the side of the

soldiers could and probably would be organized. The economic pressure of such boycotts needs no very direct contact to be effective. It is felt tens of thousands of miles away, in the most distant countries. Such a boycott would cause far greater losses to such violent people than any temporary advantage from their terrorism. It would make such tactics much less probable in the future. And the reduction in number of such events gives the non-violent resisters other opportunities to weaken their opponents' morale.

Inasmuch as the government of those soldiers in question is seeking to impose its will upon the non-violent resisters, there will necessarily be parleys sooner or later between the non-violent resisters' leaders and the officers of that army or emissaries from that government. Such parleys mean contact, and contact means an opportunity to disturb morale, just as in the case of Brest-Litovsk.

Also it should be remembered that such ruthless deeds tend to become known to the world at large and then to lessen the respect of other nations for the nation indulging in them. A decrease of prestige is not relished by any nation nowadays. The government in question, besides receiving foreign censure, will be severely criticised by its own more decent citizens. They may create very considerable pressure of public opinion against the government and compel it to alter its practices. It is true that distant civilians who have been blinded by their own pride and long-continued propaganda are very often harder to touch than the hostile soldiers on the spot. The arm-chair warriors at home during the Great War were unbelievably cruel and hard, and worse in America than in England or France because they were farther away and felt realities less. Yet once their morale gets a little undermined, they crumble rapidly, for they have not

been subjected to the discipline of soldiers.

The experienced person will say that such events are always hidden by the censorship of such a government. Sometimes this is so. Acts of the American marines in Haiti and Nicaragua were hidden that way for months. The news of Jallianwala Bagh did not reach the United States for eight months after the event. But the tendency is for them to leak out sooner or later. People of all nationalities go to all parts of the world nowadays. Travel and trade are ubiquitous. Newspaper reporters are always keen for scenting a "story," and as soon as they learn of a censorship anywhere they are still more eager. The modern press services have long stimulated people's curiosity. And if curiosity finds itself balked or thwarted, it will never rest till the story is known. And Western nations are all so jealous of one another that each is eager to learn and publish something

discreditable to the others. (I am not trying to criticise, but merely to state facts—weaknesses among those who are addicted to violence, against which stronger forces of non-violence will effectively operate.) Any considerable struggle in which one side rigidly sticks to non-violent resistance with any degree of success makes wonderful news. It is so unusual and dramatic. Newspaper reporters and correspondents have a sense of “news value,” and can be trusted to try hard to evade government consorship.

Of course, powerful ruling groups and countries rely chiefly on pride, disdain and disgust to censor the news. They or their supporters vilify these protesting groups or nations, and the general repugnance thereby created act as a screen against the truth. Shand whom we cited at the beginning of Chap. II says (p. 448):—

“Repugnance, disgust and contempt tend to arrest and detain attention on the things which

excite them only so long as may be necessary to avoid them. Repugnance, disgust and contempt tend to exclude wonder in relation to their objects. . . . (p. 378) Disgust tends to exclude curiosity about its object and all further knowledge of it. . . . Disgust tends to repress pity and all disinterested sorrow on behalf of its object."

Every trade unionist knows the truth of this out of his own hard experience. So also do the negroes, Chinese and Indians, poor immigrants in the United States, and many others. Intelligent people all over the world should be very much on their guard when they see any disdainful or vilifying newspaper stories, articles or books about any group or nation other than their own, or any statements making subtle invidious comparisons of other people with themselves. Beware of self-flattery! Whether or not such articles or books or accounts were written or told intentionally or innocently, the result is to hide the more important facts and truths in the situation. I do

not mean that one should not see all aspects of every situation fully and clearly but merely remember that adverse criticism is dangerous to the person who uses it or absorbs it.

But any repressed or oppressed groups anywhere may also be sure that sincere non-violent resistance on their own part will surely break down such barriers and rouse curiosity, respect and wonder enough to bring forth enough of the truth to bring about a far more satisfactory adjustment of the conflict.

In Col. Fuller's book previously cited, we find this statement at p. 70:—

“ Chivalry, in the broadest sense of the word, is the cultivation of respect in an enemy for or by his opponent. . . . The side which, in war, first attains a superiority in chivalry is the side which attains a spiritual victory over its enemy, a victory which normally not only precedes a material success but which wins the ethical objective of war, which is the true foundation of the peace which follows it.”

And at p. 64 :—

“ As the military object of war is to defeat the enemy and as the economic object is to add to the prosperity of the nation, so is the ethical object to enhance the national character, that is, to increase its respect in the eyes not only of the enemy but of neutral nations. A man who fights cleanly is always applauded even if he lose; consequently, under certain circumstances, it is even more important to win the ethical objective than the military one---these circumstances depending almost entirely on the mentality of the combatants.”

But the non-violent resisters must realize that they cannot lower the prestige of their opponents or create dissension among their opponents' supporters until they break through the censorship of governments, press associations, or disdain; that they cannot break through these consorships until they have conducted themselves with high excellence, cleanness and courage so as to compel respect, admiration and wonder. Therefore their chief efforts should be not in

talking to reporters or appealing for help from outsiders, but with themselves, to increase their own discipline and organization, their courage and courtesy and intelligence and cleanness and order. They should strive for such details even as clean bodies, clean clothes, clean houses, clean streets, clean talk. Military discipline is thorough and detailed like this. Non-violent discipline must be the same. For these reasons there is need for the utmost energy and determination and persistence and will-power on the part of non-violent resisters whether they be national groups or labor unions or what not. It is chiefly directed toward themselves and hence will not arouse outside opposition. They will compel respect when they deserve it and not before. And when they can compel respect, they are on the road to upsetting their opponents' morale.

One more policy of ruthlessness must be considered, namely, that of starvation.

This was used against the Germans with fearful effect during the war. But it is a weapon that cuts both ways. It not only weakened the Germans greatly during the war but so interfered with their recuperative ability after the "peace" that it reduced the prosperity of the whole world. The Allied bankers and merchants are still suffering from the German loss of purchasing power. Even the militarists are beginning to realize this.¹ The great naval nations will hesitate before they try that weapon against a whole nation.

Against smaller groups they might attempt starvation, but if such groups are really in earnest, have a good cause, and maintain good discipline, their resistance will surely affect public opinion and lower the morale of their opponents. Compare, for instance, the effect of Mac Swiney's hunger strike in prison during the Irish struggle for freedom.

1. See Col. Fuller's book, above cited, at p. 95.

142 GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

Of course certain forms of economic pressure, such as low wages, adverse tariffs, and various discriminatory trading and other practices, may amount to slow starvation. We are confining ourselves in this chapter to the relatively rapid processes and openly avowed practices of war or open conflict. The more gradual impoverishment will be discussed in a later chapter on the economic aspects of non-violent resistance.

Any persons who feel aggrieved by the policies of the ruling groups of either the British Empire or the United States may count on help from one further element in the situation. It relies in the strong desire of the peoples of those countries always to justify their conduct morally, to give it at least a moral tone or appearance.¹ This was well shown by

1. See *Englishmen, Frenchmen, Spaniards: an Essay in Comparative Psychology* by Salvador de Madariaga, pp. 27 and 58. Oxford University Press, London. 1928.

the extent to which the invasion of Belgium by the Germans in 1914 was used by Britain and the Allies to stiffen their own morale and secure help from neutrals. It enabled them to play the part of chivalrous defenders of the weak.¹ It served to cover up many mistakes, faults and evils of the Allies, and kept them all feeling splendidly self-righteous for several years, at least till the secret treaties leaked out. Most people want to appear highly moral, especially all with the Anglo-Saxon cast of mind. The political effect of this attitude of mind is a desire for and reliance upon what is known as prestige—a superiority-complex which is designed to create an inferiority-complex among other races or nations, and thus make the task of dominating somewhat easier.

The maintenance of this prestige requires respect or awe or fear from

1. Cf. *The Motives of the Soldier* by T. H. Proctor, 31 Int. J. of Ethics 26, at p. 34, Oct. 1920.

others. Now if any of these Anglo-Saxon governments or ruling groups engage in harsh violence against a group of truly non-violent resisters, the news will surely leak out sooner or later and considerably lessen the prestige of that ruling group in the eyes of the rest of the world. Also in the eyes of the more honest and intelligent persons among the nation in question. The highly moral attitude and tone of the professions of that government begin to look a little thin and ludicrous. Dignity and prestige are very difficult to preserve against a background of such inconsistencies. This is equivalent to a weakening of the morale of that governing group. After all, public opinion all over the world condemns ruthless violence and cruelty as such, once the cloak of disgust, disdain or fear propaganda has been removed. We are no longer living in the days of Jenghis Khan or Attila or Nebuchadnezzar. The way in which the world res-

ponded to the German attack on Belgium proves this, wholly aside from any question as to the Allies' sincerity in playing on the appeal. Thus the need of those who rely on prestige, for respect from the rest of the world, becomes a weak spot in their armour, a heel of Achilles, the minute that they do an act which does not deserve or actually win respect. The non-violent resister's weapon of love of truth is directed immediately at this weak spot and pushed home with all courage and fortitude.

It is quite possible that to some readers this whole chapter will seem to be built up upon a structure of theory and false assumptions. Who in this actual world of hard realities does, or ever would, for an instant, fear this so-called weapon of non-violent resistance? Pooh, pooh!

The answer is known by every candid student of history, every detective, secret-service man or C.I.D. officer, every really "hard-boiled" ruthless executive

of an American industrial corporation which has had a strike of employees, every American trade union leader, every leader of a subject people striving for political freedom. (I refer to Americans because they are rather violent—perhaps a result of their climate, their poly-national make-up and relatively short experience in living together as a nation). The answer is that every “blood-and-iron” type of governor fears non-violent resistance so much that he secretly hires the so-called *agents provocateurs* who go among the non-violent resisters and pretend to be one of them, and invite them to deeds of violence or actually throw bombs or do deeds of violence themselves. This was the method of the old Russian government under Tsardom. The rulers in power immediately make great outcry, stir up public indignation against “the miscreants,” call out the police or soldiery, and “repress the uprising” with considerable brutality,

meanwhile assuring the world that these are stern but necessary steps taken only in the interests of public safety, law and order. I do not for a moment deny that those striving for freedom or more privileges are not themselves often violent in the first instance. But if they are not violent, their opponents or the underlings of their opponents frequently stir up violence in order to take advantage of the public reaction against it. That they feel they need to adopt such tactics shows how much they fear non-violent resistance.

Non-violent resisters must face this fact without anger or bitterness. It is simply one item in the whole situation with which they have to contend. Their defence against it is to build up a thorough discipline of non-violence in thought, word and deed amongst every one of their members. They must see the whole meaning of what they are trying to do. They are trying to discipline and control the

emotion of anger and the instinct of pugnacity in the same way and to the same extent that military discipline controls the emotion of fear and the instinct of flight. Therefore, under this new discipline, violent words and actions directed against the opponent or his interests are to be made as traitorous to the cause as running away is in the army. Anger is to become as disgraceful and socially reprehensible as cowardice is now among schoolboys or soldiers.

Once that understanding and attitude and discipline are attained among the group of non-violent resisters, any *agent provocateur* who comes whispering among them or talking in their councils in favor of violence, retaliation or revenge will be immediately known for what he is, and ushered out. And the group will soon prove its tactics so clearly to the public that the latter will not be deceived by the act of an *agent provocateur*, bomb thrower or inflammatory speaker.

But is not human nature too weak for this discipline? Is it not impossible? No, not under proper training. It may take a few years to establish. It is said to take four years to make a good private soldier. New habits take time to become firm. "One lesson of the war is that discipline is effective in making good soldiers out of the most unpromising material."¹ This is as true of the control of discipline of anger as it is of the discipline of fear. It is proved by Gandhi's success with the perfectly ordinary human material among the peasantry of Bardoli district, whereby, as a result of several years of training, they conducted a wholly successful non-violent struggle against the government of Bombay Presidency for a revision of the method of assessing land taxes. Those few thousand simple and largely illiterate peasants won their fight on practically all the items of their original demands. A

1. *The motives of the Soldier*, by T. H. Proctor, 31 International Journal of Ethics 26, at p. 36. (Oct. 1920).

victory like this against the cleverest and most experienced ruling class in the world, is no small test of the efficacy of the method. More examples will be cited in a later chapter.

Napoleon said that the value of discipline is 75 per cent. of all the elements that go to make success in battle.¹ Foch wrote, "Discipline constitutes the main strength of armies."² The Duke of Wellington said, "Nature! Habit is ten times nature."³ This is just as true of the non-violent discipline as of the discipline in violence. Gandhi realized this when he called off the struggle for Indian political independence in 1922 after the Chauri-Chaura riots. He was sure that non-violent resistance was the only way by which India could gain her political freedom. He tried to teach and train

1. Lt. Col. S. C. Andrews, *Military Manpower*, p. 17, cited above.

2. Foch, *Principles of War*, p. 99, above cited.

3. Cf. William James' chapter on Habit, in his *Principles of Psychology*.

India to use that weapon. But when many did not understand the new method or failed in their self-control so that there were riots in Bombay in November, 1921 and again in Chauri-Chaura in early 1922, he saw that they were not sufficiently disciplined. He could no more wage *his* kind of war with the people so undisciplined than Napoleon or Foch could win *their* kind without discipline. Therefore, he very wisely declined battle. But that did not mean that the *method* was a failure, but only that the new discipline was not sufficiently understood nor the training sufficiently prolonged. His hostile Indian critics in this matter did not understand the new method. Some of his formal opponents understood him better and appraised the power of his weapon more truly.

Sir George Lloyd, at that time Governor of Bombay Presidency, in an interview with Mr. Drew Pearson, said:—¹

1. Quoted from article by C. F. Andrews—*The Coming Crisis in India*, in *The New Republic*, New York, April 3, 1929.

152 GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

"He gave us a scare! His program filled our jails. You can't go on arresting people for ever, you know—not when there are 319,000,000 of them. And if they had taken his next step and refused to pay taxes! God knows where we would have been.

"Gandhi's was the most colossal experiment in world history; and it came within an inch of succeeding. But he could'nt control men's passions. They became violent and he called off his program."

The failure at that time through lack of discipline no more proves that non-violent resistance is ineffective or futile or impossible than the many routs and flights in battle prove that armies and violence are ineffective and absurd. Nor do the deaths and sufferings of non-violent resisters in the past prove any more in this respect than the deaths and wounds of war. This was the first attempt to organize and discipline a large army of non-violent resisters. Is it surprising that there was enough undiscipline and misunderstanding to make it necessary to call a halt, execute a strategic retreat and

begin to reform the ranks and train them more intensively and fundamentally?

As a matter of fact, there was proportionately more misunderstanding and lack of discipline among the literate and "intelligencia" of India than among the illiterate peasantry. This is natural, because absorption of Western ways of thinking was an influence in favor of Western ways. Mental habit is strong, and so it was not easy for the "intelligencia" to understand this new concept and discipline. This largely accounts also for the misunderstanding of Gandhi in the West. In reality he is one of the greatest strategists and statesmen of all history.

Up till now, pacifists (the term is a misnomer) have not sufficiently realized either the possibilities of joint, corporate action in non-violent resistance, nor the necessity for discipline, nor the kind and intensity and many-sided details of that

discipline.¹ They should learn from their friends, the militarists.

Bertrand Russell quite truly said:²

"Passive resistance, if it were adopted deliberately by the will of the whole nation, with the same measure of courage and discipline which is now displayed, might achieve a far more perfect protection for what is good in national life than armies and navies can ever achieve, without demanding the carnage and waste and welter of brutality involved in modern war."

He goes on in the same article to show how it would work if, for instance, England were invaded by a German army of conquest, and Englishmen used non-violent resistance.

The failures and apparent futilities of non-violent resistance in the past have been due, I believe, very largely to

1. Cf. Ernst Toller—*Man and the Masses* (Masse-mensch), Trans. by L. Untermeyer,—Doubleday, Page & Co., New York, 1924.

2. B. Russell—*War and Non-Resistance*—116 *Atlantic Monthly* 266 (Aug. 1915),—Boston, U. S. A. Reprinted in his book, *Justice in War Time*—Allen & Unwin, London, 1924.

lack of discipline as well as to lack of understanding of the full implications and requirements of method. Of course, there are sure to be some casualties and losses under it, even at its best. But provided there is discipline and intelligent leadership which fully understands the psychological mechanisms and the moral and spiritual elements involved, I am convinced that the losses will be much less than in violent war. The calculus of moral probabilities gives this answer, and historical examples of its intelligent practice proves it, as will appear in a subsequent chapter. Even in the case of individual encounters, if the method is used with understanding or faith, and complete sincerity, the chances of failure or death are less, I believe, than if violence is relied upon. And, of course, even where death occurs the cause for which the man died may triumph in spite of or even because of his death. The validity of the method is to be tested.

mainly by its ability to achieve success for the causes in which it is used, but also partly by its ability to achieve such results with less destruction of life, physical injury or destruction of property than when violence is used. On both these points non-violent resistance wins, provided the discipline, understanding and leadership are sound. And all these are as possible as in the case of military methods.

Everyone knows that an army can be very effective without every soldier in it, or even a majority of them, being individual paragons of intelligence and military virtue. Discipline removes most of the effect of their individual weaknesses and adds momentum to their virtues. It is the same with a group or army of disciplined non-violent resisters. If their leaders have the requisite attitude, understanding and intelligence, the rank and file may be ordinary human material at the start. Of course, the new training and discipline will improve them enormously, but that

effect is also asserted for military discipline. Presumably, the smaller the group, the more complete the discipline and understanding must be. Individuals using non-violent resistance alone would require more self-control and ability to do it successfully than is needed for a disciplined group. But even here the inner attitude and emotional understanding and control are much more important than any intellectual ability or experience in the rough-and-tumble world. Indeed, in certain situations so-called "intellect" and experience count for almost nothing.

Hence it does not appear necessary that every single person in a nation seeking freedom by non-violent resistance must be fully disciplined to non-violence, any more than every single citizen in a nation at war must be fully disciplined for active battle and wholly fearless under attack. Yet it is just as possible for whole nations to *understand* the idea and to be so self-disciplined as to give the "troops"

158 GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

hearty support and do nothing (as by outbreaks of anger and violence, riots, etc.) to interfere with their operations, as it is the case of whole nations understanding war and supporting their armies in time of war.

“But,” says the shrewd critic, “even if we grant the efficiency of this new weapon provided it could once get under way, would it not quickly be rendered impossible by merely imprisoning or deporting for life the few leaders who understand it and see its possibilities?” The answer is, No. The idea has already gone too far. New leaders would spring up as fast as you arrest the old ones. Nowadays you can’t arrest quiet, steady, industrious, gentle people for nothing. Non-violence is decency to the n^{th} power. Governments, after all, have to make some appearance of existing for the welfare of their peoples. Wholesale arrests for the practice of virtue can’t continue very long. The example of those few leaders is so strik-

ing that their execution or life imprisonment would be dangerous to governments. Governmental prestige both at home and abroad would suffer too heavily. The discipline of non-violent resistance begins at home and can be acquired in simple daily living. It requires no marching or external drilling or carrying of arms. Therefore, once the idea gets understood, the governments, captains of industry, and strong powers of the world will have to begin to make good their professions and assertions that they exist for the benefit of the governed, or are the servants of their people.

Nor need the governors be fearful. Non-violent resistance will break down very quickly, if the cause of its adherents is not sound. In order to be successful it *must* be true. It tests the sincerity of both its users and their opponents. No governor will be willing openly to oppose the truth ; and if he is intelligent, he will want to get it on his side

or get on its side as quickly and smoothly as possible. The governors will sleep much more restfully, if they become more virtuous and open-minded and willing to learn than many of them are now. The discipline and good order developed and required for the successful practice of non-violent resistance creates the finest citizenry imaginable. It evokes trust from all sides. *Everybody* will be much more secure and happy, the governors included. They will discover unexpected delights and unlooked for prosperities for themselves as soon as they have shared their privileges a little more widely and thus unlocked the pent-up energies of mankind—the means of all wealth.

We can now see that non-violent resistance “reduces the utility of armaments as instruments of policy,” to use de Madarioga’s phrase.¹ It does so partly in

1. Salvador de Madarioga—*Disarmament*, p. 60—Oxford University Press, London, 1929; Coward-McCann Inc., New York,

direct and positive manner, proposing and aiding in the creation of new terms of settlement, new roads out of conflict. It also does so by disintegrating the morale of the opponents, the morale of troops, of commanders, of civil authorities and of their home civilian populations. It acts like the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk to raise opposition at home to the policy of the opposing government. In case of industrial strikes, it would tend to raise doubts in the minds of stockholders of the corporation involved. It tends to lower the prestige of any controlling power or group who are not acting as absolutely sensitive and true trustees or servants of the peoples within their governance.

Col. Fuller in his book heretofore quoted ¹ says at p. 46.

"The principle of demoralization has for its object the destruction of this morale; first, in the

1. *The Reformation of War* by Col. J. F. C. Fuller, D. S. O., Hutchinson & Co., London, 1923.

162 · GANDHI'S NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

moral attack against the spirit and nerves of the enemy's nation and government ; secondly, against this nation's policy ; thirdly, against the plan of its commander-in-chief ; and fourthly, against the morale of the soldiers commanded by him. Hitherto the fourth, the least important of these objections, has been considered by the traditionally-minded soldiers as the sole psychological objective of this great principle. In the last Great War the result of this was.....that the attack on the remaining three only slowly evolved during days of stress and because of a faulty appreciation of this principle during peace time."

Non-violent resistance does operate to lower all these different kinds of morale, and it may be effectively aided by economic boycotts or in some extreme instances, perhaps, by non-payment of taxes. The object is not to "deliver a moral blow," but to help change and even recreate the attitude and desires of the opponents, to lead them to see their aims in a broader aspect, to seek adjustments that will release and utilize harmoniously the energies of both parties. If the oppo-

nents are unusually obstinate and short-sighted, economic non-co-operation will usually help to stimulate their thought to good ends.

We see, therefore, that non-violent resistance is not wholly unlike the ideas for which Col. Fuller is contending, and which many nations today seem to be following. It is merely a step further in the logic, and in military history.

It is a characteristic of war that whenever a new weapon of attack is invented, an effective means of defence is soon found. This is true also in the case of the new weapon of non-violent resistance. The defence against it is for the opponent to correct his mistakes and to learn a sounder way to satisfy his desires and needs. By so doing he removes both the cause of that particular conflict and that particular weakness in his own armor, and will probably not be subject to "attack" on that same point again. And curiously, this very effective

defence does not cause chagrin in his former opponent, the non-violent resister, for they have become friends or at least better acquaintances, and one man's gain in that instance is not the other man's loss.

In cases where Asiatics have tried to relieve themselves of the economic and military pressure of European domination, they have complained that the West cannot understand any language but that of force. If that is true, it means that the West will be utterly unprepared and helpless in the face of well-disciplined, thoroughly organized and wisely led non-violent resistance, especially if it is accompanied by an equally thorough economic boycott. The strategic principle of surprise would operate most dramatically and effectively. To use non-violent resistance against the West would be complying with Napoleon's Sixteenth Maxim of War quoted above. But I am inclined to think that the West will come

to understand the new language fairly soon, once it is shown to be strong language. The above quotation from Sir George Lloyd seems to indicate a partial understanding of the new language, and considerable worry to boot. The West is in this respect something like a baby who begins to understand what words mean before he can say any of them himself. And there can be no doubt that the West understands the language of economic boycott and decreasing profits reasonably well. No doubt the West is reluctant to alter its ways, but that is a different matter. To the extent that the West does come to understand the new language more deeply, its advance will make settlements and readjustments quicker and easier.

In summary, we see that non-violent resistance resembles war :

1. In having a psychological and moral aim and effect,
2. In principles of strategy,

3. In a discipline of a parallel emotion and instinct,
4. As a method of settling great disputes and conflicts,
5. In operating against the morale of the opponents,
6. In requiring courage, dynamic energy, capacity to endure fatigue and suffering, self-sacrifice, self-control, chivalry, action,
7. In being positive and powerful,
8. In affording opportunity of service for a large idea, and for glory.

May we not then fairly describe it as a new and better weapon of war ?

It is realistic in that it does not eliminate or attempt to eliminate possibilities of conflict and differences of interest, and includes *all* factors in the situation both material and imponderable, physical and psychological.

It does not avoid hardships, suffering wounds or even death. In using it men

and women may still risk their lives and fortunes and sacrifice all. Nevertheless, the possibilities of casualties and death are greatly reduced under it, and they are all voluntarily suffered and not imposed by the non-violent resisters.

It does not require any nation to surrender any part of its real sovereignty or right of decision, as a league of nations would.

It does not surrender the right of self-defence, although it radically alters the nature of the defence.

It requires no expensive weapons or armament, no drill grounds or secrecy.

It is a weapon that can be used equally well by small or large nations, small or large groups, by the apparently weak and by the apparently strong, and even by individuals.

It compels both sides and neutrals to seek the truth, whereas war blinds both sides and neutrals to the truth.

It is for each person to do and

practice at home, abroad and in every situation of life. It is not something that can be done only by a government or by a large wealthy organization. The responsibility and the opportunity to practise it and acquire the discipline is here and now for every individual person from childhood up.

It may be practised by any and all races, nations, tribes, groups, classes or castes, young and old, rich and poor, men and women.

Inasmuch as some of the elements involved are essentially the same as trust, they have the same energizing effect as financial credit, only more so. Thus it stimulates and mobilizes, during the conflict and for a long time thereafter, all the idealism and energy of all groups and parties.

It does not truly impoverish either its users or their opponents.

It is much superior to William James' suggestion for a "moral equivalent for

war," in that it does not require State organization, direction or assistance, it is not used against the exterior forces and conditions of Nature but against human wrongs and evils. It is, therefore, much more dramatic and interesting and alluring, both for young men and old, and women, too. It has even more possibilities of high daring adventure, risk, bravery, endurance, and truly fine and noble romance than any of the chivalrous violent fighting of by-gone ages.

May we not, therefore, say of it in the words which Marshal Foch used in reference to a different occasion :—"The new kind of war has begun, the hearts of soldiers have become a new weapon."¹

1 *Principles of War*, p. 32.