



Religion, Practice and Science of Non-Violence



O. P. JAGGI



Aggression and violence—like hunger and sex—is an instinct in all living beings, animals or vegetables. A certain amount and quality of aggression is essential for men's survival and progress. But there is a limit beyond which aggression defeats its own purpose and becomes destructive. This has been observed and pondered over by sages and wise men since ancient times. As a result, all religions teach non-violence. There are organizations devoted to lead men through non-violent means. Non-violent resistance and *Satyagraha* endeavour to secure social justice for the individual or the society through one's own suffering rather than that of the opponent. All these measures have, however, succeeded to an extent only.

The author poses a problem—Is there then any hope that we may succeed in lessening violence around us? According to him there is a way, and that is through a scientific understanding of the basis of violence in man, and taking appropriate measures as a result of that.

RELIGION, PRACTICE AND SCIENCE OF NON-VIOLENCE

by the same author:

Friends of India: Biographical Profiles

Scientists of India and Their Achievements

History of Science and Technology in India:

Vol. 1 Dawn of Indian Technology

Vol. 2 Dawn of Indian Science

Vol. 3 Folk Medicine

Vol. 4 Indian System of Medicine

Vol. 5 Yogic and Tantric Medicine

A Concise History of Science including Science in India

Home Medical Handbook

Asthma and Other Allergies

Mental Tension and its Cure

RELIGION, PRACTICE AND SCIENCE OF NON-VIOLENCE

by
Dr. O. P. JAGGI
M.D., Ph.D.



***Munshiram Manoharlal
Publishers Pvt. Ltd.***

First Published August 1974
© 1973, Jaggi, Om Prakash (b. 1929)
Published by
Munshiram Manoharlal
Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
54, Rani Jhansi Road
New Delhi 110055.
Printed in India by
Agra Printing Works, Delhi 110032.

Edited by Mrs. Shashi Jain

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Preface	vii

1

Religion and Non-Violence 1-48

Hinduism	1
Jainism	7
Buddhism	12
Chinese Teacher-Sages	22
Islamism	27
Judaism	31
Christianity	33
Other Religious Groups and Societies	41

2

Practice of Non-Violence 49-88

Non-Violent Resistance	49
Adin Ballou's Non-Violent Resistance	49
Thoreau's 'Civil Disobedience'	52
<i>Satyagraha</i>	54
Principle	54
Practice	60
<i>Satyagraha</i> Campaigns	62
Role of Peace Organizations	82

3

Scientific Study of Non-Violence 89-118

Animal Instincts in Human Behaviour	89
Evolution of Man	94
Individual Aggression and its Control	99
Group Aggression and its Control	109

4

Conclusion 119-120

Bibliography 121

Index 127

PREFACE

Today the environment of man—over-crowding on the global scale, increasing contact with other peoples and cultures, the widening gulf between the rich and the poor, ideological differences—is productive of increasing friction, aggression and violence. In modern times, this has taken a destructive and violent form.

Sages and prophets taught us to observe non-violence, but we paid only lip service to this principle. In the name of religion, we indulged in violence rather than non-violence; those who did so, thought they were earning a place for themselves in heaven.

Non-violence, not as an end but a means, has been used in India under the guidance and inspiration of Gandhi. So long as a *Satyagraha* struggle remained non-violent, it succeeded in attaining its objective.

But now-a-days no body practises *Satyagraha*. What is practised now in the name of *Satyagraha* is merely *Duragraha*—not a victory over the situation but over the opponent, through coercion and pressurizing. No one seems to understand—no one is willing to understand—*Satyagraha* as conceived and practised by Gandhi.

In our present-day world of conflict and violence, *Satyagraha* is a unique and faultless tool to bring about social justice; but today there is no individual or nation, willing to make use of it. Perhaps, like Buddhism, some day it will also flourish, not in the land of its birth, but away from it.

Is there, then, anything that we can do just now to lessen the violence around us? Yes, by trying to understand the basis of violence in man. What makes an individual violent? What makes a group of individuals violent?

The following pages are an attempt to understand the implication of these few questions.

Delhi
July 10, 1974

O.P. JAGGI

इदं नमः ऋषिभ्यः पूर्वजैभ्यः पूर्वैभ्यः पथिकृद्भ्यः
To the seers, our ancestors, the first path-makers.
(*Rgveda*, X, 14-25)

1

RELIGION AND NON-VIOLENCE

The principle of Non-Violence takes an important place in all the religions of the world. Saints, ascetics and prophets of all religions have preached it all along. Some religions limit its practice to human beings; others encompass all living beings. Some consider it the highest virtue; others regard it as second only to social justice.

We will discuss the concept of Non-Violence held by different religions of the world. In the final analysis we have to see whether religion has acted as a force in curbing violence; or has it, rather resorted to violent means to achieve its religious ends.

Hinduism

The concept of non-violence (*ahimsā*) in the Hindu religion has differed from one period to another; there are differences of opinion about it among the different systems of philosophy as well.

The Vedic Aryans were essentially agricultural-pastoral people. They lived in village communities and spent most of their time in the open. They were deeply affected by the apparently mysterious working of awe-inspiring forces of nature. The shining stars which followed a fixed and regular course across the sky, to them, were the *devas* (the shining ones), the gods. So also were lightning, thunder, rain and fire. The dependence of human welfare on the mercy of these mysterious forces, naturally led the Aryans to propitiate and worship them.

The Aryans worshipped and offered sacrifices to their gods—Indra, Varuna, Agni, etc.,—in time of peace as in time of war. They wanted a good prosperous life for themselves, and if there was an obstruction to it from another person, they requested their gods for his removal or annihilation. The oblations in their sacrifices included freshly killed animals. The Aryans of the Vedic Age believed in the Non-Violence of the gods; for the opponent they had no such scruples.

By the time of the Upanishads (800 BC), however, the trend had changed. Upanishadic seers devoted most of their time to finding the ultimate truth that lies behind the visible world. They strived after and found identity between the highest principle that manifests itself, the Brahma, and the individual self, the Ātman. They sought union of the Ātman with the Brahma, so as to attain *moksha*, liberation of the soul. In the process of this search they came to realize that doing good to others and living a virtuous life were preliminaries that could lead them to their goal. *Ahimsā* (Non-Violence) was one of these virtues and requisites.

Use of the word *ahimsā* in Hindu literature is found for the first time in *Chhândogya Upanishad*.¹ A verse in it says:

*Ath yat tapo dānam arjavam ahimsā
satyavacanum ity tā asya daksinah.*²

Whatever penance, charity, sincerity, the desire not to do harm and truthfulness are, these are his contributions (towards a symbolic sacrifice).

Another verse in *Chhândogya Upanishad* says: 'He who concentrates all his senses in the self, he who is harmless towards all creatures except at holy places, he who behaves thus throughout his life, reaches the Brahma world, does not return hither again, yea, he does not return hither again.'³

Chhândogya Upanishad mentions *ahimsā* as one, though not the first, requisite. *Sandilyopanishad*, one of the later creations, mentions *ahimsā* as the first ethical restraint (*yamas*); the others,

¹According to T.W. Rhys Davids, *Chhândogya Upanishad* may belong to seventh century BC (*Ency. of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. I. Article on Ahimsa by T.W. Rhys Davids, p. 230).

²*Ch. Up.*, 3.17.4

³*Ibid.*, 8.15.1. (tr. by S. Radhakrishnan, *The Principal Upanishads*, p. 512).

in the order mentioned here are: truthfulness, non-stealing, celibacy, compassion, rectitude, forbearance, temperance in food and cleanliness.

The Upanishads enjoined upon people and seers to observe *ahimsā*, yet there was no bar to offering animal sacrifices to the gods. In fact, it was a duty to offer such sacrifices when one went to holy places. Killing of the animals for sacrificial purposes was not considered an act contrary to *ahimsā*; through it one improved one's chances of reaching the Brahmaloka and attaining freedom from rebirth.

By the time of the Epics, the *Rāmāyana* and the *Mahābhārata*, the Indian subcontinent was politically divided into different empire states, each one headed by an Aryan emperor, king or chief. Religiously and socially, however, all were guided by a common religion, tradition and customs. The performance of one's duty (*svadharma*) in life according to one's caste (*varṇa*) and stage of life (*ashrama*) was strictly enjoined upon all. The duties of a Brāhmin (priest, teacher) differed from those of a Kshatriya (warrior), a Vaishya (trader) and of a Śudra (untouchable); furthermore, these duties varied at different stages of one's life: During the first stage of life, a *brahmachari* (celibate student) was to learn by serving his teacher; in the second stage, a *grihastha* (married man) was to earn his living and look after the family; in the third stage, a *vānprastha* (forest dweller) was to live his life in meditation in a jungle, and in the fourth stage, a *sannyasin* (a person who severs all connections with his worldly life) meditated, roamed about

¹Just as ancient Greeks had keen interest in natural philosophy, and the Romans for law and order, in the same way the Indians—Hindus, Jains and Buddhists—had a special aptitude for seeking and living a religious life. The most respected person in Indian society has always been the religious saint, and his ascetic teachings have permeated Indian culture at all times.

From the unreal lead me to the real;

From darkness lead me to light;

From death lead me to immortality.

Such an attitude on the part of an Indian ascetic is not born out of frustration following the failure to achieve a comfortable life with riches and amenities, but because he had fully realized that the comforts and riches of the world could never satisfy human mind. True happiness according to him, could be attained only by lessening the desires rather than by fulfilling the desires for worldly things and attachments.

and begged his living.¹ Each person was to live and abide by his duties, if he expected praise and reward in this world and the next.

The importance of observing a virtuous life was even more strictly enjoined upon in this period, yet the definition of a virtue, as for example of *ahimsā*, differed from caste to caste and from one stage of life to the next.

The *Mahābhārata*, gives the greatest importance to the observance of *ahimsā*:

*Ahimsā paramo dharma ahimsā paramam tapam
ahimsa paramam satyam tato dharmah pravartate.*¹

Ahimsā is the highest duty, it is again the highest penance:
It is also the highest truth from which all duty proceed.

Neither with eye nor with mind nor with voice

Should one injure another.

One should not disparage another,

Nor speak ill of another.

One should not hurt any living thing.

But one should be always of kindly conduct.

Even when one is angered, one should speak pleasantly;

And when insulted, answer with a blessing.²

That man who, renouncing all pride, humbly attends upon

And serves them who are venerable for age,

Who is imbued with learning, and shorn of lust,

Who regards all creatures equally with an eye of love

Who is righteous in his acts, and who is shorn

Of the desire of inflicting any kind of injury

That truly respectable man is adored in this world.³

Abstention from injury to all creatures

In thought, word and deed.⁴

Not for the sake of fruit or reward

Does he injure any creature

Or treat any one with hostility.⁵

¹*Mahābhārata*, Anuśasana Parva, 115, 25.

²*Ibid*, 12.278,4,5,6.

³*Ibid*, 10, 537, 538.

⁴*Ibid*, 12, 162, 21.

⁵*Ibid*, 12.268, 31.

One should abstain from all acts that are fraught
 With injury or malice,
 And seek to acquire a knowledge of the soul.
 Whether in need of food and of the necessities of life
 Or transcending such need,
 One should be of virtuous disposition.

That mode of living which is founded upon a total
 harmlessness towards all creatures or (in case of actual
 necessity) upon a minimum of such harm, is the highest
 morality.

Always look upon all creatures as one's own self.

Abstain totally from inflicting any kind of injury.¹

All acts that are done without injuring any creature

Become serviceable to the doer both here and hereafter.²

The *Mahābhārata* lays stress on the observance of *ahimsā*.
 But it clearly states that one's duty in life is even more
 important. If there is a conflict between the two, it prefers duty
 to *ahimsā*:

Duties have to be laid down for maintaining the various
 relations of the world. There are two things here: *viz.*,
 abstention from injury and injury done with religious
 motives. Of these two, that which brings in righteousness
 is preferable.³

This injunction of 'duty first *ahimsā* afterwards' is even more
 forcefully and explicitly stated in the *Bhagavadgita*. In the first
 chapter of the *Gita*, when Arjuna says:

I foresee no good will come

From killing one's own kindred in war.

Even though they slay me, I wish not to strike them.

How can we be happy, having slain our own kindred

Though they, with hearts deadened with avarice;

See not the evil that will come?⁴

Lord Krishna draws Arjuna's attention to the conduct
 expected of him. He says: "The duty of the Kshatriya is to

¹*Mahābhārata*, 12. 295. 24. 30.

²*Ibid*, 12. 264.6.

³*Ibid*, 5. 15. 17.

⁴*Bhagavad Gita*, 1. 31. 35. 37. 38.

fight for righteousness. War is an open door to heaven. Moreover, as a house-holder (*grihastha*) he should not follow the ideals of a monk (*sannyasin*).¹

According to the *Gita*, a Kshatriya whose duty is to fight to protect *dharma* cannot think in terms of *ahimsā*. For him, even killing an enemy in war, is a necessary act, a duty.

The law scripture of the Hindus, *Manu-Smṛiti* goes a step further in this direction. It says:

Yā vedavihitā himsā niyatāsmimścarācare ahimsāmeva tām vidyād vedād dharmo hi nirbabhau.

Because the whole Law has sprung from the Vedas, that violence which has been enjoined by the Vedas themselves in this mobile and immobile world must be accepted or recognised as non-violence.

As regards the six systems of Hindu philosophy (*Darśhanas*), the *Purva Mīmamsā* which accepts the authority of the Vedas, also takes a similar view of duty versus *ahimsā*. According to it, destruction of life which has scriptural sanction (*sāstriya himsā*) is good (*artha*) and justified because it causes more pleasure than pain. Killing an enemy is evil (*anartha*) only if it is not permitted by the scriptures (*śāstras*). Thus *ahimsā*, in the proper sense, is totally subordinated to Vedic justice and is part of it.

The *Vaiśeṣika* system of Hindu philosophy, on the other hand, differs from the limited view of *ahimsā* of the *Mahābhārata*, *Manu-Smṛiti* and the *Purva Mīmamsā*. According to it, observance of *ahimsā* is a duty of all castes (*varnas*) and in all stages of life (*ashramas*). Sāmkhya and Yoga, the two other orthodox systems of Hindu philosophy, attach even greater importance to the unlimited and unrestricted observance of *ahimsā*.

From the above discussion it will be seen that while Hindu religion and social order regarded the observance of *ahimsā* as a virtue, it did not allow it to stand in the way of one's observance of one's duties (*svadharma*) if there was a conflict between the two. On the other hand, Hindu philosophy (except for *Purva Mīmamsā*) enjoined upon all, irrespective of caste and stage of life, the strict observance of *ahimsā*.

¹*Bhagavad Gita*, II. 32.

Jainism

During the Vedic, Upanishadic and the Epic periods, many cumbersome rituals had crept in the religion. There were some people who did not like them, particularly the animal sacrifices which were part and parcel of such rituals. They believed in and practised unqualified *ahimsā*. By the time of the sixth century BC, such people, the Jainas, had increased appreciably in number and influence. This was mainly due to the personality and teaching of Mahavira, the twenty-fourth *Tirthankara* of the Jainas.

Vardhamana Mahavira was born in 540 BC, in a suburb of Vaisali, a city in the north-east of India. He was the son of a wealthy Kshatriya nobleman named Siddhartha. His mother, Trisala belonged to an eminent Lichchavi family. During his boyhood, Mahavira is said to have been very brave and courageous, playing with snakes and elephants alike. He was brought up as a prince, and in time married Yashoda and had a daughter by her.

At the age of thirty, he left his home and family and went into the forest and adopted the life of an ascetic. Roaming about in the forest, he met a Brahmin to whom he gave half his clothing; the other half was later caught up in the thorns, and from then onwards Mahavira gave up wearing clothes altogether. For twelve years, he meditated and wandered about bearing injuries and insults alike, for people often mistook him for a thief or a vagabond. He cared neither about pain nor pleasure. He became indifferent to what he ate and where he slept. Sometimes while meditating, insects and worms would creep over his body, but he remained undisturbed.

At the end of the twelve years, while meditating on the banks of the Ujjuvaliya river under a *sal* tree, he attained enlightenment (*Kevala gyana*). Immediately after he went to Rajagriha, the then capital of Magadha, and delivered his first sermon on a hill called Vipulachala. The emperor of Magadha, Bimbisara, attended this sermon. Thereafter he continued wandering and preaching throughout the length and breadth of northern India for a period of thirty years.

He laid stress on the fact that everyone, irrespective of his caste, had a right to and could attain salvation (*nirvāna*); and

this he could do by his own efforts without the help of any Supreme authority or mediatory priests or rituals. To his discourses he welcomed people of all castes and all classes: men, women, the wealthy and the poor, the educated and the uneducated. More and more people followed his teachings. He organized his followers in a four-fold *Sangha* – the *aryas* (monks), the *arvikas* (nuns), the *shravakas* (lay men) and the *shravikas* (lay women).

Mahavira passed away at the age of seventy-two, at a place called Majjhima Pava or Pavapuri in Patna, Bihar.

After his death, Mahavira's teachings were collected in fourteen texts which came to be known as *Purwas*. Later, when these texts were lost owing to a famine in Bihar, a council was held at Pataliputra and the texts were compiled again into twelve *Angas*. These *Angas* together with commentaries on them are the most important sacred books of the Jains.

One of the most important teachings of Mahavira was the strict observance of non-violence towards all living beings. Jains accept and advocate non-violence as the highest ideal of life and as the means of attaining *nirvāna* or liberation of the soul.¹ Here are some examples from the Jaina scriptures:

A religionist should cease to injure living beings; for, this has been called the liberation which consists in peace.²

A religionist, if beaten, should not be angry.³

All beings hate pain,
therefore, one should not kill them.

This is the quintessence of wisdom
not to kill anything.

Know this to be the legitimate conclusion
from the principle of the reciprocity
with regard to non-killing.⁴

¹The first ethical principle (*vrata*) in Jainism is that a Jaina shall not kill or be violent, but shall be kind to all creation; the other four are truthfulness (*satya*), non-stealing (*asteya*), sex-restraint (*brāhmacharya*), and non-acceptance of unnecessary gifts (*aparigraha*). These five vows are to be observed partially (*anuvrata*) by the house-holders, and completely and rigorously (*mahāvratā*) by a monk.

²*Kritāṅga-sūtra*, 1.3.4.19.20.

³*Uttarādhyana-sutra*, 2.26.

⁴*Kritāṅga-sūtra*, 1.11,9-10

A religionist who is possessed of carefulness
should wander about, giving not offence to any creature.
Having mastered the Law, and got rid of carelessness,
he should treat all beings as he himself would be treated.¹

All beings hate pain; therefore, one should not kill them.
Not to kill anything is the quintessence of wisdom.
Know this to be the legitimate conclusion
from the principle of the reciprocity

With regard to non-killing.
He should cease to injure living beings;
For, this has been called the liberation
which consists in peace.²

A man should wander about treating all creatures
as he himself would be treated.³

Jaina non-violence encompasses all creatures; human beings, animals and even the smallest invisible living beings. The implied non-violence is both, physical and metaphysical. In the *Āchārāṅga-sūtra*, the first vow reads: 'I renounce all killing of living beings, whether subtle or gross, whether mobile or immobile. Neither shall I myself kill living beings nor cause others to do it or consent to it. As long as I live . . . [I will observe this rule] in mind, speech and body.'⁴ If one acts carelessly, moved by the influence of passions, there *himsā* (violence) certainly arises before him whether a living being is killed or not, because under the influence of passions, the person first injures the Self through the self; whether there is subsequently an injury caused to another being or not. A true Jaina should do nothing to hurt the feelings of another man, woman or child.

Furthermore, all the ethical principles of Jainism are also based upon non-violence. Thus, speaking truth is necessary because by telling lies one commits verbal violence and injures the feelings of another person. In like manner, stealing somebody's property amounts to violence because the person, whose property is stolen, is mentally injured. A person who

¹*Kriṭāṅga-sūtra*, 1.10.1.3.

²*Ibid*, 1.11,9,10,11.

³*Ibid*, 1.11.33.

⁴*Āchārāṅga-sūtra*, II.15.1.1. (*SBE*, XXII).

hoards wealth deprives poor and hungry persons of their wants. Surplus wealth could be used to provide food and clothing to the needy. Thus adopting the principle of non-possession means following a non-violent way of life.

There are precise rules and regulations set out about the observance of non-violence by the monks and the lay people. For the ordinary people, these rules are less elaborate than for the monks.¹ An ordinary person has to observe the following six rules (*anuvrata*):

- (1) I will not kill innocent moving animals voluntarily;
- (2) I will not commit suicide; (3) I will not commit abortion; (4) I will neither join an organisation or party whose aim is violence and destruction, nor will I participate in such activities; (5) I will not consider any individual an untouchable; (6) I will not behave cruelly towards anyone.

A monk, on the other hand, has to observe the five great vows (*mahāvratā*) and also five co-rules (*samitis*); the latter are as follows:²

1. *Iryya samiti*, or caution in avoiding injury to living beings while walking.

2. *Bhaṣa samiti*, or control over speech to avoid verbal injury.

3. *Īśana samiti*, or careful checking of food to assure that whatever food or drink has been given to him was not specially prepared for him.

4. *Ādāna Niksepānā samiti*, or using necessary articles cautiously to avoid injury to subtle lives.

5. *Parithapanika samiti*, or disbursing or throwing away unnecessary article with care and caution.

Regarding *Iryya samiti* or the rule of careful walking, Shri Kunda Kunda Acharya says: "A monk who walks upon a trodden path, free from living beings, in day-time looking (carefully) a distance of four arms-length (two yards) ahead, is said to observe carefulness in walking.

"A monk should avoid walking on the grass, particularly in the rainy season when many living beings can be killed underfoot unintentionally. He may sweep the trodden path in front of him with soft broom, so that it is free from living creatures.

¹Dasgupta, S.N., *A History of Indian Philosophy*, I, p. 200.

²*Ibid*, p. 195.

“A monk should not cook his own food because many living beings are killed by fire, nor cause others to tend fire ; but can take food prepared by others, if it is not specially cooked for him. While eating, he should make sure that no living beings are in the food.”¹

In connection with *Isana samiti* or eating food, the following rules are prescribed: “One should refrain from eating fresh vegetables, because they are a form of life. One should abstain from eating at night (*ratribhukta-tyāga*) because after sunset there are numerous insects which can drop in the food. A monk should keep a cloth before his mouth so that his breath will not kill small germs living in the air.”

Furthermore, it is enjoined upon a monk “not to build a house, not cause others to erect one, for many living creatures, both mobile and immobile, both subtle and gross, are seen to be killed when a house is being built.”

“There is nothing so dangerous as fire, for it spreads in all directions and is able to destroy many creatures; one should therefore not light a fire.”²

The extent to which a Jaina monk should go in observing non-violence is illustrated by the following anecdote in the *Āchārāṅga-sūtra*. It says: “If, on board, the boatman should say to another of the crew, ‘O long-lived one, this *śramana* is only a heavy load for the boat; take hold of him with your arms and throw him into the water’; hearing and perceiving such talk, he should, if he wears clothes, quickly take these off or fasten them, or put them in a bundle on his head. Now he may think: the rascals, accustomed to violent acts, might take hold of me and throw me from the boat into the water. He should first say to them: ‘O long-lived house-holders, do not throw me into the water; I myself shall leap from the boat into the water’.”³

Non-Violence of the Jainas, particularly of the monks, forbids taking any life even by mistake or through unmindfulness. According to it, the life of an animal is no less important than that of a man; every organic life-unit counts as one, and none as more than one.

¹Kunda Kunda Acharya, *Niyamasāra*, IV. 61 (*SBJ*, IX).

²*Uttarādhyana*, XXXV 8-12 (*SBJ*, Jaina Sūtra, II, p. 204-5).

³*Āchārāṅga-sūtra*, II, 3.2.2-3.

Vardhmana Mahavira laid emphasis upon non-violence to all forms of life, human as well as non-human; with the outward rituals adopted by the monks, traditions gradually developed through which non-human life came to be protected more arduously than even the human life.

Buddhism

While Mahavira advocated non-violence to all forms of life as a means to liberation of the soul (*nirvāṇa*), another great sage, the Buddha, laid emphasis upon the practice of compassion among human beings. His teachings spread far and wide, crossing the borders of the Indian sub-continent.

Gautama Siddhārtha, who later became the Buddha (the Enlightened One) was probably born in the year 563 BC, at Lumbini, a place now situated inside Nepal, 4 miles from the Indo-Nepal border. His father Suddhodana was the chief of the Shakya clan which had its capital at Kapilavastu. His mother, Māyā, unfortunately, died on the seventh day after the delivery and the infant was looked after by the queen's sister, Mahāprajāpati Gotami.

At the time of Siddhārtha's birth, it was prophesied that he would do great good to the world by becoming either an emperor or an ascetic. As his father wanted him to become a great emperor, he did his best to keep Gautama's mind busy in the pleasures of the world so that he should never lean towards asceticism.

Gautama received a good education in ethics, various systems of philosophy, and the Vedas. He also acquired great skill in the arts of war. At the age of eighteen, by displaying his skill and by proving his superiority over his kinsmen in a royal military contest, he won and married the beautiful princess Yashodharā, the daughter of the Shakyas Suppabuddha.

For ten years Gautama enjoyed the pleasures of a householder but in the midst of his family life, wealth, comfort and luxury, he keenly felt a yearning for something higher, something not clearly definable. One night, it is said, he dreamed that the gods were asking him to leave the life of pleasure and luxury and to wander about in search of the objective that would deliver the world of its sorrow. So far Gautama had lived mostly within the four walls of the palace, but the dream made him restless to

come out of his palace and to see for himself the world as it really was.

One day, he went out in the city on his chariot. He met an old man on the way. The prince, seeing the bent frame, the wrinkled face and the sorrowful brow asked the charioteer, who he was, why his head was white, his eyes bleary, and his body withered. The charioteer told him that those were the symptoms of old age. The same man was once a suckling child and a youth full of life, but as the years passed, the strength of his life was sapped and his body withered. Such was the fate of all mortals.

As he went further, a sick man appeared on the way. his body disfigured, gasping for breath and groaning with pain. The prince asked his charioteer, what was the matter with that man. The charioteer replied that the man was sick; the four elements of his body were in disequilibrium. He further stated that every body was subject to such conditions; the poor and the rich, the ignorant and the wise.

A little later, his chariot was suddenly obliged to stop as four persons passed by, carrying a corpse. The prince shuddered at the sight of a lifeless body and asked the charioteer, what they carried. The charioteer replied that it was a dead man; his body stiff and his life gone; his family and friends who loved him well, were carrying the corpse to the grave.

When he came face to face with such suffering, Gautama's heart became heavy with sadness and his soul was moved by unutterable compassion for his fellow beings. It was then that he awoke as it were, from the sleep of optimistic self-delusion. He could no longer enjoy the luxuries of a princely life. He thought of quitting his home, his wife and new-born son, in order to find ways and means of lessening the suffering of his fellow-beings.

One night as he arose and walked out in the garden, feeling very restless, he saw the figure of a monk under a tree. When the prince asked him where he had come from, the monk said, "I am a mendicant. I have renounced the worldly life. This is also the path for you to follow, Go out Siddhārtha, and find the goal. Now is the right time for you to leave the palace and to lead the life of a monk. You are a *Bodhisattva* now and you are destined to become the Buddha to enlighten the world." So

saying the mendicant disappeared.

The words of the mendicant made Gautama resolve to renounce his worldly life and become a mendicant himself and to seek the truth that would deliver the world of its suffering.

Silently, one night, he walked out of the palace, mounted his faithful horse Kanthaka, and finding the gates of the palace open, he went out into the silent night. He was accompanied by Chhandaka, his charioteer. Gautama was twenty-nine then.

On his way he cut off his beautiful princely hair with his sword and exchanged his royal robe for a plain cloth of ochre-colour which the mendicants wear. He bade the charioteer go back with the chariot and tell king Suddhodana that the prince had renounced the world.

After passing through several villages he reached the city of Vaishali, on the outskirts of which lived Arada Kalama, a rigorous and renowned teacher. Gautama became his disciple and through pious concentration attained the seventh stage of meditation (*akinchanyatana*=sphere of desirelessness). Not being satisfied with what he could attain here, he left the place and went to Rajagriha and became a disciple of another teacher Rudraka Ramaputra. Here again he found that his teacher could not help him attain the final Truth.

Gautama moved from place to place listening to the teachings of revered teachers. These teachings differed and even contradicted each other, hence they could not satisfy him. He abhorred the rituals that involved sacrifice of animals. For six long years, Gautama meditated, fasted and bore all the rigours of an ascetic life. In the process, his body was reduced to a skeleton. The fame of his asceticism spread far and wide, but he himself was nowhere near attaining his goal. He felt that extreme penance was not the right path. From then on he resolved to strengthen his body by food and drink so as to make it fit for further struggle until the goal was achieved.

One day, after bathing and taking some food, Gautama sat under the shade of the *Bodhi* tree on the bank of the Nairanjana river in Bodh-Gaya, in deep meditation. At this time, it is said, Maro Papima, the lord of the five desires and of death, and the greatest enemy of Truth, came out with his three daughters and a host of evil spirits, to tempt him. But Gautama remained calm, poised and determined. He exclaimed his resolve by saying,

“On this spot, let my body lie dried up; let the flesh, bones and skin be dissolved into atoms; still, without attaining the precious *bodhi* (the highest spiritual enlightenment) I shall not move an inch. This is my determination.”

It was at this spot that Gautama at last achieved enlightenment. He said, “There is suffering and sorrow in the world. Birth is attended with pain, growth is sorrowful and decay is painful. Illness is sorrowful and death is sorrowful. Sad it is to be joined to that which we do not like; sadder still is the separation from that which we love, and painful is the craving for that which cannot be obtained.

“The cause of suffering is lust. The surrounding world affects sensation and begets a craving thirst which clamours for immediate satisfaction. Verily, it is the thirst (or craving) causing the renewal of existence, accompanied by sensual delight seeking satisfaction, now here, now there; that is to say, the craving for the gratification of the passions, or the craving for a future life or the craving for success in the present life. The desire to live for the enjoyment of self entangles us in the net of sorrow.

“Pleasures are the bait and the result is pain.

When the flame of desire and lust is extinguished the state of *nirvāna* is reached.”

Thus enlightened, the Buddha wandered about in different places in India delivering his message. He told his disciples to pursue practical methods in order to arrive at the Truth, and not to be distracted with academic speculations about ‘the Beyond and the Ultimate.’ What was most needed was the removal of ignorance, thirst, attachment etc., by the comprehension of the above four Truths. He further said, “Neither abstinence from fish or flesh, nor going naked; nor shaving the head, nor wearing matted hair, nor dressing in a rough garment, nor covering oneself with dirt, nor sacrificing to *Āgni*, will cleanse a man who is not free from delusions.

“Anger, drunkenness, obstinacy, bigotry, deception, envy, self-praise, disparaging others, superciliousness and evil intentions constitute uncleanness.

“.... By suffering, the emaciated devotee produces confusion and sickly thoughts in his mind. Mortification is not conducive even to worldly knowledge, how much less to a

triumph over the senses.

“But to satisfy the necessities of life is not evil. To keep the body in good health is a duty, for otherwise we shall not be able to acquire wisdom and keep our mind strong and clear.”

The right path to be followed, according to the Buddha, was the ‘eight-fold way’: right speech, right action, right means of livelihood, right exertion, right mindedness, right meditation, right resolution and right point of view.

During the forty-five years of his public life, from the time of his proclaiming this new religion, the Buddha preached these noble truths amongst the masses. His new order did not recognise distinctions of caste or creed. Kings and beggars, rich and poor, sages and sinners, brahmins and pariahs, all joined the order.

Compassion towards all human beings is one of the most important teachings in Buddhism, as evidenced by some of these scriptural readings:

Him I call a first-class person
who is tolerant with the intolerant,
Mild with the violent,
And free from greed among the greedy.¹

The man who is not hostile amongst the hostile,
who is peaceful amongst the violent,
Not seizing upon anything amongst those who seize
upon everything, I call a first-class person.²

If villainous bandits were to carve you limb from limb,
Even then be it your task to preserve your hearts
Unmoved, never to allow an ill word to pass your lips,
But always to abide in compassion and goodwill
With no hate in your hearts,
enfolding the bandit in radiant thoughts of love,
and proceeding thence to enfold the whole world
in your radiant thoughts of love,
Thoughts great, vast and beyond measure,
in which no hatred is, or thought of harm.³

¹*Dhamma-pada*, 406.

²*Sutta Nipata*, 630.

³*Majjhima Nikaya*, 1.129.

As I am, so are these, As these are, so am I.

Identifying himself with others,
Let him not kill, nor cause any one to kill.¹

Not for our life would we ever
intentionally kill a living being.²

A brother ought not intentionally
to destroy the life of any being.³

All men tremble at punishment
All men fear death.
Remember that thou are like unto them.
And do not kill, nor cause slaughter.
All men tremble at punishment.
All men love life.

Remember that thou art like unto them.
And do not kill, nor cause slaughter.⁴

Live, delighting in and delighted by non-injury.⁵

Who controls his rising anger as a rolling chariot
Him I call the real charioteer.
The others only hold the reins.⁶

“Whatsoever monk shall knowingly deprive of life a human being, or shall seek out a murderer of a human being or utter the praises of death, or incite another to self-destruction, saying ‘Oh, my friend: what good do you get from this sinful, wretched life? Death is better to thee than life’: If, so thinking, and with such an aim, he, by various arguments, utter praises of death, or incite another to self-destruction, he, too, is fallen into defeat, he is no longer in communication.”⁷

“Him I call a Brāhmin who without hurting any creatures, whether feeble or strong, does not kill nor cause slaughter.”

“Him I call indeed a Brāhmin, who is tolerant with the intolerant, mild with the violent, and free from greed among

¹*Sutta Nipata*, 331.

²*Mahāvagga*, 6. 31. 13.

³*Ibid*, 1. 78. 4.

⁴*Dhamma-pada*, 129-130.

⁵*Itivattaka*, 38.

⁶*Dhamma-pada*, 222.

⁷*SBE*, XIII, I, p. 4.

the greedy.”¹

Even the unintentional taking of a human life is a sin. In the city of Vaishali, there once lived a priest, who while carrying the alms bowl, sat down upon a chair that was covered with a cloth, killing a child that was underneath. At about the same time, there was another priest who received poisoned food; which he gave to another priest, not knowing that it was poisoned, and the second priest died. Both went to the Buddha and informed him in much sorrow of what had taken place. The Buddha declared that the priest who had the poisoned food was innocent, but the priest who sat on the chair, and through it caused the death of a child, was guilty, as he had not taken the precaution of looking under the cloth, and had sat down without being invited to sit down by the house-holder.

After the Buddha passed away, the followers of Buddhism divided into two schools, each one believing that it carried the true teaching of the Buddha. Generally speaking, the first school, Hinayana looked upon the salvation of the individual as the goal, whereas the other school, Mahayana took the salvation of all beings as its aim. The first three centuries of the Christian era witnessed the spread of Buddhism over large parts of Asia including China. Impetus in this direction was provided by the missionary zeal of emperor Ashoka.

Ashoka

Of the many rock and pillar edicts that convey the political, social and philosophical thoughts of Ashoka's time, the thirteenth rock edict informs us about the emperor being won over to non-violence . . . It says, “When he had been consecrated for eight years, the Beloved of the gods, the king Piyadassi conquered Kalinga. A hundred and fifty thousand people were deported, a hundred thousand were killed and many times that number perished. Afterwards, now that Kalinga was annexed, the Beloved of the gods, very earnestly practised *Dhamma*, desired *Ādhamma*, and taught *Dhamma*. On conquering Kalinga, the Beloved of the gods felt remorse, for, when an independent country is conquered, the slaughter, death, and deportation of the people is extremely grievous to the Beloved

¹*Dhamma-pada*, XXVI 405-6 (*SBE*, X, p. 93).

of the gods, and weighs heavily on his mind. What is even more deplorable to the Beloved of the gods, is that those who dwell there, whether Brahmins, *śramanas*, or those of other sects or house-holders who show obedience to their teachers and behave well and devotedly towards their friends, acquaintances, colleagues, relatives, slaves, and servants, all suffer violence, murder, and separation from their loved ones. Even those who are fortunate to have escaped, and whose love is undiminished (by the brutalizing effect of war), suffer from the misfortunes of their friends, acquaintances, colleagues and relatives. This participation of all men in suffering weighs heavily on the mind of the Beloved of the gods. Except among the Greeks, there is no land where the religious order of Brahmins and *śramanas* are not to be found, and there is no land anywhere where men do not support one sect or another. Today if a hundredth or a thousandth part of those people who were killed or died or were deported when Kalinga was annexed were to suffer similarly, it would weigh heavily on the mind of the Beloved of the gods.

“The Beloved of the gods believes that one who does wrong should be forgiven as far as it is possible to forgive them. And the Beloved of the gods conciliates the forest tribes of his empire, but he warns them that he has power even in his remorse, and he asks them to repent, lest they be killed. For the beloved of gods wishes that all beings should be unharmed, self-controlled, calm in mind and gentle.

“The Beloved of gods considers victory by *Dhamma* to be the foremost victory. And moreover, the Beloved of gods has gained this victory on all his frontiers to a distance of six hundred *yojanas* where reigns the Greek king named Antiochus, and beyond the realms of that Antiochus in the land of the four kings named Ptolemy, Antigonus, Magas and Alexander; and in the south over the Cholas and Pandyas as far as Ceylon. Likewise here in the Imperial territories among the Greeks and the Kambojas, Nabhkas and Nabhapanktis, Bhojas and Pitinikas, Andhras and Parindas, everywhere the people follow the Beloved of the god’s instructions in *Dhamma*. Even where the envoys of the Beloved of the gods have not gone, people hear of his conduct according to *Dhamma*, his precepts and his instructions in *Dhamma* and they follow *Dhamma* and will continue to follow it.

“What is obtained by this is victory everywhere, and everywhere victory is pleasant . . .

“This inscription of *Dhamma* has been engraved so that any sons or great grandsons that I may have should not think of gaining new conquests, and in whatever victories they may gain should be satisfied with patience and light punishment. They should only consider conquest by *Dhamma* to be a true conquest, and delight in *Dhamma* should be their whole delight for this is of value in both this world and the next.”

In order to do good to his people and to mankind in general, Ashoka employed his personal energies and that of his vast and mighty empire to this end. Besides, he tried to inculcate *Dhamma* not only among the peoples in his own dominions but also all over the world, so that all may enjoy the blessings of “non-injury, self-control, equable conduct, and gentleness.” Welfare of the people became his motto.

In order to lessen tension between people of different religions and sects in his domains, Ashoka advocated: (1) promotion of basic tenets which are common to all religions; (2) cultivation of a sense of unity of all religions and sects; (3) coming together of exponents of different religions in religious assemblies; (4) learning the texts of other religions so as to become proficient in the scriptures of different religions.¹ Ashoka set an example himself by honouring all sects and making gifts to them all.

He abolished in his kingdom all public pastimes and popular sports that involved the killing of animals and curtailed animal sacrifices. Slaughter of animals for meat was also abolished. The unrestricted slaughter of animals for the royal table was first limited to one deer and two peacocks a day; later even this was totally abolished. Animals such as parrots, wild geese, bats, ants, tortoises, squirrels, porcupines, lizards, rhinos and pigeons were declared protected animals. The royal sport of hunting was abolished. The husk of different grains was forbidden to be burnt as it contained minute living beings; forests were not to be burnt either, as there was a danger of burning animals in them. Fish was forbidden to be caught or sold for fifty-six days in a year. The castration of animals and

¹Twelfth rock edict.

marking of horses was not to be done on certain holy days. All these measures were an expression of non-violence towards animals.

Ashoka replaced pleasure-trips with pilgrimages to holy places, like Bodh-Gaya, Lumbini and tours of the out-of-the-way and neglected villages and places in his empire. He saw to the needs and welfare of the people there and set an example for his officers to follow. Capital punishment however, was not abolished.

The decline of the Maurya empire, almost immediately after the death of Ashoka has been ascribed by different scholars to different causes, one of which is the policy of non-violence followed by Ashoka. Whatever it may be, Ashoka set up a noble example of observance of non-violence between individuals, groups and communities inside the empire as also between different empires.

Bhakti Cult

The millennium, after the Buddha passed away, was a glorious period in the history of India. The empires of the Mauryas—especially of Ashoka the great—of the Kushanas, the Guptas and Harsha, witnessed, generally speaking, the observance of religious duties both by the emperors and the masses. After this period, due to foreign invasions which greatly disturbed the generally tranquil life of the ordinary people, the religious duties were observed more in ritual than in spirit. By this time, the acute fervour and influence of Buddhism and Jainism had declined and religious ritualism had taken a strong hold on the people.

With the prevailing deprivation of pride and privileges, even the concept of non-violence changed its garb; as a virtue it went into the background, and devotion to God (*bhakti*) came into the forefront. In every part of India, there arose saints and mystics, who advised the masses to regard the hardship of life as unreal: "All things except Krishna are ephemeral," said Narasimha. The saints exalted the power of *bhakti*, and the *bhakti* cult prevailed all over India. The lyrics of Kabir and Nanak of the north, of Namdev, Tukāram and Muktābai in the south, of Jaydeva, Chandidas, and Chaitanya of Bengal, were sung with devotion all over India, as they are done even today.

Mira, one of the greatest woman saints of India, was inflicted with every imaginable torture by her king husband. But according to a legend, her sheer devotion to Krishna, made her the victor in the end. “Rana sends a cup of poison, Go and give it into the hands of Mirā,” she records in a song. And then, “Mirā drank it as if it were nectar. The Lord of the Universe protected her.” Narasimha of Gujarāt is said to have had a similar experience. The king of Junāgarh, in order to test the poet’s sainthood, put him in an empty cell and then told his victim to produce a garland from the Lord before morning, or else he would be executed. The devotee-poet prayed to his master throughout the night, and Krishna sent him an exquisite garland at dawn.

Hundreds of such legends, alongwith innumerable mystic songs, have created in India a general belief in the efficacy of love, *bhakti* and non-violence. The saints of the Middle Ages, are still a living force in the religious and cultural life of India.

Some of the songs and verses composed by the saints of India regarding their faith in non-violence are as follows:

It is the speciality of a tree

That it returneth good for evil.

He who loppeth its branches, sitteth in its shade;

And it returneth him good for evil.

It gives the fruit when clods are thrown at it.

When carved into a boat, it saveth him who carved it.

Few are the holy men who, like trees, serve God’s servants.¹

As thou deemest thyself, so deem others.

Then shalt thou become a partner in heaven.²

To use force is tyranny, though thou call it lawful.³

Chinese Teacher-Sages

While other civilisations and lands produced prophets, priests and ascetics, the Chinese civilisation produced teacher-sages, who evolved a way of life to preserve and improve the human society in which they lived. They occupied an eminent place in

¹‘Bhaj Gur Dass’ Analysis, war 26. Macauliffe, *Sikh Religion*, 4.260, 261.

²Kabir’s hymns, asa 17: Macauliffe, 6.205.

³*Ibid*, 6.307.

Chinese society because they could guide the moral and social development of their disciples and fellow beings. They believed more in 'this-worldliness' than in other-worldliness. There was no eagerness on their part to leave this world as a realm of deceitful appearance (the *Māyā* of the Hindus). They advocated making the most of the promising values that man and society here and now exhibit. They never allowed their thoughts to obscure the positive virtues, the rich opportunities, and high responsibilities that the world presented before them. They accepted this world with cheer and hope saying 'one should accept the world as it is and find what measure of poise and happiness and strength can be found in it'. It is only during the last fifty years that this traditional Chinese society has started changing.

Two hundred years after the founding of the Chou dynasty, i.e., beginning from 850 BC, aggressive wars between different chieftains in China became frequent, the prestige of central authority having fallen quite low. Maintenance of law and order was precarious, insecurity was on the increase and anxiety was deepening. Such moral coherence as had apparently been won in earlier days was disintegrating, while irresponsibility and selfish indifference was widespread among the leaders of society at all levels. This provocative situation produced in China a number of teacher-sages such as Confucius, Mo Tse, Lao Tse and Mencius. The common problem before them was 'how to save society'; and it was in this connection that non-violence took shape and significance.

Confucius: He was born in 551 BC in the state of Lu, now a part of Shantung province. His father died early, and he was brought up by his mother. Confucius was very interested in his studies. Later in his life he held several responsible ministerial positions but these could not satisfy him. He saw that the society around him needed political and social reforms. He went about the different provinces meeting men in positions of authority, and propagating his ideas with a view to reforming the society of his time. Later, he took up teaching—a job which he thought was most important for the regeneration of society.

His disciple Tselu was once asked by the Duke of Ch'u to give him a description of Confucius, and Tselu, too baffled to reply, came and reported to the master. Confucius at once said,

“Why didn’t you tell him that I am a man who seeks the truth untiringly and teaches others unceasingly, who forgets to eat when he is enthusiastic about something, who loses all his worries when he is happy, and who doesn’t know that old age is coming on?”

Confucius is reported to have summarized his own spiritual growth thus: “At fifteen I began to be seriously interested in study; at thirty I had formed my character; at forty I had no more perplexities; at fifty I knew the will of Heaven; at sixty nothing that I heard disturbed me; at seventy I could let my thought wander without trespassing the moral law.” Confucius died in 479 BC.

According to Confucius, peace lay in social equilibrium. His doctrine of *jen* (sympathy) was based on a hierarchic golden rule: ‘Treat your subordinates as you would be treated by your superiors.’ Some of the sayings in Confucian thought about non-violence and tolerance are as follows:

What a man dislikes in his superiors,
let him not display in the treatment of his inferiors.

What he dislikes in inferiors,
let him not display in the service of his superiors.

What he hates in those who are before him,
let him not therewith precede those who are behind him.

What he hates in those who are behind him,
let him not therewith follow those who are before him

What he hates to receive on the right,
let him not bestow on the left.

What he hates to receive on the left,
let him not bestow on the right.

This is what is called,
“The principle with which,
as with a measuring square,
to regulate one’s conduct”.¹

What you do not like when done to yourself
do not do to others.²

¹*Great Learning*, 10.2.

²*Doctrine of the Mean*, 13.3.

Mo Tse: Another teacher-sage of China, Mo Tse (468-401 BC), laid great emphasis on peace, universal love and the equality of all men. His arguments against violence are as relevant in modern times as they were in his own day. He said: "Suppose a man enters the orchard of another and steals the other's peaches and plums. Hearing of it, the public will condemn it; laying hold of him, the authorities will punish him. Why? Because he injures others to profit himself. As to seizing dogs, pigs, chicken and young pigs from another, it is even more unrighteous than to steal peaches and plums from his orchard. Why? Because it causes others to suffer more and it is more inhumane and criminal. When it comes to entering another's stable and appropriating the others' horses and oxen, it is more inhumane than to seize the dogs, pigs, chicken and young pigs of another. Why? Because others are caused to suffer more; when others are caused to suffer more, then the act is more inhumane. The innocent stripping him of his clothing, dispossessing him of his spear and sword is even more unrighteous than to enter another's stable and appropriate his horses and oxen. Why? Because it causes others to suffer more; when others are caused to suffer more than the act is more inhumane and criminal."

"All the gentlemen of the world know that they should condemn these things, calling them unrighteous. But when it comes to the great attack of states, they do not know that they should condemn it. On the contrary, they applaud it, calling it righteous. Can this be said to be knowing the difference between righteousness and unrighteousness!"

"Now, if there were a man who, upon seeing a little blackness, should say it is black, but, upon seeing much, should say it is white; then we should think he could not tell the difference between black and white."

"The world's leaders have no idea of what is for their own profit . . . Those who love others will be loved in return. Do good to others and others will do good to you. Hate people and be hated by them. Hurt them and they will hurt you. What is hard about that?"

Lao Tse: "The old sage" is said to have composed *Tao Teh*

¹*The Works of Mo Tse; Condemnation of War*, 1.17, translated by Y.P. Mei: *The Wisdom of China and India*, edited by Lin Yutang.

Ching around the fourth century BC. This Chinese classic moulded Chinese thought for centuries to come. Here are some selections from this and other Taoist books about non-violence:

Be resolute but not boastful; resolute but not haughty;
resolute but not arrogant; resolute because you cannot
avoid it, resolute but not violent.¹

The tender and yielding conquer the rigid and strong.
To compel by show of force, is no gain to a nation.²

The good commander is not imperious.
The good fighter is not wrathful.
The greatest conqueror does not wage war.
The best master governs by condescension.³

Surely you would not make a bower into a battlefield
nor a shrine of prayer into a scene of warfare.
Have nothing within which is obstructive of virtue.
Seek not to vanquish others in cunning, in plotting in war.⁴

If I slay a whole nation and annex the territory
in order to find nourishment, wherein does the victory lie.⁵

By the warmth of affection they sought the harmony of joy,
And to blend together all within the four seas,
And their wish was to plant this everywhere
As the chief thing to be pursued.
They save their age from war, they forbade aggression,
and sought to hush the weapons of strife.
In this way they went everywhere,
counselling the high and instructing the low
Though the world might not receive them,
they only insisted on their object the more strongly.

Mencius: He was an interpreter and follower of Confucius.
He lived between 372-289 BC, two centuries after his master.
Mencius believed that "Love overcomes its opposite just as water
overcomes fire. Those, however, who nowadays practice love,

¹*From Reason and Virtue.*

²*Tao Teh Ching*, 36.2.

³*Ibid*, 18.1.

⁴Kwang Tze, 24.2.

⁵*Ibid*, 33.3.

[do it] as though with a cup of water they could extinguish a whole wagon-load of faggots on fire, and when the flames are not put out, say that water cannot overcome fire. Such a course is the greatest aid to what is contrary to love, for the final outcome will simply be thus—the loss [of that small amount of love].” Mencius preached love and tolerance to his fellow-men.

Here is a man who treats me
in a perverse and unreasonable manner.
In such case the superior man will turn round upon himself:
“I must have been wanting in propriety,
How should this have happened to me?”

He examines himself, and is especially benevolent.
He turns round upon himself,
and is especially observant of propriety.
The perversity and unreasonableness of the other,
however, are still the same.
The superior man will again turn round upon himself:
“I must have been failing to do my utmost.”
He turns round upon himself, and proceeds to do his
utmost.¹

When one subdues men by force,
they do not submit to him in heart,
But because their strength is not adequate.
When one subdues men by virtue,
they are pleased in their hearts’ core,
And submit sincerely.²

There are men who say: “I am skilful at marshalling troops
‘I am skilful at conducting a battle.’
They are great criminals.”³

Islamism

Islam, whose followers number one in every seven people in the world, gathered momentum and spread far and wide among people in lands far off from the place of its origin. The religion and the empire that Islam created produced a rich new culture

¹*Mencius*, 4.2.28, 5, 5, 6.

²*Ibid*, 2.1.3.2.

³*Ibid*, 7.2.4.1.

and a vast treasure of knowledge which contributed towards the birth of the European Renaissance. The founder of this religion was Mohammed.

Mohammed: He was born about AD 570, in a highly-respected but poor branch of an otherwise rich Quraish clan in the city of Mecca. His father died before he was born, his mother when he was six years of age. Mohammed was brought up by his grandfather and by his uncle, and spent considerable time with bedouins in the desert. Later he accompanied caravans as far as Syria. He must have been highly esteemed as a young man among his fellow citizens because he received the by-name *Al Amin*, the trust-worthy. He married a rich widow, and was a devoted husband.

Mohammed was of a contemplative nature and went frequently to a lonely spot, outside Mecca, to fast and to meditate. One day in AD 611, at the age of forty, while in deep meditation he received a revelation. A voice called him and demanded "Speak thou in the name of thy Lord." At first, he had grievous doubts whether this was a genuine call from God or not. But the stream of revelations flowed steadily with only minor interruptions.

The compilation of all the revelations of God through Mohammed is called the *Koran*. It says: *Allahu akbar, la illaha illa allah wa muhammadun rasulu allah* (God is great, there is no God besides God, Mohammed is his messenger [apostle]). The God, Mohammad spoke of, was One, eternal, changeless and no attribute derived from the experience of His creatures can be attributed to Him. Yet it is proper to liken Him to that which is "loftiest in heaven and earth." Mohammed claimed for himself no supernatural role; he performed no miracles. In relation to God, he was as completely humble as any other human being would have to be. The message of God to His people, through Mohammed was:

When the Heaven shall cleave asunder,
And when the stars shall disperse
And when the seas shall gush together,

And when the graves shall be turned upside down
Each soul shall know what it has accomplished
or kept back.

O, man! what hath misled thee against thy generous Lord,
Who hath created thee, moulded and shaped thee aright?

This was a judgment message. Mohammed's fellow citizens laughed at him and ridiculed him, saying "A crazy fool, telling fables, of the ancients. What! When we shall have lived, and become dust and bones, shall we indeed be judged?"

At the time of Mohammed, Arabia was a land of rugged rock and desert, traversed by a few caravan trails. The nomads roaming the peninsula were vigorous individualists, although restrained in vital matters by traditional loyalty to their clans. They believed in many gods and paid obeisance to their images. The message of Mohammed that 'there was only one God and no other god' was contrary to their traditional beliefs and customs. This created an increasing hostility among them against Mohammed and his comparatively few followers. Mohammed and his family were ostracised and almost died of starvation. For twelve years he underwent persecution, but he never wavered in bringing the message of the God to his people. When finally he was informed that the people of Mecca were plotting to kill him, he and his true friend Abu Bakr fled to Medina, a city north of Mecca, which welcomed him. This flight (*hijra*) took place on July 16, 622 AD.

Here he was confronted with city government and the revelations lose some of their ardent flavour and begin to deal with principles of government, administration, civil laws etc., thus laying the ground-work for the juridical code of Islam.

Within a few years Mohammed established himself so strongly at Medina that he was not only able to withstand a determined attack by his Meccan enemies but could follow up the victory by a vigorous offensive against them. In AD 630, he captured Mecca, purged the Ka'ba of its blasphemous images and unacceptable rites, and generously extended an amnesty to all who submitted to his rule. Mohammed died at the age of sixty-three.

Mohammed, by the forceful appeal of his personality and his capacity for moral leadership, succeeded in achieving a superclannish unity, on a basis of equality. He felt and showed compassion for those to whom life was a struggle. He aimed at realizing in Islam, a community where there is security without

dependence for all, and where each one who submits to the divine sovereignty feels respect for every other as his equal. In Islam equality is not only preached but practised as well. Islam rejects special privileges of race or caste. This is clearly in evidence when Moslem pilgrims flock to Mecca from all over the world. They lay aside their special garb and don the seamless white robe which makes one indistinguishable from any other pilgrim and proclaims to all the world that he is just a devout worshipper of *Allah* and nothing more. The same is also witnessed every Friday in mosques all over the world. It is this equality which attracted many low-caste Hindus to Islam in India.

The realistic principle, repeated in several passages of the *Koran*, is: "We will not task a soul beyond its ability." A Moslem is expected to live up to the standard that lies within his ability. Detailed rules are laid down, guided by the concepts of justice, mercy, and humane consideration which the loyal Moslem is expected to practice in daily life. They lift his conduct above the impulsive, biased, and self-centered behaviour of the mass of men, while not insisting, as a matter of law, that he conform to the ideal which only the most spiritually alert can glimpse. Thus he is asked to go as far as the average man can go in meeting the concrete situations and obligations of social life in an attitude of equality and the spirit of brotherhood, while growing towards a fuller example of the perfect love and tenderness that the saintly character embodies.

Thus we see that the Moslem social ethic combines a high ultimate standard with a set of rules which recognize human weakness. Love is the supreme ideal and yet the average man is not really expected to love his enemy, only to treat him with respect, chivalry, and fairness. Justice and compassion are to be practised toward all, and love and tenderness toward those who are close to one by ties of family or friendship. Equality and brotherhood are to be exemplified toward other Moslems, of whatever race, rank, or calling and toward non-Moslems too, so far as the attitude of the latter does not prevent their realization. None is to kill anybody and the rule of God in this matter is:

"We have ordained that he who slayeth any one,
unless it be a person guilty of man-slaughter

Or of spreading disorder in the land,
 shall be as though he had slain all mankind;
 But that he who saveth a life
 shall be as though he has saved all mankind alive.”¹

The *Koran* explicitly teaches that only defensive war is permissible; but there are also passages clearly implying that it is a duty to make war upon disbelievers until they submit to Moslem rule and pay tribute or even (in the case of idolators) until they become converted to Islam. This belief has, unfortunately led to many battles and wars over the centuries.

The *Koran*, generally speaking, rejects asceticism or mysticism; yet only two centuries after Mohammed, a school of Moslem mystics, ‘Sufis, a term originally meaning ‘wool’ and referring to the coarse garb worn by them, made their appearance. According to the Sufis, salvation consists in the realization of union with God, rather than in submission to His authority. They teach that love of God and of others in God, is the supreme mark of spiritual perfection. ‘Love,’ according to Jelal-al-Din Sufi, “is the remedy of our pride, and self-conceit the physician of all our infirmities. Only he whose garment is rent by love becomes entirely unselfish. He who loves God supremely, sees God in all His creatures, and expresses this divine love in all his dealings with them.”

The Sufi form of Islam even transcends all sectarian distrust and recognizes spiritual unity with sincere seekers of God in other religions. Ibn Arabi is quoted as saying, “There was a time when I took it amiss in my companion if his religion was not like mine, but now my heart admits every form. It is a pasture for gazelles, a cloister for monks, a temple for idols, a Ka’ba for the pilgrims, the tables of the Law, and the sacred book of the *Koran*. Love alone is my religion, and whithersoever men’s camels turn, it is my religion and my faith.”²

Judaism

Judaism upholds social justice rather than non-violence: good for good, evil for evil. The God of the Jews, Yehweh, is the

¹*Koran*, 5.35.

²Moore, G.F., *The History of Religions*, New York, 1919, p. 450.

law-giver and judge. He lays down commandments, embodying justice among people, and expects people to observe them. Those who observe his commandments, earn his appreciation and love and are rewarded; those who do not observe them but later humbly and earnestly repent, get the assurance of forgiveness, but those who neither observe His commandments nor repent suffer His wrath.

In the *Old Testament*, the patriarchs and prophets (Noah, Moses and others) say:

Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.¹

He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall be surely put to death And if any mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe.²

And he that killeth any man shall surely be put to death And if a man cause a blemish in his neighbour, as he hath done, so shall it be done to him: breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth.³

“And the judges shall make diligent inquisition: and behold if the witness be a false witness, and hath testified falsely against his brother, then shall ye do unto him as he had thought to have done unto his brother. So shalt thou put the evil away from among you And thine eye shall not pity: but life shall go for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot.⁴

The God of the Jews does not mind punishing the enemies of the Jews.⁵ He has no humane feelings for them, sometimes ordering for wholesale slaughtering of their captives, including men, women, and children.⁶

All the welcome things that God's goodness provides should be consecrated to Him and be used in His service for human happiness, and when so used they are pleasing to him.

¹Gen. IX. 6.

²Exodus XXXI. 12.23-3.

³Lev. XXIV. 19, 20.

⁴Deut. XIX. 18, 21.

⁵ Like the gods of the Vedic Aryans. The period of Vedic Aryans is between 1500-1000 BC. Moses lived about 1200 BC.

⁶Judges 20: 23-21: 24.

Christianity

While the prophets of the Jews portrayed their God as believing in social justice among human beings, Jesus Christ portrayed God as a Loving Father. The contrast between the Jews and the Christians in their approach to social problems is clearly discernible in the following teaching of Jesus Christ. He said: "Ye have heard that it was said, 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth.' But I say unto you, resist not him that is evil but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also."¹

Christ was born in Bethlehem on December, 25th 5 BC.² He is said to be the only-begotten Son of the Heavenly Father through the miraculous conception of the Virgin Mary, born to deliver the world from sin and suffering and to establish the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. A special star, heralding his birth arose above the horizon in the east. The wisemen seeing that star, came to the spot where the newly born babe was resting; they adored him addressing him as the 'King of the Jews.'

King Herod, hearing of the event, was greatly troubled in his mind. He became extremely angry and sent out men to destroy all children under two years of age in Bethlehem and along the coast. In the meantime, Joseph, the husband of Mary, was roused one night from sleep by an angel, on whose advice he took the young child and his mother and went to Egypt, thus saving his life.

When Jesus was twelve years old, he displayed his divine wisdom by answering the most difficult theological questions of the learned Jewish scholars.

After the death of King Herod, the family returned to Galilee. Jesus grew to manhood participating in the duties of a carpenter's vocation but pondering deeply over the religious and moral needs of his people. From the age of twelve till thirty, we do not know much about the life of Jesus. It is said that at the time of his baptism at the age of thirty, the heavens were opened and the Holy Ghost descended in bodily shape in the form of a dove over his head and a voice was heard from

¹Matthew, 5.39.

²This error in calculation in Christian calendar was detected only later on.

Heaven saying, "This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased."

While returning from Jordon, Jesus went into the wilderness where he fasted for forty days. Here he was tempted by the devil, but he conquered the latter. On reaching Galilee he proclaimed his message in the synagogues, but the Jewish priests did not receive him as their Messiah. Thereupon from Galilee he went to Nazareth. There he preached among the poor people, healed the sick, cast out devils, restored the sight and hearing of the blind and the deaf, resuscitated the dead, walked upon water, and performed many miracles among his disciples and followers. Thus he proved to the world that he was the true Son of the living God.

When he entered Jerusalem, he was betrayed by one of his disciples. He instituted the memorial supper, and then he was crucified, having made a full confession of his Messiahship before Pontius Pilate. After three days, he rose from the dead and appeared alive before his disciples. Jesus Christ promised to come again upon the clouds of Heaven to establish the Kingdom of Heaven, to raise the dead, and to give to his devoted disciples the crown of everlasting life.

In and through his life, Christ taught non-violence, charity, self-denial, control of passions, renunciation, universal love, faith in God. The religion of Jesus the Christ, did not resemble the faith of the Jewish people. His religion was a radical departure from theirs in principles and ideals as well as in the means of attaining them. It was much simpler in form and more sublime in nature. It was neither dogma, creed, system or theology. It was a religion without priests, without ceremonials, without rituals or even strict observance of the Jewish laws. Just as the Buddha rebelled against the ceremonials, rituals and priest-craft of the Brahmins and introduced a simpler form of worship and a religion of the heart, so among the Jews, nearly five hundred years later, Jesus of Nazareth rebelled against the rituals of the priests among the Jews.

Love your enemies; Do good to them who hate you.

Bless them who curse.

And pray for them who despitefully use you.¹

¹Luke, 6. 27.

When reviled, we bless.

When persecuted, we bear it patiently.¹

Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.²

How oft shall my brother sin against me,
and I forgive him?

Till seven times?

Not until seven times, but until seventy times seven.³

The Lord will judge between the nations,

And will decide concerning many peoples.

And they shall beat their swords into plough-shares

And their spears into pruning-hooks,

Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,

Neither shall they learn war any more.⁴

All they who take the sword shall perish with the sword.⁵

Jesus, in his teachings placed emphasis on love of God and love of fellow-beings. Love of God means not only glad submission to His will, but also the giving of one's whole self to Him in joyful surrender. Love of men extends to all without exception, but it means especially those who are poor, sick, weak, or unjustly treated, and special thoughtfulness in meeting their needs in a spirit of kindly service. 'Love thy neighbour' encompasses any human being in need, belonging to any race.⁶ This love also includes heart-felt concern for those who act as enemies. "If you love only those who love you...what is there remarkable in that? But...love your enemies and pray for your persecutors, so that you may show yourselves true sons of your Father in Heaven, for He makes His sun rise on bad and good alike, and makes the rain fall on both upright and wrong-doers."⁷

¹1 Corinthians, 4.12.

²Matthew, 19.19.

³Matthew 18.21.

⁴Isaiah, 2.3.4.

⁵Matthew, 26.52.

⁶Luke, 10.25-37.

⁷Matthew, 5.44-47.

Blessed are the merciful, for they will be shown mercy!
 Blessed are the pure in heart, for they will see God!
 Blessed are the peace-makers, for they will be called God's sons!

After the crucifixion of Christ, his apostles preached his teachings of love and good-will and helped the needy and the sick. But they as well as other new converts were hindered in their work and were prosecuted by the Jewish leaders. In AD 64, emperor Nero set fire to the city of Rome and blamed the Christians, enraging the general populace to extirminate them. Many a time, the Christians were nailed to the cross, covered with pitch, and then set on fire; they were thrown into enclosed places to be devoured by hungry lions, or were torn apart with ropes pulling the limbs in opposite directions. In spite of such terrible atrocities which continued for more than two hundred years, the converts to Christianity increased in number. They refused to serve in the armies of the emperors as it was against the teachings of Christ. Tertullian, a leading Church father, when he noticed a few Christians in the army of Marcus Aurelius (AD 161-180), opposed it vehemently. He reminded them of Jesus' command to Peter to put up his sword. He said, "Shall it be held lawful to make an occupation of the sword, when the Lord proclaims that he who uses the sword shall perish with the sword? Or shall the son of peace take part in the battle when it does not become him even to sue at law? And shall he apply the chain, and the prison, and the torture, and the punishment, who is not the avenger even of his own wrongs?"

Another true follower of Jesus, father Origen,¹ in AD 250, argued in favour of the role of the Christians outside the army. He said that Christians through their peaceful manner of life were a much greater help to the emperor than they would be if they served as soldiers or magistrates. He argued: "For men of God are assuredly the salt of the earth; they preserve the order of the world, and society is held together as long as the salt is uncorrupted...And as we by our prayers vanquish all demons who stir up war and lead to the violation of oaths and disturb the peace, we in this way are much more helpful to the kings

¹Cadoux, C.J., *The Early Christian Attitude to War*, p. 17.

than those who go into the fields to fight for them...We do not indeed fight under him although he requires it; but we fight on his behalf forming a special army—an army of piety, by offering our prayers to God....Christians are benefactors of their country more than others. For they train up citizens, and inculcate piety to the Supreme Being; and they promote those whose lives in the smallest cities have been good and worthy, to a divine and heavenly city... And it is not for the purpose of escaping public duties that Christians decline public offices, but that they may reserve themselves for a divine and more necessary service in the Church of God for the salvation of men.”¹

The emperors, however, were not convinced by this argument. They convicted those who refused conscription. One of the best known examples of the Christians' refusal to serve as a soldier in the army and consequent death is that of Maximilian, the young Numidian in AD 295. He was brought before the proconsul of Africa for induction into the army. He refused induction and the military uniform, saying: “I cannot serve as a soldier; I cannot do evil; I am a Christian.” When told that his refusal would mean death, he replied; “I shall not perish, but when I shall have forsaken this world my soul shall live with Christ, my lord.” He was then put to death at the age of twenty-one and his father ‘returned home giving thanks to God that he had been able to bring such a present to the God.’ Throughout the church there was much sympathy for the stand which Maximilian had taken and in course of time he was recognized as one of the heroes of the Church.

Then in AD 313, a startling thing happened. Constantine the Roman emperor, declared himself a Christian and recognized Christianity as a legal religion. Constantine was the first Christian to occupy the Roman throne. Before going into battle against a powerful enemy in AD 312, he prayed to the God of the Christians for victory. It is said that in the bright afternoon he suddenly saw a flaming cross in the sky, and above it the inscription in words of fire. ‘*In hoc signo vinces*’ (In this sign thou wilt conquer). That night he believed he heard a voice from heaven telling him to place on his banner the Cross of Christ instead of the Roman eagle. He did accordingly and

¹ *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vs. 4, 668 (Origen Vs. Celsus 8: 73-75).

won the battle against heavy odds.

By a decree called the Edict of Milan in AD 313, the Christians were granted complete religious liberty, and persecutions were held illegal. Constantine and his mother Helena built beautiful churches in Jerusalem, Bethlehem and Constantinople. Grants of land and money were given by the emperor for the support and promotion of the Christian Church. Pastors and teachers were paid their salary by the government and were exempt from paying taxes. If accused of any crime, they could only be tried by Church tribunals. Bishops and members of Christian congregations were accorded positions of leadership in local and state governments and in the court of the emperor.

When such privileges were accorded to Christianity and the Christians, the governing classes, the rich and the worldly, all came into the fold in numbers, bringing with them their usual ways of conduct. Influx of such people into the Church—blurring the line between the Church and the world, corrupting influence of sudden prosperity and wealth, and the subordination of religion to policy and politics—lowered the morals of the Christians and the Church. The speed of degeneration was as astonishing as the magnitude of corruption. Before a century had passed, there were quite a few who declared that the Church had more reason to deplore its prosperity than the adversity and persecution which it had suffered in the third century.

From this point on, a great change came over the Christian Church. The emperor himself being a Christian soldier, it was natural that soon there would be many Christians in the army. In the course of time, the Church gave up its non-resistant position. The sign of the cross of Jesus was now an imperial military emblem, bringing good fortune and victory. The supposed nails of the cross, which the emperor's mother found and sent to him, were made into bridle-bits and a helmet, which he used in his military expeditions.¹

Other changes took place at a rapid pace. In AD 314, the Council of Arles announced a decision that “they who throw away their weapons in time of peace shall be excommunicate.”

¹Cadoux C. J., *The Early Church and the World*, p. 256.

The statements of the Church fathers began to sound a different note from that so familiar before 313. About AD 350, Athanasius said, "Murder is not permitted, but to kill one's adversary in war is both lawful and praiseworthy." A little later, Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, made the case even stronger by saying: "That courage which either protects the homeland against barbarians, in war or defend the weak at home, or saves one's comrades from brigands is full of righteousness." Then in AD 416, the empire even went so far as to forbid non-Christians to serve in the army at all.¹ And so the non-violent Christian brotherhood founded by the suffering Christ, after three and a-half centuries, was transformed into a militant imperial state Church.

Many church leaders began to reinterpret the non-violent teachings of Christ and the scriptures in a compromising way so as to make them fit the lower moral standards which the Church had adopted. Augustine (died AD 430) was able to work out a plausible theory of 'just wars,' which might be fought with the approval of God.² He said, "A just war is wont to be described as one that avenges wrong, when a nation or state has to be punished for refusing to make amends for the wrongs inflicted by its subjects, or to restore what it has seized unjustly."³

So far as the teachings of Christ concerning compassion and love and 'Resist not evil' were concerned, even darker days lay ahead, particularly between AD 1000 and 1450. The Roman Pope claimed authority not only over the Church but also over the governments of the world. He was more interested in power than in Christ's teachings. He claimed to be the representative of Jesus Christ on earth, and as such demanded allegiance and obedience. He enthroned and dethroned emperors as he liked. Many of the popes lived in the most shameful transgression of God's law.

Their greatest sin was complete denial of salvation by grace, through faith. Instead, indulgences were sold and the

¹*op. cit.*, p. 257.

²*De republica* III, XXII 33, cited by Scott Law, in *The State and the International Community*, Vol. II. p. 303.

³St. Augustine, *Questions on Heptateuch* BK. VI. Qu. X. cited by Scott, *op. cit.*, Vol. II. p. 304.

purchasers were promised that their stay in purgatory after death, would be shortened. One of the oft-repeated statements about the purchase of indulgences was: 'As soon as the money clinks in the chest, the soul flits into heavenly rest.' Christ was pictured more as a stern and cruel judge than as a loving Saviour. The sale of indulgences became an encouragement to sin.

Several crusades fought for about 175 years (AD 1096-1270) to free the holy city of Jerusalem, involved a lot of expenditure and killings. The occupation of Jerusalem in AD 1099, by the Christians led to an unmerciful massacre of the Turks. Blood flowed in the streets where the Saviour had once walked and preached. Even during their most brutal moments, the Turks had not been guilty of such slaughter. Yet, when the slaughter was completed, the same crusaders who had murdered the enemy in cold blood knelt bare-headed and prayed at the Holy Sepulchre.

The crusades cost Europe five million young men, whose lives should have been devoted to works of peace. Even the lives of children were lost in these crusades. The saddest of all the crusades was the Children's Crusade which was undertaken in AD 1212. It was believed by many that children because of their innocence could win where their sinful elders could not. As a result of this mistaken idea, a little shepherd boy in France, rallied 30,000 children to the cause of the cross, and a boy in Germany led out 20,000 children at the same time. These children expected miraculous aid in conquering the Holy Land. Many died on the way from starvation, disease and exhaustion and very few of the 50,000 returned to their homes.

Religious-minded people who did not agree with the Papal authority were excommunicated, exiled or put to death. John Wycliff (1415), John Hus (1415) and Savonarola (1498) are some prominent examples.

The atrocities committed by the established authority of the Church, however, did not and could not last long. The futility of the crusades, the enlightenment brought about in the Renaissance period, the Copernican concept of the astronomy and the recognition of the place of man in the universe, the Industrial Revolution and opening up of vast new areas of the globe to mankind, and the Reformation of the Church by

Martin Luther, ushered in a new era defined by broader perspectives.

Other Religious Groups and Societies

During the sixteenth and the seventeenth century, different societies and communities developed among Christians who believed and practised Christ's teachings of non-violence. Prominent among them were the Mennonites or Anabaptists, a Protestant group originating in Switzerland in the sixteenth century, the Friends or Quakers, a similar group originating in seventeenth century England, and the Church of the Brethren or Dunkers originating in Germany in the early eighteenth century. These three make up what have come to be called the 'historic peace churches.' They have taken the Sermon on the Mount seriously, and from the beginning of their history they have taught that all warfare is wrong.

Mennonites: The Mennonite church was founded in Zurich, Switzerland, in 1525, by a group of earnest Bible students, known as the Swiss Brethren. They were commonly called Anabaptists because of their practice of adult, as opposed to infant, baptism. As these men searched the scriptures, they were convinced that not only the Catholic but also the Protestant churches of their day failed to meet the standards of the New Testament. This was especially true, they felt, in the case of the doctrine of non-violence.

The early Mennonite church, therefore, was a brotherhood of regenerated believers who accepted the word of God as the only rule of faith and practice. Great emphasis was placed on discipleship: a literal obedience to the commands of Christ, in faithfully following his steps. They searched the scriptures diligently, and the way of life which they found there they lived within the brotherhood and taught in their meetings.

Among the doctrines upon which they laid stress were freedom of conscience, the separation of church and state, and non-resistance. Indeed, they believed that the state was necessary and ordained by God for the maintenance of order in the unregenerate society of the world. But they also believed that according to the scriptures, the Christian could have no part in the use of force, whether as a soldier in the army or as a magistrate in the civil government. The use of the sword, the

exercise of vengeance, and the taking of human life were strictly forbidden to the disciple of Christ.

Quakers: The Society of Friends called Quakers, was founded c. 1650 by George Fox. Quakers, throughout their three hundred years' history, have maintained that the teaching and spirit of Jesus Christ by which they believe they are guided, lead to a rejection of war in all circumstances, whether, as a means of defence, or for the promotion of justice. They are convinced that war is wrong in itself and wrong in the eyes of God. They dissent from the judgement of Augustine and of the official Church since his time and they deny that there can be such a thing as a 'just war.'

At the time of founding the Society, George Fox said: "All that pretend to fight for Christ are deceived, for His kingdom is not of this world, therefore, His servants do not fight. Fighters are not of Christ's kingdom, but are without Christ's kingdom; His kingdom starts in peace and righteousness, but fighters are in the lust: and all that would destroy men's lives are not of Christ's mind who came to save men's lives. Christ's kingdom is not of this world; it is peaceable: and all that are in strife are not of His kingdom. All that pretend to fight for the Gospel are deceived, for the Gospel is the power of God, which was before the devil, or fall of man was; and the gospel of peace was before fighting was. Therefore, they that pretend fighting, are ignorant of the Gospel; and all that talk of fighting for Sion, are in darkness for Sion needs no such helpers. All such as profess themselves to be ministers of Christ, or Christians, and go about to beat down the whore with outward, carnal weapons, the flesh and the whore are got up in themselves, and they are in a blind zeal; for the whore is got up by inward ravening from the spirit of God; and the beating down thereof, must be by the inward stroke of the sword of the spirit within. All such as pretend Christ Jesus, and confess Him, and yet run into the use of carnal weapons, wrestling with flesh and blood, throw away the spiritual weapons. They that would be wrestlers with flesh and blood, throw away Christ's doctrine; the flesh is got up in them, and they are weary of their sufferings. Such as would revenge themselves are out of Christ's doctrine. Such as being stricken on one cheek, would not turn the other, are out of Christ's

doctrine; and such as do not love one another, nor love enemies, are out of Christ's doctrine..."¹

In 1660, a Declaration from the 'Harmless and Innocent People of God, called Quakers,' was presented to Charles II. It said: "We utterly deny all outward wars and strife, and fightings with outward weapons for any end or under any pretence whatever; this is our testimony to the whole world. The spirit of Christ by which we are guided is not changeable, so as once to command us from a thing as evil, and again to move unto it; and we certainly know, and testify to the world, that the spirit of Christ, which leads us into all truth, will never move us to fight and war against any man with outward weapons, neither for the kingdom of Christ, nor for the kingdoms of this world."

The views of the Quakers about military service by a Christian were explicitly stated by Dymond (1824) in his book *On War*. He stated: "His duty is mildly but firmly to refuse to serve." Furthermore, he said, "There are people who, without any definite reasoning, simply conclude that responsibility for Government measures rests entirely on those who enact them; or that the rulers and kings decide what is right and wrong for their subjects and that the duty of the subjects is to obey. Such considerations, I believe often serve as opiates to men's conscience. . . . We are indeed not responsible for the crimes of our rulers, but we are responsible for our own actions. And the crimes of our rulers are our own, if, knowing them to be crimes we promote them by our co-operation Those who suppose that obedience in all things is required, or that in political affairs responsibility is transferred from them to their rulers, deceive themselves.

"We think, then, that it is the business of every man who believes that war is inconsistent with Christianity, respectfully but steadfastly to refuse military service. And let those whose lot it is to act thus, remember that a great obligation rests upon them. On their fidelity, as far as it depends on man at all, depends the cause of peace for mankind. Let them allow their opinions and maintain them, not in words only but also, if need be, by sufferings. If you believe that Jesue Christ forbade

¹Fox, G., *The Time of My Commitment*.

murder, pay no heed to the arguments or to the commands of those who call on you to take part in it. By such a firm refusal to take part in violence, you will call down on yourselves the blessings promised to those who hear the word of God and keep it, and the time will come when even the world will honour you as having contributed to the reformation of mankind.”

The Quakers like the Mennonites do not believe that the state should direct the affairs of the church. But in other ways they are very different from the Mennonites: they believe it possible for members of the church to play an active part in the affairs of the state and in this way induce the state to adopt the peaceful ways of the church.

Non-Resistance Society: In Boston U.S.A., a Christian pacifist, William Lord Garrison, created a Non-Resistance Society in 1838. It was based on the doctrine of non-violence as advocated by Jesus Christ. Through it, he with his colleagues, intended to overcome the prejudice of colour, race and nationalism that stood in the way of the practice of non-violence. He had a broader aim than that of any of the different Christian groups and societies. Some of the principles that the Non-Resistance Society adopted are as follows:

“We cannot acknowledge allegiance to any human government. We recognize but one King and Law-giver, one Judge and Ruler of mankind . . . Our country is the world, our countrymen are all mankind. We love mankind of our nativity only as we love all mankind. We love the land of our nativity as we love all other lands. The interests and rights of American citizens are no more dear to us than those of the whole human race. Hence we can allow no appeal to patriotism to revenge any national insult or injury We conceive that a nation has no right to defend itself against foreign enemies or punish its invaders, and no individual possesses that right in his own case, and the unit cannot be of greater importance than the aggregate. If soldiers thronging from abroad with intent to commit rapine and destroy life may not be resisted by the people or the magistracy, then ought no resistance to be offered to domestic troubles of the public peace or of private security.

“We regard as unchristian and wrong not only war itself, whether offensive or defensive, but all preparations of war: the

building of any naval ship, any arsenal, of any fortification; we regard as unchristian and wrong the existence of any standing army, all military chieftains or soldiers, all monuments commemorative of victory over a fallen foe, all trophies won in battle, all celebrations in honour of military exploits, all annexations acquired by armed force; and we regard as unchristian and wrong every edict of government requiring military service of its subjects.

“In consequence of all this, we consider it unlawful to bear arms or to hold any office that obliges us to compel men to do right on pain of imprisonment or death. We, therefore, voluntarily exclude ourselves from every legislative and judicial body, and repudiate all human politics, worldly honours, and stations of authority.

“If we cannot occupy a seat in the legislative or on the bench, neither can we select others to act as our substitutes in any such capacity.

“It follows that we cannot sue any man at law to compel him by force to restore anything which he may have wrongly taken from us or others; but if he has seized our coat, we shall surrender up our cloak rather than subject him to punishment.

“We believe that the penal code of the old covenant, ‘an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,’ has been abrogated by Jesus Christ, and that under the new covenant the forgiveness instead of the punishment of the enemies has been enjoined upon all his disciples in all cases whatsoever. To extort money from enemies, to confine them in prison, to exile them, or hang them on gallows, is obviously not to forgive but to take retribution.

“The history of mankind is crowded with evidence proving that physical coercion is not adapted to moral regeneration; that the sinful disposition of men can be subdued only by love, that evil can be exterminated only by goodness; that we should not trust to the strength of an arm to preserve us from harm, but that real security dwells in gentleness, long suffering and mercy; that it is only the weak who shall inherit the earth, but that the violent who resort to the sword are destined to perish with the sword.

“And, therefore, both for the safety of life, property, liberty, public quietude and private welfare, and in order to fulfil the

will of Him who is King of kings and Lord of lords, we cordially adopt the non-resistance principle, being confident that it provides for all possible consequences, and expressing the will of God, must ultimately triumph over every evil force. We advocate no revolutionary doctrines. The spirit of revolutionary doctrine is the spirit of retaliation, violence and murder, and neither fears God nor regard man. We would be filled with the spirit of Christ. Following the fundamental rule of not resisting evil by evil, we cannot engage in plots, riots, disturbances, or violence. We shall submit to every ordinance and every requirement of government except such as are contrary to the commands of the Gospel, and in no case resist the operation of law, except by meekly submitting to the penalty of disobedience. But while we shall adhere to the doctrine of non-resistance and shall passively endure all attacks directed against us, we intend on our part, in a moral and spiritual sense, increasingly to assail iniquity in high places and in low places, in civil, political, legal and ecclesiastical institutions, and to strive to hasten the time when the kingdoms of the world will have become the kingdoms of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Garrison's lifelong work within the pacifist tradition is well known now. His editorship of the *Liberator* and the *Non-Resistant* was intimately connected with his crusade to abolish slavery without resort to violence.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation: Another prominent group of Christians which strictly follow the teaching of Christ was formed in 1914. This was called the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Its convictions are:¹

1. Love, as revealed and interpreted in the life and death of Jesus Christ, involves more than we have yet seen, that it is the only power by which evil can be overcome, and the only sufficient basis of human society;

2. In order to establish a world-order based on Love, it is incumbent upon those who believe in this principle to accept it fully, both for themselves and in their relationship to others, and to take the risks involved in doing so in a world which does not as yet accept it;

¹Brittain, Vera, *The Rebel Passion*.

3. Therefore, as Christians, we are forbidden to wage war, and that our loyalty to our country, to humanity, to the Church Universal, and to Jesus Christ, our Lord and Master, calls us instead to a life service for the enthronement of Love in personal, social, commercial and national life;

4. The Power, Wisdom and Love of God stretch far beyond the limits of our present experience, and that He is ever waiting to break forth into human life in new and larger ways.

5. Since God manifests Himself in the world through men and women, we offer ourselves to Him for His redemptive purpose, to be used by Him in whatever way He may reveal to us.

The F.O.R. has branches all over the world now and is following its ideals and propagating them among others.

These and many other such societies of Christians are doing very useful work in teaching and practising, so far as possible, the teachings of Christ.

We now come to the end of the study of different religions of the world so far as it concerns the principle of non-violence. The teachings of the originators, prophets or sages of these religions are clear and precise: 'Observe Non-Violence'.

But has it actually been so?

The Hindu religion, in general, does not condemn injury or violence; more important than observing non-violence is observing one's duty (*svadharma*), keeping in view the caste order (*varna*) and the stage of life (*ashrama*): a Kshatriya cannot but fight and destroy the enemy; a house-holder (*grihastha*) cannot but support the family.

A deplorable feature of Hindu religion has been the violence that it perpetrated upon one of its own caste, namely the Śūdra. Even the penal code was different for the Śūdras; for an offence, while a Brahmin had only to pay a paltry fine, a Śūdra had molten lead poured into his ears or eyes or a limb cut. All this was done and tolerated in the name of religion.

Buddhism preached compassion among human beings. It had among its followers emperors, monks and laymen. Strict adherence to its principles was, however, possible only by the monks. Nevertheless, the message of Buddha converted many a heart to follow the path of non-violence.

The Jaina religion propagates non-violence among all living beings; in actual practice the rituals that have crept in it have directed this principle at lower forms of life at the neglect of fellow beings.

In the name of their respective religions, the Moslems and the Christians have shed blood, and called those wars 'holy.'

It must be admitted that propagation of non-violence through religion has not been very effective so far as larger groups of people are concerned; in fact, many a time religion *per se* has been the cause of much violence and warfare. In individual cases, however, the religious precepts of non-violence have succeeded in converting many a heart.

2

PRACTICE OF NON-VIOLENCE

All religions teach the individual to be non-violent, the primary aim is the good that it earns for the individual; the benefit to the society being only a byproduct.

In contrast to the above narrow objective, there is another approach wherein the benefit to the society is the primary aim, and in the process of attaining it, the individual works actively and suffers hardships and sacrifices. Such an approach motivated many people when larger, more complex, industrial cities and societies came into being. This social objective took different practical shapes under different environments. People motivated by this objective ushered in (1) Non-Violent Resistance (2) *Satyagraha* (3) Peace Organisations. Through these, the principle of non-violence was used as a means to bring about social justice among people, which was the need of the day. We shall now see how these movements developed and how far they achieved their objective.

Non-violent Resistance

About the middle of nineteenth century, in the U.S.A., a group of people advocated resistance to violence or social injustice, through non-violence. This was not an entirely new approach, yet by laying stress upon it and elaborating it further, it proved to be almost a new method.

Adin Ballou's Non-Violent Resistance

Adin Ballou (1803-1890) was one of the earliest proponents

of this principle. He was the founder, with Garrison, of the Non-resistance Society and its president in 1843. He was active in this field for over fifty years. Defining his concept, he said¹ "The term non-resistance itself. . . demands attention. It requires very considerable qualifications. I use it as applicable only to the conduct of human beings towards human beings, not towards the inferior animals, inanimate things, or satanic influences. If an opponent, willing to make me appear ridiculous, should say—'you are non-resistant, and, therefore, must be *passive* to all assailing beings, things and influences, to satan, man, beast, bird, serpent, insect, rocks, timbers, fire, floods, heat, cold and storm'—I should answer, *not so*; my non-resistance relates solely to conduct between human beings. This is an important limitation of the term. But I go further, and disclaim using the term to express absolute passivity, even towards *human beings*. I claim the right to offer the utmost moral resistance, not sinful, of which God has made me capable, to every manifestation of evil among mankind. Nay, I hold it my *duty* to offer such moral resistance. In this sense my very non-resistance becomes the highest kind of *resistance* to evil. This is another important qualification of the term. But I do not stop here. There is an uninjurious, benevolent *physical* force. There are cases in which it would not only be allowable, but in the highest degree commandable, to *restrain* human beings by this kind of force. Thus, maniacs, the insane, the delirious, sick, ill-natured children, the intellectually or *morally* non-compos mentis, the intoxicated and the violently passionate, are frequently disposed to perpetrate outrages and inflict injuries, either on themselves or others, which ought to be kindly and uninjurious prevented by the muscular energy of their friends. And in cases where deadly violence is inflicted with deliberation and malice aforethought, one may nobly throw his body as a temporary barrier between the destroyer and his helpless victim, choosing to die in that position, rather than be a passive spectator. Thus another most important qualification is given to the term non-resistance. It is not non-resistance to animals and inanimate things, nor to satan, but only to human beings. Nor is it *moral* non-resistance to human

¹Ballou, Adin, *Christian Non-violence*.

beings, but chiefly physical. Nor is it physical non-resistance to all human being, under all circumstances, but only so far as to abstain totally from the infliction of personal injury, as a means of resistance. It is simply non-resistance of injury with injury—evil with evil.

“Non-resistance alone makes it possible to tear out evil by the root, both out of our own hearts and those of our neighbours. The teaching forbids the doing of that by which evil is multiplied in the world. He who attacks another and insults him engenders in him the sentiment of hatred, the root of all evil. To offend another because he has offended us, on the specious pretext of removing an evil, is really to repeat an evil deed, both against him and against ourselves—to beget, or at least to free and to encourage, the very demon we wish to expel. Satan cannot be driven out by Satan, untruth cannot be cleaned by untruth, and evil cannot be vanquished by evil.

“True non-resistance is the one true resistance to evil. It crushes the serpent’s head; it kills and finally destroys the evil sentiment.

“Non-resistance is as practicable as any good prescribed by the Law of God. The good cannot under all circumstances be executed without self-renunciation, privation, suffering, and in extreme cases the loss of life itself. But he who values life more than the fulfilment of God’s will, is already dead to the one true life. Such a man, in trying to save his life, shall lose it. And in general, where non-resistance demands the sacrifice of one life, or the sacrifice of some essential good of life, resistance demands thousands of such sacrifices.

“Non-resistance preserves; resistance destroys. It is incomparably safer to act justly than to act unjustly; to bear an insult than to resist it by violence. It is safer even in relation to the present life. If no man resisted evil with evil, our world would be blessed.

“If only one man acted thus, [non-resistantly] and all the others agreed to crucify him, would it not be more glorious for him to die in the triumph of non-resisting love, paying for his enemies, than to live wearing the crown of Caesar, bespattered with the blood of the slain? But one man or a thousand who have firmly determined not to resist evil with evil—whether among enlightened people or savage neighbours—are much safer

from violence than those who rely on violence. The robber, murderer, or deceiver, will more quickly leave them alone than those who resist with weapons. They who take the sword perish with the sword, and those who seek peace, who act in a friendly manner, inoffensively, who forget and forgive offences, for the most part enjoy peace, or, if they die, die blessed.

“Thus, if all kept the commandment of non-resistance, it is evident that there would be no offences and no evil needs. If these formed a majority, they would establish the reign of love and goodwill, even towards the ill-disposed, by never resisting evil with evil and never using violence. If there were a considerable minority of such, they would have such a corrective moral effect upon society that every cruel punishment would be abolished, and violence and enmity would be changed to peace and love. If there were but a small minority of them, they would rarely experience anything worse than the contempt of the world, and the world in the meanwhile, without noticing it and without feeling itself under obligation, would become wiser and better for this secret influence. And if, in the very worst case, a few members of the minority should be persecuted to death, these men, dying for the truth, would leave behind them their teaching, sanctified by their martyr’s death.”

Thoreau’s ‘Civil Disobedience’

While Adin Ballou formulated the concept of non-violent resistance, Thoreau (1817-1862) showed how to use it so as to get justice and fair-play from the opponent—in his case, the State. Some excerpts from his article ‘On the Duty of Civil Disobedience’ advocating his view point, are as follows:¹

“Unjust laws exist: shall we be content to obey them, or shall we endeavour to amend them, and obey them until we have succeeded, or shall we transgress them at once? . . . Men generally, under such a government as this, think that they ought to wait until they have persuaded the majority to alter them. They think that, if they should resist, the remedy would be worse than the evil . . .

“Under a government which imprisons any unjustly, the true

¹Thoreau, H. D., *Walden or Life in the Woods*, On the Duty of Civil Disobedience, P. 281.

place for a just man is also a prison. The proper place today, the only place which Massachusetts has provided for her free and less desponding spirits, is in her prisons, to be put out and locked out of the State by her own act, as they have already put themselves out of their principles

“ . . . If any think that their influence would be lost there [in prison], and their voices no longer afflict the ear of the State, that they would not be as an enemy within its walls, they do not know by how much truth is stronger than error, nor how much more eloquently and effectively he can combat injustice who has experienced a little in his own person. Cast your whole vote, not a strip of paper merely, but your whole influence. A minority is powerless while it conforms to the majority; it is not even a minority then; but it is irresistible when it clogs by its whole weight. If the alternative is to keep all just men in prison, or give up war and slavery, the State will not hesitate which to choose. If a thousand men were not to pay their tax-bills this year, that would not be a violent and bloody measure, as it would be to pay them, and enable the State to commit violence and shed innocent blood. This is, in fact, the definition of a peaceable revolution if any such is possible. If the tax-gatherer, or any other public officer, asks me, as one has done, “But what shall I do”? My answer is, “If you really wish to do anything, resign your office.” When the subject has refused allegiance, and the officer has resigned his office, then the revolution is accomplished. But even suppose blood should flow. Is there not a sort of blood shed when the conscience is wounded? Through this wound a man’s real manhood and immortality flow out, and he bleeds to an everlasting death. I see this blood flowing now.

“I have paid no poll-tax for six years. I was put into a jail once on this account, for one night; and, as I stood considering the walls of solid stone, two or three feet thick, the door of wood and iron, a foot thick, and the iron grating which strained the light, I could not help being struck with the foolishness of that institution which treated me as if I were mere flesh and blood and bones, to be locked up. I wondered that it should have concluded at length that it was the best use it could put me to, and had never thought to avail itself of my services in some way. I saw that, if there was a wall of

stone between me and my townsmen, there was a still more difficult one to climb or break through before they could get to be as free as I was. I did not for a moment feel confined, and the walls seemed a great waste of stone and mortar. I felt as if I alone of all my townsmen had paid my tax. They plainly did not know how to treat me, but behaved like persons who are underbred. In every threat and in every compliment there was a blunder; for they thought that my chief desire was to stand on the other side of that stone wall. I could not but smile to see how industriously they locked the door on my meditations, which followed them out again within let or hindrance, and they were really all that was dangerous. As they could not reach me, they had resolved to punish my body; just as boys, if they cannot come at some person against whom they have a spite, will abuse his dog. I saw that the State was half-witted, that it was timid as a lone woman with her silver spoons, and that it did not know its friends from its foes, and I lost all my remaining respect for it, and pitied it."

The path advocated by Henry David Thoreau inspired Gandhi decades later. While Thoreau fought non-violently against slavery in the United States, Gandhi fought against the might of the British empire through *satyagraha*, a technique which we shall now discuss in detail.

Satyagraha

Satyagraha is the application of the principle of non-violent resistance that Gandhi launched for the first time in South Africa. It contains in it Adin Ballou's concept of Non-violent Resistance, Thoreau's 'Civil Disobedience', William James' 'Moral Equivalent of War' and Ruskin's 'Wages of Labour' enunciated in his *Unto This Last*. But the amalgam has its own identity—the identity of Gandhi himself.

Principle

The word *satyagraha* was coined in 1906, in South Africa by Gandhi himself. In connection with the Asiatic Amendment Ordinance, introduced into the Transval Legislative Council, Gandhi launched a 'passive resistance' movement, but as the struggle continued, he felt that 'some new principle had come into being.' He then announced through the pages of his

newspaper *Indian Opinion* that a prize would be given for the best name invented to designate the movement. One competitor suggested the word *sadagraha*, meaning 'firmness in a good cause.' Gandhi writes: "I liked the word, but it did not represent the whole idea I wished it to connote. I, therefore, corrected it to *satyagraha*. *Satya* (Truth) implies love, and *agraha* (firmness) engenders and, therefore serves as a synonym for force. I thus began to call the Indian movement *satyagraha*, that is to say, the force which is born of Truth and Love or non-violence, and gave up the use of the phrase 'passive resistance.'

Elucidating his concept of Truth, Gandhi wrote: "The word *satya* is derived from *sat*, which means *being*. Nothing is or exists in reality except Truth. That is why *Sat* or Truth is perhaps the most important name of God. In fact, it is more correct to say that Truth is God, than to say God is Truth . . ."

"Generally speaking, observation of the law of Truth is understood merely to mean that we must speak of truth. But . . . the word *Satya* or Truth should be understood in a much wider sense. There should be Truth in thought, Truth in speech, and Truth in action. To the man who has realized this Truth in its fulness, nothing else remains to be known, because all knowledge is necessarily included in it . . . Devotion to this Truth is the sole justification for our existence."

Such a Truth was an ideal which Gandhi strived to achieve in his life. He wrote: "I am but a seeker after Truth. I claim to be making a ceaseless effort to find it. But I admit that I have not yet found it. To find Truth completely is to realize oneself and one's destiny, that is, to become perfect. I am painfully conscious of my imperfections, and therein lies all the strength I possess, because it is a rare thing for a man to know his own limitation."¹

Gandhi's concept of non-violence (*ahimsa*) differs remarkably from the traditional Indian non-violence. Gandhi used it as a means, not an end; a means to removing social injustices and social evils in society. According to him, non-violence could be used as a means to achieve social justice not merely through non-injury of the opponent, but through love for him; not

¹*Young India*, 17th Nov. 1925.

through his suffering but through one's own; not through meek submission to humiliation and the evil-designs of the opponent but through resisting him non-violently even in the face of sure death.

Man's inability to know the truth required that he maintain an unceasingly open approach to those who differed from him. . . . The pursuit of truth did not admit of violence being inflicted on one's opponent . . . for what appears to be a truth to the one may appear to be an error to the other.¹

In his famous article entitled, When killing may be *ahimsa*, he said " . . . there may be far more *himsa* (violence) in the slow torture of men and animals, the starvation and exploitation to which they are subjected to out of selfish greed, the wanton humiliation and oppression of the weak and the killing of their self-respect that we witness all around us today than in mere benevolent taking a life. . . .

"When a person claims to be non-violent, he is expected not to be angry with one who had injured him. He will not wish him harm; he will wish him well; he will not swear at him; he will not cause him any physical hurt. He will put up with all the injury to which he is subjected by the wrong-doer."

Gandhi's *ahimsa* sometimes made him go against the traditional *ahimsa* of the Hindus. He narrates: "A calf was lame and had developed terrible sores; he could not eat, and breathed with difficulty. After three day's argument with myself and my co-workers, I put an end to its life. Now that action was non-violent because it was wholly unselfish, in as much as the sole purpose was to achieve the calf's relief from pain." Clarifying his action, he said, "Man is not to drown himself in the well of *śāstras* (religious books) but he is to dive in their broad ocean and bring out pearls. At every step he has to use his discrimination as to what is *ahimsa* and what is *himsa*. . . ."

According to Gandhi, non-violence cannot be preached. It has to be practised. "The minimum that is required of a person wishing to cultivate the *ahimsa* of the brave, is first to clear one's thought of cowardice and in the light of the clearance regulate his conduct in every activity, great or small. Thus the votary must refuse to be cowed down by his superior, without

¹Young India, 25th Aug. 1920.

being angry If I succeed in curbing my temper every time and though able to give blow for blow, I refrain, I shall develop the *ahimsa* of the brave which will never fail me and which will compel recognition from the most confirmed adversaries.”

“ . . . If one does not practise non-violence in one’s personal relations with others and hopes to use it in bigger affairs, one is vastly mistaken. Non-violence like charity must begin at home.”

With such lofty ingredients of Truth and non-violence, •
Gandhi created the concept of *satyagraha*.

Satyagraha, based on the twin fundamental concepts of truth and non-violence, aims at seeking a resolution of the conflict not by injuring, crushing, or humiliating the opponent or by breaking his will, but by helping him change his understanding and his sense of values, so that he will join whole-heartedly with the *satyagrahi* in seeking a settlement truly amicable and truly satisfying to both sides. The *satyagrahi* seeks a solution under which both parties can have complete self-respect and mutual respect. The function of *satyagraha* is not to harm the opponent nor to impose a solution against his will, but to help both parties into a more secure, creative, happy and truthful relationship.

In *satyagraha*, it is the *satyagrahi* who volunteers to suffer, and he avoids inflicting needless suffering on the opponent. Gandhi would not allow a movement aimed directly at Englishmen to continue during Easter Sunday, and, out of respect for his opponent’s susceptibility to tropical heat, he would call off action during the hottest hours of the day.

While a *satyagrahi* starts *satyagraha* because according to him the basic concepts of truth are being challenged, yet he is always prepared to revise his opinion if he is persuaded of its falsity. This is, however, not to suggest that a *satyagrahi* is a weak or easy opponent; he may persist unto the last without relaxing his hold on the original position which he takes to be the truth. His insistence is on the means—truth and non-violence—, not on the goal. A *satyagrahi* does not aim at victory over his opponent but rather for a synthesis of the two opposing claims. He does all he can to persuade the opponent of the correctness of his own position, but, while he carries on

his persuasive activity, he allows the opponent every opportunity and, indeed, invites him to demonstrate the correctness of his (the opponent's) position. He is, at all times, prepared to depart from his own position and to embrace the opponent's position should he be persuaded, by the opponent, of his error. This may, of course, be total or partial departure; the *satyagrahi* may be persuaded to abandon certain parts of his original position. He recognizes, and attempts to demonstrate to his opponent that he recognizes, the desirability of a resulting synthesis, and that he is not seeking a one-sided triumph. His effort is to allow for the emergence of the best re-structuring of the situation. *He seeks a victory, not over the opponent, but over the situation* (fulfilling the total human needs of the situation).

A *satyagrahi* never forgets the distinction between evil and the evil-doer; he does not harbour ill-will or bitterness against the latter. He does not even employ needlessly offensive language against the evil person, however, unreasonable his act may be. For it is an article of faith with every *satyagrahi* that there is none so fallen in this world but can be converted by love. A *satyagrahi* always tries to overcome evil by good, anger by love, untruth by truth, *himsa* by *ahimsa*. There is no other way of purging the world of evil.

A person who claims to be a *satyagrahi* always tries by close and prayerful self-introspection and self-analysis to find out whether he is himself completely free from the taint of anger, ill-will and such other human infirmities, whether he is not himself capable of those very evils against which he is out to lead a crusade. *Satyagraha* pre-supposes self-discipline, self-control, self-purification.

Analysing the psychology of the *satyagraha* encounter, Gregg said:¹ If one man attacks another with physical violence and the victim hits back, the violent response gives the attacker a certain reassurance and moral support. It shows that the position of violence on the victim's scale of moral values is the same as that of the attacker. A mere display of either fear or anger by the victim is sufficient to have this effect. It makes the attacker sure of his own *savoir faire*, of

¹Gregg R. B., *Power of Non-Violence*.

his choice of methods, of his knowledge of human nature and hence of his opponent. He can rely on the victim to react in a definite way. The attacker's morale is sustained, his sense of values is vindicated.

But suppose the assailant, using physical violence, attacks a different sort of person. The attitude of this new opponent is fearless, calm, and steady, because of a different belief, training, or experience. He does not respond to the attacker's violence with counter-violence. Instead, he accepts the blows good-temperedly, stating his belief as to the truth of the matter under dispute, asking for an examination of both sides of the dispute, and stating his readiness to abide by the truth. He offers resistance, but only in moral terms. He states his readiness to prove his sincerity by his own suffering rather than by inflicting harm on the assailant.

At such an unusual and unexpected reaction, the assailant will be surprised. If at first he was inclined to be scornful or contemptuous of the victim as a coward, those feelings rapidly become displaced by curiosity and wonder 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 insecure because of the novelty of the situation and his ignorance of how to handle it. He loses his poise and self-confidence.

If there are onlookers, the assailant soon loses still more poise. Instinctively, he dramatizes himself before them and becomes more aware of his position. With the audience as a sort of mirror, he realizes the contrast between his own conduct and that of the victim. In relation to the onlookers, the attacker with his violence, perhaps, begins to feel a little excessive and undignified, even a little ineffective, and by contrast with the victim less generous and in fact brutal. He realizes that the onlookers see that he has misjudged the nature of his adversary, and realizes that he has lost prestige. Of course, he does not want to acknowledge it, but his feelings betray themselves in hesitance of manner, speech or glance. The onlookers perceive it, and he himself senses a further loss of public support.

The non-violent resister has demonstrated his sincerity and

deep conviction. 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. Non-violence coupled with voluntary suffering is just such an incontestable proof of sincerity. Voluntary suffering is probably also a sure sign that the whole being of the sufferer—body, mind, will and spirit is integrated and at work with singleness of purpose.

“ . . . Sooner or later, his conduct wins public sympathy, admiration and support, and also the respect of the violent opponent himself.”

Practice

To wage *satyagraha* successfully needs organisation and training of the participants. Leaders must firmly believe that non-violence is superior to violence, not only on moral grounds but also as a practical proposition. When the leaders have such an attitude, the rank and file may, at the start, be ordinary human material, yet training and discipline will bring out the best in them.

Such leaders can inculcate the requisite characteristics among the volunteers, through their own examples. In no case should the volunteers resort to violence. They should not take revenge for any act of inhumanity of the opponent. They must be prepared to show generosity themselves, and must expect the directing body to do so always. They must not expect any unjust advantages to accrue to them in case of success. Those who are in happy circumstances must share their wealth with the unfortunate ones. They will joyfully obey all the orders issued by the leader of the corps, and will carry out orders in the first instance even though they appear to them insulting, inimical or foolish, and only appeal, if they like, to the higher authority, later. They are free before joining to determine whether the organization satisfies them, but after they have joined it, it becomes a duty to submit to its discipline.

The objective of training the masses is not that every single person in a nation seeking resolution of conflicts 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 possible for a whole nation to understand the idea and

be so self-disciplined.

The launching of a non-violent resistance campaign needs many other things to be looked into thoroughly. Before the start of the campaign, the leaders ought to fully understand the society and the social forces working in it. Furthermore, they should seek personal rapport with the opponent as there is the outside chance that the issue at stake hinges on the intrusion of his private attitudes into his official actions, or on his ignorance of the situation etc. There is always a chance that courtesy, courage and honesty may win his respect and enable him to be accommodating towards the demands that are not basically against the system that he upholds. The opponent should be stripped of his fears and apprehensions. It is distinctly to the advantage of the *satyagrahis* if they can summon sufficient empathy to see matters from his point of view so that they can help him to see the situation as it actually is.

Throughout the campaign, mass demonstrations can serve as a convincing index of numerical strength. To get a maximum turn out, however, they should be wisely spaced, adequately publicized and imaginatively staged with full use of vivid symbols of the movements, purpose and unity as well as devices to amplify the message and boost morale, and to make unmistakably clear the fact that the leadership group and the cadres have the full support of the masses. Large numbers, however, are unwieldy and can lead to violent actions as well, unless properly trained and disciplined.

The rule to be always remembered about *satyagraha* is that it is never adopted abruptly and never till all other and milder methods have been tried.

As the *satyagraha* campaign proceeds the leaders should see that the objectives, strategy and tactics of the campaign are fully understood by the volunteers and the masses and that the movement is progressive. Side by side, a persistent search for avenues of co-operation with the opponent on honourable terms should be sought, without surrendering the essentials in negotiation and always insisting upon full agreement, if possible.

To promote the spirit of non-violent resistance among the Indian masses, Gandhi advocated the formation of the Peace Brigade whose members, according to him, should possess the qualifications that have, in general, been set forth before.

Having stated the principles and practice of *satyagraha*, we shall now discuss some specific instances of *satyagraha*. Here again we will see the outcome of such struggles and the factors that influenced them.

Champaran Satyagraha 1917: Champaran is a district of the Tirhut division in Bihar, India. The peasants there were compelled by law to allot 15 per cent of their total land for indigo cultivation.

One of these oppressed peasants invited Gandhi to investigate the conditions of the workers on the indigo plantations. After he arrived there, Gandhi began his inquiry without much publicity, but the planters resented his activities there and persuaded the District Magistrate that the presence of Gandhi was dangerous to the peace of the district. The Magistrate served an eviction notice on Gandhi. Gandhi replied that he had come there from a sense of duty, and was doing nothing but carefully and quietly ascertaining facts. He further stated that he intended to stay and would gladly submit to any penalty for disobedience.

Gandhi was summoned to the court and tried. The brief statement that he made on that historic occasion has since become a classical summation of *satyagraha*. He said, "With the permission of the court, I would like to make a brief statement showing why I have taken the very serious step of seemingly disobeying the order passed under Section 144 of Cr. P.C. In my humble opinion it is a question of difference of opinion between the local administration and myself. I have entered the country with motives of rendering humanitarian and national service. I have done so in response to a pressing invitation to come and help the *ryots*, who urge they are not being fairly treated by the indigo planters. I could not render any help without studying the problem. I have, therefore, come to study it with the assistance, if possible, of the Administration and the planters. I have no other motive, and cannot believe that my coming can in any way disturb public peace and cause loss of life. I claim to have considerable experience in such matters. The Administration, however, have thought differently. I fully appreciate their difficulty, and I admit too that they can proceed upon information they received. As a law-abiding citizen my first instinct would be,

as it was, to obey the order served upon me. But I could not do so without doing violence to my sense of duty to those for whom I have come. I feel that I could just now serve them only by remaining in their midst. I could not, therefore, voluntarily retire. Amid this conflict of duties, I could only throw the responsibility of removing me from them on the Administration. I am fully conscious of the fact that a person, holding, in the public life of India, a position such as I do, has to be most careful in setting an example. It is my firm belief that in the complex constitution under which we are living, the only safe and honourable course for a self-respecting man is, in the circumstances such as face me, to do what I have decided to do, that is, to submit without protest to the penalty of disobedience.

“I venture to make this statement not in any way in extenuation of the penalty to be awarded against me, but to show that I have disregarded the order served upon me not for want of respect for lawful authority, but in obedience to the higher law of our being, the voice of conscience.”

Before Gandhi could be sentenced by the court, the Lieutenant-Governor withdrew the case against him in a dramatic manner, and allowed him to make the enquiry. He also assured Gandhi that he would get whatever help he needed from the officials.

While Gandhi was making a strict and impartial enquiry about the working condition of the *ryots* in Champaran, the Lieutenant-Governor interested himself in the case, and after conferring with Gandhi, appointed a Government Commission, with Gandhi as one of the members. The Commission reported unanimously that the indigo law was unfair and the exactions of the big planters unjust.

Satyagraha Against Rowlatt Bill, 1919: This was the first nation-wide *satyagraha* campaign in India launched between 1st March 1919 to 18th April 1919.

Sir Sidney Rowlett, as Chairman of the Sedition Committee in 1918, had recommended measures to strengthen the hand of the government in the control of crime. The so-called Rowlatt Act (Government of India Act No. XI of 1919) ‘was framed to enable anarchical offences to be tried expeditiously before a strong court consisting of three High Court Judges, with no

right to appeal.' This act also provided powers to arrest and confine persons suspected of acts threatening public safety; and with powers to demand suspected persons to furnish security, to reside in a particular place, or to abstain from any specified act.

According to the Indian masses and leaders, such a Bill was 'unjust, subversive of the principles of liberty and justice, destructive of the elementary rights of an individual on which the safety of India as a whole and of the State itself was based.' Furthermore, the Bill appeared to be a denial of the promises made by British statesmen during the First World War and confirmed the suspicion that Britain intended to deprive India's progress to independence.

Gandhi appealed to the Viceroy to withhold his assent. He also informed him that in case the Bill became law, no other course was open to him but to lead a mass *satyagraha* against it. The Viceroy and the government, however, showed no disinclination in proceeding further with the Bill.

Of this situation Gandhi wrote later in the following words: "We daily discussed together plans of the fight, but beyond the holding of public meetings, I could not then think of any other programme. I felt myself at a loss to discover how to offer civil disobedience against the Rowlatt Bill if it was finally passed into law. One could disobey it only if the Government gave one the opportunity for it. Failing that, could we civilly disobey other laws? And if so, where was the line to be drawn?

" . . . While these cogitations were still going on, news was received that the Rowlatt Bill had been published as an Act. That night I fell asleep while thinking over the question. Towards the small hours of the morning I woke up somewhat earlier than usual. I was still in that twilight condition between sleep and consciousness when suddenly the idea broke upon me—it was as if in a dream. Early in the morning I related the whole story to Rajagopalachari: "The idea came to me last night in a dream that we should call upon the country to observe a general *hartal*. *Satyagraha* is a process of self-purification, and ours is a sacred fight, and it seems to me to be in the fitness of things that it should be commenced with an act of self-purification. Let all the people of India, therefore, suspend their business on that day and observe the day as one of fasting and prayer. . . ."

Hartal was initially fixed on 30th March 1919, but was subsequently changed to 6th April. It was observed in Delhi on 30th March because the leaders of the movement there had not received the announcement of postponement; elsewhere it was held on the 6th of April. It was very nearly a complete *hartal*.

Hartal, fasting and processions were organized to arouse the masses. Civil disobedience of the laws in question was restricted only to those who took the pledge "that in the struggle (they) will faithfully follow truth and refrain from violence to life, person or property." The law was broken by publishing and selling prohibited literature.

The government on its part fell heavily on the *satyagrahis*. They were lathi-charged, mercilessly beaten and imprisoned. Gandhi was arrested on 8th April near the border of the Punjab while he was proceeding to that province; later he was taken back and released at Bombay. As a result of these retaliatory measures, violence broke out in many places. Stone-throwing, arson, cutting of telegraph lines and even killing of some Indian and British people was resorted to by the incensed masses in some places. Violence, on the part of the masses disturbed Gandhi very much. He suspended the *satyagraha* movement and went on a three day 'penitential fast.'

But the Government took further repressive measures. Martial law was imposed in Ahmedabad, Lahore and Amritsar.

Apropos the Martial law rule under General Dyer, the infamous Jallianwala Bagh massacre was enacted in Amritsar. The Police, under the direction of the British officers, fired upon a crowd gathered within a confined area, killing hundreds of helpless persons. Public flogging was freely resorted to and the Indians were forced to crawl upon their bellies when passing a certain lane where an English woman had been assaulted.

This movement against the Rowlett Bill was a failure, as it was marked by violence on the part of the participants. This happened because of the inadequate preparation of those who participated, especially those on the periphery of the campaign. The code of discipline which was understood and adhered to by some of the prominent leaders in the campaign was not sufficiently understood and followed by the volunteers and the masses. The masses of India which had formerly remained

completely inert, when suddenly faced with the political awakening, produced such a tremendous amount of energy that sparks flew hither and thither. Gandhi's 'Himalayan miscalculation,' as he called it, lay largely in his failure to anticipate the overwhelming response among the masses which his appeal invoked.

Vykom Temple Road Satyagraha 1924-1925: This *satyagraha* was undertaken from spring 1924 to autumn 1925 in the village Vykom, in the state of Travancore, at the southern tip of India.

A highway runs through the low-lying country around Vykom and through this village and close by, were the Brahmin quarters and a temple. For centuries, the Brahmins had refused to permit any low-caste untouchable to use this road. This was a serious disability inasmuch as it required untouchable to take a long circuitous route to reach their dwellings.

To help the untouchables get rid of this restriction imposed upon them by the Brahmins and the State, some of the social workers familiar with Gandhi's technique of *satyagraha* decided to take the matter in their hands. Gandhi was ill, many hundred miles away, but the young leaders came north to consult him.

Before the start of the campaign every effort was made to negotiate a settlement with the Brahmins as well as with the state authorities, but they proved fruitless. Efforts were then made to attract public attention and win sympathy for the Vykom untouchables. A camp was set up and the participants in the campaign had a thorough coaching in the principles underlying *satyagraha*. Prayer meetings were held daily. The volunteers in the camp were instructed to become self-sufficient; hand-spinning was part of that duty.

The *satyagrahis* started the struggle by taking several of their untouchable friends with them along the forbidden road. They were immediately beaten by the Brahmins, and one was seriously hurt. But the young *satyagrahis* offered no violence in return. The police arrested several of these young men for trespassing and they were imprisoned for different periods of time. As news of the *satyagraha* spread, volunteers came pouring in from all parts of the country to take the place of those arrested. The state could not manage to arrest all of them, hence it ordered the police to prevent any more of the

satyagrahis from entering the road. The police formed a cordon across the road. According to Gandhi's instructions, the *satyagrahis* then stood opposite the police barrier in an attitude of prayer. They organized themselves into shifts, taking turns in standing there for six hours at a time. They built a hut nearby, undertook their duties on a religious basis and did handspinning while not on active duty. At no time did they use violence. Such a state of affairs continued for months.

Later when Gandhi got well, he visited Vykomb. Talking to the *satyagrahis* there, he told them of the wider implications of their struggle and enunciated before them the *satyagraha* principles. He said, " . . . It is a struggle deeply religious for the Hindus. We are endeavouring to rid Hinduism of its greatest blot. The prejudice we have to fight against is an age-long prejudice. The struggle for the opening of the roads round the temple which we hold to be public to the untouchables is but a small skirmish in the big battle. If our struggle was to end with the opening of the roads in Vykomb, you may be sure I would not have bothered my head about it. If, therefore, you think that the struggle is to end with opening of the roads in Vykomb to the untouchables you are mistaken. The road must be opened. It has got to be opened. But that will be the beginning of the end. The end is to get all such roads throughout Travancore to be opened to the untouchables, and not only that, but we expect that our efforts may result in amelioration of the general condition of the untouchables, and 'unapproachables.'

As regards the means required to wage such a struggle, he said, " . . . We should carry on this struggle on the lines of strict non-violence *i.e.*, by suffering in our own person. That is the meaning of *satyagraha*. The question is whether you are capable of every suffering that may be imposed upon you or may be your lot in the journey towards the goal. Even whilst you are suffering you may have no bitterness—no trace of it—against your opponents. And I tell you it is not a mechanical act at all. On the contrary, I want you to feel like loving your opponents, and the way to do it is to give them the same credit for honesty of purpose which you claim for yourself. I know it is a very difficult task . . . It is true that they have their ends to serve. But so have we our ends to serve. Only we consider

our ends to be pure and, therefore, selfless . . . Three-fourths of the miseries and misunderstandings in the world will disappear, if we step into the shoes of our adversaries and understand their standpoint. We will then agree with our adversaries quickly or think of them charitably. In our case there is no question of our agreeing with them quickly as our ideals are radically different. But we may be charitable to them and believe that they actually mean what they say. They do not want to open the roads to the untouchables. Now whether it is their self-interest or ignorance that tells them to say so, we really believe that it is wrong of them to say so. Our business, therefore, is to show them that they are in the wrong and we should do so *by our suffering*. I have found that mere appeal to reason does not answer where prejudices are age-long and based on supposed religious authority. Reason has to be strengthened by suffering and suffering opens the eyes of understanding. Therefore, there must be no trace of compulsion in our acts. We must not be impatient and we must have an undying faith in the means we are adopting . . . I know that it is a difficult and slow process. But if you believe in the efficacy of *satyagraha*, you will rejoice in this slow torture and suffering, and you will not feel the discomfort of your position as you go and sit in the boiling sun from day to day. If you have faith in the cause and the means and in God, the hot sun will be cool for you. You must not be tired and say, 'how long'; and never get irritated. That is only a small portion of your penance for the sin for which Hinduism is responsible."

The *satyagrahis* followed the principles to a word. When the rainy season came, the road, being on low ground, was flooded. Still they continued to stand, at times up to their shoulders in water, while the police kept up the cordon in small boats. The shifts had to be shortened to three hours. Self-suffering was a characteristic attitude of the *satyagrahis*. For sixteen months, they suffered physically both from attacks of their orthodox opponents and from the inclemency of the weather. So just was their patience that even after the police cordon had been withdrawn, they persisted in peaceful *satyagraha*, with the aim of making their opponents understand their point of view.

The endurance and the consistent non-violence of the

satyagrahis was finally too much for the Brahmins. In the autumn of 1925, after a year and four months, their obstinacy broke down, and they said: "We cannot any longer resist the prayers that have been made to us, and we are ready to receive the untouchables." The Brahmins opened the road to everybody irrespective of caste.

The success of the Vykom *satyagraha* had reverberations throughout India. It aided in removing similar restrictions against the untouchables in other parts of the country.

Ahmedabad Labour Satyagraha February-March 1918: In 1917, there developed a dispute over the amount of Dearness Allowance to be paid to textile workers by the mill-owners in Ahmedabad, India. Earlier the labourers were getting a special bonus as an incentive to continue working even while an epidemic of plague had broken out in the city. This plague bonus in some cases was as high as 70 to 80 per cent of the workers' wages, and had been continued after the plague danger had subsided. In January 1918, when the mill-owners made known their intention of withdrawing the bonus, workers made an appeal for at least a 50 per cent increase on the July salaries as there had been a sharp rise in prices, amounting to as much as two to four times the old prices.

Gandhi was informed of the situation first by one of the mill-owners, who requested his intervention. Gandhi went to Ahmedabad and began his investigation. Both sides agreed to submit the dispute to an arbitration board consisting of three representatives from each side; Gandhi was requested by the workers to be one of the members on their behalf. He agreed.

The arbitration proceedings had scarcely got under way, when the labourers in some of the mills, (in the absence of Gandhi from Ahmedabad) acting upon the fear of threatened lockout, struck work. Thereupon the arbitration broke down. The mill-owners declared that they would dismiss all the workers who were not willing to accept a 20 percent increase as Dearness Allowance.

Investigations conducted by Gandhi had shown that a 35 per cent increase in the worker's salary, was a just demand. Consequently he advised the workers to ask for it. But the mill-owners rejected the demand. Conflict followed.

Gandhi, who had entered the earlier situation as a conciliator,

became the leader of the workers, and introduced *satyagraha* as the technique whereby a constructive solution could be achieved. He organized the workers and told them to earn their living during the period of *satyagraha* by undertaking some other labour, and this they did. Daily meetings were held and information bulletins were issued on the progress of the *satyagraha* strike. Gandhi asked the workers to remain completely non-violent, and not to waver at all in their decision. Demonstrations were taken through the streets of Ahmedabad with banners reading 'Ek Tek' (United Resolve).

A few days after the start of the *satyagraha* strike, the mill-owners in order to create a cleavage in the ranks of the workers, announced that those who wanted a 20 per cent increase as dearness allowance could come and start work in the mill. Some of the needy waverers among the labourers got ready to join work. This, if done, would have led to failure. Gandhi fearing this, declared, that 'unless the strikers rally and continue the strike till a settlement is reached or till they leave the mills altogether, I will not touch any food.' And he went on a fast forthwith.

On the third evening of Gandhi's fast, Ambalal Sarabai, the leader of the mill-owners came forward with suggestions of arbitration in the dispute and Gandhi broke his fast. Later arbitration proposals upheld the decision of the workers for a 35 per cent increase in their wages.

Bardoli Satyagraha 1928: In Bardoli, a small district near Surat in Bombay Presidency, 88000 peasants waged a non-violent campaign from 12th February to 4th August 1928. This was to persuade the Bombay government to launch an impartial inquiry into the recent enhancement of land revenue.

The dispute arose because contrary to the advice of the Joint Parliamentary Committee appointed to consider the Government of India Bill 1919, and contrary to a resolution of the Legislative Council of the Bombay Presidency in 1924, the Bombay Provincial Government in 1927 raised the rate of rural taxation very severely—nominally 22 per cent but in actual practice in some instances over 60 per cent. The peasants were of the view that the investigation upon which the increase had been based was wholly inadequate, and that the increase was unwarranted and unjust. They requested the Governor to appoint an

independent and impartial committee of inquiry to hold a thorough public investigation of all the evidence. But the Government paid no attention to the request.

Hence at the initiative and request of the peasants, who had already been told of their legal rights and the justice of their demands, a movement was led by Vallabhbhai Patel, with the inspiration and advice of Gandhi. Patel held several large meetings with the representatives, Hindus and Muslims like, from more than half the affected villages. He questioned them very closely to estimate their determination, strength and cohesion. He described fully and clearly to the peasants the possibilities and terrors of Government power. He told them frankly that the struggle might be prolonged indefinitely and he gave them several days to think it all over and to discuss it among themselves. Later, when they returned in still larger numbers and were fully resolved to enter upon the struggle, Patel led them to it. By this time all their efforts to get redress of their grievances from the government had proved in vain and they were left with no option but to offer *satyagraha*.

On 12th February 1928, with a resolution setting forth the demand for an enquiry and the refusal of the peasants to pay the assessment until the government either accepted the amount of the old assessment as full payment or until an impartial tribunal was appointed to investigate the entire situation, the *satyagraha* campaign was started.

Through the already existing social service centres, sixteen 'camps' were organized in different parts of the district. These camps were manned by 250 volunteers, who were disciplined in the techniques of *satyagraha*. There were other volunteers for collecting and passing on the news and whereabouts of the government officials and their plans. A news bulletin was printed every day and distributed to every village. 10,000 copies of it were distributed in the district while 4,000 were sent to subscribers outside. Patel's speeches were also distributed in pamphlet form. A printed pledge promising to stick together under their leaders, to adhere to truth, and to remain non-violent, no matter what happened was signed by thousands of people. The remarkable feature was the active part taken by the women folk alongside the men.

The Government did its best to compel the peasants to pay

the tax. Flattery, fines, flogging, bribery and imprisonment, all proved ineffective. Attempts were made to divide the communities against each other. The land and goods of the peasants were forfeited and distributed or sold among the Pathans of the North-west Frontier Province, who were brought into the district to terrorize the villagers.

The peasants, however, insisted on ploughing the lands which had been attached by the Government. Technical trespass was also extended especially by women volunteers through the building of huts and camps upon forfeited land. The *satyagraha* committee, without doubt, was directing much of the life of the villagers throughout the district, especially during the latter months of the campaign. For an official to receive any services in the district, he had to have the permission of the *satyagraha* headquarters.

The preliminary preparations were so perfect that there was no hesitation in the follow-up action. The oppression solidified the feeling of the people. A strong social boycott was maintained against all government representatives and those who purchased forfeited goods or lands. The boycott, however, did not interfere with the supply of physical necessities to such people.

A continuous assessment of the situation was made by the leaders of the movement, and especially by Sardar Patel, who was a master at organization. New tactics were developed to meet specific situations as they arose. Maintaining unity among people from the various religions, castes and occupational communities within the Bardoli populace, was particularly looked into. The opposition efforts to emphasize these divisions were countered by skilled measures. Taking into consideration the changing conditions, the emphasis laid upon fearlessness in the early stages of the movement was changed to peace and unity in the later stages. Increasing publicity all over the country was eliciting more and more sympathy for the original inhabitants of Bardoli. The strength of the peasant participants was on the increase. Several members of the legislature resigned in protest against the Government's stand. The matter was discussed in the provincial legislature and even so far as in parliament in London.

After five and a half months, the Government had to yield to practically every one of the demands of the *satyagrahis*. The

Governor appointed a committee of inquiry, agreed to restore all the land that had been sold or forfeited, and re-instated the village officials who had resigned. When the committee of enquiry made its report, it 'substantially justified' the original complaints of the peasants, and recommended a tax increase less than that which had been assessed by the Government.

Bardoli was one of the most meticulously planned and executed *satyagraha* campaigns in India for it achieved exactly the objectives for which it was offered.

The Salt Satyagraha 1930-1931: The Salt *satyagraha* was part of the year-long civil disobedience movement from March 1930 to March 1931. While the ultimate objective of this civil disobedience was to procure complete independence for India, its immediate objective was the withdrawal of the Salt Acts through which the Government had a monopoly over the manufacture and sale of salt. The Salt Act was chosen for contravention by Gandhi in a general civil disobedience movement because it not only appeared to be basically unjust in itself, but also because it symbolized an unpopular, unrepresentative, and alien Government.

Gandhi urged the Viceroy, Lord Irwin on 2nd March 1930, for a negotiated settlement, failing which, he informed him, he planned to lead a march to the sea where *satyagrahis* would, in violation of the salt monopoly, prepare salt from sea water.

In the meanwhile, volunteers for *satyagraha* undertook courses of training and each one, for participation in the *satyagraha*, pledged: (1) a desire to join the civil resistance campaign for the independence of India undertaken by the National Congress; (2) to accept the creed of the Notional Congress, *i.e.*, the attainment of complete independence by the people of India by all peaceful and legitimate means; (3) to be ready and willing to go to jail and undergo all other sufferings and penalties that may be inflicted on him in this campaign; (4) in case he is sent to jail, he shall not seek any monetary help for the family from the Congress funds; (5) and shall implicitly obey the orders of those who were in charge of the campaign.

Vallabhbhai Patel was entrusted with the task of preparing the route for the proposed 200 mile-long march.

On 12th March 1930, after receiving no assurance of the

repeal of the Salt Acts from the Viceroy, Gandhi and his *co-satyagrahis* left Ahmedabad for Dandi on the sea coast. The march attracted the attention of the whole world.

The *satyagrahis* reached Dandi on 5th April. The following morning, after prayers, they proceeded to the beach where they prepared salt from sea water, thus technically breaking the Salt Laws. Initially, the Government did not arrest Gandhi but arrested the other leaders instead.

Gandhi now proposed to occupy salt works at Dharsana, if the Government did not remove the salt tax, and to this effect he wrote a letter to the Viceroy informing him of his plan. On 5th May, Gandhi was arrested. Afterwards when the other *satyagrahis* under the new leadership marched forward to occupy the salt depots, they were mercilessly beaten by the police. But none of the *satyagrahis* wavered, flinched or offered any violence whatsoever. It was an exemplary scene of *satyagraha* whose news spread all over the world. A detailed account of this heroic *satyagraha* was written by Webb Miller, Foreign Correspondent of the United Press, U.S.A. who was an eye witness to the grim tragedy. He wrote: "Slowly and in silence the throng commenced the half-mile march to salt-deposits. A few carried ropes for lassoing the barbed wire stockade around the salt pans. About a score who were assigned to act as stretcher-bearers wore crude, hand-painted red crosses pinned to their breasts, their stretchers consisting of blankets. Manilal Gandhi, second son of Gandhi, walked among the foremost of the marchers. As the throng drew near the salt pans, they commenced chanting the revolutionary slogans, *Inquilab Zindabad*, intoning the two words over and over.

"The salt-deposits were surrounded by ditches filled with water and guarded by four hundred native Surat Police in Khake shorts and brown turbans. Half a dozen British officials commanded them. The police carried *lathis*, five foot clubs tipped with steel. Inside the stockade, twenty-five native riflemen were drawn up.

"In complete silence, the Gandhi men drew up and halted a hundred yards from the stockade. A picked column advanced from the crowd, waded the ditches, and approached the barbed wire stockade, which the Surat Police surrounded, holding

clubs at the ready. Police officials ordered the marchers to disperse under recently imposed regulation which prohibited gathering of more than five persons in any one place. The column silently ignored the warning and slowly walked forward. I stayed with the main body about a hundred yards from the stockade.

“Suddenly, at a word of command, scores of native police rushed upon the advancing marchers and rained blows on their heads with their steel-shod *lathis*. Not one of the marchers even raised an arm to fend off the blows. They went down like ten-pins. From where I stood I heard the sickening whacks of the clubs on unprotected skulls. The waiting crowd of watchers groaned and sucked in their breaths in sympathetic pain on every blow.

“Those struck down fell sprawling, unconscious, or in pain with fractured skulls or broken shoulders. In two or three minutes the ground was quilted with bodies. Great patches of blood widened on their white clothes. The survivors, without breaking ranks, silently and doggedly marched on until struck down. When everyone of the first column had been knocked down, stretcher-bearers rushed up, unmolested by the police, and carried off the injured to a thatched hut which had been arranged as a temporary hospital.

“Then another column formed while the leaders pleaded with them to retain their self-control. They marched slowly towards the police. Although everyone knew that within a few minutes he would be beaten down, perhaps killed, I could detect no signs of wavering or fear. They marched steadily with heads up, without the encouragement of music or cheering or any possibility that they might escape serious injury or death. The police rushed up and methodically and mechanically beat down the second column. There was no fight, no struggle; the marchers simply walked forward until struck down. There were no outcries, only groans after they fell. There were not enough stretcher-bearers to carry off the wounded; I saw eighteen injured being carried off simultaneously, while forty-two still lay bleeding on the ground awaiting stretcher-bearers. The blankets used as stretchers were sodden with blood.”

Of another day of the Salt *satyagraha*, the Chicago Daily News, published the following account from Negley Farson, its

special correspondent in India: "Bombay, 21 June: At 7 o'clock began to come processions of white-robed volunteers bearing red, green and white banners, singing "We will take *Swaraj*—India our Motherland.' At the head of each walked a tiny detachment of women and girls dressed in orange robes, many garlanded with jasmine. They marched steadily on past the policemen and actually lined up behind the stretchers.

"They waited there in a long front down the boulevard for the order to march on the field.

"I shall not forget the scenes which followed. Dark-faced Marathi policemen in their yellow turbans marched along in column led by English sergeants across the field toward the waiting crowd. As they neared it the police went faster and faster.

"Mounted Indian policemen who had been galloping across the field, whacking heads indiscriminately, came to a stymie when they faced the little cluster of blue Akali turbans on the slender Sikh men. The Sikhs are brave men—how can we hit them? It was not fear, but respect.

"But the police, determined to try to clear the field, at last rushed around the Sikh women and began to hit the men. I stood within five feet of a Sikh leader as he took the lathi blows. He was a short, heavily muscled man.

"The blows came—he stood straight. His turban was knocked off. The long black hair was bared with the round top knot: He closed his eyes as the blows fell—until at last he swayed, and fell to the ground.

"No other Sikhs had tried to shield him, but now, shouting their defiance, they wiped away the blood streaming from his mouth. Hystrical Hindus rushed to him, bearing cakes of ice to rub the contusions over his eyes. The Sikh gave me a smile—and stood for more.

"And then the police threw up their hands. 'You cannot go on hitting a blighter when he stands up to you like that.' "

Wave upon wave of *satyagrahis* came forward, were beaten and jailed, but there was no end to the queue of *satyagrahis*. When the monsoons set in, other forms of civil disobedience were resorted to, like the boycott of foreign-made products, especially cloth, disobedience of publicity restrictions etc. The movement continued for a year.

Ultimately a settlement was reached between Gandhi and the Viceroy and the Gandhi-Irwin Agreement was published on 5th March 1931. As a result of this Agreement many immediate and late objective were achieved by the *satyagrahis*. The Salt Laws were not repealed, but a new official interpretation was effected in the settlement, which specified that, 'for the sake . . . of giving relief to certain of the poorer classes, the Government would, extend their administrative provisions, on line, already prevailing in certain places in order to permit local residents in villages, immediately adjoining areas where salt can be collected or made, to collect or make salt for domestic consumption or sale within such villages, but not for sale to or trading with individuals outside them.'

The Government also agreed: (1) amnesty to persons convicted of non-violent offences in connection with civil disobedience; (2) withdrawal of the restraining ordinances; (3) restoration of confiscated, forfeited or attached properties; (4) administrative concession to make salt in certain areas. In return, civil disobedience was ended, and in particular the following activities were discontinued: (1) organized defiance of the provisions of the law; (2) movement for non-payment of land revenue and other legal dues; (3) publication of news-sheets in support of civil disobedience; (4) attempts to influence civil and military servants or village officials against Government or to persuade them to resign their posts. Furthermore, it was agreed that a Round Table Conference would be held to consider such questions as federation, reservation of subjects (e.g. defence, external affairs) financial credit and position of minorities.

The non-violent resistance of the *satyagrahis* was exemplary throughout this campaign. All the other requirements of an ideal *satyagraha* were more than adequately met within it. Such a nation-wide *satyagraha* planned and executed as perfectly as possible, encouraged many Indians to believe that Indian independence was not far off—though in this they were mistaken.

Satyagraha struggles launched by Gandhi were successful to the extent to which the people who participated in them were prepared and trained. They failed partially or wholly when there were lacunae in their preparation and planning. That the whole

country became aware and active in the cause of attaining independence and ultimately succeeded in getting it, is largely due to these *satyagraha* struggles.

Struggles based on non-violent resistance have been waged in other countries as well; one of the most important is the struggle of the Negroes in the United States against segregation.

The American Negro's Non-Violent Resistance Against Racial Discrimination

The present-day Negro in America is continually forced to confront his past: the two elements of history are the fact of his forefathers' slavery and the white man's complex amalgam of victory and guilt. Negroes had been slaves of the white people formerly but gradually as education, awareness of their rights as human beings, and their economic status improved, they resented discriminatory treatment and indignities. But the majority of them were discouraged and unwilling to assert their rights.

In Montgomery, Alabama, according to State laws and convention, the first four rows of seats from the front, holding about ten persons, were reserved for whites. The last three rows of seats were in theory reserved for Negroes, but if a white person boarded the bus when the front four rows were filled with whites, he had the prior choice of sitting wherever he wished, even if a Negro, male or female, had to get up to accomodate him.

On December, 1, 1955, a Negro seamstress, Mrs. Rosa Parks, boarded a bus to get home after her day's work. She sat down in the first seat behind the section reserved for whites. Soon after she took her seat, some white people got on the bus and the driver ordered Mrs. Parks and three other Negroes in that row to move back in order to accomodate the whites. By that time all the other seats were occupied. The other three Negroes complied with the order, but Mrs. Parks quietly refused. The driver called the police and had her arrested.

Mrs. Parks was a dignified and highly respected member of the Negro community. Her arrest proved to be a trigger which released the long-smoldering resentment of the Negro community into action. In protest the Negroes boycotted the use of buses on 5th December, the day when Mrs. Parks was

to be tried in the court. Not one of the fifty thousand Negroes of the city rode in a bus that day. Mrs. Parks was tried and fined ten dollars. She filed an appeal in a higher court. In a mass meeting held that night in one of the churches, it was decided unanimously to continue the boycott until: (1) courteous treatment by the bus operators was guaranteed; (2) passengers were seated on a first-come-first-served basis—Negroes seating from the back of the bus toward the front, while whites seated from the front toward the back; (3) Negro bus operators were employed on predominantly Negro routes. Furthermore, an organization called the Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA) was created; president of this Association was a young, highly educated Negro minister, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. He was entrusted with the work of directing the protest. Dr. King was familiar with Gandhi's non-violent *satyagraha* technique and from the beginning he carried his campaign forward on similar lines.

As the bus boycott continued, a Negro taxi driver stopped beside an elderly Negro woman who was trudging with obvious difficulty. "Jump in, grandmother," he said, "You do not need to walk." She waved him to go on. "I am not walking for myself," she called out, "I am walking for my children and grandchildren." Another Negro woman said she preferred tired feet to a tired soul.

Mass meetings were held twice a week in the Negro churches, rotating from one to another. Programmes included prayers, scripture readings, singing of hymns and reading of reports by different committees. Dr. King explained in great detail the effectiveness and application of non-violence and love of the opponent. Possible situations where provocative violence might be used against them, and how to behave under such circumstances, were even demonstrated to people.

The boycott of buses was complete. The Government tried to break it on various occasions by having Negro car drivers arrested on all sorts of pretexts, pressurizing the insurance companies into cancelling the insurance on Negro cars, spreading false rumours that Negro leaders had agreed to call off the boycott, attempting to disrupt the unity of the Negro leaders by inciting jealousy etc. Dr. King was arrested and jailed for allegedly speeding in his car. But the crowd of Negroes that

promptly gathered at the jail was so huge, though entirely peaceful, that the jailer took fright and released him on bond. Hate-mail and threatening calls poured into the houses and offices of the Negro leaders. On the night of January 30th, 1956, a bomb was thrown on the porch of Dr. King's house. Luckily the property damage was slight and nobody was injured. A crowd of angry Negroes rapidly gathered, but Dr. King pleaded with them not to be violent or angry, and restrained them.

A large number of Negro leaders were indicted, arrested and tried for conspiracy in preventing the operation of lawful business. Dr. King was tried first, found guilty and fined five hundred dollars. He appealed the case. On their part, the Negro lawyers filed a suit in the United States Federal Court asking that bus segregation be stopped because it was contrary to the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The Federal court decided in favour of the Negroes and held that the city bus segregation laws of Alabama were unconstitutional. Later the United States Supreme Court affirmed the decision of the lower Federal Court.

With the decision going in their favour, the executive board of the Montgomery Improvement Association decided to end the official protest immediately. In subsequent mass meetings, the Negroes were instructed to be completely non-violent and conciliatory in manner and action when they began riding the buses again. Scenes of possible provocation were described, enacted and rehearsed at these meetings. Constant courtesy was enjoined.

A backlash of white violence erupted in the city. City buses were fired upon. Negroes were assaulted. Four Negro churches were bombed; two of them were completely destroyed. This was, however, condemned even by the local newspapers, the white ministers, and many white business associations.

The racial problem in America is still a terrifying one. But to keep it from taking a violent turn, Dr. King adopted non-violent resistance as suggested by Gandhi.

Other non-violent resistance struggles that have been waged in some other countries are: (1) Hungarian Non-Violent Resistance (1859-1867); (2) Finland's Non-Violent Resistance (1898-1917); (3) Denmark's Non-Violent Resistance (1940-42);

(4) Norway's Non-Violent Resistance (1940-43). Some of them failed when violence crept into them.

Whither Satyagraha?

Throughout India, local *satyagrahas* are reported almost daily. Even while Gandhi was alive, strikes and fasts had become a universal plague. Agitations organised in whichever way and for whatever objective, were widely described as '*satyagraha* movements.' Nowadays the name *satyagraha* has come to be applied to almost any direct social or political action, short of organised violence, against government or an institution.

They are intended to apply sufficient pressure against the allegedly unjust policy of the opponent so as to make him agree to one's own supposedly just demands. A strike is typical of the straight forward application of such pressure. It is commonly employed to effect economic pressure, and is intended to hurt business or to strain relationships so that normal functions are brought to a halt, or at least inhibited. Normal functioning is not allowed to be resumed until policy changes are instituted. The participants in such campaigns approach the conflict with a set of prejudgements: the opponent is, *ipso facto*, wrong; the 'immoral' position that he holds must be exposed and in its place be substituted a 'morally right' position which is preconceived as being correct.

While a *satyagraha* strives for and seeks a re-synthesis of position whereby the opponent is converted through a change of heart so that ultimately both the parties in conflict feel the joy of triumph over the situation, these above-mentioned procedures of strikes and fasts (which may perhaps be termed *duragraha*) seek concessions by application of undue pressure; the loss to the opponent is no consideration to a *duragrahi*.

Yet these *duragrahas* are the order of the day. The leaders and the participants of such struggles do not have the purity of mind, the preliminary training, or the patience to practice *satyagraha*. *Satyagraha* as conceived and practised by Gandhi is a faultless instrument which can provide social justice through non-violent means, but just now it is out of fashion, out of demand; people do not understand the working of this instrument; they are not even inclined to understand its

working. Some day somebody will rediscover it. Perhaps like Buddhism it is destined to flourish in countries other than the land of its birth.

Role of Peace Organizations

‘Talk things over’: this old and well-tried adage holds good among individuals and nations alike. Since ancient times, attempts have been made to create platforms where contending parties could come together and settle their disputes. Many a time such attempts have succeeded in maintaining or restoring peace.

Theoretical plans for a united regional or world order, put forward by individuals or organisations, from time to time, run into thousands; these are some of the significant ones: Pierre Dubois in 1306, Dante Alighieri in 1310, Desiderius Erasmus in 1514, Hugo Grotius in 1625, Charles Irenee Castel, Abbe de Saint-Pierre in 1712, Jeremy Bentham in 1789, Johann Gottlieb Fichte in 1795, Immanuel Kant in 1795.

Kant's Eternal Peace

In *Eternal Peace*, the plan enunciated by the German philosopher Immanuel Kant, he pointed out that the state of peace among men who live alongside each other is not a state of nature (*status naturalis*). Rather it is a state of war which constantly threatens even if it is not actually in progress. Therefore, the state of peace must be founded; for the mere omission of the threat of war is no security of peace.

Kant recommended a republican civil constitution for each state, “which is founded upon three principles: First, the principle of the freedom of all members of a society as men; second, the principle of the dependence of all upon a single common legislation as subjects; and third, the principle of the equality of all the citizens . . .” To bring such nations into a bond, he envisaged a federation of free states. This seems to be a relevant proposition even in our own day.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, a number of peace conferences were held at the international level. These conferences, however, remained non-governmental until the end of the nineteenth century. Efforts were made to have leading figures attend the conferences. International arbitration as a

means of settling differences between States when diplomacy had failed, was projected as a means to avoid war. Two World Peace Conferences, held at the Hague in 1899 and 1907 drew up conventions for the establishment and procedure of a permanent tribunal of arbitration.

Although many disputes between great as well as small nations were resolved by arbitration, yet it did not succeed many a time. So the Franco-Prussian, the Anglo-Boer and Russo-Japanese wars were fought preparing the way for the First World War.

The League of Nations

The terrible experience of the First World War and the destruction of millions emphasised the urgent need to form a society of independent nations which would accept international law to regulate their relations, and a system of collective security which would put an end to war, or at least offer an alternative to it. The League of Nations came into being as part of the world order. The Covenant of the League in its preamble gave as one of the objects “the firm establishment of the understanding of international law as the actual rule of conduct among governments, the maintenance of justice, and the scrupulous respect for treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another.” The League set up representative organs and an international secretariat whose purpose was to preserve the peace and promote international co-operation in political, economic and social activities of the members. The Covenant included articles about submitting any serious dispute, likely to lead to a rupture, to arbitration or enquiry by the council of the League. Both the Assembly, on which each member was represented by an equal number of delegates, and the council, where the smaller states had a limited and rotating representation, were vested with large powers of settling difference.

The League of Nations proved much less effective in practice. Its coercive measures against an aggressor state broke down after a few year when challenged, first by Japan, then by Italy, and finally by Nazi Germany. After its failure to check Mussolini and Hitler, the League lost authority as an instrument of collective security.

United Nations Organization

During the Second World War successive attempts were made by the Allied Powers to design a new basis of world order which should be stronger and more comprehensive. A series of international declaration were published, defining the principles of a new order which was to be named the United Nations, because its original members were united against the Nazi-Fascist Axis. Sir Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and Franklin Roosevelt, President of the United States, drew up a common programme of purposes and principles, the Atlantic Charter in August 1941. It recognized the right of all peoples to choose their form of Government. Then in October, 1943, the Government of the four Big Powers, the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and China—France was still under the Nazi yoke—issued the Moscow Declaration, which stated the necessity of establishing a general international order based on the principles of sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership of all such states. Finally a Conference of the United Nations convened in San Francisco, in April, 1945, drew up the Charter of the United Nations, which replaced the Covenant of the League.

The Charter of the United Nations (signed on June 26, 1945) stated: We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and

To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights . . .

To promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom . . .

To practice tolerance and live together in peace . . .

To insure . . . that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and

To employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples, have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

In the event of a state refusing to carry out the decisions of the United Nations, Article 41 of the Charter states: The Security Council may decide what measures, not involving the use of armed force, are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United

Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations. Furthermore, Article 42 states: Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate; it may take such action by air, sea or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations. According to Article 43, All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities including the rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

The United Nations Charter was based on the principle of sovereign equality of states on the one hand, and the special responsibility of five big powers on the other, for maintaining the peace. In the executive organ, the Security Council, these powers must act together to enforce peace; and each could exercise a right of veto upon any action to which it did not consent. The Charter recognized the place of power in the world, both in the composition and the functions of the Security Council and in the provision that the General Assembly should make decisions on important questions by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. The aim, however, was to initiate a rudimentary form of World Government.

Unhappily, after a few years, the Big Powers fell out, and instead of acting together to maintain peace, they engaged in a cold war between the Soviet Union, and latter Communist China, on the one side and the Western Powers on the other. The articles of the Charter that dealt with military sanctions and the formation of a United Nations Force under the Security Council were a dead letter; but an extension of the functions of the General Assembly, enabling it to adopt a resolution for action to assure peace, was a way round the deadlock in the Security Council.

A threat to the survival of the human race and civilization everywhere, which had not been foreseen by those who drew up the Charter, was suddenly thrust into the picture, when a few months after the signing of the Charter, atomic bombs were hurled on Japan 'in order to hasten the end of the war against her.' This led to a race in nuclear weapons between the two giant powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. Gradually some other nations also acquired, atomic bombs or the capability to make them. The United Nations has so far succeeded in avoiding a major conflict, but it could not avoid hundreds of local or regional battles and wars since its inception. So far it has neither been a total success nor a total failure. Yet its very existence is a source of courage and inspiration. Dag Hammarskjöld, Secretary General of the United Nations, during the critical days of the Korean armistice talks, aptly said: "Those are lost who dare not face the basic facts of international inter-dependence. Those are lost who permit defeats to scare them back to a starting point of narrow nationalism. Those are lost who are so scared by a defeat as to despair about the future. For all those, the dark prophecies may be justified. But not for those who do not permit themselves to be scared, nor for the organization (U.N.) which is the instrument at their disposal in the fight—an instrument which may be wrecked, but, if that happens, would have to be, and certainly would be, recreated again and again."

The United Nations is important not only for what it has achieved, but perhaps even more, for what it symbolises. It symbolises the will and the resolve of the peoples and the nations to solve their conflicts through non-violence rather than violence. Persistent faith in the concept of the United Nations, in spite of its many failures, indicates clearly that the human race will and must go forward towards a single world government so as to end the state of anarchy that exists now between the nations of the world.

Ideal World Organization

Confederations like the League of Nations and the United Nations Organization have served a useful purpose. A confederation, however, by its very nature is not an ideal system to preserve peace. The failure of the League of Nations and

the shortcomings of the United Nation Organization lead us to conclude that it is impossible to build up a super-national authority on the basis of separate national states. If the men who form the authority are persons nominated by national governments, they will never be anything but delegates of those governments; they will always be bound to give priority to the particular interests of their national state and not the general interest of world order. "Powers—large and small—carry their difficulties and their conflicts of interest to the United Nations. The conflicts do not shrink; they expand. The Great Powers in conflict with one another seek for allies among the lesser powers and form hostile groups which complicate and aggravate the situation; the small states count the sport of the Great Powers, who, in order to maintain their diplomatic combinations, at once take sides. No important dispute is ever settled otherwise than by agreement between Great Powers. A few States that remain outside of fixed diplomatic combinations and are, therefore, able to maintain an independent attitude, have from time to time exercised a conciliatory influence but this only happens in the case of secondary disputes and moreover, these lesser powers not having at their disposal the forces that might become necessary to back their action, are themselves compelled to have recourse to the Great Powers. Each representative in the United Nations is in the last resort, the delegate of his own state, controlled by it and responsible to it. Every important problem tends, therefore, to be considered as conflict of national points of view."¹

A much more effective organization of sovereign political units can be a federation which includes at least three levels of government: local, state and federal. The act of federation involves a rearrangement of the existing distribution of authority, a sovereignty held by the largest existing political units. In most federations, the three levels of government are parallel, each operating within a specified and limited sphere.

The essential difference between confederations and federations is in this precise division of authority among the several layers of government and in the right of the highest or federal level to by-pass all its member political units and reach

¹Davis J. (1952): *Peace, War and You*.

down to deal with its smallest unit, the individual. Federation preserves diversity where it is worth preserving or where cannot be eradicated peacefully. It creates the minimum of effective government at the inter-state level while allowing decentralized autonomy to existing state and local governments. Federation preserves plurality of Government within an overall unity. Federation involves the simultaneous disarmament of the hitherto independent states. In most federations, the minimum power transferred to the federal government includes determination of war and peace, provision for the common defense, regulation of foreign and inter-state commerce, conduct of foreign relations and creation of a uniform currency. Until the end of Second World War about a dozen great regional federations were in existence and many more have come up after that.

A federation of the nations of the world seems to be an ideal organization to end the prevailing anarchy between the nations.

So far the international peace organizations have tried to resolve the conflict situations after they have arisen; they could do better by laying equal or more stress upon inculcation of habits of non-violence among peoples of the world so that lesser number of such situations arise.

3

SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF NON-VIOLENCE

Over the past few decades, efforts have been made to understand the nature of aggression in man. This has been done through observations made on lower animals and through psychological and social studies in man. The application of the results obtained seems encouraging.

Animal Instincts in Human Behaviour

Why is a man violent? To get an answer to this question, we shall have to go into his antecedents; we will have to study animal behaviour.

Human beings are animals—though of a very special kind, and human behaviour is an outgrowth, or a uniquely specialised form of animal behaviour. Hence understanding animal behaviour is likely to help us to understand human behaviour better.

Co-operation and tolerance, aggression and violence are all observed in the animal kingdom. Co-operation is most obvious between mates, or parents and off-springs. Tolerance among different species of animals living side by side in a jungle is also a clearly observed phenomenon (except in the case of carnivores and their prey, which is a different matter altogether).

In the forest reserves, one can frequently see several species of animals, monkeys, hogs, buffaloes, deer, stags, elephants and rhinoceros near a water hole at the same time; eating the same food and drinking from the same limited water source, these different species of animals live beside each other without

apparent conflict. A similar situation prevails in the forest, although observation is more difficult there. The general impression gathered is of a very wide range of tolerance for other species.

While the above observation applies to animals belonging to other species, this does not apply to the animals belonging to the same species. Avoidance, agonistic display (fighting position) and violence often occurs among animals of the same species. This is well illustrated when monkeys are crowded into a small area near a water hole at the end of a dry season. Hogs, deer, stags and other ungulates might be mixed among the monkeys, but if two monkey troops are at the water hole at the same time, they remain separate and no mixing occurs. If a large troop comes to the hole, a smaller troop will move slowly away, feeding as it goes. Conflict between groups of monkeys (rhesus) living in different places in the cities of India is not an uncommon phenomenon. One such conflict reported among three groups of monkeys living in close proximity, in a temple is interesting and informative. Here the areas that the three groups occupied overlapped to such an extent that groups frequently came in contact with one another and there was not much space available to the groups to live apart. For various day-to-day activities such as gathering and taking food, clinging from the branches of the tree, and for occupying territory, there were occasions for conflict which were settled more by display of anger than by actual fighting. It is impossible to watch a group of monkeys for any long period of time without observing conflict over food or inter-personal relations. Actual fighting among these animals is rare; this is because the animals know each other and their hierarchical positions in the group are already determined.

How and why the animals generally limit themselves to a display of aggressiveness we shall now see.

When an animal is aggressively aroused, a number of basic physiological changes, through its autonomic nervous system, occur within its body so that it is geared for action. But it does not launch an immediate attack. The enemy provokes aggression as well as fear; aggression drives the animal on, the fear holds it back. An intense state of inner conflict arises. It begins by threatening to attack. If, in this state, it presents a

sufficiently intimidating spectacle to its opponent, the latter slinks away; this obviously is preferable. The victory can be won without the shedding of blood. The species as a whole is able to settle its disputes without undue damage to its members and obviously benefits tremendously in the process.

Throughout the higher forms of animal life, there has been a strong trend in this direction—the direction of ritualised combat. Threat and counter-threat have largely replaced actual physical combat. Full-blooded fighting does, of course, still take place from time to time, but only as a last resort, when aggressive signalling and counter-signalling have failed to settle a dispute.

Elaborate threat rituals are observed in different animal species. The contestants circle one another in a characteristically stilted fashion, their bodies tense and stiff. They may bow, shake, shiver, swing rhythmically from side to side or make repeated short, stylised runs. They paw the ground, arch their backs, or lower their heads. All these intention movements act as vital communication signals and combine effectively with the autonomic signals to provide a precise picture of the intensity of the aggression that has been aroused, and an exact indication of the balance between the urge to attack and the discretion to retreat.

One of the side-effects of an intense inner conflict is that an animal sometimes exhibits strange and seemingly irrelevant pieces of behaviour. It is as if the tensed up creature, unable to perform either of the things it is desperate to do, finds an outlet for its pent-up energy in some other, totally unrelated activity. Its urge to flee blocks its urge to attack and *vice-versa*, so it vents its feelings in some third activity: this is called displacement. Threatening rivals can suddenly be seen to perform curiously stilted and incomplete feeding movements, and then return instantly to their full threat postures. Or they may scratch or clean themselves in some way, interspersing these movements with the typical threat manoeuvre. Some species perform displacement nest-building actions, picking up pieces of nest material that happen to lie nearby and dropping them on to imaginary nests. Others indulge in instant sleep, momentarily tucking their heads into a snoozing position, yawning or stretching.

All these activities, the intention movements, the autonomic signals, and the displacement activities, become ritualised and together provide the animals with a comprehensive repertoire of threat signals. In most encounters they will be sufficient to resolve the dispute without the contestants coming to blows.

But if this system fails, as it often does under conditions of extreme crowding for example, then real fighting follows and the signals give way to the brutal mechanics of physical attack. Then, the teeth are used to bite and slash, the head and horns to butt and spear, the body to ram and push, the legs to kick and swipe, the hands to grasp and squeeze, and sometimes the tail to thrash and whip. Even so, it is extremely rare for one contestant to kill the other. Species that have evolved special killing techniques for dealing with their prey seldom employ these when fighting their own kind. As soon as the enemy has been sufficiently subdued and ceases to be a threat, it is ignored.

As soon as the loser realizes that his position has become untenable, he performs certain characteristic submissive displays indicating to the stronger animal that he is no longer a threat and does not intend to continue the fight; on the contrary, he is trying to mollify and appease the attacker so that he should spare him further damage. Such submissive displays, appease the attacker and rapidly reduce his aggression, speeding up the settlement of the dispute.

Submissive displays operate in several ways. Basically they either switch off the signals that have been arousing the aggression, or they switch on other, positively non-aggressive signals. The first category, simply serve to calm the dominant animal down, the latter help by actively changing his mood into something else. The crudest form of submission is gross inactivity. Because aggression involves violent movement, a static pose automatically signals non-aggression. Frequently this is combined with crouching and cowering. Aggression involves expanding the body to its maximum size, and crouching reverses this and therefore acts as an appeasement. Facing away from the attacker also helps, being the opposite of the posture of frontal attack. Other threat-opposites are also used: if a particular species threatens by lowering its head, then raising the head can become a valuable appeasement gesture; if an attacker erects its hair, then compressing it will serve as a

submission device. In certain rare cases, the loser will admit defeat by offering a vulnerable area to the attacker. A chimpanzee, for example, holds out its hand as a gesture of submission, rendering it extremely vulnerable to a serious bite. This gesture serves to appease the dominant individual.

There are other appeasement signals too. The weaker animal crouches and begs from the dominant one, in an infantile posture characteristic of the particular species, a device especially favoured by females when they are being attacked by males. It is often so effective that the male responds by regurgitating some food to the female, when the latter completes the food-begging ritual by swallowing it. Now in a thoroughly protective mood, the male loses his aggression and the pair calm down together. Another is the adoption of a female sexual posture by the weaker animal. Regardless of its sex, or its sexual condition it may suddenly assume the female rump-presentation posture towards the attacker; this stimulates a sexual response which dampens the mood of aggression in the latter. In such situations, a dominant male or female will mount and pseudo-copulate with either a submissive male or a submissive female. Furthermore, the weaker animal may either invite the winner to groom it, or may make signals requesting permission to perform the grooming itself. Monkeys make great use of this device and this can occasionally be observed in a zoo in the monkey's enclosure. They have a special facial gesture to go with it, consisting of rapidly smacking the lips together—a modified, ritualised version of part of the normal grooming ceremony. When one monkey grooms another, it repeatedly pops fragments of skin and other detritus into its mouth, smacking its lips as it does so. By exaggerating the smacking movements and speeding them up, it signals its readiness to perform this duty and frequently manages in this way to suppress the aggression of the attacker and persuade it to relax and allow itself to be groomed. After a while the dominant individual is so lulled by this procedure that the weakling can slip away unharmed.

Through these threat signals and submissive displays, the animals of a species avoid fighting to a finish. Further order and peace is achieved through the following two procedures:

Members of many species of animals, divide the available

living space among themselves. An animal that is still searching for a suitable territory, withdraws when it meets with an already established owner. When neighbouring territory owners meet near their common boundary, by means of specially evolved signals, each indicates to the other to keep out. The response is appropriate: instead of proceeding to intrude, the animal withdraws, and neighbours are thus contained by each other. The same applies to two groups of animals. This is how the animals manage to have all the advantages of their hostile behaviour without the disadvantages of physical conflict. They divide their living space in a bloodless way by the use of distance-keeping signals rather than actual fighting.

Some species of animals such as fish, lizards, birds and many mammals have the members of their groups arranged in orderly ranks called peck order. This is observed most commonly among hens in a chicken run. The order is based on threats or the direct use of force: the most aggressive animal is the highest in rank and it dominates the rest and has the right to nip or peck any of other subordinate animals, and they do not fight back. The remaining animals in the group are arranged in a series of decreasing dominance i.e., the second in rank cannot dominate the highest ranker but can dominate all the others, and so on down the line. The individual encounters in these animals that determine dominance are, however, not really fights, for they seldom involve bloodshed; they are more like symbolic trials of strength.

Thus we see that whether it is threat symbols or appeasement displays, territorial behaviour or peck order, in all these measures, aggressive behaviour is adaptive and useful. It makes sense biologically: It preserves the integrity of the species.

The same is not the case with man. His aggressive behaviour has now lost its adaptive function. For this we need to study the various stages through which man has evolved.

Evolution of Man

We know that gorillas and chimpanzees make use of objects such as branches of trees and stones against their enemies by dropping or tossing these objects in the air or sometimes unquestionably aiming them at the intruder in their territory. It is hypothesised that in many populations of apes, related to the

present day gorillas and chimpanzees, in which minimal use of branches of trees and stones and efficient bipedal locomotion was already present, changes in environmental conditions over millions of years, led to a more skillful use and manufacture of stone tools; efficient locomotion and tool use affecting each other in a feed-back relationship and each being at once cause and effect of the other.

The above hypothesis is supported by the archaeological discovery of two types of stone tools: simple ones belonging to Lower Pleistocene made probably by members of the genus *Australopithecus*, a hominid but not yet a precursor of the human being who hunted and lived bipedally away from the jungle in the open, and complex stone tools belonging to a later period of Middle Pleistocene (500,000 years ago) made by members of the earlier species of human being such as Jawa man and Neanderthal man. They thus indicate increasing hand skill with the progressive evolution of man.

More interesting is the discovery of the fossilized skulls of the *Australopithecus*, Jawa man and Neanderthal man which show that while in the case of *Australopithecus*, the capacity of the skull was only about 500 cu. cm. in Jawa man it was about 1000 cu. cm. and in Neanderthal man about 1500 cu. cm.

Correlation of the above two group of observations shows that capacity to make and use progressively complex stone tools and increase in the size of the brain are directly related. This appears logical too. Changing climatic and environmental conditions made it necessary for evolving man to make more complex tools and as he thought of them, made them and used them, gradually his thinking apparatus, the brain, increased in size. Other important changes occurred in his brain as well.

Examination of the cortex of the brain of man by Penfield and Rasmussen (1950), has shown that the size of particular areas of the motor cortex controlling muscles is proportional to the skill with which the relevant muscles are used. It has been shown that the areas concerned with the motor control of the thumb and hand are greatly enlarged in man in comparison with comparable areas in the brain of a chimpanzee. This clearly indicates that increasing hand skill which came with tool use altered the proportional representation of this part of the body in the cortex controlling their action. Furthermore, the structure

of the brain that makes memory, planning and language possible also grew as well as changed in feed-back mechanism with the social evolution. And this is how man emerged from the apes.

The earliest men probably snared and hunted wild animals and birds, caught fishes and collected wild fruits. They were food-gatherers. We do not know enough of their social customs and behaviour, but can make a rough guess, from the study of the present day food-gathering societies.¹

A study of the most primitive human societies still existing on the earth such as the food-gathering societies of Africa, Indonesia, Australia, brings out interesting observations regarding aggression.

Generally speaking, these people lack material possession, pottery or metal works. They do not weave or spin. They construct some sort of shelter of tree branches, practice no agriculture and do not domesticate animals. Traps and snares and bow and arrows are sometimes the only possessions.

The predominant grouping is that of small bands of relatives consisting of a single family, parents and children. It may also be slightly more complicated and consist of, say, grand-parents, children and grandchildren, or of married brothers or some such grouping.

Each group has its own hunting ground, about which it moves making temporary settlements here and there. They have no tribal organization. They do not possess chiefs or chiefly classes. It would appear each group is equal to the other. The senior members of the group exercise any necessary authority and guidance.

Within the family group, all is peaceful. The young men are not trained as warriors. They do not raid their neighbours for women or property. There is no evidence of fighting for food. Slavery is unknown and so is cannibalism and human sacrifice. Food-gatherers are noted for their hospitality. Strangers are welcomed and given their due share of food and shelter.

An apparent exception to the above is to be found in the strict laws of trespass that many of these people observe. Nearly all the groups have fairly clearly determined areas over which

¹Such a comparison, for various reasons, is not strictly warranted.

they alone have the right to hunt. Should their area be infringed by neighbouring groups, or by strangers, they are quick to retaliate, often to the extent of killing the offender.

Thus we see that in turning from ape to man, the food-gatherer kept intact its character of group territoriality, an essential aspect of which character is that the members of a group unite when in hostile confrontation with another group that approaches or crosses into their feeding territory.

Getting of food through agriculture (along with domestication of animals and use of pottery) in the Neolithic Age—which was operative in different parts of the world at different times (generally speaking between 10,000 to 7000 BC)—had profound consequences on human behaviour. Many new social institutions, organizations, magico-religious ceremonies became associated with its quest and as a consequence of it. Yet, in these early food-producing communities, so the evidence suggests, violent forms of behaviour was strictly canalized; it was centered around the ruling groups, human sacrifice and associated institutions.

Round 4000 BC, some nuclei of prosperous village communities, in the region between the East Mediterranean and the Indian subcontinent, nourished by surplus food, developed industries and foreign trade and here the cities came into being.

Around 3000 BC, the archaeologist's picture of Egypt, Mesopotamia, and the Indus Valley no longer focusses attention on communities of simple farmers, but on cities embracing various professions and classes. The scene is occupied by priests, princes, scribes, specialized craftsmen and professional soldiers. The most striking objects now unearthed are no longer the tools of agriculture and the chase, but tools and lots of weapons. By 3000 BC armies of soldiers specially trained in the use of weapons to kill the opposing armies had come into being.

Thus it was that man's inherited sense of (1) group territoriality—which no doubt, proved useful at one time when man was hunting other animals for food—ultimately led on towards the mutual assistance in time of intra-species battles and wars; and (2) the peck-order in which the most aggressive animal dominates the less aggressive animals, formed the basis of individual violence.

Like other animals and primates, man also has signals for threat, appeasement and displacement of aggression. Yet due

to disuse they have become too weak in his case. Instead of having physical combat wherein all the above mechanisms come into working condition, man developed weapons which he could throw on his enemy from greater and greater distances—sling-shots, spears, arrows, bullets, bombs from aeroplanes and guided missiles etc. The result of this has been disastrous. While few people would be willing to strangle, stab or burn children or, for that matter, adults, with their own hands, the same people as air-crews are prepared to drop bombs. Appeasement signals being out of the picture, the outcome is that the rivals instead of being defeated, are indiscriminately destroyed. The proper business of intra-species aggression at a biological level of subduing and not killing the enemy has thus been ruptured.

And yet, in spite of the above disadvantages, man has survived and may still survive. We know that the physical make up of man is inferior to that of most other animals: his body is not particularly well adapted for escape, self-defence, or hunting; he is not, for example, exceptionally fleet on foot, and would be left behind in a race with a hare; he has no protective body armour like the tortoise; he has no wings to give him an advantage in spying out and pouncing upon his prey; his muscular strength, teeth and nails are incomparably inferior to those of carnivores. But in spite of these disadvantages, man has not only survived but also subdued all other animals and enormously increased in number as well.

We shall see how this could happen.

About half a million years ago, Asia and Europe were visited by periods of intense cold—the Ice Ages—that lasted for thousands of years. By that time there were in existence several species of elephants ancestral to modern Indian and African elephants. To meet the rigours of the Ice Age, some elephants now termed mammoth developed a shaggy coat of hair. During these Ice Ages, there were already several species of man, contemporary with the mammoth. But they did not inherit shaggy coats and did not develop such to meet the crisis. Instead of undergoing the slow physical changes which eventually enabled the mammoths to endure the cold, they found out how to control fire and to make coats out of skins. And so they were able to face the cold as successfully as the mammoths. When the last Ice Age passed, the mammoth became extinct because it could not endure the

temperate climate but man just put off his coat and survived.

Prior to the mammoths, gigantic reptiles like dinosaurs and ichthyosaurs which flourished in wide expanses of sea and swamp during the Jurassic era in warm and moist climate, became extinct when the climate became drier and colder and waters more restricted. These reptiles perished because they were too closely adapted for living in a particular set of conditions.

From the above examples, we learn, that exclusive adaptation to a peculiar environment can prove biologically disadvantageous, and on the other hand, capacity for adaptation to changing environments helps the species to survive.

We shall now deal with the causes and circumstances that make an individual or a group of individuals aggressive and violent.

Individual Aggression

The causes and circumstances that elicit an aggressive response from an individual are:

1. Frustration and noxious stimuli
2. Reinforcement history
3. Social facilitation
4. Temperament

We will take each one of them separately.

Frustration and Noxious Stimuli: Frustration and noxious stimuli of various type are the two chief antecedents of aggression; their frequency and intensity determines the degree of aggressiveness.

Frustration is not necessarily caused if a person who wants something is prevented from getting it. A distinction has to be made between a deprivation which is unimportant to a person (easily substituted for, with few serious after-effects), and a deprivation which is a threat to his personality, to the life goals, to his defensive system, to his self-esteem or to his feeling of security. It is only the later deprivation which leads to frustration. Let us try to understand this distinction clearly.

A child deprived of an ice-cream cone may have lost simply an ice-cream cone. Another child, however, deprived of an ice-cream cone, may have lost not only a sensory gratification, but may also feel deprived of the love of his mother because she

refused to buy it for him. For the second child the ice-cream cone has not only an intrinsic value, but may also be the carrier of psychological values.

Take another instance. The question: Does sexual deprivation give rise to all or any of the many effects of frustration, e.g., aggression, sublimation etc? The answer to it depends on two different situations. There are many cases in which celibacy has no psychopathological effects, in others it has many bad effects. The factor which determines which effect prevails in an individual, depends upon whether or not sexual deprivation is felt by the individual as representing rejection by the opposite sex, inferiority, lack of worth, lack of respect, or isolation. Sexual deprivation can be borne with relative ease by individuals for whom it has no such implication.

Similarly, criticism from a friend may be taken in two different ways. Ordinarily the average person will respond by feeling attacked and threatened (which is fair enough because so frequently criticism is an attack). But if he is convinced that this criticism is not an attack or a rejection of him, he will then not only listen to the criticism but possibly even be grateful for it.

After having discussed situations which may or may not lead to frustration, let us now have a look at the situations that necessarily cause frustration.

Suppose a subject was to direct two subordinates in a building task, but the subordinates never allow him to attain the goal of completing the small structure; or a subject who is not allowed to complete a task and is told that he has not met a criterion of performance and that he will not receive a reward; or stimuli are applied that divert the subject's attention from the task at hand, e.g., of a student reading for examination; or each time an experimental dog feels hungry and wants to pick up a morsel of meat, he gets an electric shock. The above different factors such as, barriers, failures, distractors and conflict, lead to interference in the instrumental responses and consequent frustration.

Now, the question is: Does frustration always lead to aggression? While earlier, it was suggested that the intensity and/or frequency of aggression co-varies with the strength of frustration, which is determined by the strength of the response

tendency being blocked, the degree of interference and the number of frustration sequences, it is now generally believed that frustration produces instigations to a number of different types of response, one of which is an instigation to aggression.

Instigation to aggression may occupy any one of a number of positions in the hierarchy of instigations aroused by a specific situation which is frustrating. If the instigation to aggression is the strongest member of the hierarchy, then acts of aggression will be the first response to occur. If the instigations to other responses incompatible to aggression are stronger than the instigation to aggression, then these other responses will occur at first and prevent, at least temporarily, the occurrence of acts of aggression. This opens up two further possibilities. If these other responses lead to a reduction in the instigation to the originally frustrated response, then the strength of the instigation to aggression is also reduced so that acts of aggression may not occur at all in the situation in question. If, on the other hand, the first responses do not lead to a reduction in the original instigation, then the instigations to them will tend to become weakened through extinction so that the next most dominant responses, which may or may not be aggression, will tend to occur. From this analysis it follows that the more successive responses of non-aggression are extinguished by continued frustration, the greater is the probability that the instigation to aggression will eventually become dominant so that some response of aggression will actually occur.

In the case of repeated frustrations, the response of the individual depends upon what he himself expects, as for example later thwartings sometime evoke milder reactions than do the first in a series of frustrations, and this difference may be due to the later thwartings being anticipated. In general, expected frustrations produce less intense emotional reactions than do unanticipated frustrations. Two reasons are suggested: (1) through anticipating interference with his activity, the individual may alter his actions, or even his goals, so that he actually experiences less frustration; (2) expected frustrations may be judged as less severe.

Besides frustration, noxious stimuli of various types such as attack and annoyers also act as antecedents to aggression. Attack involves delivery of noxious stimuli to the victim. When

an individual is attacked he either flees or fights back, depending upon many variables.

Annoyers are stimuli that in some way irritate or are aversive, as for example, the foul smell in another's breath; a bright light shining directly at the eyes. These stimuli are, however, not focussed towards a victim or group of victims, and there is no reinforcement. One way to escape such noxious stimuli is to leave the situation; another way is to attack the source of the irritant in an attempt to remove the annoying stimulus.

Between the two: frustration and attack, the latter is more potent as an antecedent to aggression. This has been proved experimentally. Three groups of college men and women, were administered an 'Abstract Ability Test' and told that the test correlated highly with I Q. They were also told that the test could easily be completed in the time allotted. In one group (frustration) insufficient time was allowed; subjects were stopped after 5 minutes, with no one able to complete the test. Second (attack) group was allowed to complete the test but insulted immediately afterwards. The experimenter derogated their performance ability and maturity level. The third (control) group was allowed sufficient time to complete the test but was not insulted afterwards. Subsequently, the three groups were tested for their aggressiveness. Attack yielded sufficiently more aggression than frustration.

Not only can our feelings, behaviour or remarks about a particular situation elicit aggressive response from the other individual, but also the actual words used in describing those remarks excite greater or lesser intensity of aggression.

Reinforcement History: Like any other response, aggression owes its habit strength to the consequences that follow it. Frequent, strong reinforcement of attacking responses leads to a strong attacking habit as in the elimination of a noxious stimulus or the attainment of a reward. If rewards follow aggression often and early in the individual's development, the habit may be extremely resistant to extinction. The tendency to attack may become so strong that it pervades virtually all areas of adjustment, making it impossible for the individual to distinguish between situations calling for aggression and those calling for more peaceful responses. They have difficulty in

extinguishing their tendency to attack and substituting other instrumental responses that lead to rewards in a peaceful society. A less extreme example is the individual who fights his way out of poverty by knocking down anyone who blocks his path to success. Such a person typically continues his aggressive ways after he has attained success, despite changed conditions that no longer call for aggression. The aggressive habit is too strong and too pervasive to fade away.

Social Facilitation: Group tendencies and attitudes towards aggression are an important determinant of its habit strength, whether the group is the family, the community, the social class, or the entire culture. Anthropologists have demonstrated the wide range of differences in aggressiveness to be found in different cultures and also the links between aggressiveness and child-training practices. Much of the learning that occurs in childhood is of the imitative variety, the child mimicking his parents, teachers and other older members of the group. When aggression predominates in the group, there is ample opportunity for the child to acquire a strong aggressive habit merely by following in the footsteps of older group members. When aggression is relatively absent in the group, the models of behaviour that the child imitates are marked by non-aggressiveness, and the tendency to attack remains weak.

Temperament: Temperament refers to the characteristics of behaviour that appear early in life and remain relatively unchanged. It is not clear whether these characteristics are more innate than learned. Temperament variables affect all behaviour, not just aggression.

The temperament variables that influence the development of aggressiveness are: (1) impulsiveness (2) activity level, (3) intensity of reaction, and (4) independence.

All infants are impulsive, being unable to inhibit responses. As children mature they are expected to delay, to think before acting, and the ability to delay a response is one sign of maturity. Individuals differ considerably in their ability to delay, to tolerate frustration. Those who cannot wait are more likely to be aggressive than those who can tolerate the tension of having to delay. When an anger stimulus occurs, the impulsive person tends to become angry and immediately responds with aggression. There is insufficient time to develop

inhibition of the attacking response, to allow for the learning of responses incompatible with aggression. Once the aggression occurs, its habit strength depends upon the consequences (positive or negative), but the impulsive person tends to make more frequent aggressive responses because of the lack of inhibition. The over-deliberate person should, other things being equal, be at the other extreme—low aggressiveness. His latency of aggression is sufficiently long for responses incompatible with aggression to be well learned. He tends to delay responding to an anger stimulus, and sometimes the delay is so long that an aggressive response is unnecessary. Thus extreme deliberation before responding may tend to prevent the occurrence of an aggressive response when the individual is presented with an anger stimulus.

Activity level refers to the amount of energy expended in every day activities, and it is determined in part by hormones. Individuals may be ranged on a continuum from sluggishness to hypomania, and their place on this continuum is one determinant of aggressiveness. High activity means involvement in a greater variety of situations and often leads to social intrusiveness. In his busy activity, the energetic person inevitably involves himself in more interactions with others, especially competitive, conflicting interactions. By serving as an irritant to others in the everyday interactions, the active person produces anger in others, which is fed back to him. Thus the more active person is likely to be presented with more anger stimuli than the less active person. Since the frequency of anger stimuli is one determinant of aggressiveness, the greater the activity level, the higher the probability of a strong aggressive habit.

Intensity of reaction to a situation differs in different people. Some individuals tend to react with intensity to a situation which elicits mild responses from most people. The greater the intensity of rage, the higher the probability and the greater the intensity of aggression. Since frequency and intensity of aggressive responses are indicants of habit strength, the highly reactive individual should be more aggressive than less reactive individuals.

Independence refers to a tendency towards self-sufficiency and resistance to group pressures. It may be seen in the child who

refuses to sit on an adult's lap, who will not sit still and accept adult affection; in contrast, a more dependent child thrives on being held and kissed and later is more susceptible to group pressures. For the independent individual, there are more irritants in his everyday interactions because of strong pressures for conformity and submission to the demands of others. Thus in his interactions with others, the independent individual chafes and becomes angry. On the response side, the tendency to rebel is an important component in independence, and rebelliousness is part of aggressiveness. The need to assert one's own individuality not only produces more irritants for oneself and for others, but by the very content of the rebellious response the individual is engaging in aggression. Thus the independent person, almost by definition, has a stronger aggressive habit than the dependent, conforming person.

Another sub-topic that we need to discuss here is the quantitatively increased fighting response after application of a noxious stimulus elicited in males, as compared with the females. It has been observed in the laboratory that among mice of the ordinary domestic strains, the females rarely if ever fight, but combats between males are frequent and can easily be induced during early maturity. 25-days after castration, by which time the effect of male sex hormones has been eliminated, none of these animals ever fight. Implanting testosterone propionate pellets (male sex hormones) in each animal to replace the male hormone, again leads to fights. When these pellets are removed, most of the animals stop fighting; a few however keep fighting on. This shows that the male sex hormone controls fighting.

Allowing the animals to become accustomed to fighting and then castrating them does not lead to a cessation of fighting, which shows that the male hormone must be present in order to get the animal to start fighting, but it is no more necessary once a strong habit has been established. Although small amounts of male hormones continue to be secreted by the adrenal glands of even castrated males, habit formation obviously has a strong effect. The male sex hormone seems to act by lowering the threshold of responsiveness to the painful stimulation which normally causes fighting.

Nervous control of aggression has not been studied in men for various reasons, but it has been done extensively in lower

animals, for instance in cats. It has been shown that the experimental removal of the cerebral cortex in a cat, makes it hyperexcitable to fighting. Stimulation of the hypothalamus through an inserted electrode elicits strong anger reaction. These two observations indicate that an intact cerebral cortex represses anger which is initially produced through hypothalamic stimulation. (In the natural state the original stimulus for anger reaction comes from outside which in turn stimulates the hypothalamus).

Further studies along these lines have helped to tell us what happens when a noxious stimulus is applied to an animal. It stimulates the hypothalamus. From there some stimulation goes to centres controlling voluntary muscles involved in scratching and body posture. A larger share goes to the sympathetic nervous system, and to the adrenal gland which in turn activates several internal organs. The heart beats strongly and rapidly, digestion stops, and blood, under high pressure, is directed towards the skeletal muscles. These responses put the animal in readiness to deal with an emergency requiring great physical activity.

Continued use of emergency reactions during the course of everyday living often leads to irreversible tissue changes e.g., the chronically angry person may eventually have a permanently elevated blood pressure. It has recently been shown that constant tension, anxiety and anger cause high levels of catecholamines, especially noradrenaline in the blood during the greater part of the day. This results in the mobilisation of free fatty acids in amounts greatly in excess of the oxidative needs of the tissues, so that some of them get deposited in the arterial walls causing atheromatous narrowing of the arteries including that of coronary arteries of the heart. Excess of the free fatty acids in the blood also predispose these narrowed arteries to blocking, and to consequent heart attack.

Control: It has been shown by behavioural scientists that every species is adapted to a way of life. Structure, physiology, emotions and mental abilities are all integrated and make possible specific behaviour of that species. Just as it is easy for man to learn speech or tool-use because the basis for these abilities has been built into the brain by selection and evolution, so it is easy for man to learn to be aggressive and to

glory in conflict. This does not mean that it is very probable. It does mean that aggression will easily appear whenever it is rewarded (reinforcement and social facilitation). It does mean that young males will feel joy in conflict whenever the social system provides opportunity for and approval of conflict.¹

From the above statement it becomes clear that if we want to control aggressiveness and violence, *we must achieve a culture which teaches and educates against it.*

Starting from childhood we find that a less aggressive tolerant child is more likely to come from a home where he feels welcome, accepted and loved; where punishment is not harsh or capricious, and the child does not have to guard every moment against impulses that might bring down parental wrath upon his head. His attitude towards parents is well differentiated, that is to say, while the child accepts them on the whole, he may, without fear, be critical. Unlike the prejudiced child, he does not love them consciously and hate them unconsciously. His attitude is patterned and public, affectionate but not hypocritical. He accepts them for what they are, and does not live dreading their superior power. There is, in consequence, no sharp cleavage between conscious and unconscious layers of his mental emotional life. His frustration tolerance seem to be relatively high. Feeling secure within his own ego, there is less of a tendency to externalise (project) conflict. When things go wrong, it is not necessary to blame others: he can blame himself without falling into a state of alarm.

Such seems to be the general ground work for tolerant social attitudes. Undoubtedly, this ground work is in large part the product to home training, of the modes of reward and punishment used by the parents, of the subtle atmosphere of family living.

Children who lack these environments and consequently become aggressive pose a problem for parents and society.

It has been shown that extreme permissiveness constitutes a kind of reinforcement because the child realizes that aggression is entirely acceptable to the parent. Low permissiveness and high punishment, as also high permissiveness and low punishment,

¹Hamburg, D.A. (1963) *Expression of the Emotions in Man*, p. 300-317.

are associated with medium aggression. High permissiveness and high punishment are associated with high aggression; the mother who allows her child to aggress and then punishes severely has the most aggressive child.

Low permissiveness and low punishment is associated with low aggressiveness in the child; the mother who stops aggression quickly but does not punish it severely has the least aggressive child.

If we accept the last situation as most desirable for making the child least aggressive, we also have to be clear about the kind of punishment to be meted out to the child. Goodenough (1931)¹ listed the following methods in attempting to control aggression in children.

Scolding	Appeal to self-esteem or humour
Reasoning	Spanking or slapping
Threatening	Other corporeal punishment
Frightening	Deprivation of privileges
Coaxing	Putting in a chair
Bribery	Putting to bed
Praise	Deprivation of food
Soothing	Isolation
Ridicule	Ignoring attitude
Appeal to the emotions	Diversion of child's attention
Social approval or disapproval	Removal of source of trouble.

Goodenough found that with the advancing age of the children, there is a decrease in the use of physical punishment, coaxing, ignoring and diverting, and a shift to the use of scolding, threatening and isolation. Boys receive more spanking, threatening, bribery, and isolation than girls, who receive more ignoring than boys.

While there are differences in the effectiveness of these methods of control, the differences are overshadowed by the manner in which they are used. Goodenough found that virtually any method is effective in controlling aggression when used by some parents, but other parents have little success, no matter what the method. This point is important in attempting

¹Goodenough (1931) cited by Redl, F. & Wineman, D. in *The Aggressive Child*, 1957.

an evaluation of the relative effectiveness of parental discipline.

When the parent loses control and becomes angry, the anger intensifies the punishing behaviour, making it more severe and more physical. The punishment then becomes a strong attack, inciting the child to further aggression. Loss of control by the parent is perhaps a more crucial variable than severity of punishment. The parent is not only a source of differential reinforcement for the child but also a model whose behaviour is closely imitated. When the parent loses control, the effect of punishing aggression is counteracted by the presentation to the child of angry, aggressive behaviour to be copied. Hence, so far as possible punishment must be administered in a detached manner. Particularly with physical punishment, it is important for the parent to provide a ritualistic adult quality to the act (such as in spanking) so that the child can differentiate between such disciplinary aggression and aggression that the child might copy.

It is occasionally observed that while mothers tolerate very little aggression directed against themselves they are more permissive of attacks against the child's playmates or even encourage aggression against children in the neighbourhood, believing that a child must learn to "take care of himself." The child learns that it is dangerous to attack authority figures, and his aggression becomes limited to those weaker than himself.

As at home, the atmosphere that surrounds the child at school is exceedingly important. If discrimination, authoritarianism and hierarchy dominate the system, the child cannot help but learn that power and status are the dominant factors in human relationships.

We can conclude the subject of aggression and punishment by saying that aggressive actions are inhibited when the individual anticipates punishment for such behaviour and/or believes that these hostile acts will violate the standards of conduct he wants to uphold. The strength of the inhibitions against aggression is a direct function of the amount of punishment anticipated for aggressive behaviour so that with instigation to aggression held constant, overtly hostile behaviour is less likely, the stronger the expected punishment and the more probable the occurrence of this punishment.

Group Aggression

No one set of considerations, whether from psychology or any of the other social sciences, can satisfactorily explain all manifestations of group aggressiveness and intergroup conflict. Many instances of violence between groups have been precipitated by competition for scarce values or properties. Other cases of intergroup aggression originate in emotional tensions. Some people are innocent victims of hostility engendered by the frustrations of living. As scapegoats, they are the victims of prejudiced attitudes for which, they, to some extent at least, are blameless. In the next few paragraphs, we will confine ourselves to the study of prejudice as a factor that leads to intergroup aggression and violence.

Prejudice

In the course of growing up, a man picks up and adopts a certain set of notions about people who do not belong to his way of thinking. If these notions that he adopts involve thinking ill of others *without sufficient warrant* he can be said to be prejudiced.

There are many reasons for a person to develop prejudices. Essentially it is in fulfilment of one's own needs and in support of an individual's own style of life, at the back of which is his own insecurity, fear and guilt. Prejudice offers him an opportunity of relieving his personal conflicts by offering a target for his hostile impulses.

The most potent maintainer of prejudice is habit strength. Throughout childhood and adulthood, there are literally thousands of everyday learning situations in which prejudice is stamped in. The habit becomes deeply entrenched, fortified by years of imitation and reinforcement. It is all the more difficult to alter these habit patterns when there is strong reinforcement behind them.

Prejudices that engender intergroup aggression and violence are of various types. These include (1) Out-group prejudice, (2) National prejudice, (3) Ideological prejudice, (4) Racial prejudice, (5) Religious prejudice etc. We shall take them up one by one.

Out-group Prejudice: One's family ordinarily constitutes the smallest and firmest of one's in-groups. Common feeling grows

less and less as the contact lessens. A minor offence, overlooked in a member of our own group, seems intolerable when committed by a member of an out-group.

Cultural variation of many sort—differences in language, food customs, social habits, and so forth—which seem unimportant at first glance can and do lead to prejudice. So deeply rooted is our cultural heritage that we are rarely conscious of it.¹

By an individual nation, all other nations are generally believed to be morally 'far away,' or 'much inferior;' they are considered suitable objects on which to exercise national pride ('there is no better country than ours'), national hate ('our enemy is always the same')—all aspects of national egocentrism and egotism. This creates a very favourable atmosphere for developing emotionally charged and standardized symbols and myths which seriously distort the real face and character of other peoples and nations.

Even in such a situation of out-group prejudice, there are some factors that must exist before there can be inter-group conflict. These are: (1) people are categorized together as a unit and collectively regarded as a frustrating agent; (2) the group is visible; i.e., there is awareness of it and a perception of it as being 'different,' and (3) there is some frustrating contact with the group. The rapid influx of a group into an area is particularly likely to breed antagonism towards the group if (a) it is visibly different, and (b) the older residents of the area are in real or imagined competition with the new group, resulting in the group being seen as a frustrator.

National Prejudice: Upto the nineteenth century, it was believed that the division of the world into independent sovereign states, distinguished from one other on the basis of nationality, was both natural and desirable. It was considered that peace could not be secured nor the human personality allowed to reach its full height unless such a division was carried through to completion.

With the passage of time, nationalism all over the world has become more aggressive. Priority of the state in matters moral, economic and territorial over the other states is considered

¹Telberg (1956) They Don't Do it Our Way, UNESCO *Courier*, III. May, 1, p. 6-7.

absolute. "Given fifty-odd national sovereign states, given fifty-odd armies, navies and air forces, given fifty-odd independent governments, each of which is the judge of its own quarrels and the punisher of its own wrongs; I repeat given these conditions, there can be only one result—war."¹

Prejudice in favour of one's own nation and consequently against other nations, has created a very difficult situation for mankind. Nationalism, which has resulted in the parceling out of our living space has tended to enhance our group territorialism, which is an inherited weakness from our animal predecessors.

Ideological Prejudice: Frustrations can also arise from the knowledge of the existence of opposing belief systems. World history documents how opposing ideological systems have frequently come into open conflict.

Many a time, it is the authorities or the governments themselves who encourage the people to develop ideological prejudices against the opposing nation or system. It helps them to deflect the wrath of the population initially aimed at them, on to a foreign government. For this 'strategic' prejudice to lead to open aggressiveness, the people must (1) be angry, (2) see the given group as being responsible for their frustrations, (3) believe the attack upon the group as ethically justified, and (4) think that they will not be punished for the aggression.

Racial Prejudice: In the tenth century, history tells us, a Muslim philosopher, an Arab living in Spain, made the following comment about the barbarians of the North: "Their temper is slow and their humours raw; their hair is long and their complexion pale. The sharpness of their wit, the perspicacity of their intelligence is nil; ignorance and indolence are dominant among them as well as crudeness and lack of judgement." Centuries later, the events turned full circle. Prosperity, technology and the power of the West looked down upon the peoples of other lands, in the East.

In the nineteenth century when European imperial expansion called for some justification, concept of superior and inferior races was created. Poets (Kipling), racial theorists (Chamberlain), and statesmen proclaimed colonial peoples to

¹Davies (1945) *The Seven Pillars of Peace*, London.

be 'inferior,' 'requiring protection,' 'a lower form of evolution,' 'a burden to be borne altruistically.' All this pious concern and condescension masked the financial advantage that came from exploitation. Segregation developed as a device for preventing sympathy and sentiments of equality.

Later studies, however, have completely exploded the myth of superior and inferior races. At the time of the First World War, over a million recruits in the American Army including many Negroes, were given psychological tests. The results showed in the first place that Negroes from the south (where educational and economic handicaps were greater) obtained scores which, on the average, were definitely inferior to those of Negroes from the north (where such handicaps, though they existed, were much less severe). Even more strikingly, the Negroes from some of the northern states turned out to be superior to the whites from some of the southern states.¹ This was true in the case of both types of intelligence tests used, one depending on language, the other a performance or non-language test.

In another study, it has been found that no connection exists between the biological constitution of the peoples and the level of their past or present culture, nor is there any hereditary or other biological reason for supposing that, just because white civilization is leading in the development of the present highly technical age, some races have less aptitude for learning technological skills.² There is no reason, for example, why an African, because he is a Negro, can not learn to drive a tractor or be a soil chemist, or do any other task originated by a white.

Of course, children of a highly technical civilization have an enormous advantage over those who live in simple, isolated cultures. At an early age they learn the logic that two and two make four, they unconsciously learn the principle of cause and effect, they tinker with machines to see how they work. A Negro child born in the jungle of the Congo is brought up in a world with a different image of nature and its forces. If he is to adopt Western culture, he has to learn not only how a machine works, but also to interpret natural phenomena

¹Otto Klineberg, (1951) *Race and Psychology*, pp. 10-17, 24.

²(1952) *What is Race?* pp. 60-63.

according to rigid laws which no longer permit the intervention of spirits or magic. But these are cultural, not racial, differences. When the same Negro grows up in a technical environment, he may well become a scientist like George Washington Carver, or a leader like Booker T. Washington.

The net result of all the research that has been conducted in this field is to the effect that innate racial differences in intelligence have not been demonstrated; that the obtained differences in test results are best explained in terms of the social and educational environment, that as the environment opportunities of different racial or ethnic groups become more alike, the observed differences in test results also tend to disappear. The evidence is overwhelmingly against the view that race is a factor which determines level of intelligence.

Religious Prejudice: For centuries, Hindus have called Muslims *mlechhas* (impure), the Muslims have called Hindus infidels, and this has led to riots, killings etc. The Jews have been persecuted for their religion since ages. The crusades of the Middle Ages are another example.

While a religion unites co-religionists, it creates prejudice against those belonging to other religions. In practice, however, the creed of universalistic brotherhood does not work. People who adhere to different absolutes are not likely to find themselves in agreement.

Manifestations of Prejudice: What people actually do in relation to groups they are prejudiced against is not however, always directly related to what they think or feel about them. Two Hindu employers, for example, may dislike members of a minority community to an equal degree. One may keep his feelings to himself and may hire one on the same basis as any worker, perhaps because he wants to gain goodwill for his factory or store in the minority community. The other may translate his dislike into his employment policy and refuse to hire one. Both men are prejudiced, but only one of them practices discrimination.

Most people who have prejudices talk about them. With like-minded friends, occasionally with strangers, they may express their antagonism freely. But many people go beyond this mild degree of antipathetic action.

If the prejudice is more intense, it leads the individuals to

avoid members of the disliked groups, even perhaps at the cost of considerable inconvenience. In this case, the bearer of prejudice does not directly inflict harm upon the group he dislikes. He takes the burden of accommodation and withdrawal entirely upon himself.

The prejudiced person makes detrimental distinctions of an active sort. He undertakes to exclude all members of the group in question from certain types of employment, from residential housing, political rights, educational or recreational opportunities, churches, hospitals or from some other social privileges. Segregation is an institutionalized form of discrimination, enforced legally or by common custom.

In cases where prejudice breaks into a violent attack on the other group, one can be fairly certain that the following steps have prepared the way:

(a) There has been a long period of categorical prejudgement. The victim group has long been typed. People have begun to lose the power to think of the members of an out-group as individuals.

(b) There has been a long period of verbal complaint against the victimized minority. The habits of suspicion and blaming have become firmly rooted.

(c) There has been growing discrimination.

(d) There has been outside strain upon members of the in-group. They have for a long time suffered from economic privation, a sense of low-status, irritation due to political developments such as war-time restrictions or fear of unemployment.

(e) People have grown tired of their own inhibitions and are reaching a state of explosion. Irrationalism comes to have a strong appeal.

(f) Organized movements have attracted these discontented individuals, or a less formal organization—a mob—may serve their purpose in case no formal organization exists.

(g) From such a formal or informal social organization, the individual derives courage and support. He sees that his irritation and his wrath are socially sanctioned, (social facilitation). His impulses to violence are thus justified by the standards of his group—or so he thinks.

(h) Some precipitating incident occurs. What might

previously have been passed over as a trivial provocation now causes an explosion. The incident may be wholly imaginary or it may be exaggerated through rumour.

(i) When violence actually breaks out, the operation of social facilitation becomes important in sustaining the destructive activity. To see other equally excited persons in a condition of mob frenzy augments one's own level of excitement and behaviour. One ordinarily finds one's personal impulses heightened and one's private inhibitions lessened.

The participants in fist fights, gang fights, vandalism, riots, lynchings, pogroms, are predominantly youthful. It seems unlikely that young people are more frustrated in their lives than older people, but presumably they do have a thinner layer of socialized habit between impulses and their release. It is relatively easier for youth to regress to the tantrum stage of infant wrath and lacking long years of social inhibition, to find a fierce joy in this release. Youth too has the agility, the energy and the risk-taking proclivity, required for violence.

It has also been observed that rioters are usually drawn from lower socio-economic classes. To some extent this fact may be due (1) to the lesser degree of discipline (self-control) taught in families of these classes and (2) to the lower educational level which prevents people from perceiving correctly the true causes of their miserable living conditions.

Control over Prejudice: It is easier not to allow prejudices to be developed than to break those that are already well-established in a community or group. Hence efforts in this regard should be directed particularly towards children.

The school, and the state should not cease practising or teaching the principles of democratic living. Together, their influence may establish at least a secondary model (the family and home being the prime social unit) for the child to follow. If they succeed in making him question his system of values, the chances for a maturer resolution of the conflict are greater than in the absence of such questioning.

Among the school-going boys and girls different approaches are advocated so as to make them more tolerant and less prejudiced. These include: (1) Informational approach, (2) Vicarious experience approach, (3) Contact and acquaintance approach, (4) Group re-training, (5) Individual therapy, and

(6) Legislation.

Information as such does not necessarily alter either attitude or action. Its gains are less than those of other educational methods. There is however, virtually no evidence that sound factual information, does any harm. Perhaps its value may be long delayed, and may consist in driving wedges of doubt and discomfort into the stereotypes of the prejudiced. It seems likely, too, that the greater gains ascribed to other educational (e.g. project) methods require sound factual instruction as a basis.

Vicarious experience approach employs movies, dramas, fiction and other devices that invite the students to identify themselves with members of an out-group. These are effective because they induce identification with minority group members, though the students participation is only passive.

Contact and acquaintance programme call for field trips, area-surveys, work in social agencies or community programmes. Exhibitions, festivals and pageants encourage a sympathetic regard for the customs of minority groups, and call for active participation of the student. The student develops a direct contact with minorities instead of gathering mere information about them. The gain is greater if these members regard themselves as part of a team.

Through group re-training a group is taught what it is like to be in another's shoes. It makes use of group discussion, socio-drama etc.

Individual therapy comprises individual conferences which allow for therapeutic interviews and counselling and catharsis. If his statements have been exaggerated, and unfair—as they usually are—the resulting shame modifies his anger and induces a more balanced point of view.

It is not recommended that every programme start off by inviting catharsis. To do so would create a negative atmosphere at the outset. It is most likely to be needed when people feel that they themselves are under attack. When this situation prevails, no progress can be made until catharsis is allowed. With patience, skill and luck, the leader may then at the right moment guide the catharsis into constructive channels.

Mass media of communication such as newspapers, radio and television can prove of immense help, provided they are

utilized carefully and judiciously.

Legislation against discriminative tendencies, if enforced, may be a sharp tool in the battle against discrimination. So too may court decisions that invalidate discriminatory legislation left over from the past. Legal action, however, has only an indirect bearing upon the reduction of personal prejudice. It cannot coerce thoughts or instil subjective tolerance. It says, in effect, "Your attitudes and prejudices are yours alone, but you may not act them out to a point where they endanger the lives, livelihood, or peace of mind, of individuals or groups living near you." Law is intended only to control the outward expression of intolerance. And for this reason, legislative action is one of the major methods of reducing not only public discrimination, but private prejudice as well.

But legislative remedies are only one of several possible channels for improving ethnic relations and changing prejudiced attitudes.

Discussion of individual aggressiveness and the factors that lead to it, as well as of the group aggressiveness and the different prejudices that predispose towards it, and the measures suggested to control them, embolden us to say that if proper steps are taken, violence and aggression in a group or society can be lessened.

CONCLUSION

Aggression and violence—like hunger and sex—is an instinct present in all living beings, animals or vegetables.

Throw more seeds in a piece of land than it has the capacity to grow and nourish; you would see the aggression and fight amongst the plants for the nutrients from the soil and the air; the plants elbow each other out to reach for the light of the sun.

“Survival of the fittest” is also the rule in the animal kingdom and most of the time, the fittest is also the strongest.

Aggression and violence is in the nature of man as well. This is one of the instincts in him. Together with the instincts of hunger and sex, it serves the purpose of nature: the propagation of the species. Without the instinct of aggression and violence, man cannot survive the forces of nature.

But there is a limit beyond which aggression defeats its own purpose. If it exceeds that limit, it becomes destructive. In the above example of the seeds and the field, the fight amongst the plants to reach for the sources of nutrition, leads to production of lesser number of smaller grains and that also of a poorer quality. And if the struggle is very severe, the plants may exhaust themselves before they produce any seed at all. This causes total destruction.

The same is the case with man. A certain amount and quality of aggression is essential for his survival and progress. More of it is detrimental for his very existence and that of his society.

This has been observed and pondered over by the sages and wise men since ancient times. That is why they devised methods to curb the violence of man.

There are social restrictions and traditions against violence. All the religions of the world propagate non-violence. There are organizations devoted to lead men through non-violent means. Non-violent resistance and *satyagraha* endeavour to secure social justice for the individual or the society through one's own suffering rather than that of the opponent.

All these measures have succeeded, to an extent, in curbing the violence of the individual as well as the group of individuals. All these need to be encouraged and propagated further. They are the mile-stones in our efforts to curb down violence.

But they in themselves are not enough in today's fast-moving world crowded with people and their problems, wherein each day pours in more and more struggles and tensions for everybody.

In our present-day world, if we wish to live and let live, we need to have a greater hold on our violent tempers and tendencies. We adults have to realize this and act accordingly.

Through our own example, we need to teach and to demonstrate the value of tolerance and non-violence to our children—the coming generation which is bound to witness even more struggle and tensions. And here while I do not, in any case, underrate the value of home environments in producing more tolerant children, I wish to lay more stress on teaching the same in the schools.

I feel convinced that this is the time when we should start teaching tolerance and non-violence as one of the subjects in our schools, all over the world. There should be curricula and books on the subject with regular theory and practical examinations, and assessment, as we have for some of the other subjects.

There should be research institutions in every country which should devise better ways and means of teaching and propagation of tolerance and non-violence.

Since his birth, man has faced heavy odd—created by nature or himself. Through his own efforts, he has overcome them and has even flourished.

There is all the reason to hope that he will overcome his excessive aggression and violence—his own creation—through his own means.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1

- ALEXANDER, G.G., *Lao Tze, The Great Thinker*, London, 1895.
- BARODIA, U.K., *History and Literature of Jainism*, Bombay, 1909.
- BLOOMFIELD, M., *Hymns of the Atharva-veda, SBE*, Vol. 42, Oxford, 1897.
- BOOL CHAND, *Lord Mahavira*, Banaras, 1948.
- BRITTAIN, V., *The Rebel Passion*, George Allen & Unwin, London, 1964.
- CADOUX, C.J., *Christian Pacifism Re-examined*, Oxford, 1940.
- CHALMERS, Lord, *Majjhima Nikaya: Further Dialogues of the Buddha, SBB*, Vols. 5-6, Oxford, 1926.
- COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS, *Prefaces to Peace: Symposium*, 1943.
- COOMARASWAMY, A.K., *Buddha and the Gospel of Buddhism*, New Delhi, 1974.
- DASGUPTA, S.N., *History of Indian Philosophy*, 3 Vols., Cambridge, 1932-40.
- DUTT, M.N., *Ramayana*, English translation in prose, Calcutta, 1892-94.
- , *Mahabharata*, Calcutta, 1895-1905.
- ELIOT, C., *Hinduism & Buddhism*, 3 Vols. London, 1921.
- FIELD, D., *The Religion of the Sikhs*, London, 1914.
- GEIGER, W., *Mahavamsa*, English translation, London, 1912.
- GRIFFITH, R.T.H., *Ramayana*, English translation in verse, Banaras, 1915.
- GRIFFITH, R.T.H., *The Hymns of Rigveda*, Lazarus, Banaras, 1920-26.

- INOUE, S., *Laotse*, Tao Teh King, Tokyo, 1928.
- JACOBI, H., *Acharanga*, English translation, London, 1882.
- , *Uttaradhyayana*, SBE, Oxford, 1895.
- JAINI, J.L., *Outlines of Jainism*, Cambridge, 1916.
- JENNINGS, W., *The Confucian Analects*, London, 1895.
- JHA, G., *Mimamsa Sutras of Jaimini*, English translation, SBH, Allahabad, 1910.
- KEETON, G.W., *The Path to Peace: Symposium* (ed), The London Institute of World Affairs, London, 1945.
- KEITH, A.B., *Buddhist Philosophy in India & Ceylon*, Oxford, 1923.
- KENT, C.R., *The Shorter Bible, The New Testament*, London, 1918.
- LEGGE, J., *The Life and Teachings of Confucius*, London, 1875.
- , *The Sacred Books of China: The Texts of Confucianism*, SBE, Vol. 16, Oxford, 1899.
- LYALL, L.A., *The Sayings of Confucius*, London, 1925.
- , *Mencius*, London, 1932.
- MACAULIFFE, M.A., *The Sikh Religion*, 6 volumes, Oxford, 1909.
- MAX MULLER, F., *Dhammapada*, English translation, SBE, Oxford, 1898.
- MEDHWIST, C.S., *The Tao Teh King*, Chicago, 1905.
- MILLER, W.B., *Non-violence: A Christian Interpretation*, London, 1964.
- MOFFATT, J., *The Old Testament*, 2 Vols., New York, 1924-25.
- MOOKERJI, R.H., *Asoka* (Gaekwad Lectures), London, 1928.
- OLDENBERG, H., *Dipavamsa*, English translation, 1879.
- , *Therigatha*, English translation, PTS, London, 1883.
- PALMER, E.H., *The Quran*, translated in 2 Vols. in SBE, Vols. 6 & 9, Oxford, 1880.
- RADHAKRISHNAN, S., *Indian Philosophy*, 2 Vols., London, 1927.
- RHYS DAVIDS, T.W., *Majjhima Nikaya*, English translation, SBE, Oxford, 1881.
- , *Vinaya Pitaka*, English translation, SBE, Oxford, 1881-85.
- , *Digha Nikaya*, in 3 Vols., English translation, London, 1911.
- ROY, P.C., *Mahabharata*, English translation, Calcutta, 1884-96., revised edition, 1970-74, New Delhi.

- ROCKHILL, W.W., *The Life of the Buddha*, London, 1884.
 SMITH, V.W., *Ashoka, The Buddhist Emperor of India*, Oxford, 1920.
 STEVENSON, S., *The Heart of Jainism*, Oxford, 1915.
 TELANG, K.T., *Bhagavadgita*, English translation, SBE, Oxford, 1908.
 THOMAS, E.J., *The Life of Buddha as Legend and History*, London, 1927.
 YOUNG, R., *The Holi Bible*, Funk & Wagnalls. Edinburgh, 1891.

2

- ACLAND, R., *Waging Peace*, London, 1958.
 AIYAR, S.P., *Politics of Mass Violence in India*, Bombay, 1967.
 ARON, R., *Peace & War*, London, 1962.
 AUROBINDO, *Doctrine of Passive Resistance*, Calcutta, 1948.
 BANDOPADHAYAY, *My Non-violence: Gandhi*, Ahmedabad, 1960.
 BEDI, B.P.L., *Gandhi's Non-violent Weapon*, Unity, Delhi, 1952.
 BELL R.G., *Alternative to War*, London, 1959.
 BONDURANT, J.V., *Conquest of Violence*, Princeton, 1958.
 BOULDING, K.E., *Conflict & Defence*, New York, 1962.
 BOWLESS, C., *The New Dimensions of Peace*, New York, 1955.
 CURTIS, L., *World Revolution in the Cause of Peace*, New York, 1946.
 DASGUPTA, A.C., *Non-violence, the Invincible Power*, Calcutta, 1946.
 DAVIS, J., *Peace, War & You*, New York, 1952.
 DIWAKAR, R.R., *Satyagraha*, Bombay, 1946.
 —, *Satyagraha in Action*, Calcutta, 1949.
 —, *The Pathway to Peace*, Patna, 1950.
 DULLES, J.F., *War of Peace*, New York, 1955.
 DUNN, T., *Alternatives to War & Violence: A Search*, London, 1963.
 EINSTEIN, A., *Why War?* International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, League of Nations, 1933.
 FRANK, T.D., *Seminar Report on World Peace Through World Law*, Delhi, 1965.
 FRIEDRICH, C.J., *Inevitable Peace*, Cambridge, Mass., 1948.
 FRYE, W.R., *A United Nations Peace Force*, The Carnegie

- Endowment for International Peace, 1957.
- MASHRUWALA, K.G., *Practical Non-violence*, Ahmedabad, 1941.
- MEADE, J.E., *The Economic Basis of a Durable Peace*, London, 1940.
- MENNINGER, K., *Love Against Hate*, New York, 1942.
- MILLER, W.B., *Non-violence: A Christian Interpretation*. London, 1964.
- NATHAN, O. & NORDEN, H., *Einstein on Peace*, London, 1963.
- NAVAJIVAN, *Non-violence in Peace & War: Gandhi*, Ahmedabad, 1949.
- NEVINS, A., *The Strategy of Peace*, New Delhi, 1961.
- PARULEKAR, N.B., *Let Us Win the Peace*, Bombay, 1944.
- , *Science of Soul Force*, Bombay, 1962.
- PHILLIMORE, W.G.F., *Three Centuries of Treaties of Peace*, London, 1919.
- PYARE LAL, *Gandhian Techniques in the Modern World*, 1953.
- PRABHY, P.K. & RABINDRA, K., *Fasting in Satyagraha: Its Use and Abuse*, Ahmedabad, 1965.
- QUINCY, W., *A Study of War*, in 2 Vols., Chicago.
- RAMACHANDRAN, G. & MAHADEVAN, T.K., *Gandhi: His Relevance to Our Times*, New Delhi, 1967.
- REVES, E., *The Anatomy of Peace*, New York, 1945.
- ROTHERMUND, I., *Philosophy of Restraint*, Bombay, 1963.
- RUTHFRY, *Victories Without Violence*, London, 1957.
- SHARP, G., *Meaning of Non-violence*, London, 1957.
- , *Gandhi Faces the Storm*, Ahmedabad, 1961.
- SHRIDHARAN, K.J., *War Without Violence*, New York, 1939.
- SIBLEY, M., *Quiet Battle*, Bombay, 1965.
- SKINNER, J.A., *Towards a Non-violent Society*, London, 1959.
- TOPA, I., *Ethos of Non-violence*, Ahmedabad, 1964.
- UNESCO, *All Men Are Brothers*, Bombay, 1959.
- VAN SLYCK, P., *Peace: The Control of National Power*, The Fund for Education Concerning World Law, New York, 1963.
- VENKATARANGAIYA, M., *Gandhi's Gospel of Satyagraha*, Bombay, 1966.
- VISVA-BHARATI, *The Task of Peace-making in the world*, Pacifist Meeting Committee, Calcutta, 1949.
- WRIGHT, Q., *A Study of War*, Chicago, 1942.
- WYNNER E. & LLOYD, G., *Searchlight on Peace Plans*, New York, 1949.

3

- ALLPORT, G.W. & KRAMER, B.M., Some Roots of Prejudice, *J. Psychol.*, 22, 9-39, 1946.
- , *The Nature of Prejudice*, Reading, Mass, 1954.
- APPEL, M.H., Aggressive Behaviour of Nursery School Children & Adult: Procedures in dealing with such children, *J. Exp. Educ.* 11, 185-199, 1942.
- BANDURA, A. & WALTERS, R.H., *Adolescent Aggression*, New York, 1959.
- BENDER, L. *et al.*, *Studies in Aggressiveness*, Genet. Psychol. Monogr, 18, 357-564, 1936.
- BERKOWITZ, L., Anti-Semitism and the Displacement of Aggression, *J. Abnorm Soc. Psychol.*, 59, 182-7, 1959.
- , Repeated Frustrations & Expectations in Hostility arousal, *J. abnorm. Soc. Psychol.*, 60, 422-9, 1960 B.
- BERNARD, J., *The Nature of Conflict*, in Int. Social Ass., Paris, 1957.
- BETTELHEIM, B., JANOWITZ, M., *Dynamics of Prejudice*, New York, 1950.
- BODY, M.K., Patterns of Aggression in the Nursery School, *Child Development*, 26, 1-11, 1955.
- CHILDE, V.G., *Man Makes Himself*, London, 1965.
- COHEN, A.K., *Delinquent Boys*, New York, 1955.
- DETHIER, V.G. & STELLAR, E., *Animal Behaviour*, New Jersey, 1962.
- DOLLARD, J. *et al.*, *Frustration of Aggression*, New Haven, 1939.
- EYSENCK, H.J., *The Dynamics of Anxiety and Hysteria*, London, 1957.
- FUNKENSTEIN, D.H. *et al.*, *Mastery of Stress*, Cambridge, Mass., 1957.
- HAFEZ, E.S.E., *The Behaviour of Domestic Animals*, London, 1962.
- HARTLEY, E.L. *Problem in Prejudice*, New York, 1946.
- HIRSCH, J., *Behaviour-Gentle Analysis*, New York, 1967.
- KOHLER, W., *The Mentality of Apes*, London, 1923.
- LEVY, D.M., The Hostile Act, *Psychol. Rev.*, 48, 356-61, 1941.
- LURIA, A.R., *The Nature of Human Conflict*, London, 1932.
- MILLER, N.E., The Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis, *Psychol. Rev.*, 48, 337-42, 1944.

- MILLER, N.E., *Inner Conflict and Defence*, New York, 1960.
- MORGAN, C.L., *The Animal Mind*, London, 1930.
- PERRY, W.J., *The Primordial Ocean*, London, 1935.
- REDL, F. & WINEMAN, D., *The Aggressive Child*, New York, 1957.
- ROSENZWEIG, W., An Outline of Frustration Theory, in *Personality & Behaviour Disorders*, New York, 1944.
- SCOTT, J.P., *Animal Behaviour*, Chicago, 1958.
- , *Aggression*, Chicago, 1958.
- SHERMAN, M., The Frustration Threshold, *Amer. J. Psychiat.*, 104, 242-6, 1957.
- SHERIF, M. & SHARIF, C.W., *Groups in Harmony and Tension*, New York, 1953.
- TAHTINEN, U., *Theories of Punishment: Studies from the Point of View of Non-violence*, Turku, 1963.
- THORPE, W.H., *Learning and Instinct in Animals*, Cambridge, Mass., 1956.
- TINBERGEN, N., *The Study of Instinct*, Oxford, 1951.
- YATES, A.J., *Frustration & Conflict*, London, 1962.
- ZAWADSKI, B., Limitations of the Scapegoat Theory of Prejudice, *J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol.*, 43, 127-41, 1948.
- ZUCKERMAN, S., *The Social Life of Monkeys and Apes*, New York, 1932.

INDEX

- Achāranga-sūtra*, 8, 11
- Adin Ballou's Christian non-violence, 50-52; non-violent resistance, 49-52
- Aggression, Group, 110-18; Prejudice, 110-18; Control over prejudice, 116-18; Ideological prejudice, 112; Manifestations of prejudice, 114-16; National prejudice, 111-12; Out-group prejudice, 110-11; Racial prejudice, 114; Religious prejudice, 114
- Aggression, Individual, 99-109; Control of, 106-09; Frustration, 99-102; Male sex hormone, role of, 105; Nervous control, 105-06; Punishment, role of, 108-09; Reinforcement, 102-03; Social facilitation, 103; Temperament, 103
- Ahimsa*, 1-21, 55-57
- Ahmedabad labour *satyagraha*, 69-70
- Ambrose, Bishop, 39
- American Negro's non-violent resistance against racial discrimination, 78-81
- Animal instincts in human behaviour, 89-94; Appeasement signals, 93; Peck order, 94; Submissive displays, 92; Territorial behaviour, 94; Threat rituals, 91
- Aryans, 1-2
- Ashoka, 18-21
- Athanasius, 39
- Augustine, 39
- Bardoli *satyagraha*, 70-73
- Bentham, Jeremy, 82
- Bhagvadgita*, 5-6
- Bhakti cult, 21-22
- Buddhism, 12-18
- Chhândogya Upanishad*, 2
- Children's Crusade, 40
- Chinese teacher-sages, 22-27
- Christ, Jesus, 33-36
- Christianity, 33-41
- Civil disobedience, 65
- Conclusion, 119-20
- Confucius, 23-24
- Constantine, Emperor, 37
- Corinthians*, 35
- Council of Arles, 38
- Crusades, 40
- Dag Hammarskjöld, 86
- Dante Alighieri, 82
- Denmark's non-violent resistance, 81
- Dhamma, Ashoka's, 18-19
- Dhamma-pada*, 16-17
- Doctrine of the Mean*, 24
- Dubois, Pierre, 82
- Duragraha*, 81
- Edict of Milan, 38
- Erasmus, Desiderius, 82
- Eternal Peace* of Kant, 82
- Evolution of man, 94-98; Food-gathering stage, 96-97; Food-producing stage, 97
- Fellowship of Reconciliation, 46-47
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 82

- Finland's non-violent resistance, 81
 Fox, George, 42
 Gandhi, 54-78
 Garrison, William, 44, 50
 Gautama Siddhartha, 12-16
Great Learning, 24
 Gregg, R.B., 58
 Grotius, Hugo, 82
Hartal, 65
 Hinduism, 1-6
 Hungarian non-violent resistance, 81
 Hus, John, 40
 Ideal World Organisation, 87-88
Isaiah, 35
 Islamism, 27-31
 Jainism, 7-12
 James, William, 54
 Judaism, 31-32
 'Just War,' 39
 Kabir's hymns, 22
 Kant, Immanuel, 82
Koran, 28, 30-31
Kritāṅga-sūtra, 8-9
 Kunda Kunda Acharya, 11
 Lao Tse, 25-26
 League of Nations, 83-84
 Luke, 34
 Luther, Martin, 41
Mahābhārata, 3-5
Mahāvagga, 17
 Mahavira, Vardhamana, 7-8
Majjhima Nikaya, 16
Manu-Smṛiti, 6
 Martin Luther King (Jr.), 79
Matthew, 35
 Maximilian, 37
 Mencius, 26-27
 Mennonites, 41-42
 Mohammed, 28-30
Moral Equivalent of War, 54
 Mo Tse, 25
 National Congress, 73
 Non-resistance Society, 44-46
 Norway's non-violent resistance, 81
Old Testament, 32
 Origen, Father, 36
 Peace Brigade, 61
 Peace Conference at the Hague, 83
 Peace Organisations, 82
Power of Non-violence, 58-60
Purva-Mimamsa, 6
 Quakers, 42-44
Rāmāyana, 3
 Reformation, 40
 Rosa Parks, 78
 Ruskin, 54
 Saint-Pierre, Abbe, 82
 Salt *Satyagraha*, 73-78
Sāmkhya, 6
Satya, 55
Satyagraha, 54-82; Champaran *satyagraha*, 62-63; Practice, 60-81; Principle, 54-60; against Rowlatt Bill, 63
 Savonarola, 40
 Society of Friends, 42-44
Sutta Nipata, 16-17
 Tao Teh, 25
 Tertullian, 36
 Thoreau's 'Civil Disobedience,' 52-54
 United Nations Organizations, 84-86
Unto This Last, 54
 Untouchables, 66
 Upanishads, 2
Uttarādhyayan-sūtra, 8
 Vaiśeshika system, 6
 Vallabhbhai Patel, 71, 74
 Vykam temple road *satyagraha*, 66-69
 Wycliff, John, 40
 Yoga, 6

Dr. O.P. Jaggi M.B.B.S., M.D., Ph.D. is head of the Clinical Research Department at the Vallabhbhai Patel Chest Institute, University of Delhi. He has made several original scientific contributions which have been published in various professional journals.

Dr. Jaggi is equally well known as a writer and author. His *Scientists of Ancient India and their Achievements*, *History of Science and Technology in India* (in five volumes) and *Friends of India: Biographical Profiles* are some of the important publications.

jacket by S. Banerjee

A Select List on Religion & Philosophy

THE YOGA OF THE SAINTS. Analysis of spiritual life by <i>Dr. V.H. Date</i> , revised and enlarged edition.	35.00
BUDDHA AND THE GOSPEL OF BUDDHISM by <i>Dr. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy</i> . illd.	45.00
MEDIEVAL MYSTICISM OF INDIA by <i>Kshitimohan Sen</i> , with a foreword by <i>Dr. Rabindra Nath Tagore</i> .	40.00
THE SRIMAD BHAGAVATAM OF KRISHNADWAIPAYANA VYASA translated into English prose from the original Sanskrit text with exhaustive index of proper names & words, by <i>J.M. Sanyal</i> , in 2 volumes.	110.00
EARLY BUDDHISM AND ITS ORIGIN by <i>Dr. Vishwanath Prasad Varma</i> .	65.00
VEDANTA EXPLAINED by <i>Dr. V.H. Date</i> , Samkaras' commentary on the Brahma-Sutras, with new light on the philosophy of Samkara with a foreword by <i>Prof. R.D. Ranade</i> , in 2 volumes.	100.00
THE FOLK ELEMENTS IN HINDU CULTURE. A contribution to Socio-religious studies in Hindu folk-institutions by <i>Benoy Kumar Sarkar</i> .	45.00
RELIGIONS OF ANCIENT INDIA by <i>Louis Renou</i> .	20.00
BRAHMA YOGA OF THE GITA by <i>Dr. V.H. Date</i> .	65.00
THE CROWN OF HINDUISM by <i>J.N. Farquhar</i> .	50.00
THE HEART OF JAINISM by <i>Mrs. Sinclair Stevenson</i> .	40.00
HINDU ETHICS—A HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL ESSAY by <i>John Mckenzie</i> .	38.00
THE ADI GRANTHA OR THE HOLY SCRIPTURES OF THE SIKHS, translated by <i>Dr. Ernest Trumpp</i> .	150.00
EVOLUTION OF HINDU SECTS up to the time of Sankaracharya by <i>Dr. Sudhakar Chattopadhyaya</i> .	35.00
THE RELIGIONS OF INDIA by <i>Dr. E. Washburn Hopkins</i> .	60.00
INDIAN THEISM from the Vedic to the Muhammadan period by <i>Nicol Macnicol</i> .	35.00
THE POPULAR RELIGION AND FOLKLORE OF NORTHERN INDIA by <i>William Crooke</i> , new edition, revised and illustrated with 24 halftone photographs, in 2 volumes.	100.00
THE STUDY OF THE SELF CONCEPT OF SANKHYA YOGA PHILOSOPHY by <i>Dr. Francis V. Catalina</i> .	20.00
MODERN RELIGIOUS MOVEMENT IN INDIA by <i>J.N. Farquhar</i> , with 24 illustrations.	35.00
ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF VAISNAVISM by <i>Dr. Suvara Jaiswal</i> .	35.00
ISLAM IN INDIA OR THE QUNUN-I-ISLAM: The Customs of the Musalmans of India by <i>Dr. Ja'far Sharif</i> . illd.	40.00

for complete catalogue please write:

MUNSHIRAM MANOHARLAL PUBLISHERS PVT. LTD.

Oriental and Foreign Booksellers and Publishers

Post Box 5715, 54 Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi-110055