

**George Mason University**

---

**From the Selected Works of Lester R. Kurtz**

---

2006

# Gandhi's Paradox: The Warrior and the Pacifist

Lester R. Kurtz, *George Mason University*



Available at: [https://works.bepress.com/lester\\_kurtz/2/](https://works.bepress.com/lester_kurtz/2/)

**C**ONVENTIONAL wisdom assumes that power grows out of the barrel of a gun, as Mao put it, or is given to those who steer a course down the mainstream. Mahatma Gandhi, however, is a “counterplayer” whose success lies not in accepting dominant paradigms but in challenging them.

Most of the world’s religious and philosophical traditions have ambivalent guidelines for individuals and collectivities to use in deliberating about whether to fight or to flee.

Most traditions embrace two opposing polar motifs regarding the use of violence, however, with intermediate taboo lines that allow the use of violence when certain criteria are met. On one end of the spectrum is the warrior motif that allows or requires the use of violence as a sacred obligation and on the other end is the pacifist motif that prohibits it with the same divine sanction. Ironically, most traditions include elements of both ends of the spectrum; established religions often emphasize the warrior motif while rallying the troops (and support for them) but promote the pacifist motif to facilitate the domestic peace. A similar theme appears in Hinduism. Despite some injunctions against violence in the ancient Vedic literature, the popular Hindu epics such as the *Mahabharata* are replete with violent battles and sacrifices.

Virtually all spiritual traditions give contradictory advice on the use of force in conflict: the warrior motif advocates warfare as a religious duty (as in Krishna’s advice to Arjuna in the *Bhagavad Gita*), whereas the pacifist motif prohibits harming others (as in the concept of *ahimsa*). Gandhi takes from the warrior concept the duty to fight and from the pacifist principle the notion of nonharmfulness, to develop *Satyagraha* as a way of fighting

## Gandhi’s Paradox The Warrior and the Pacifist

Lester R. Kurtz

without harming. Gandhi’s strategy was to confront existing assumptions, to seize alternative sources of power (not in order to hold but rather to disperse it) and to create a new paradigm of conflict based on ancient spiritual teachings.

Gandhi emerges as a charismatic nonviolent leader out of the violence of the twentieth century and the colonial world system, and a proponent of freedom out of a context of oppression. Like the lotus rising out of the mud Gandhi does not so much echo as challenge the political culture of our time. He creatively addresses a wide range of conflicts by constructing a nonviolent approach to a context of violent conflict, from religious and communal to political and economic. His

legacies do not provide techniques for fleeing to the mountains for solitary meditation or the withdrawal of a *sanyasi* from society. Rather, they play a major role in challenging the world system of European colonialism and establish the groundwork for a new kind of social movement that challenges systems of domination throughout the world.

Yet, the Indic civilization provides the soil in which a profound tradition of pacifism grows, the root of which is the concept of *ahimsa*, noninjury or nonharmfulness, which stands in sharp contrast to the warrior motif and, indeed, contradicts it. Gandhi claims that the doctrine is “the most distinctive and the largest contribution of Hinduism to India’s culture”<sup>1</sup> along with the related idea



Gandhi on the spinning wheel

that “all life (not only human beings, but all sentient beings) is one, i.e., all life coming from the One universal source, call it Allah, God or Parameshwara.”<sup>2</sup>

### Synthesizing Dichotomies

Gandhi’s cultural innovation that takes the world by a storm early in the twentieth century (and continues to be felt in the twenty-first) is in his paradoxical synthesis of the warrior-pacifist dialectic. Drawing from the warrior motif he defines battles against injustice and evil systems as religious duties, and from the pacifist he embraces the notion of not harming others, including even the enemy. In his concept of *Satyagraha* – Truth Force, Soul Force, or holding fast to the Truth – he advocates a form of struggle that emerges from deep spiritual conviction and targets not people, but systems, not individuals but behavior.

Gandhi’s synthesis of the warrior and pacifist dichotomies is based upon a paradigm of conflict that includes four central elements:

- Distinguishing between individuals and their behavior, or separating the “doer from the deed,” the “sin from the sinner;”
- Fearlessly challenging unjust systems through non-cooperation (using a variety of tactics from hunger strikes and mass demonstrations to strikes, boycotts, and nonviolent interventions);
- Creating parallel structures that initiate the construction of an alternative system to replace the objectionable one (e.g., the khadi movement to spin and weave homespun textiles while boycotting British cloth); and
- Recognizing that conflict can be either constructive or destructive.

The Gandhian path to peace does not require eliminating

*Fear is not a disease of the body; fear kills the soul*

conflict, but engaging in it nonviolently, recognizing the creative potential of conflict in which one does not harm individuals but attacks the systems, behavior, and ideas with which one disagrees.<sup>3</sup>

### Tradition as Revolution

One of the keys to Gandhi’s success in mobilizing the Indian Freedom Movement and other movements for radical social change during his lifetime is his ability to envision and present revolutionary aspirations by means of an appeal to tradition and his revitalization of tradition as an instrument of social change.

At the core of Gandhi’s life and thought was a deep spirituality that drove him. To quote his own words:

“Great causes like these cannot be served by intellectual equipment alone; they call for spiritual effort or

soul force which comes only through God’s grace”<sup>4</sup>

His spirituality had a Hindu foundation from his childhood but was forged out of encounters between indigenous tradition and a variety of others, notably Jainism and Buddhism but also Islam and Christianity.

He drew upon the tradition in deep and rich ways and incorporated it as his own, but he also transformed key elements of it to weave it into his own unique worldview. Consequently, despite the fact that Gandhi was neither a spiritual guru nor a religious scholar, he had a substantial impact on the spiritual tradition in the subcontinent.


### Ahimsa in the Indic World

The precept not to kill or harm lies at the basis of Gandhi’s notion of *Satyagraha*, or truth-force and is, in fact, something active itself.<sup>5</sup> According to Gandhi<sup>6</sup>, Ahimsa is not merely a negative state of harmlessness, but it is a positive state of love, of doing good even to the

evil-doer. But it does not mean helping the evil-doer to continue the wrong or tolerating it by passive acquiescence . . . If I am a follower of Ahimsa I must love my enemy. I must apply the same rules to the wrong-doer, who is my enemy or a stranger to me, as I would to my wrong-doing father or son.

For Gandhi ahimsa is not just a matter of not killing; it is a positive state of love. It is a natural response of a deep spiritual commitment for Gandhi, but it has a practical dimension as well.

At the psychological level ahimsa is a strategy for throwing the adversary off guard. As Gene Sharp<sup>7</sup> puts it, participants in nonviolent actions “will . . . be able to apply something like jiu-jitsu to their opponent, throwing



**Gandhi as a lawyer in South Africa**

him off balance politically, causing his repression to rebounded against his position, and weakening his power. Furthermore, by remaining nonviolent while continuing the struggle, the actionists will help to improve their own power position in several ways.” This is a subtle psychological insight incorporated into the teachings of many religious leaders (e.g., Jesus and the Buddha), but seldom practiced in international relations.

Finally, ahimsa as an element of conflict strategies reduces both personal and collective motivations for harmful reciprocity.<sup>8</sup> To quote Gandhi, “If I kill a man who obstructs me, I may experience a sense of false security. But the security will be short-lived. For I shall not have dealt with the root cause.”<sup>9</sup> Although the use of nonviolence does not guarantee “success” in a conflict, neither does violence.

### Satya and Ahimsa

Gandhi summarized his understanding of nonviolence in his equation:

God=Truth=Ahimsa

Ahimsa, for Gandhi, is not a mere ethical guide but a fundamental principle of the universe. As he put it, Ahimsa is my God & Truth is my God. When I look for Ahimsa, Truth says, “find it through me.” When I look for Truth, Ahimsa says, “Find it through me.”<sup>10</sup>

Ahimsa is not something that is easily achieved, but is rather the fruit of ascetic discipline and self-control. As Gandhi<sup>11</sup> puts it,

“The path of truth is as narrow as it is straight. Even so is that of ahimsa. It is like balancing oneself on the edge of a sword. By concentration an acrobat can walk on a rope, but the concentration required to tread the path of Truth and Ahimsa is far greater. The slightest inattention brings one tumbling to the ground. One can realize Truth and Ahimsa only by ceaseless striving.”



During a walk on the beach a young boy leads Gandhi

Nonetheless, it can be achievable by all who are willing to undertake the necessary self control and sacrifice. As Gandhi put it, “Means to be means must always be within our reach, and so Ahimsa is our supreme duty. If we take care of the means, we are bound to reach the end sooner or later.”

This perspective presents a radical challenge to mainstream thinking about power and social change: if, as Gandhi proposes, Ahimsa and Truth are equated with God, then nonviolence is more powerful than anything else, including violence. This equation is an integral part of Gandhi’s schema for understanding the nature of the universe. He wrote two columns in his diary:<sup>12</sup>

<b>Truth is</b>	<b>Untruth is</b>
light	darkness
life	death
goodness	evil
existence	non-existence
love	hatred

The most significant aspect of Gandhi’s understanding of Ahimsa —

*Live as if you were to die tomorrow. Learn as if you were to live forever.*

at least from the sociological point of view — is that he extended it to the social/political sphere, thus diverging from more traditional interpretations of the concept, which was more commonly, cultivated a detachment from social involvement.<sup>13</sup> As Margaret Chatterjee puts it, “What is special about Gandhi’s development of the [Hindu] tradition is the utilisation of recognised pathways to individual liberation for the wider purpose of the transformation of society.”<sup>14</sup> His goal was to extend what was often emphasized as an individual ethic to the collective life, eventually “eliminating violence from social, political and economic life.”<sup>15</sup> Social activism based on religious conviction and the ethic of Ahimsa was also linked intimately in Gandhi’s ethos with courage.

### Ahimsa as Courage

The practice of ahimsa is impossible without courage; nonviolent action, from Gandhi’s point of view, is inextricably bound up with fearlessness. He contends, “The brave are those armed with fearlessness, not with sword, the rifle or other carnal weapons which are affected only by cowards.”<sup>16</sup> Thus, Ramchandra Gandhi rightly claims that “Mahatma Gandhi’s greatest contribution to our time ... is this: that

he has introduced the word nonviolence into the vocabulary of heroism. Up until the nineteenth century if anybody spoke of nonviolence, they would have been regarded as a coward who was rationalizing his cowardice. ... But today, whether it is India or Pakistan or the Soviet Union or the USA or any power, for all of them, nonviolence is a serious moral option. It may not always be a practical one. No one is embarrassed easily by the word nonviolence. It has entered into the vocabulary of courage and heroism.”<sup>17</sup>

Gandhi was emphatic about the relationship between nonviolence and courage.<sup>18</sup> Not only was it a practical matter — one is not easily able to sustain a nonviolent stance in the face of adversity without courage — but it is also a matter of fundamental belief. “Cowardice,” he insisted, “is wholly inconsistent with non-violence.”<sup>19</sup>

In the political sphere Gandhi was quite insistent on the use of nonviolence; “Gandhi assumed the position of an absolute moralist as far as political violence and terrorism was concerned,” writes Kamlesh Mohan. “He declared ...I am an uncompromising opponent of violent method, even to serve the noblest of causes.”<sup>20</sup>

**Act with Fearlessness:** The kind of courage required by nonviolent resistance discussed above grows out of the “friendly universe” assumption that Gandhi teaches those who would engage in Satyagraha. Whereas fear breeds violence, fearlessness enables one to take on entire systems single-handedly and without violence. One thus acts out of courage even when deliberately breaking the law in acts of civil disobedience. The significance of fearlessness in Gandhi’s approach to struggle cannot be overemphasized and must be understood in the context of the

*An eye for an eye only  
ends up making the whole  
world blind*

colonial system, established by force and ratified by violence.

This attitude was rooted, of course, in Gandhi’s spiritual convictions, but was not dependent upon a religious legitimation. As Paul Power puts it, civil disobedience “was not so much a call to ‘obey God rather than man’ but rather a ‘*dharmic*’ appeal to his people to restore their integrity and to fulfill their duty. The validating source of disobedience is found in a horizontal rather than a vertical relationship.”<sup>21</sup>

Thus, Gandhi’s mobilization strategies were designed not only to address the structure and policies of the government but even so “to bring about a change in the attitude of the people at large. It is their conversion that really mattered.”<sup>22</sup> Finally, however, they were also directed at himself; ultimately it was not his effect on the masses or neither the impact of Satyagraha on the system nor any concrete consequences of his action

that provide the crucial test of Satyagraha. What matters is if one is true to oneself; if his inner voice told him he had to stand alone, that is what he felt he must do: “You have to stare the world in the face, although the world may look at you with bloodshot eyes. Do not fear. Trust that little thing which resides in the heart, it says, “Forsake friends, wife, and all; but testify to that for which you have lived, and for which you have to die.”<sup>23</sup>

### **Role of Suffering**

Whereas conventional wisdom does understand the salience of courage in serious conflict, Gandhi’s understanding of the role of suffering turns the common sense paradigm on its head. It is, in fact, this premise of nonviolence that is the most objectionable to many partisans of conflict because it seems so counterintuitive. In violent conflict the object is usually to inflict a maximum and sustain a minimum amount of suffering. To accept suffering oneself is at the heart of Gandhi’s nonviolence.

This paradoxical turn has its roots in the Vedic traditions in which suffering — more than evil — is the underlying problem of existence, but



**Gandhi and his handpicked successor, Jawaharlal Nehru**

even here Gandhi is a “counterplayer” in interpreting tradition because “Suffering ... has always posed itself, to the philosophers and sages [of India], as something to be got rid of, that is, as a practical problem.”<sup>24</sup> Chatterjee contends that

it was not until Gandhi that we find the innovatory idea of suffering (‘the richest treasure of life’) itself being regarded as a way of dealing with suffering. ... Gandhi ... sees the sufferings of men in a particularistic way, rather than, as the philosophers had seen it, as a general cosmic condition. Secondly, he centres on the sufferings of others as the focus of our meliorist efforts, not the sluffing off of the chains of bondage for our own personal liberation. The sufferings to be got rid of stem from the injustices that beset the poor; they derive from wickedness in high places as well as from wickedness within the human heart.... Gandhi is not concerned with finding a metaphysical justification for suffering or with speculation about its cause. He scientifically diagnoses the diseases of society, his heart responds to those in distress, and he works out a new tapasya, a new mârga<sup>25</sup> for tackling human miseries.<sup>26</sup>

Gandhi’s innovation lies in the duty of self-sacrifice, in the process of a struggle in which suffering is accepted rather than inflicted as a way of not so much defeating as converting the opponent. Like most of Gandhi’s cultural innovations, this concept was rooted in his religious understandings of the world and tested in his own struggles, beginning in South Africa. As he put it,

Suffering is the law of human beings; war is the law of the jungle. But suffering is infinitely more powerful than the law of the jungle



**Gandhi with Begum Abdullah (left) and Khallida Abdullah in Srinagar**

for converting the opponent and opening his ears, which are otherwise shut, to the voice of reason.... The appeal of reason is more to the head but penetration of the heart comes from suffering. It opens up the inner understanding in man. Suffering is the badge of the human race, not the sword.<sup>27</sup>

The application of these premises about the power of nonviolence and the use of suffering in conflict is the process of nonviolent direct action that Gandhi dubbed *Satyagraha*.

### **Applied Non-violence**

With satya combined with ahimsa, you can bring the world to your feet.<sup>28</sup>

The means by which Gandhi applied his nonviolent philosophy

***With satya combined with ahimsa, you can bring the world to your feet.***

was Satyagraha, that is “truth force” or “soul force,” at the same time both spiritual act and a political tool for attacking the structures of violence. This concept, coined by Gandhi himself to distinguish his approach to struggle from the often-misunderstood aspects of “passive resistance,” combines the Sanskrit words for Truth (Satya) and firmness or strength (agraha). Satyagraha is nonviolence in action, the use of “Truth Force” or “Soul Force” as opposed to “Brute Force” or “body force,” i.e., physical violence, while engaged in struggle. Gandhi’s understanding of the Satyagrahi was possible only within the context of a self-discipline cultivated in a religious sense, such as the traditional vows (from the *Pancha Yamas*) of Patanjali:

- *Satya* (Truth);
  - *Ahimsa* (nonviolence),
  - *Satya* (non-stealing),
  - *Aparigraha* (non-possession),
- and
- *Brahmacharya* (chastity)<sup>29</sup>

Gandhi claim that a Satyagrahi (i.e., one who engages in Satyagraha) must be disciplined, but also “must have a living faith in God....”<sup>30</sup> How one defines God may be quite open to interpretation, but the element of faith in some form is essential from Gandhi’s point precisely because his paradigm of conflict is so contradictory to that put forth in conventional thinking that it is difficult to sustain without a deep conviction.

Ashis Nandy contends that “Gandhi was neither a conservative nor a progressive. And though he had internal contradictions, he was not a fragmented self-alienated man driven by the need to compulsively conserve the past or protect the new. Effortlessly transcending the dichotomy of orthodoxy and

iconoclasm, he forged a mode of self-expression which by its apparently non-threatening simplicity reconciled the common essence of the old and the new."<sup>31</sup>

Gandhi contended that nonviolence is "not a cloistered virtue to be practised by the individual for his peace and final salvation, but it is a rule of conduct for society."<sup>32</sup> He admits, however, that "we are strangers to the nonviolence of the brave on a mass scale" and that some doubt "the possibility of the exercise of nonviolence by groups, much less by masses of people," thus restricting its use to "exceptional individuals" (*ibid.*). If nonviolence might seem strange and counterintuitive, Gandhi insisted, it was nonetheless based upon the very nature of human existence and the structure of the cosmos.

Obviously non-cooperation has its price — those who refuse to bow down to the tyrant may well lose their lives — and the Satyagrahi must expect to suffer when doing so. Paradoxically, however, that very suffering is a sign of victory if accepted without violence, rather than an element of defeat as it is with struggle. Gandhi readily admits that although "non-violence being the mightiest force in the world and also the most elusive in its working, it demands the greatest exercise of faith."<sup>33</sup> It was not only an article of faith, however, but also a conclusion of his experience. He was convinced also that human history was filled with nonviolence from the very beginning of the species.<sup>34</sup> The only barrier to the use of nonviolence, according to Gandhi, is the human misperception that violence is somehow stronger. "The difficulty one experiences in meeting *himsa* arises from weakness of mind."<sup>35</sup>

Humans are basically good: Although Gandhi was certainly not so naive as to assume that humans



60 years old Gandhi leading the 240-mile Salt March

were incapable of evil behavior, the *Satyagrahi* must always draw out the best in his or her adversary in struggle. This element of the strategy is linked to Gandhi's insistence on separating the doer from the deed. All people have engaged in evil-doing; that does not make one's opponents evil. Rather, it means that both you and your opponent are capable of evil.

This assumption, like the others, has both a spiritual and a practical political side, a corollary of the Thomas Theorem: "That which is defined as real is real in its consequences."<sup>36</sup> By treating people as if they were good, Gandhi often forced them to act as if they were, thus rendering the ontological question somewhat irrelevant. A number of major consequences for the conduct of conflict flow from this assumption. Perhaps the most important is that one not only could but also should

***I object to violence because when it appears to do good, the good is only temporary; the evil it does is permanent***

associate on a friendly basis with an adversary, a violation of one of the most common tenets of the violent paradigm of conflict, which requires a certain dehumanization of the opponent.

The second, and related consequence of treating an adversary with respect, is the opening of channels of communication and the creation of a space for a resolution of the conflict that benefits all parties to it and does not leave in its wake grievances that set the stage for the next round of battle. "It is the acid test of non-violence," Gandhi writes, "that, in a non-violent conflict there is no rancour left behind, and in the end the enemies are converted into friends. That was my experience in South Africa, with General Smuts. He started with being my bitterest opponent and critic. Today he is my warmest friend."<sup>37</sup>

Indeed, this aspect of *Satyagraha* has deep roots in the Indic religions, which are replete with admonitions even to love one's enemies and to show them compassion. The Ramayana, for example, A superior being does not render evil for evil; this is a maxim one should observe;

the ornament of virtuous persons is their conduct. One should never harm the wicked or the good or even criminals meriting death."<sup>38</sup> Moreover, one should show compassion even towards people who are injuring others, "for who is without fault?"<sup>39</sup>

In Jainism we even find what I call the "compassion gap:"

My Lord! Others have fallen back in showing compassion to their benefactors as you have shown compassion even to your malefactors. All this is unparalleled.<sup>40</sup>

Finally, in Buddhism we see a similar emphasis on compassion

"He abused me, he beat me, he defeated me, he robbed me!" In those who harbor such thoughts hatred is not appeased.... Hatreds never cease through hatred in this world; through love alone they cease. This is an eternal law.<sup>41</sup>

Elsewhere the Buddha advises:

*Conquer anger by love.*

*Conquer evil by good.*

*Conquer the stingy by giving.*

*Conquer the liar by truth.*<sup>42</sup>

### **Experiments with Truth**

As the title of Gandhi's autobiography emphasizes, Gandhi's approach was characterized not by simplistic citations of dogmas — although his profound convictions inspired his theories, he insisted that nonviolence be experimented with rather than simply expounded. "Ahimsa is a science," he insisted. "The word 'failure' has no place in the vocabulary of science. Failure to obtain the expected result is often the precursor to further discoveries."<sup>43</sup>

*Satyagraha* thus involves a process of systematic trial and error, of learning from one's mistakes while remaining firm in one's convictions. It requires, in other words, the kind of synthesis of certainty and humility that Gandhi saw in the image of the scientist. This practical emphasis of Gandhi's appears repeatedly and was the base of much of his support. As

Gene Sharp contends, even his followers were adherents to nonviolence not so much out of conviction but as a consequence of its demonstrated effectiveness. "So long as they were able to remain convinced of the practicality of his policy," Sharp notes, "they continued to support it. But when other problems ... arose in which Gandhi still believed his nonviolent technique was relevant but which he offered only generalizations and not comparable detailed courses of action which could be seen to be practicable, his political colleagues went their own way...."<sup>44</sup>

In the end, Gandhi's experiments with truth must be seen as part of a larger set of South Asian experiments with Truth. As S. Radhakrishnan<sup>45</sup> points out, "India seems to have been selected, in the economy of things, for the purpose of offering solutions for racial and religious conflicts." Indeed, Gandhi's experiments with *Satyagraha* provide an occasion for reflection for the human community the world over, a new way of thinking about conflict, and perhaps a way out of the violence that threatens to destroy us all.

### **Footnotes:**

<sup>1</sup> *Young India* 19-1-1928, p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Gandhi, Mohandas K. [1945] 1967. *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi*, edited by R. K. Prabhu and U. R. Rao. Ahmedabad: Navajivan, p. 93.

<sup>3</sup> Gandhi's paradigm parallels Georg Simmel's understanding of conflict as a form of social interaction that can be either constructive or destructive, a social asset as well as a liability (see Simmel, Georg. 1971. *Georg Simmel on Individuality and Social Forms*, ed. Donald N. Levine. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.) It provides a rich theoretical base for confronting — in an innovative way — what Jürgen Habermas calls the "colonization of the life world" by large-scale

bureaucratic systems.

<sup>4</sup> Gandhi, Mohandas K., *Harijan* (21-11-1936).

<sup>5</sup> Mehta, Ved. 1993. *Mahatma Gandhi and His Apostles*. New Haven: Yale University Press, p. 183, translates ahimsa as "love force" or "nonviolent force" and refers to its long religious history.

<sup>6</sup> Gandhi, Mohandas K. [1945] 1967. *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi*, edited by R. K. Prabhu and U. R. Rao. Ahmedabad: Navajivan, pp. 153-154.

<sup>7</sup> Sharp, Gene. 1979. *Gandhi as a Political Strategist*. Boston: Porter Sargent; cf. Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*. Boston: Porter Sargent, 2005.

<sup>8</sup> See Kurtz, Lester. 1998. *The Nuclear Cage*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice-Hall.

<sup>9</sup> Gandhi, Mohandas K. *op cit.*, p. 138; *Young India*, 26-2-1931, p. 1.

<sup>10</sup> Gandhi, Mohandas K. [1955] 1987. *Truth is God*, edited by R. K. Prabhu. Ahmedabad: Navajivan, p. 4; *Young India* 4-6-25.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 34.

<sup>12</sup> Mahadevan, T. K. 1969. "An Approach to the Study of Gandhi." *Gandhi Marg* 13 (Jan.). Reprinted, Pp. 45-61 Biswas, S. C. ed. 1969. *Gandhi: Theory and Practice, Social Impact and Contemporary Relevance*. Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, p. 51

<sup>13</sup> See, e.g., Karunakaran, K. P. 1985. *Gandhi — Interpretations*. New Delhi: Gitarajali., p. 17, who claims that "The adherence to religion was interpreted by many Hindus as an escape from life and nonresistance, if not submission, to evil."

<sup>14</sup> Chatterjee, Margaret. 1983. *Gandhi's Religious Thought*. London: Macmillan Press., p. 68.

<sup>15</sup> Mohan, Kamlesh. 1978. "Towards a Re-evaluation of Non-violence & Courage in Gandhian Thought." p. 93. *Journal of Gandhian Studies* 5 (January), p. 89-98.

<sup>16</sup> Gandhi, Mohandas K. [1945] 1967. *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi*, edited by R. K. Prabhu and U. R. Rao. Ahmedabad: Navajivan, p. 59.

<sup>17</sup> Personal interview, New Delhi, 1990.

- <sup>18</sup> Mohan, Kamlesh. 1978. "Towards a Re-evaluation of Non-violence & Courage in Gandhian Thought." p. 91. *Journal of Gandhian Studies* 5 (January), p. 89-98. Mohan contends that courage has three dimensions: the spiritual, physical, and psychological, and that "Its central virtues are selflessness and detachment."
- <sup>19</sup> *Non-violence in War & Peace*, p. 59 as cited in Mohan, Kamlesh. 1978. "Towards a Re-evaluation of Non-violence & Courage in Gandhian Thought." p. 90. *Journal of Gandhian Studies* 5 (January), p. 89-98.
- <sup>20</sup> Mohan, Kamlesh. 1978. "Towards a Re-evaluation of Non-violence & Courage in Gandhian Thought." p. 93. *Journal of Gandhian Studies* 5 (January), p. 89-98. This passage, written in *Young India* December 11, 1924, is a mere four years after the earlier quote advocating violence over cowardice.
- <sup>21</sup> Power, Paul F. 1987. "Satyagraha as Civil Disobedience." Pp. 77-82 in Grover (1987). p.79. Power goes on to note that "Gandhi stipulated that true followers should be theists. Yet strict adherence to this requisite would exclude Jawaharlal Nehru from the circle of resisters behaving in concert with Satyagraha."
- <sup>22</sup> Prasad, Bimal. 1985. *Gandhi, Nehru, and JP: Studies in Leadership*. Delhi: Chanakya Publications. p. 23.
- <sup>23</sup> quoted in *ibid.*: p. 62.
- <sup>24</sup> Chatterjee, Margaret. 1983. *Gandhi's Religious Thought*. London: Macmillan Press, p. 75. The concept of Gandhi as a "counterplayer" is a central theme in Erikson, Erik H. 1969. *Gandhi's Truth: On the Origins of Militant Nonviolence*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- <sup>25</sup> Tapasya refers to
- <sup>26</sup> Margaret Chatterjee, *op. cit.*, p. 75
- <sup>27</sup> *ibid.*, p. 78; *Young India* 5-11-1931, p. 341.
- <sup>28</sup> Gandhi, Mohandas K. [1945] 1967. *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi*, edited by R. K. Prabhu and U. R. Rao. Ahmedabad: Navajivan, p. 167.
- <sup>29</sup> Chirappanath, A. K. 1978. "Modern Search for Peace: The Gandhian Way.", p. 170. *Journal of Gandhian Studies* 5 (April), p. 160-176. Chirappanath observes that Gandhi also added other vows such as fearlessness, the removal of untouchability, "bread labour," tolerance of all religions, humility, and swadeshi. "However, to him, 'the taking of a vow does not mean, that we are able to observe it completely from the very beginning.'"
- <sup>30</sup> Gandhi, Mohandas K. [1945] 1967. *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi*, edited by R. K. Prabhu and U. R. Rao. Ahmedabad: Navajivan, p.171; *Harijan* 25-3-1939, p. 64.
- <sup>31</sup> Nandy, Ashish. 1980. *At the Edge of Psychology: Essays in Politics and Culture*. Delhi: Oxford UP, p. 71.
- <sup>32</sup> Gandhi, Mohandas K. [1945] 1967. *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi*, edited by R. K. Prabhu and U. R. Rao. Ahmedabad: Navajivan [1945] 1967, p. 129.
- <sup>33</sup> Gandhi, Mohandas K. [1945] 1967. *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi*, edited by R. K. Prabhu and U. R. Rao. Ahmedabad: Navajivan[1945]1967, p. 123; *Harijan* 7-1-1939, p. 417.
- <sup>34</sup> Gandhi, Mohandas K. [1945] 1967. *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi*, edited by R. K. Prabhu and U. R. Rao. Ahmedabad: Navajivan [1945]1967, p. 271; *Young India* 17-3-1927, p. 86.
- <sup>35</sup> Gandhi, Mohandas K. [1945] 1967. *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi*, edited by R. K. Prabhu and U. R. Rao. Ahmedabad: Navajivan[1945]1967, p. 123; *Harijan* 1-6-1947, p. 172
- <sup>36</sup> See Merton Merton, Robert. 1976. *Sociological Ambivalence and Other Essays*. New York: Free Press.
- <sup>37</sup> Gandhi, Mohandas K. [1945] 1967. *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi*, edited by R. K. Prabhu and U. R. Rao. Ahmedabad: Navajivan [1945] 1967, p. 124; *Harijan* 12-11-1938, p. 327.
- <sup>38</sup> *Yuddha Kanda* 115. Available online 28 February 2006 at <http://www.unification.net/ws/theme144.htm>.
- <sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>40</sup> *Vitaragastava* 14.5
- <sup>41</sup> *Dhammapada* 3-5. Available online 28 February 2006 at <http://www.unification.net/ws/theme144.htm>.
- <sup>42</sup> *Ibid.* 223.
- <sup>43</sup> Gandhi, Mohandas K. [1945] 1967. *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi*, edited by R. K. Prabhu and U. R. Rao. Ahmedabad: Navajivan [1945] 1967, p. 123; *Harijan* 6-5-1939, p. 113.
- <sup>44</sup> Sharp, Gene. 1987. "Nonviolence: Moral Principle or Political Technique?" pp. 51-52, Pp. 29-53 in Grover, Verinder, ed. 1987. *Gandhi and Politics in India*. New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications. Cf. Sharp, Gene. 2005. *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*. Boston: Porter Sargent.
- <sup>45</sup> Radhakrishnan, S. 1979. *Indian Religions*. New Delhi: Orient Paperbacks, p. 72.

---

*The author is Professor of Sociology at the University of Texas at Austin, USA. email: lkurtz@soc.utexas.edu webpage: <http://www.geocities.com/lkurtz3904/homepage.html>*