9

Gandhi's Global Legacy

Some Contemporary Western Reactions

The British governing classes, who believed that they had a divine sanction to 'civilise' the rest of the world, were infuriated to be told by Gandhi that what they called 'British civilisation' was only an idea, betrayed by the reality of imperialism. At their most reactionary they retreated into abusive bluster, as did Winston Churchill, who in 1931 called him 'a malignant subversive fanatic', stating that:

> It was alarming and also nauseating to see Mr Gandhi, a seditious Middle Temple lawyer, now posing as a fakir of a type well-known in the East, striding half-naked up the steps of the Viceregal palace, while he is still organising and conducting a defiant campaign of civil disobedience, to parley on equal terms with the representative of the King-Emperor. Such a spectacle can only increase the unrest in India and the danger to which white people there are exposed.[1]

On other occasions, Churchill called Gandhi 'a thoroughly evil force, hostile to us in every fibre', and 'a traitor'.[2] Lord Wavell, viceroy from 1943 to 1947, described him as 'a malignant old man' and 'a very tough politician and not a saint'.[3]

A similar lack of empathy towards Gandhi was shown by a group of Oxford dons whom Gandhi was invited to meet when he was in England in 1931. The professors, who were touted as the best 'trained minds' of the day, subjected Gandhi to three hours of dry, scholastic questioning. They refused to concede that there could be any justification in resorting to civil disobedience. Gandhi would not concede any ground to them at all in this respect, resulting in a complete impasse. Edward Thompson, one of the Oxford dons present on that day, concluded: 'He can be exasperating', and went on to say that he now understood why the ancient Athenians had demanded Socrates' death.[4]

Men such as these were too limited by their own class horizons to be able to even begin to understand what Gandhi was about. Not all were so blinkered. Many devout Christians in Europe and the USA understood the moral basis to Gandhi's work, and some even compared him with Christ. For example, Fenner Brockway wrote in 1929 that Gandhi 'in living out his creed personally... has probably succeeded in doing so more completely than any man since the time of Christ.'[5] Lord Irwin, who served as viceroy from 1926 to 1931, was a staunch Christian who appreciated Gandhi as a man of God, and in 1930 he was reluctant to arrest a saint—which gave Gandhi the leeway to carry out his legendary salt march. In a speech of January 1931, Irwin stated that he recognised the spiritual force that impelled Gandhi, and believed that they shared a common desire for the good of India. He politely requested his cooperation in working to restore 'the seal of friendship once again upon the relations of two peoples, whom unhappy circumstances have lately estranged.'[6] The statement was not received well by most of Irwin's

compatriots in India, who were not as yet prepared to concede that Gandhi's 'saintliness' was in any way genuine or that his ethics were at all valid.

There were many Westerners whose feelings for Gandhi were not merely sympathetic, but wildly enthusiastic. In the closing years of the nineteenth and early years of the twentieth centuries there were many in Europe and America who believed that the salvation of humanity lay in a forthcoming global spiritual awakening. Some anticipated a new millennium to be inaugurated by a coming World Saviour who, it was suggested, would appear in the East, probably from India. The founder of the Theosophical society, Madame Blavatsky, stated shortly before her death in 1891 that the real purpose of the society was to prepare for the coming of 'the Messiah or the World Teacher'.[7] Her successors soon discovered such a saviour in the person of a young and charismatic South Indian Brahman called Jiddu Krishnamurti. He was groomed to assume his great global role by the Theosophists of Adyar in Madras; by 1927 Annie Besant felt that the time was ripe to declare that: 'The World Teacher is here.'[8] Unfortunately for the Theosophists, Krishnamurti promptly dissociated himself from this plan, declaring that the supposed divinity in him was no more than a chimera imposed on him by his disciples.

Many Europeans and Americans projected their spiritual yearnings in these respects onto the figure of Gandhi. We can see this in one of the most important of the early Western biographies of Gandhi, Romain Rolland's *Mahatma Gandhi: The Man Who Became One with the Universal Being* (1924). As the title suggests, the emphasis was on the saintly qualities of the Mahatma: 'With Gandhi, everything is nature—modest, simple, pure—while all his struggles are hallowed by religious serenity ...'[9] Seven years later the two met in Switzerland. Rolland described Gandhi's blessing to him as they parted: 'It was the kiss of St Dominic and St. Francis.'[10]

Another such spiritual pilgrim from Europe was the Sicilian aristocrat Joseph Jean Lanza Del Vasto (1901–81). A scholarly Christian idealist who

thirsted for transcendental awakening, he travelled in 1937 to India to meet Gandhi. In a book written in French in 1943, *Le Pèlerinage aux Sources*, he described his feelings as he arrived at the ashram at Wardha for the first time.

> In the middle of the parched field is a small clay hut, open and so low that it makes no break in the countryside. In the doorway under the slope of the thatched roof, a little, half-naked old man is seated on the ground. It's he! He waves to me—yes, to me!—and makes me sit down beside him and smiles to me. He speaks—and speaks of nothing else but me—asking me who I am, what I do and what I want. And no sooner has he asked than I discover that I am nothing, have never done anything and want nothing except to stay like this in his shadow.
>
> Here he is before my eyes, the only man who has shown us a green shoot in the desert of this century. A man who knows the hard law of love, hard and clear like a diamond. The captain of the unarmed, the father of the pariahs, the king who reigns by the divine right of sainthood. He has come to show us the power over this earth of absolute innocence. He has come to prove that it can stop machines, hold its own against guns and defy an empire. He has come into the world to bring us this news from beyond, where nothing changes, to teach us the truth that we have always known, being Christians. Truth so ill-assorted with us, so strangely contradictory to everything that the world and men had taught us, that we did not know what to do with it. We kept it between the four walls of the church and in the dark of our hearts. He, the Hindu, had to come for us to learn what we had always known. While the old man questions me and smiles, I am silent, trying not to weep.[11]

Like many before him and after, del Vasto had fallen under the spell of Gandhi, drawing from him a vindication of his own particular ethical beliefs and yearnings. The passage brings out well Gandhi's remarkable ability to open himself to all sorts of people and then work his ways on them through his engagement with them as individuals. As del Vasto goes on to say: 'Every

statement he makes is illuminated by different approaches to the same point, so that the humblest intelligence has access to it and the keenest is riveted. Not even the most trifling detail is beneath his dignity, just as in his eyes every man has his worth and nothing is without its importance.'[12] He became a follower, and Gandhi conferred on him an Indian name—Shantidas, or 'servant of peace'. There were many such others who came to his ashram at that time. As one Indian follower later wrote: 'At Sevagram I found myself among young people from all around the world—Americans, Japanese, Africans, Europeans, even Britons—who had come to see Gandhi and to help him in his work. Whether a persons skin was white, brown, or black, whether he or she supported or opposed him, seemed to make no difference to Gandhi: he related to all with ease and respect. Almost immediately, he made us feel we were part of his own family.'[13] Del Vasto's search, which had taken him to India and to Gandhi, had started as a spiritual quest, but his close contact with Gandhi soon conferred a harder social edge to his understanding. He returned to Europe fired by the idea of establishing a 'Gandhian Order in the West'. In the years after the Second World War he set up communes known as 'Communities of the Ark' which sought to be as self-sufficient as possible, with members carrying out physical labour without the help of modern machines as a condition of membership. Initially, most of those drawn to these communes came from an intellectual or aristocratic background, though the membership broadened to include other classes in time. Unlike a monastic order—but as in Gandhi's ashrams—men and women lived together in these collectives.

Del Vasto became active in French politics in 1957, fasting for twenty days in protest against the torture of Algerians by the French. In the following year he started a separate organisation, the Action Civique Non-Violent, dedicated to non-violent political action. This body waged a campaign in 1959–61 against the internment camps set up for Algerians in France who were suspected of supporting the liberation war in Algeria. Volunteers went to the camps and demanded to be arrested for the same 'crime'. Support was

also extended to those who objected to serving in the army in Algeria. After some arrests, and the launching of an indefinite fast by Louis Lecoin, a prominent conscientious objector since the time of the First World War who had spent ten years in jail for his beliefs, the French government capitulated and accepted that citizens had a right to refuse military service on grounds of conscience. This was recognised in law in 1963. The organisation also campaigned against nuclear weapons, carrying out the first ever occupation of a nuclear power facility in 1958.[14]

The elevated yearnings of men such as Rolland and del Vasto were those of an élite disenchanted with their own civilization. The reaction to Gandhi by the lower classes of Europe were, as in India, a mixture of the earthy, curious and miraculous, though there was often a friendly irreverence which would have been out of place in the subcontinent. Thus, when Gandhi was walking through the streets of the East End of London on his visit in 1931 an urchin was heard to yell: 'Hey, Gandhi, where's your trousers?' Gandhi laughed heartily, and later quipped: 'You people wear plus-fours, mine are minus-fours.'[15]

Gandhi's trouserless apparel also struck the imagination of the working-class youth of Saltburn in the North-East of England. At the time of their annual carnival, when there was a prize of five shillings offered for the best fancy-dress costume, the unemployed lads wondered how they could win this handsome sum. A community storyteller later recalled their ingenious solution:

> 'Yer'd need a real posh costume.' ...
>
> 'Yer don't!' said Nick. 'Look at this.'
>
> He produced a crumpled sheet of grease-stained newspaper that must have wrapped last night's chips.
>
> 'See that!'

> He pointed to a large photograph under the headline: 'MAHATMA GANDHI. INDIAN LEADER VISITS LONDON.' We peered at a brown spindly figure wearing wire-framed spectacles and a loin cloth; his pathetic thinness accentuated by the plump, well-fed look of the dignitaries around him.
>
> 'This Gandy—he's a famous fella. Like Tom Mix or Hughie Gallagher. I heard me da talkin' about him,' explained Nick. 'He's in aall the papers and on the wireless as well. One of us'll go as Gandy. It'll cost nowt for a costume!'

Geordie Skinner was chosen for the part. They improvised a costume out of a white towel and 'grandads specs', with an old broom handle for Gandhi's staff on which was nailed a placard made from an old shoebox lid stating: 'GANDY FOR HOME ROOL'. They coloured Geordie's skin with a mixture of gravy browning and cocoa. When the procession began, Geordie strode to the front, still wearing his hobnail boots, but promptly dropped his 'staff' down a manhole. As he wrestled to retrieve it, his spectacles fell in as well. In his distress, he took out his large flat cloth cap—which was of a well-worn and indeterminate mushroom colour—and clapped it on his head. When the judges at last reached him they conferred with great solemnity:

> 'Charming! Quite charming. Delightfully different!' said the Vicar. 'Beautifully marked! Such an ingenious idea!' agreed the Mayoress. She turned to the Carnival Secretary who was hovering pencil poised. 'First prize to the toadstool with the elf underneath!'[16]

Would the local élite—we may wonder—have been so delighted had they known that the youth had meant to represent the 'subversive' figure of Gandhi?

There were many other such curious and wonderstruck reactions to Gandhi in England at that time. When he visited Lloyd George at his farm in Surrey, the servants insisted on coming out to meet the 'holy man'.

According to Lloyd George, none other of his many distinguished visitors had ever inspired such a reaction. When Louis Fischer interviewed Lloyd George some seven years later, he was told that an unknown black cat had appeared and sat on Gandhi's lap. It disappeared after he had left, only appearing some years later when Gandhi's devoted follower Madeline Slade came to visit the farm.[17]

The popular responses to Gandhi on the European continent were equally unpredictable, and in some cases bizarre. When Gandhi was due to arrive at Rolland's house in 1931, the elderly author received hundreds of letters relating to the visit:

an Italian wanted to know from Gandhi what numbers would win in the next national lottery; a group of Swiss musicians offered to serenade Gandhi under his window every night; the Syndicate of the Milkmen of Leman volunteered to supply 'the King of India with dairy products during his stay. Journalists sent questionnaires and camped around Rolland's villa; photographers laid siege to the house; the police reported that the hotels had filled with tourists who hoped to see the Indian visitor.[18]

In all of this, one senses that Gandhi struck a chord with the working class in away that he generally did not among the ruling class. When, for example, Gandhi visited Lancashire, a region of England that had suffered very materially from the Indian boycott of foreign textiles, the local working class gave him a warm and empathetic welcome. One unemployed worker stated: 'I am one of the unemployed, but if I was in India I would say the same thing that Mr. Gandhi is saying.'[19] At the Greenfield Mill in Darwen, a photograph shows him surrounded by women workers, cheering him heartily, raising their fists in a show of solidarity. Despite their subsequent reputation for racism, a significant portion of the English working class appeared at that time to have a remarkable empathy for the man who above all stood for freedom for India, reaching out with a warm-hearted enthusiasm that was almost entirely alien to their hard-faced superiors.

Gandhi and the Pacifist Movement

Gandhi and his movement were of central importance in the development of modern pacifism, which stands for a principled rejection of the use of violence at all levels of politics. This emerged in the West as a full-fledged doctrine only in the 1930s.[20] It originated in protests against the military-industrial complex during the First World War. After the war, anti-war protesters came to see Gandhi as a shining example of pacifism in action. Frederick Fisher has noted how in this respect, Gandhi appeared on the world stage at just the right psycho-logical moment. Earlier, his message would have been almost certainly ignored. As it was, he struck a chord with a generation that thirsted for peace and demanded that future international conflicts be resolved non- violently.[21]

A central figure within the newly emerging pacifist movement was the Dutch anarcho-syndicalist Bart de Ligt (1883–1938). A Christian pastor, he was imprisoned by his government during the First World War for making anti-war speeches. His church did not support him in this, and he subsequently became disillusioned with Christianity as it was practised in his day. He studied Greek paganism and Eastern religions, moving towards a belief in more cosmic and universal truths. In the 1920s he became active in the Dutch labour movement, giving it a strong anti-militarist thrust. Moving to Geneva in 1925, he came into contact with the Russian exile Pavel Biryukov, who championed the cause of the Russian pacifist Christian sect of the Dukhobors, which had been persecuted by both the Tsars and the Bolsheviks and had been admired by Tolstoy. He came to see pacifism as something rooted in such long-standing traditions, but providing at the same time a revolutionary means towards a transformation of popular consciousness in an age of mass politics.

During these years de Ligt corresponded with Gandhi and met him in Switzerland in 1931. Later, he persuaded Gandhi to join the Paris-based anti-war organisation, the Reassemblement International Contre la Guerre

et le Militarisme (RIGM). In his book *The Conquest of Violence* (1937) he argued that the non-cooperation of syndicalist strikes should be joined with Gandhis principled non-violence. He was however critical of Gandhi in several important respects. He felt that he was often inconsistent in his non-violence, as during the First World War, when he supported the British war effort. Also, he criticised Gandhi's demand that the Indian people should control their defence forces, when in fact he should have been seeking to disband them. He felt that in these respects Gandhi's nationalism came into conflict with his non-violence. He also disliked the tendency for Gandhi to be idolised as a new and infallible messiah, for there needed to be a continuing critical scrutiny of his practice.[22]

De Ligt was not altogether fair in his criticism. Although Gandhi had supported the British during the First World War, going so far as to lead a recruiting campaign, he admitted his error soon after the war had ended. An Indian who had visited the battlefield at Ypres just after the slaughter, made a point of seeking him out and telling him that he had been wrong to support a conflict that represented the very antithesis of civilized values. After listening to the description of the carnage, Gandhi commented: 'I am sorry I had anything to do with this war. I believed Woodrow Wilson's dream; that it was a war to end war. But I now see that force can never banish force.'[23]

In America, pacifist theory was developed by a lawyer who was active in the labour movement in the 1920s called Richard Gregg. Impressed by Gandhi's campaigns against the British, he went to India to study the Gandhian movement at first hand, and became converted to the principle of non-violence. He published various books on the subject in the 1920s and 1930s.[24] Gregg helped to popularise Gandhian theory in the USA. Following from this, a Committee for Non-violent Revolution was founded there in 1946, which opposed the armaments industry and encouraged people to refuse to serve in the armed forces or work in arms factories, deploying

mass civil disobedience if necessary.[25] This fed into the movement against nuclear weapons that emerged in the 1950s in both America and Europe. Gandhi had been an outspoken critic of nuclear weapons after the American atomic bombing of Japan in 1945. He condemned 'the supreme tragedy of the bomb', stating that it revealed most starkly that: 'War knows no law except that of might.'[26] Also that: 'I regard the employment of the atom bomb for the wholesale destruction of men, women and children as the most diabolical use of science.'[27] He refused to accept the argument that possession of nuclear weapons acts as a deterrent against war, on the grounds that there can be no lasting, durable or moral peace through such means. In Britain, Gandhi's outrage and techniques of struggle were invoked in the Direct Action Committee Against Nuclear War, which was formed in 1957. Within a year, it had given birth to the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) and its annual Aldermaston March. During the late 1950s the anti-nuclear movement also adopted civil resistance. For example, in 1957, Harold Steele, a Quaker, sailed into the British nuclear testing ground at Christmas Island in the Pacific.[28]

During the 1960s and 1970s CND abandoned civil resistance and it faded from the public eye. The anti-nuclear movement was reinvigorated in Germany in 1979, when NATO announced its plans to station missiles with nuclear warheads on German territory. In early 1980, a million signatures were collected in Germany in protest against the plan to station nuclear missiles there. Leading intellectuals, such as Heinrich Böll, Günter Grass and E.P.Thompson, joined the campaign. This led to the creation of END (the organisation for European Nuclear Disarmament). There were mass demonstrations throughout Europe, including Eastern Europe, one of which involved establishing a hundred-kilometre-long human chain between two US army bases in Stuttgart and Neu-Ulm. In May 1983, West German activists, some of whom were Green Party members of parliament, crossed over to East Berlin and held a demonstration there. The peace movement in East Germany, known as 'Swords into Ploughshares', had already been

banned, and they were promptly arrested and deported back to the West. Their demand did not however go unrecognised. The East German leader Eric Honecker promptly sent a message to the activists that he, like them, wanted to establish a nuclear-free zone in central Europe, and he invited them to meet him. The Soviet bloc had no interest in entering into a ruinously expensive new arms race with the USA. However, when it came to a vote in the German parliament, the vote in favour of accepting American missiles on German soil was passed with a comfortable majority. After this END lost its momentum and went into decline.[29]

Women played a notable role in this wave of protest, particularly in the peace camps established in Britain in the 1980s on the peripheries of military bases, chemical and biological warfare research centres and arms factories. There were over a dozen such camps, the best known being that at Greenham Common, which was set up in 1983 outside a nuclear weapons base.[30] After camping there for years, the base was eventually abandoned, with the land reverting to being a public common. Other peace camps continue outside nuclear submarine bases at Faslane and the Holy Loch in Scotland.

From the 1970s, the peace and ecology movements worked hand in hand against the military-industrial complex. By its very name, Greenpeace exemplifies the unity between these two tendencies. Eco-warriors have deployed non-violent civil resistance by breaking into places where nuclear weapons are kept, or sailing into nuclear testing sites. In 1972 a French naval patrol ship at the Mururoa Atoll nuclear testing site rammed one such vessel, which served to galvanise opposition to the tests throughout the South Pacific.[31] Despite this, they continued. In 1985, French secret agents planted a bomb on the Greenpeace flagship, the Rainbow Warrior, killing one crew member, Fernando Pereiro. The resulting outcry led to the French government having to admit its culpability, two of its agents being convicted of manslaughter and jailed.

Another important international initiative that has flowed from the peace movement has been that of the Peace Brigades International (PBI), which was founded in 1981. It was inspired in part by the work of the Gandhian Shanti Sena in post-independence India.[32] The PBI has three main strands, first, to send unarmed volunteers to protect people who are threatened with repression and provide publicity for violations of human rights, second, to train people in techniques of non-violent resistance and conflict resolution, and third, to document successful non-violent initiatives as an example for others.[33] It has carried out such work in trouble spots in central America, the Caribbean, the Balkans, Palestine, Sri Lanka and South Africa. Volunteers have put their lives on the line in very dangerous areas to protect local peace and human rights activists from death squads, in the process often bringing a feeling of new hope and security in conditions of terrible violence.

In India, JP was the leading spokesperson for peace in the period before 1980. He consistently opposed Indian military action in wars against Pakistan, China, the Nagas, and in the conquest of Goa in 1960. He saw war as a crime against humanity and demanded international disarmament. During the armed occupation of Goa, and during the Indo-China war of 1962, JP had wanted to take an active role in stopping the conflict. He was dissuaded from this by Vinoba Bhave, who supported the use of military force by the Indian state and who insisted that Gandhian workers should engage only in social work within India. Although JP felt that Bhave's position was very un-Gandhian, he agreed to keep quiet in deference to his position as elder statesman of the movement. As it was, some people branded JP as 'unpatriotic'.[34] There was a similar divide between the two leaders over the issue of nuclear weapons. When Indira Gandhi exploded an atomic bomb in May 1974, ostensibly for 'peaceful purposes', Bhave took her at her word and stated that nuclear bombs could help to irrigate land and thus wipe out poverty.[35] JP, on the other hand, condemned the atomic explosion strongly.[36]

JP's close lieutenant, Narayan Desai, developed this strand of Gandhian struggle after JP's death. He led a campaign in the early 1980s against the building of a nuclear power plant at Kakrapad, which was near his ashram at Vedchhi in South Gujarat. The police fired on one of the demonstrations in 1986, with a protester being killed. The building went ahead, and the plant went critical in 1991.

This experience has given rise to a small but vocal movement against nuclear power in India, led by Narayan Desai's daughter, Sanghamitra and her husband Surendra Gadekar. She is a qualified doctor who has carried out investigations of the radiation effects of nuclear power plants, uranium mines and the nuclear explosions at Pokhran in 1998. She has found evidence of congenital deformities and lung problems which have been categorised as tuberculosis, but which could well be lung cancer. Gadekar is a scientist who has dedicated his life to exposing the dangers of nuclear power and nuclear weapons. Together, they run a journal called *Anumukti,* which is, in the words of its sub-heading 'devoted to non-nuclear India'.

There are also a group of activists who have been taking a stand against the development of nuclear weapons in India. Although India only became a nuclear power openly with the explosions of a series of atomic bombs by the incoming BJP government at Pokhran in May 1998, this development had long been on the cards.[37]

Two prominent opponents have been Praful Bidwai and Achin Vanaik, who campaigned long and hard against India's endorsement of the nuclear option. Although not Gandhians, in their writings they cite Gandhi's principled stand against nuclear weapons as an inspiration.[38] For years they fought against a massive lack of concern within the public as a whole as to the terrifying logic of nuclear weapons. The majority tacitly accepted the argument of the Hindu right that India's position in world politics would be greatly enhanced once the country went nuclear, and there appears to have been general popular support for the 1998 explosions, even though it was an

action that provided perhaps the grossest insult imaginable to Gandhi's memory. As was stated by one observer: 'They [the Hindu right] assassinated Gandhi twice, the first time in January 1948, and for the second time in May 1998.'[39]

Since then, doubts have emerged, as Pakistan quickly went nuclear in response, and then a year later launched an invasion of Indian territory at Kargil in Kashmir. Nuclear weapons were of no avail in what turned out to be a very conventional form of warfare. From then on, the anti- nuclear movement took off, with protest groups springing up all over India. In 1999, coinciding with the first anniversary of the tests, there was a march from Pokhran to Sarnath, the place near Banaras where the Buddha lived and preached. Some 30,000 to 40,000 people participated, including some old Gandhians who had participated in the nationalist movement. In October 2000 the BJP leader L.K. Advani noted what was for him a worrying tendency for environmentalist and anti-nuclear activists to make a common cause. He condemned both for being 'anti-national'. A month later, a large National Convention for Nuclear Disarmament and Peace was held in Delhi, attended by over 600 delegates, including representatives from Pakistan. Arundhati Roy used this forum to mount a fierce attack on Advani, stating that he was mistaken in believing that 'only people who march in khaki and swear by bombs are patriots.' She argued that she was the real patriot in fighting against weapons and irrigation projects that threatened to destroy the lives of millions of Indian citizens.[40] The convention led to the formation of the Coalition for Nuclear Disarmament and Peace, a network of over 200 groups. Many of these came from groups with a substantial Gandhian influence, like the Narmada Bachao Andolan, although to be inclusive it did not endorse non-violence as an absolute principle.

Gandhian Resistance on a World Stage

For large numbers of people in countries which had been colonised by Europeans, or who were tyrannised by authoritarian or racist rulers, Gandhi became a figure who symbolised and stood for the assertion of the oppressed. His position in this respect was secured by the salt march of 1930, the progress of which was reported by the world media on a daily basis. Coming at the dawn of the age of the rapid transmission of sound, photography and film around the globe, this was one of the first such media event in history. The march was mounted as a visual spectacle that focused on the figure of the thin, scantily clad old man surrounded by his khadi-wearing comrades, together defying the might of the empire with strict non-violence. Gandhi employed the language of what is now known as the sound-bite: e.g. 'I want world sympathy in this battle of Right against Might' or 'We are entering upon a life and death struggle, a holy war; we are performing an all-embracing sacrifice in which we wish to offer ourselves as an oblation.'[41] Americans in particular lapped it up, jubilant at what they saw as a further vindication of their own historic rejection of British imperialism. A few months later, *Time* magazine declared Gandhi its 'Man of the Year'.

India's winning of independence in 1947 was widely believed to vindicate Gandhi's method of resistance. In most parts of the world it was recognised that armed struggle against authoritarian states was hardly an option, due to the massive discrepancy between the military might of the rulers and people. Violent revolts could succeed only in a few exceptional circumstances, as in China.[42] It came to be seen that modern governments, with their strong and often secretive and authoritarian bureaucracies, but with a nominal commitment to a rule of law, were particularly susceptible to principled non-violent protest. A resistance which revealed the moral failings of those who exercised power while remaining strictly non-violent had the advantage of appealing to many of those in the ranks of the police, bureaucracy and army who propped up the regime. The government, it was argued, would prefer to compromise rather than find itself crumbling from

within. This would appear to have been borne out in the case of Iran in 1979, where an autocratic government found its authority eroded so rapidly through mass protest and demoralisation within the police and military that it was forced to surrender power.[43]

The chief opposition to such a strategy came from those who were encouraged by the armed victories of the people in countries such as China, Cuba, Algeria and Vietnam to embrace a romantic notion of the power of revolutionary violence. This was epitomised in the cult of Che Guevara. It was argued that in the last instance all states would defend themselves with a ruthless display of violence. Therefore, however much the state may be put on the defensive by mass strikes and other forms of civil resistance, the movement would at some stage have to escalate to the stage of armed struggle. Some who followed this line formed underground revolutionary terrorist groups such as the Angry Brigade, the Red Army Faction and, in India, the Naxalites.[44]

Most of these terrorist groups have been wiped out without achieving anything concrete. Those that can claim some success have tended to operate in conjunction with mass civil resistance, as with the Palestinians against the Israeli state or the Irish Republicans against the British. Even in these cases, terrorism has had a severe down side. It has given an opening for strong state repression, with a suspension of civil liberties and the punishment of the civilian population as a whole. The terrorists then often turned inwards, targeting 'collaborators' for vengeance and resorting to crime to fund their activities, so that the movement ended up being corrupted beyond redemption. Such violence has often hampered the building of alternative democratic and decentralized forms of power rooted in civil society. Underground terrorist organisations also embraced a very macho style of operation that alienated women activists.[45]

It has been argued, following from this, that Gandhian-style non-violent civil resistance has had a greater global impact since 1945 than armed

struggles and violent resistance.[46] Such a formulation begs many questions, such as the role that US armed aggression played in shaping struggles during the second half of the twentieth century. Also, there has been often a complex interaction between civil resistance and more violent forms of struggle. It also leaves out of account the question of leadership, for the Gandhian method depends very strongly on the presence of an inspired and charismatic moral leader. The rest of this chapter looks at two resistance movements which have brought such leaders to the fore—that of the self-assertion of African-Americans in the USA and the South African revolt against apartheid—and also at Petra Kelly and the Green Party in Germany, to see to what extent Gandhi has provided both an inspiration and an effective method for struggle in each case.

The African-American Struggle in the USA

Gandhi was admired among African-Americans in the USA from the 1920s onwards. His work was publicised by Marcus Garvey and WE.B. Du Bois among others. In 1936, Howard Thurman (1900-1981)—a distinguished Baptist minister, theologian and academic who was from the American South—led a delegation of prominent African-American Christians to India to meet Gandhi. Gandhi quizzed him and the others about racial discrimination in the USA, and then expounded on his principles of non-violent resistance to injustice. Mrs. Thurman pleaded with Gandhi to come to the USA: 'We want you not for white America, but for the Negroes; we have many a problem that cries for solution, and we need you badly.' Gandhi said that he still had much to do in India, but when he felt the call, he would not hesitate to travel there. Thurman said that what Gandhi had told them resonated strongly with their Christianity. Mrs Thurman then sang two well-known spirituals, and Gandhi—obviously moved—observed that 'it may be through the Negroes that the unadulterated message of non-violence will be delivered to the world.'[47]

Gandhi also inspired Bayard Rustin (1910–1987), who was from an African-American Quaker family of Pennsylvania. He joined the Communist Party in the 1930s, but refused to accept their dogmatic line that racial discrimination would disappear once socialism was established in the USA. He broke with the party in 1941 when it ordered its members to stop fighting for Negro rights, as the USA and Russia were now allies and such internal dissent would, it claimed, detract from the struggle against Hitler. Rustin linked up with A. Philip Randolph, the African-American leader of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, a trade union. Together they established the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) in Chicago in 1942.

Rustin had already been in contact with Krishnalal Shridharani, who after studying at the Gujarat Vidyapith—Gandhi's university in Ahmedabad—had taken part in the salt march of 1930 and had been subsequently jailed. In 1934 Shridharani emigrated to the USA, where he became a prominent advocate of Gandhian non-violence. In 1939 he published an influential book on Gandhian techniques called *War Without Violence*.[48] This book became 'the semiofficial bible of CORE'.[49] Shridharani himself was a hard drinker, a cigar-smoker and a womaniser, and his African-American disciples learnt through him that 'Gandhian politics did not require a life of dull asceticism.'[50]

CORE staged non-violent protests that challenged racist employment practices in Chicago. Rustin himself refused to serve in the army during the Second World War, and was jailed for three years as a conscientious objector. After his release, he took up the cause of Indian independence, picketing the British embassy in Washington, and being arrested on a number of occasions. In 1947, he and other CORE activists travelled on buses through the South to test a Supreme Court ruling that Negro passengers could sit wherever they wanted to in buses. Rustin was beaten up and jailed for six months under local segregation laws, a sentence which he accepted in a true Gandhian spirit. After his release, he took up an invitation

to visit India as a guest of the Congress party.[51] There were further protests, beatings and imprisonments for Rustin in the early 1950s—an experience he described, humorously, as 'going Gandhi'.[52]

While Rustin was carrying on his protests, Martin Luther King was studying at Morehouse College, Connecticut, Crozer Seminary, Pennsylvania, and the School of Theology of Boston University. King, who was born in 1929 in Atlanta, Georgia, was the son of a Baptist minister who was active in fighting for the rights of the African-Americans of that city. A leading member of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People (NAACP), the body founded by WE.B. Du Bois in 1909, Martin Luther King Sr. had led a voting-rights march on the city hall in 193 6.[53] While studying at Crozer Seminary, Martin Luther King Jr. attended a lecture on Gandhi by Mordecai Johnson, who had just returned from a visit to India. Johnson argued that Gandhian non-violent protest could be used in the battle for African- American rights. King stated later that the 'message was so profound and electrifying that I left the meeting and bought a half-dozen books on Gandhi's life and works.'[54] He was encouraged in this research by one of his teachers, George Davis, who was a pacifist and admirer of Gandhi.[55] King was particularly impressed by the way in which Gandhi had channelled his anger at injustice into a constructive and creative non-violent engagement. He realised that such a resistance provided a deeply Christian weapon that could provide a strong base for the mass mobilisation of African-Americans. As he stated: 'He was probably the first person in history to lift the love ethic of Jesus above mere interaction between individuals to a powerful effective social force on a large scale.'[56]

King was also influenced strongly by Howard Thurman, who had led the delegation to meet Gandhi in 1936. Thurman was a professor at the School of Theology of Boston University when King was studying there for his doctorate between 1951 and 1954. In 1949 he had published his most important book *Jesus and the Disinherited,* which— inspired in part by

Gandhi—sought for a Christian means for combating oppression. Thurman argued that Jesus, who was from a poor Jewish family, had devoted his life to fight for his people. He stood for the self- pride and assertion of the colonized under the tyranny of Rome. Jesus understood, however, that the Roman Empire could not be fought head-on and that the battle had to be of the spirit. Christianity was thus forged 'as a technique of survival of the oppressed. ... Wherever his spirit appears, the oppressed gather fresh courage; for he has announced the good news that fear, hypocrisy, and hatred, the three hounds of hell that track the trail of the disinherited, need have no dominion over them.'[57]Thurman argued that the anger generated by injustice must be transformed into a constructive force. Later, King used to carry this book with him for inspiration during his campaigns.

In 1954, at the age of twenty-five, King was appointed as pastor of the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, the capital of Alabama. He could have stayed and worked in the less-segregated North, but he chose deliberately to fight segregation at its core. His chance came soon enough, when in December 1955 an African-American teacher called Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on a crowded bus to a white man. She was arrested and charged with breaking the local segregation laws. It is perhaps no coincidence that it was a similar experience of racial discrimination on public transport that had first politicised Gandhi in South Africa. It was an experience that King himself had been through. In the words of Greg Moses, At the age of fifteen, King won an oratorial prize by celebrating the ideals of the United States Constitution. Riding in a bus on his way home from the speech King was ordered out of his seat. Reflecting behind the veil that was dropped between him and the white passengers ... King recalled, "It was the angriest I have ever been in my life.'"[58] When the court punished Parks with a fine of $14, King and other civil rights workers decided to protest the law by organising a boycott of the city's buses. Bayard Rustin, who had long experience of such Gandhi-inspired protests, came to Montgomery to work as an adviser in the campaign. This was the start of a long and fruitful

comradeship between two great proponents of non-violence. Rustin prevailed on King to dispense with armed guards and to embrace non-violence as a key element of the struggle. King asserted that they were putting democracy into practice in a truly Christian way and insisted that they should bear no enmity towards their opponents and that they should observe complete nonviolence. Rustin also helped forge strong links with African-American radicals of the northern cities who raised funds to support the Montgomery campaign.

After a year of resistance, the Supreme Court came down on the side of the protesters, with bus segregation being ruled illegal. King declared that 'Christ furnished the spirit and motivation, while Gandhi furnished the method.'[59] In this way, the protesters had occupied the moral high ground in away that proved irresistible. This struggle, coming less than a decade after Gandhi's assassination, provided a remarkable vindication of the Gandhian method.

In the following years, King led a series of courageous protests in cities throughout the South against segregation in schools, on buses and at eating places. He also fought for the right to vote. Due to a systematic refusal by white officials to register African-Americans, often on very flimsy grounds, only about a quarter of those eligible to vote were actually registered to do so at that time in the South.[60] King and Rustin established the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) in 1957 to carry on this work. In many cases, the Southern whites responded with violence, even bombing African-American churches. King himself was arrested and jailed on numerous occasions. In 1958, for example, he was arrested and beaten up by the police in Montgomery. When a photograph of King was published in the national press showing two policemen twisting his arm behind his back, the police commissioner stated laconically that there was nothing unusual about the behaviour of his officers in this respect.[61]

Although King was always modest about himself, declaring that he had 'no Messiah complex',[62] he believed strongly in the need for powerful and charismatic leadership. As he stated in 1960: 'people cannot devote themselves to a great cause without finding someone who becomes the personification of the cause.'[63] In this, King was influenced by Hegel, whose work he had studied at Boston University. Hegel had argued that throughout history certain 'world historical individuals' who had the vision and intellect to understand the spirit of their age had been able to provide inspiring moral leadership at critical historical junctures. King understood Plato, Aristotle, Lincoln and Gandhi to be such persons.[64] For all his modesty, he saw himself in such a mould.

Like Gandhi, King was nevertheless all too aware of his fallibilities as a leader. Not all of his Southern campaigns were successful. For example, in 1962, he agreed to take personal charge of the campaign in Albany, Georgia, and was soon arrested. There were however various rival groups amongst the local African-Americans, and one paid King s fine, so that he found himself ejected from jail against his will. The local police chief had studied Gandhian methods and was careful to keep his men in order and to treat the protesters with decorum, so that the newspapers were deprived of the usual photographs of police brutalities. King also made tactical mistakes in Albany, as when he agreed to obey a federal court injunction that ruled against the protest, as he did not want to alienate the federal authorities. This angered the radicals in the movement, who saw it as a sell-out. Soon after, there was a riot, in which two thousand African-Americans attacked the police with bottles and stones. King was, inevitably, accused of stoking this violence. The protest lost its momentum and petered out without any substantial gains.[65]

King's methods were nonetheless redeemed by some remarkable successes, as in the campaign in Birmingham, Alabama, of 1963. The target here was the segregation of eating-places in a city that was notorious for the

hardline racism of its white population. Only recently, the local Ku Klux Klan had castrated an African-American and dumped his mutilated body in the road.[66] Unlike in Albany, King and his colleagues planned their campaign meticulously. They decided to focus on some prominent retail outlets, such as Woolworth's, harassing them with sit-ins and boycotts that would hit business where it hurt most— in the pocket. They were also careful to ensure that there were plenty of protesters willing to go to jail, so that the jails would be filled in away that would embarrass the authorities. King anticipated that the local police would not react in a disciplined manner, as they had in Albany. This was crucial, for he wanted to expose the true nature of Southern racism to the outside world, so that the federal government would be forced to intervene. As King stated, he intended to provoke the 'oppressor to commit his brutality openly—in the light of day—with the rest of the world looking on.'[67]

The police commissioner of Birmingham—Eugene 'Bull' Connor—declared that he was not going to tolerate any 'nigger troublemakers' in his city.[68] Many of the local African-Americans feared what might happen, and King had to use all of his powers of oratory and persuasion to instil the necessary solidarity and enthusiasm for the stuggle. He ran workshops on non-violent resistance, in which the volunteers were trained to resist police provocation without rancour. The jails were soon filling with protesters. When the Alabama state court served an injunction forbidding the protest, King defied it by leading a march. The day was Good Friday, and he talked of 'the redemptive power of suffering', and said that he was heading for jail as 'a good servant of my Lord and master, who was crucified on Good Friday.'[69] His supporters compared him to Jesus, as he marched at the head of a procession, dressed in the faded denim of the African-American worker, and was arrested and jailed.

In prison, he wrote a manifesto that became famous as the 'Letter from Birmingham City Jail'. This was addressed to some prominent white

clergymen of Alabama who in January 1963 had published an open letter condemning King for his confrontational tactics at a time when, they alleged, desegregation was being achieved through court rulings. They feared that King's activities would provoke disturbances. King told them that the whites of Alabama had consistently refused to obey court orders in the past and had ruthlessly enforced their own local segregation laws. They had learnt that an oppressor never handed out freedom willingly—it had to be demanded and fought for by the oppressed. They had therefore decided to bring matters to a head: 'Non-violent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and establish such creative tension that a community that has consistently refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue.'[70] King had been told by the clergymen to be patient and wait. In response he wrote—in a long sentence of great power—of the experiences that had seared his soul:

> I guess it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say 'Wait.' But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fathers at will and drown your sisters and brothers at whim; when you have seen hate-filled policemen curse, kick, brutalize and even kill your black brothers and sisters with impunity; when you see the vast majority of your twenty million Negro brothers smothering in an airtight cage of poverty in the midst of an affluent society; when you suddenly find your tongue twisted and your speech stammering as you seek to explain to your six-year-old daughter why she can't go to the public amusement park that has been advertised on television, and see tears welling in her little eyes when she is told that Funtown is closed to coloured children, and see the depressing clouds of inferiority begin to form in her little mental sky, and see her begin to distort her little personality by unconsciously developing a bitterness towards white people; when you have to concoct an answer for a five- year-old son asking in agonizing pathos: 'Daddy, why do white people treat coloured people so mean?'; when you take a cross-country drive and find it necessary to sleep night after night in the uncomfortable corners of your automobile because no motel will accept you; when you are humiliated day in and day out by nagging signs reading 'white' and

> 'coloured'; when your first name becomes 'nigger' and your middle name becomes 'boy' (however old you are) and your last name becomes 'John,' and when your wife and mother are never given the respected title 'Mrs.'; when you are harried by day and haunted by night by the one fact that you are a Negro, living constantly at tiptoe stance never quite knowing what to expect next, and plagued with inner fears and outer resentments; when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of 'nobodiness; then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait.[71]

King went on to justify his breaking of selected laws, and made a very Gandhian distinction between just laws which accorded with morality and the will of God—which were to be obeyed—and unjust laws, which they had an obligation to disobey. He argued that any law that degraded a human being could be considered unjust; and also any law imposed by a majority on a minority that was not binding on the majority. He intended to break such laws in an open manner, and in a spirit of brotherly love. He also stated how disappointed he was with white moderates, who criticised the victims of racism for their actions, rather than the racists who provoked them. He warned them that if they did not give a more whole-hearted support to the civil rights movement, African-American anger was likely to vent itself in the racial hatred of Black Nationalism and violence on the streets.

When he was released from jail after eight days, King found that the campaign was flagging. He then took the risky step of mobilising children to court arrest. He knew that he could be criticised for using children, and that some of them might get hurt. But, he reasoned, they were being hurt everyday by whites. He also saw the photo-opportunity provided by the symbol of young children marching against a pernicious segregation. They proved to be exemplary protesters, courting arrest with youthful and fearless enthusiasm in a manner that caused immense logistical problems for the police. On the second day of the children's marches, 'Bull' Connor ordered his men 'Let 'em have it'. Batons, fire hoses and dogs were unleashed in a

scene of mayhem that was filmed and broadcast in harrowing detail on television channels throughout America. President Kennedy declared that the sight made him 'sick', and that 'I can well understand why the Negroes of Birmingham are tired of being asked to be patient.'[72]

The protests continued with ever-increasing vigour, as the campaigners sensed that they had forced the white racists of the city on the defensive. Then, confronted by a massive demonstration on 5 May, 'Bull' Connor's men refused to obey him when he ordered them to disperse the crowd by force. As the protesters marched through their ranks, some of the firemen stood holding their unused hoses and wept. Five days later, it was agreed that eating-places throughout the city would be desegregated. King announced that this was a demonstration of the power of non-violence in its purest form: 'I saw there, I felt there, for the first time, the pride and the *power* of non-violence.'[73]

In his application of non-violent resistance, King was far more confrontational than Gandhi. He actively sought out situations in which he could deploy his techniques of protest, so that his life consisted of a series of engagements in rapid succession, with some being carried on simultaneously. He was always on the front-line himself, heading marches, giving inspirational speeches, courting jail and negotiating with the authorities. Gandhi himself rarely led mass campaigns, and later in life preferred to fight alone rather than risk mass protest that could go awry. King, by contrast, constantly exposed himself to the huge risks involved in such experiments in mass non-violent action.

King's most significant innovation was the concept of 'creative tension'.[74] He spelt this out very lucidly in his speech from Birmingham City Jail:

> I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that the present tension of the South is merely a necessary phase of the transition from an obnoxious negative peace, where the Negro passively accepted his unjust plight, to a substance-filled positive peace, where all men will

> respect the dignity and worth of human personality. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We bring it out in the open where it can be seen and dealt with. Like a boil that can never be cured as long as it is covered up but must be opened with all its pus-flowing ugliness to the natural medicines of the air and light, injustice must likewise be exposed, with all of the tension its exposing creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion before it can be cured.[75]

To forge such a state of 'creative tension', King learnt to carry out careful research on a situation before he evolved a strategy suited for that particular place and historic moment. If the conditions were not right, he was wary about launching a struggle. What he required above all was a local African-American community with strong internal solidarity and willingness to fight non-violently, and a white population that would react in a ham-fisted and self-defeating way. Birmingham was not the only place that fulfilled these criteria: St Augustine in Florida (1964) and Selma, Alabama (1965) were two other places that provided such an environment. King also valued lieutenants who had the ability to provoke retaliation—men such as Hosea Williams, who was known for his non-violent aggression in street confrontations. King celebrated Williams as his 'crazy man', his 'wild man, adding that: 'When Hosea can't have his way, he creates a lot of tension'.[76]

Like Bayard Rustin, King adhered to Gandhian non-violence without trying to follow the Mahatma's ascetic and disciplined way of life. King enjoyed good food (with a high meat content) and fine wines. He stayed in costly hotels on his tours, relishing the luxury. He dressed impeccably in smart and expensively tailored suits.[77] After visiting India in 1959 to tour places associated with Gandhi, King vowed to set aside a day each week for fasting and meditation. The vow was soon forgotten—King had neither the time nor willpower to carry it out.[78] He was also very bad at keeping time, but shrugged off his frequent late arrivals at meetings as being an inevitable case of what he jokingly called CPT, or 'Coloured People's Time'.[79] He had

extra-marital sexual relationships with some of his women-followers and admirers. One such intimacy was recorded on tape by FBI snoopers in 1964, and it was to do him considerable political damage over the next four years, as it allowed the sinister FBI boss, J. Edgar Hoover, to mount a smear campaign that undermined his moral reputation. King was guilt-stricken by his failure in this respect, and he resolved constantly not to allow it to happen again.[80]

The period 1964–5 was a turning point for the civil rights movement. 1963 had been a year of triumph, with the victory in Birmingham, followed by the great march on Washington, where King delivered his powerful 'I have a dream' speech. In 1964, President Johnson backed civil rights legislation that made it illegal to practise segregation in any public place in the USA. But in the same year, Newark, Harlem, Chicago, Philadelphia and Jersey City exploded in race riots. King was jeered at when he went to Harlem at the invitation of the mayor of New York to try to cool tensions.[81] Harlem was the stronghold of Malcolm X, who in that year denounced what he characterised as the 'Christian- Gandhian groups':

> Christian? Gandhian? I don't go for anything that's non-violent and turn the other-cheekish. I don't see how any revolution—I've never heard of a non-violent revolution or a revolution that was brought about by turning the other cheek, and so I believe that it is a crime for anyone to teach a person who is being brutalized to continue to accept that brutality without doing something to defend himself. If this is what the Christian-Gandhian philosophy teaches, then it is criminal—a criminal philosophy.[82]

Although Malcolm X revealed here a profound misunderstanding of both Gandhi and King's non-violence, for both believed in confronting an oppressor most actively, his words struck a chord with his own followers.

Malcolm X was what was known at the time as a 'Black Nationalist'. He demanded that African-Americans should fight for a separate nation- state

in which they would hold power for themselves.[83] He himself rejected Christianity and had converted to Islam. In a debate with Bayard Rustin in 1960, he had criticised the civil rights position that African- Americans should struggle to assert themselves within the American polity, arguing that in a racist society they could never become full- fledged citizens. 'People come here from Hungary and are integrated into the American way of life overnight, they are not put into any fourth or third class or any other kind of class. The only one who is put in this category is the so-called Negro ...'[84] He condemned what he called 'the passive approach' which he saw as a mere palliative preached by liberals.

Arguments such as these began to exert a growing hold over the imagination of young African-Americans of the northern cities. Their problems were different to those of the South, for they already had the vote and there was no segregation by law The vast majority, however, lived in poverty in squalid ghettoes where they were rack-rented by slum lords. Many were unemployed and they were victimised on a daily basis by policemen who 'treated every Negro as a criminal merely because he was a Negro'.[85] Their anger exploded periodically in so-called 'race riots', in which they lashed out at their oppressors and were shot down in the streets.

King decided that he had to extend his movement to the North. In early 1966 he set up home in a cramped and soul-destroying apartment in a Chicago ghetto and launched a movement for integrated housing in the city. He contacted a number of youth gangs, met their leaders and spent long hours in persuading them to embrace non-violence and act as marshalls in demonstrations. He held workshops in non-violence, persuading them that the southern protests had gained far more than the northern riots. Some two-hundred gang members—enthused by the attention given to them by such a famous and charismatic leader—agreed to give non-violence a chance.[86]

Chicago was however not a southern city ruled by hardline racists. The mayor was Richard Daley, a wily politician and a Democrat who claimed to be doing his best to implement President Johnson's anti- poverty programmes. He even boasted that within two years there would be no slums left in the city. He had strong allies within the African- American community of Chicago, and he mobilised them to counter King's threat.[87] By mid-1966, it seemed that the Chicago campaign was going nowhere.

It was at this juncture that King was faced with a rebellion in his ranks. Several young Northerners had been inspired by the civil rights movement and had gone south to participate in the protests. By 1966, however, some of them were becoming disillusioned with King's methods. Matters came to a head in June 1966, during a protest march in Mississippi. After a white man had shot one of the marchers, King overheard some of his fellow-protesters saying that the days of non-violence were passing. Some began to arm themselves with guns so that they could fight back. Others accused white sympathisers of trying to appropriate the movement and told King that they didn't want any whites marching with them: 'This should be an all-black march. We don't need any more white phonies and liberals invading our movement.'[88]This was a direct rejection of King's stress on inclusion.

The leading figure in this group was Stokely Carmichael, then twenty-four years old and a magnetic young leader who had been involved in the civil rights movement since 1961. By 1965 he had come round to the Black Nationalist position. During the Mississippi march he told King that African-Americans should grab power wherever they were in a majority: 'I'm not going to beg the white man for anything I deserve. I'm going to take it.'[89] A few days later he proclaimed before a crowd: 'We been saying freedom for six years now and we ain't got nothin'. What we gonna start saying now is Black Power!' The crowd roared back: 'BLACK POWER!! BLACK POWER!! BLACK POWER!!'[90] To King's disgust, the media quickly took up this slogan, with all of its potential for sensation.

During the next three years, King devoted his energies to countering what he saw as the profound errors of Black Power. He understood the anger which had produced this new militancy, and he was always more sympathetic to it than the white liberals, most of whom felt not only threatened by the slogan, but bitter that a movement with which they had sympathised had spawned—so they believed—such rabid hatred. King felt, however, that the Black Power celebration of violence was completely misguided. They could never hope to defeat white America in a show of force, and their relatively feeble violence would provide an excuse for white racists to unleash a wave of genocidal killings of blacks, no doubt under the slogan of 'White Power'.[91] King went on to argue that in advocating violence, Black Power was not adopting a revolutionary line: 'One of the great paradoxes of the Black Power movement is that it talks unceasingly about not imitating the values of white society, but in advocating violence it is imitating the worst, the most brutal and the most uncivilized value of American life.'[92] King also condemned Black Power for its repudiation of all whites as racists: 'I reminded them of the dedicated whites who had suffered, bled and died in the cause of racial justice, and suggested that to reject white participation now would be a shameful repudiation of all for which they had been sacrificed.'[93]

For all the rationality of his arguments, King was well aware that what mattered most were results. He had to prove to the African- Americans of the northern cities that they would gain more through non-violent protest than rioting in the streets. In this respect, Chicago became of crucial importance to his movement. He decided to launch mass civil disobedience in the city. He was heckled by supporters of Black Power at one of the first meetings in July 1966. Although bitterly upset, he took it as a challenge and pressed ahead with protests. He was not, however, able to generate any 'creative tension. There were street riots that July, and although not connected in any way with the campaign, they underlined the extent to which King's movement was a mere sideshow in the violent life of that city.

King rushed from riot- spot to riot-spot, calming the people and persuading the authorities to act in a constructive manner. He met with the gang leaders and took from them renewed promises to remain non-violent. The rioting stopped before it gained any further momentum, and several commentators felt that King had been instrumental in this.[94]

King then pressed ahead, announcing a series of marches to all-white neighbourhoods. They were met with racist taunts by working-class white men and women, who waved American Nazi Party insignias and Confederate flags and taunted them with cries of 'you monkeys' and 'Nigger go home!' The white suburbanites even taunted the police who protected the marchers with being 'nigger-lovers' and 'white trash'. Rocks, bricks and bottles were hurled at the marchers. On one occasion a brick hit King, bringing him to the ground. A knife was also thrown at him, but missed its target. King was astonished at the sheer venom of the reaction—he stated that he had seen nothing like it in the South. He rejoiced, however, that the young gang leaders who had marched with them had remained non-violent. Mayor Daley retaliated with an injunction banning such marches, on the grounds that they stirred up trouble. King then decided to lead a march on Cicero, a suburb outside the city limits that was not covered by the injunction. Cicero—previously known as the home of A1 Capone—was a notoriously racist place that had in 1951 reacted with violence when an African-American family had tried to settle there. To forestall this march, Daley met with King and worked out a plan to reform the city's housing. King then called off the march. Although many saw this as a victory, black radicals accused King of selling out. In general, there was a feeling that the Chicago campaign of 1966 had flopped. Daley was still in control, promising change but doing very little to eradicate African-American poverty and poor housing in any meaningful way.[95] King continued to be haunted by the hate-filled screams of the whites of Chicago, even stating that southern whites should go to Chicago 'to learn how to hate'.[96] In contrast to previous campaigns, Chicago left him depressed rather than elated.

There were further riots in the northern cities in 1967. As Greg Moses has written: 'In the last years of King's life, non-violence was losing its tenuous hold on the American imagination.'[97] Radicals everywhere were celebrating the cathartic power of revolutionary violence and terror. Black Power was only one example of this tendency. To counter this, King wrote his last book *Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community?*. Published in 1967, it represented a heartfelt plea for the continuing relevance of non-violence. He argued that: 'Returning violence for violence multiplies violence, adding deeper darkness to a night already devoid of stars. Darkness cannot drive out darkness: only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate: only love can do that.'[98]He demanded a politics that was driven by love and not hate. "What is needed is a realization that power without love is reckless and abusive and that love without power is sentimental and anaemic.'[99] Black Power, he asserted, divorced power from love and based itself on hatred. He refused to accept that love was associated with resignation of power. 'Power at its best is love implementing the demands of justice. Justice at its best is love correcting everything that stands against love.'[100] Greg Moses has argued that King's position represented an important theoretical breakthrough:

> From King's point of view, the error of separating power from love has been tragically compounded by Christian thinkers who, in divorcing their ethereal Platonic version of love from their temporal struggles for power, left themselves open to Nietzsche's withering attacks. As Nietzsche rejects the 'Christian' concept of love, Christians reject the 'Nietzschean' will to power. All this mutual rejection is unfortunate in King's view, because the two concepts are not really 'polar opposites' but necessary co-conceptions of ethical development.[101]

King himself claimed that Gandhi had been the first to grasp this great truth: 'What was new about Mahatma Gandhi's movement in India was that he mounted a revolution on hope and love, hope and non-violence.'[102]

King always knew that his life was in danger; death-threats were an almost everyday feature of his life.[103] When he heard the news of John F. Kennedy's assassination in November 1963, his first reaction was 'I don't think I'm going to live to reach forty.'[104] Although he proved to be prescient in this respect (he was thirty-nine years of age when shot and killed in Memphis by a white racist on 4 April 1968), his faith in God gave him the strength to carry on with undiminished militancy despite the threats. What mattered, he said, was the quality and not the quantity of one's life: 'If you are cut down in a movement that is designed to save the soul of the nation, then no other death could be more redemptive.'[105] In a speech during a demonstration in Alabama in 1965 he stated: 'I do not know what lies ahead of us. There may be beatings, jailings, and tear gas. But I would rather die on the highways of Alabama than make a butchery of my conscience. There is nothing more tragic in all this world than to know right and not do it. I cannot stand in the midst of all these glaring evils and not take a stand.'[106]

This faith allowed him to conquer his fears, even in the face of terrifying physical aggression. Hosea Williams—whose non-violent courage King himself had praised—recounted being with King in situations in which 'I had so much fear the flesh trembled on my bones.' He added: 'He was the truest militant I ever met. He not only talked that talk; he walked that walk.'[107]

King's assassination had been preceded by that of Malcolm X three years before. During the last year of his life, Malcolm X had been moving towards King in spirit, and had begun to try to patch up their differences in the weeks before his death. Although in certain respects the antithesis of King, he was also a man of strong moral principles and a brilliant and charismatic leader in his own right. Despite his harsh comments on King's non-violence, his courageous struggle for the moral self-assertion of the poor African-Americans of the northern cities was in practice also waged without the use of violence. He just refused to accept non-violence as a principle. As he

stated at a mass meeting in 1965: 'I don't advocate violence, but if a man steps on my toes, I'll step on his. ... Whites better be glad Martin Luther King is rallying the people because other forces are waiting to take over if he fails.'[108] The Nation of Islam, in which Malcolm X was a leading figure until his acrimonious break with the organisation in the final year of his life, sought to inculcate an upright, puritanical, moralistic, disciplined and deeply religious approach to life. Followers were expected to give up liquor, drugs and tobacco. Breaking such lifelong habits helped inculcate what Malcolm X saw as 'black self-pride'.[109] The founder of the Nation of Islam, Elijah Muhammad, taught that 'idleness and laziness were among the black's greatest sins against himself', and Malcolm X himself was punctilious in keeping to time.[110] In these particular respects he was closer in spirit to Gandhi than Martin Luther King ever was. By breaking with Christianity and asserting that Islam was the true religion for the African-American, the organisation sought to break their inferiority complex—the 'Uncle Tom' attitude which saw salvation as lying in imitation of the whites. However, although Elijah Muhammad had an elaborate theology which depicted the white men as devils, he sought to opt out in an essentially quietist way rather than challenge white power head-on. Malcolm X, who took the Nation of Islam from being a tiny, obscure body in the early 1950s to being a mass organisation in the early 1960s, extended the theoretical denunciation of white Americans into a political confrontation.[111]

The first such clash occurred in Harlem in New York in 1958 when a member of the Nation of Islam who happened to be a bystander during a scuffle between the police and some African-Americans was beaten viciously and arrested by the police. Malcolm X immediately organised a mass protest by the Muslims, who stood in massed ranks, silently, before the building in which he was being held. The police had never experienced anything like this before, and agreed to take the wounded man to the local hospital. A large and swelling crowd marched behind them as they took him there. When a police officer ordered them to disperse, Malcolm X told him

that they were not breaking any law. Only later, when he gave the word, did they go home. This stand had an electrifying effect in Harlem—the 'Black Muslims' were now seen as an activist body taking on white racism in an entirely new way.[112]

In 1963, Malcolm X broke with the Nation of Islam after Elijah Muhammad, who had been exposed as having sexual relations with two young secretaries, refused to admit his human frailties and instead turned on his most important follower in a vicious way.[113] To give himself breathing space, Malcolm X went on hajj to Mecca in early 1964. This experience transformed him. He found in the Islamic countries a world in which people were not judged by their colour, and he came to see that the hatred of whites that he had previously propounded was itself a product of American racism. In Islam, he found a sense of brotherhood which transcended race.[114] From Mecca, he travelled to countries in black Africa that were newly liberated from colonial rule. There, he found black people living with dignity and self-respect. On his return to America in May 1964 he told the waiting press that he would never again make sweeping indictments of all whites: 'The true Islam has shown me that a blanket indictment of all white people is as wrong as when whites make blanket indictments against blacks.'[115]

In the last year of his life, Malcolm X began to make conciliatory moves towards Martin Luther King. King himself had criticised Malcolm X strongly as an extremist who was bringing 'misery upon negroes'.[116]Malcolm X, however, wanted to reach out and build a new alliance between the civil rights movement of the South and his own Black Pride movement of the northern ghettoes. In one of his last statements he said:

> Sometimes, I have dared to dream to myself that one day, history may even say that my voice—which disturbed the white man's smugness,

> and his arrogance, and his complacency—that my voice helped to save America from a grave, possibly even fatal catastrophe.
>
> The goal has always been the same, with the approaches to it as different as mine and Dr Martin Luther Kings non-violent marching, that dramatizes the brutality and the evil of the white man against defenceless blacks. And in the racial climate of this country today, it is anybody's guess which of the 'extremes' in approach to the black mans problems might *personally* meet a fatal catastrophe first—'non-violent' Dr King, or so-called 'violent' me.[117]

On 21 February 1965, Malcolm X was shot dead while addressing a meeting in Harlem. Although the hand of Elijah Muhammad and the Nation of Islam was suspected, it is likely that there were elements within the CIA or FBI that had either connived in the assassination or been actively involved.[118]

Although Malcolm X refused to be associated with Gandhian nonviolence, there were certain parallels between the two men. Malcolm X may have attacked Gandhian non-violence, but he was a great admirer of the man who had fought British imperialism in India. He regarded Gandhi as a great 'leader of the people' who had been politicised by his experience of white racism in South Africa.[119] Both were fighters against injustice and were charismatic figures who based their message on a strongly moral appeal that was rooted in a firm faith in God. Malcolm X's strong anti-white message was intended to shock people out of their complacency in a way that paralleled Gandhi's sweeping rejection of Western civilisation in *Hind Swaraj*. In the last year of his life, Malcolm was moving towards new forms of dialogue—with white sympathisers, pan-African nationalists, the radical regimes in Algeria, Tanzania, Cuba, and with Martin Luther King and the civil rights movement. It was almost certainly this attempt to build a powerful new alliance of those opposed to American racism and imperialism which proved the last straw for certain forces within the

American state system. Like Gandhi, Malcolm X died fighting intolerance and hatred. Martin Luther King was to die three years later while struggling to build a similar solidarity of the oppressed.[120]

Although King's death in 1968 brought an end to the period of the great campaigns for African-American civil rights, the movement had changed the political scene in the USA in a radical new direction. Gandhian techniques of resistance had been shown to work in an American context, in a way that legitimised them for a generation of Americans. It had forged a whole vocabulary of protest, with songs such as 'Freedom Now!' and 'We Shall Overcome' becoming the new anthems of dissent. In his last two years, King himself became a leading figure in one such protest, that against the war in Vietnam. Besides massive marches and street demonstrations, there were public burnings of draft cards. Such protest was then extended into campaigns for womens', gay and lesbian rights, and the environmental movement. As Greg Moses has noted: 'it is commonplace to announce that King's death marked the end of an era, but in the broader life of the mind a logic of nonviolence was just beginning to make its way into the world.'[121]

The Revolt Against Apartheid in South Africa

After Gandhi left South Africa in 1915, he placed his third son Manilal in charge of his work there. Manilal ran the Phoenix Ashram, published *Indian Opinion*, and kept up the struggle for the rights of Indians.[122] In 1946 he played a leading role in a major campaign of protest against new legislation that discriminated against those of Indian origin that built directly on the legacy of Gandhi's own resistance to the white regime three to four decades earlier. The satyagraha continued for two years, with mass rallies and the picketing of and squatting on of land reserved for whites-only occupation. Indians of all classes were involved—men and women alike—and around two thousand were jailed, including the two main leaders, Yusif Dadoo and G.M. Naicker. Although confined to the Indian community, many blacks

were deeply impressed by the power of the protest. As Nelson Mandela later wrote:

> It instilled a spirit of defiance and radicalism among the people, broke the fear of prison, and boosted the popularity and influence of the NIC [Natal Indian Congress] and TIC [Transvaal Indian Congress]. They reminded us that the freedom struggle was not merely a question of making speeches, holding meetings, passing resolutions and sending deputations, but of meticulous organisation, militant mass action and, above all, the willingness to suffer and sacrifice. The Indians' campaign harkened back to the 1913 passive resistance in which Mahatma Gandhi led a tumultuous procession of Indians crossing illegally from Natal to the Transvaal. That was history; this campaign was taking place before my own eyes.[123]

Blacks felt a novel sense of solidarity with a community hitherto regarded by them as being little better than lackeys of the whites.[124]

The 5th Pan-African Congress, which had met in Manchester in 1945, had already endorsed Gandhian passive resistance as the preferred method for resistance to colonialism in Africa. In 1949 the African National Congress (ANC) in South Africa committed itself to non-violence in its struggle against apartheid. Manilal Gandhi wanted them to state that non-violence was a moral principle to be observed at all costs, but the majority of the ANC leaders saw it as a tactical matter, arguing that in a situation of an overwhelming control of force by the white regime, violent resistance would have been futile. This became the official ANC line, despite Manilal's vigorous objections.[125]

In 1952 the ANC launched a campaign against the pass laws in which blacks violated the law by entering white areas. There was however some violence, which gave the rulers an excuse to crush the movement ruthlessly. Non-violent protest continued in the 1950s and 1960s under the leadership of Albert Luthali (1899–1967), who was strongly committed to non-violence

as a principle. This courageous Zulu chief was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1960.

Long before this, however, many of the ANC leaders had begun to question the strategy of non-violence. New laws were being passed which criminalized even the mildest displays of dissidence. Protesters could now be detained indefinitely without trial. As Mandela stated:

> I began to suspect that both legal and extra-constitutional protests would soon be impossible. In India, Gandhi had been dealing with a foreign power that ultimately was more realistic and far-sighted. That was not the case with the Afrikaners in South Africa. Non-violent passive resistance is effective as long as your opposition adheres to the same rules as you do. But if peaceful protest is met with violence, its efficacy is at an end. For me, non-violence was not a moral principle but a strategy; there is no moral goodness in using an ineffective weapon.[126]

The matter came to a head after the Sharpeville massacre of 1960, in which sixty-nine non-violent protesters were shot and killed by the police in cold blood. The ANC leaders retaliated by burning their passes in public, which led to a declaration of martial law and their being thrown in jail. Many of these leaders felt that non-violence had had its day. After their release, there was a heated debate within the ANC, with Luthali standing up for non-violence. He was supported by J.N. Singh, an Indian ANC leader, who advanced the Gandhian argument that: 'Non-violence has not failed us, we have failed non-violence'.[127]Eventually, the Gandhians were forced to bow to the majority line—that there should be underground violent resistance. The military wing of the ANC was however to be separate, and under the leadership of Mandela, Walter Sisulu and Joe Slovo.

Mandela did not however turn his back on Gandhi entirely. He could never forget J.N. Singh's words—they continued to reverberate in his head even thirty years later.[128] He continued to be a passionate admirer of

Gandhi, whom he saw as a champion of the rights of the colonised and racially oppressed. He never forgot that Gandhi's fierce anti- colonialism was born in South Africa from bitter experiences of racial discrimination and from seeing the brutal repression of the Bambata rebellion by white British troops.[129] Mandela argued that Gandhi did not in any case rule out violence in extreme circumstances, in particular when non-violence was a cover for cowardice, or when honour was at stake. Mandela believed that what mattered was not so much whether a movement was strictly non-violent so much as the balance maintained between non-violence and violence. 'Violence and non-violence are not mutually exclusive; it is the predominance of the one or the other that labels a struggle.'[130] He therefore advocated a limited form of violence, involving acts of sabotage against government installations and property, taking care to avoid injuring people. Mandela felt that it was vital that they did not set off a blood feud between black and white: 'Animosity between Afrikaner and Englishman was still sharp fifty years after the Anglo-Boer war; what would race relations be like between black and white if we provoked a civil war?'[131] Non-violent civil resistance continued, with strikes, demonstrations, boycotts and moral pressure from church leaders such as Desmond Tutu and Alan Boesak. The work of these latter figures greatly enhanced the moral power of the struggle.[132]

Although he had turned his back on strict non-violence, Mandela, like Gandhi, understood that a struggle that created bitterness between opponents made it harder in the long term to reach a lasting solution to a problem. He himself had an almost saintly ability to refuse to think badly of his enemies, believing very strongly that: 'Man's goodness is a flame that can be hidden but never extinguished.'[133] He felt himself vindicated in this when he saw certain whites rise above their prejudices—men such as Justice Rumpff who in a celebrated judgement of 1961 refused on the basis of the evidence before him to convict the ANC leaders for acts of violence or being communists, even though the government demanded it.[134] Even during the

long and terrible years in jail, Mandela continued to appeal to the humanity of his jailors, and a small number of these hardest of people responded with sympathy.[135] After his release, he sought to bring these qualities to his negotiations with President WE de Klerk: 'To make peace with an enemy, one must work with that enemy, and that enemy becomes your partner.'[136]

By the late 1960s, it was clear that the ANC strategy of violent underground struggle was going nowhere. Many of its best leaders were in jail and silenced, while those in exile found that they could do little to pursue their strategy to any effect, and began to quarrel amongst themselves.[137] It was against this background that a new leader emerged who reasserted the principle of struggle through open and non-violent resistance in a most powerful way. This was Steve Biko, who was born in the eastern Cape Province in 1946. While a medical student in the late 1960s, he had taken the leading role in formulating a new creed of Black Consciousness. There were strong parallels between Bikos position and that of Malcolm X. Like Malcolm X, Biko criticised the blacks for their complicity in their own subjugation: 'The type of black man we have today has lost his manhood. Reduced to an obliging shell, he looks with awe at the white power structure and accepts what he regards as the "inevitable position".'[138] He argued that there could be no genuine liberation until the blacks learnt to be proud of themselves and consider themselves to be the equal of the whites. He rejected the ANC strategy of building a multi-racial political alliance, as this tended to reinforce a mentality of dependency on whites. Biko was the most articulate and charismatic of this new generation of young black activists, and was soon the acknowledged leader of the new Black People's Convention (BPC). Discussion groups were set up, and local community self-help projects inaugurated, involving educational, health, welfare and cultural activities.[139]

Biko's aim was to build the strength of the blacks so that they would be eventually in a position to negotiate with the white regime from a much

more powerful base. He never rejected the possibility of dialogue. For this reason, he stressed that, in contrast to the ANC, the BPC did not have any armed wing and that: 'We operate on the assumption that we can bring whites to their senses by confronting them with our overwhelming demands.'[140] He refused to rule out the possibility that violence might be needed at a future date, but felt that they had other better methods of struggle available to them, such as attacking the South African economy from within. He predicted that once investors lost confidence in the apartheid regime, capital would drain away and induce a panic amongst the whites, who would then be forced to negotiate. He thought that this process would begin to work its way through by the late 1970s.[141]

The Black Consciousness movement rejected direct political work with whites, and was very critical of white liberals who, they said, only criticised the regime to salve their conscience, while still enjoying a white lifestyle. Biko was however careful to distinguish between whites as people, whom he refused to hate, and whites as part of 'the System', which he opposed in an uncompromising manner. As he once stated about Black Consciousness:

> it isn't a negative, hating thing. Its a positive black self-confidence thing involving no hatred of anyone, not even the Nats [the hardline white supremacist Nationalist Party]—only of what they represent today. ... Our main concern is the liberation of the blacks—the majority of South Africans—and while we want to establish a country in which all men are free and welcome citizens—white as well as black—we have to concentrate on what means most to us blacks.[142]

These were very Gandhian sentiments, and Biko had other qualities of a leader in this mould. He lived in a simple and austere way. He always reached out to others, striving to meet them as human beings, whatever their political or racial differences. He did this with humour and without a trace of arrogance. If he realised that he had made a mistake, or that an argument of his was faulty, he was prepared to accept his error with grace.

He had a firm vision of what he stood for and wanted in politics, and was prepared to die for it if necessary. His close friend Donald Woods said of him: 'He had a rocklike integrity and a degree of courage that sent one's regard for the potentialities of the human spirit soaring skyhigh.'[143] He was in every respect a figure of towering moral stature.

Biko carried on his political work in Durban until 1973, when a banning order was passed on him, restricting him to his own King William's Town. He carried on working there openly, until stopped from doing so in 1975. Thereafter he continued his activities secretly, often breaking the banning order. He was arrested several times and spent periods in jail. Then, after being caught breaking the banning order in 1977, he was interrogated and tortured by the police, being beaten so severely that he suffered brain damage. He died, untreated, five days after this murderous assault. The police claimed that he had been injured in a scuffle.

When the news of this atrocity broke, there was a sense of profound shock, followed by riots in the streets. The government responded by clamping down on the Black Consciousness movement. Many of its leaders were arrested and jailed, and banning orders were issued on white supporters. Internationally, there were renewed demands for economic sanctions against South Africa, and the United Nations passed a vote that there should be no future arms sales to the apartheid regime. The events frightened many foreign investors, who began to withdraw their capital.[144] Biko's murder showed very clearly that the white regime was not prepared to engage in any dialogue with the blacks, even those who believed in non-violent resistance and a gradual and peaceful transition to majority rule.

Over the next decade, the white regime continued in its hardline stance, even though Prime Minister PW Botha took steps to 'modernize' the regime, which involved watering down some aspects of what was called 'petty apartheid'. The town of Soweto went into revolt, with a whole generation of young black women and men dedicating their lives to the

struggle. The collapse of the Portuguese empire in Africa and then the apartheid state in Rhodesia saw the emergence of new black regimes in neighbouring regions. There was a revival of the guerrilla campaign of the ANC, and raids on South Africa were carried out from bases in Angola and Mozambique. Botha allowed the military a free hand to fight the guerrillas, both in South Africa and in the neighbouring countries—to considerable effect.

During the 1980s the international anti-apartheid movement grew in strength, with demands for Mandela's release and attacks on multinational corporations which continued to have dealings with South Africa. However, it was only in 1989, when F.W. de Klerk replaced Botha as prime minister, that the Nationalist Party changed its policy of all-out repression of the black movement. Until then, black resistance—non-violent and violent, national and international—had failed to undermine the regime in any very serious way. De Klerk seems to have realised, nonetheless, that opposition was building an irresistible momentum, and that it would be in the long-term interests of the Afrikaners to negotiate with moderate blacks and reach a settlement rather than risk a revolutionary explosion in which they would lose everything.[145]

The implementation of this policy brought Mandela's release in 1990 and the move towards the transition to black rule, which took place in 1994. Once in power Mandela refused to sanction any recriminations against whites and their erstwhile supporters. This was despite the terrible violence of the final years of apartheid, seen in particular in a wave of murderous attacks on ANC activists and supporters by followers of Chief Buthelezi with the connivance of the white state. For Mandela, the process of healing was of far greater importance than satisfying an understandable desire for revenge. The moral stature that he has as a result achieved throughout the world is one that in modern times has been equalled only by that of Gandhi himself.[146]

Petra Kelly and the German Greens

In Europe, one of the most prominent figures in recent years to be inspired by Gandhi has been Petra Kelly, a leader of the German Green Party (Die Grünen). However, unlike Gandhi she fought elections and represented her party in parliament. This caused tensions that were never resolved in a satisfactory manner before her violent and tragic death in 1992. The manner of her death also raised questions about her possible failure to reconcile her private life with her non-violent beliefs.

Kelly was born in Bavaria in 1947, moving with her family to southern USA in 1960. There, she was inspired by the civil rights and anti-Vietnam war movements. Returning to Europe in 1972, she was actively involved in the anti-nuclear movement, and in 1980 was a co-founder and first leader of the German Green Party, which brought together a wide variety of ecological action groups. In 1983 she and twenty-six other Greens were elected to the Bundestag. She served there until the 1990 elections, when the Greens suffered an electoral reverse. While a member of the Bundestag, she led a series of non-violent protests against nuclear installations and military bases. These included protests in East Berlin and Moscow. She also took part in an occupation of the German embassy in Pretoria in protest at German economic ties with the apartheid regime in South Africa. She was also to the fore in protesting against the violation of human rights in Tibet by the Chinese government (she had adopted an orphaned Tibetan girl in 1973).[147]

Kelly drew her inspiration directly from the Gandhian tradition of non-violent moral activism. One of her earliest political heroes was Martin Luther King. She studied political science at university in Washington, where she was introduced to Thoreau and his theory of civil disobedience. She was impressed by the way that King had acknowledged Gandhi and Thoreau as inspirational examples. According to her biographer, Sara Parkin: 'Petra's gods were Gandhi and Martin Luther King. Her bibles were Thoreau and Gene Sharp ...'[148] She became strongly committed to a

thoroughgoing non-violence in pursuit of a politics informed by truth.[149] Her non-violence, like that of Gandhi, was not passive but active, and it entailed 'seeking opportunities for dialogue or taking actions which would liberate people from the violent system (of thinking) which prevented them from seeing the power and rightness of non-violence.'[150]

As with Gandhi, these politics flowed from a deep inner spirituality. Kelly had been brought up in Bavaria in a devout family of Roman Catholics, and in her childhood had wanted to become a nun.[151] She was drawn to Martin Luther King in part by his strong Christian faith. Later, she became drawn to Catholic liberation theology.[152] During the 1970s her Catholicism gave way to a more eclectic and humanistic faith, a new 'holy trinity of non-violence, personal responsibility and truth.'[153] These became her guiding spiritual truths. She insisted that 'The spiritual dimensions of non-violence as lived by Gandhi are to me most important,'[154] and that—quoting Martin Luther King—'unarmed truth and unconditional love will have the final word in reality.'[155]She also believed that 'we cannot solve ... political problems without addressing our spiritual ones.'[156]

She even claimed that her ecological values flowed from Gandhi:

> In one particular area of our political work we have been greatly inspired by Mahatma Gandhi. That is in our belief that a lifestyle and method of production which rely on an endless supply of raw materials and which use those raw materials lavishly, also furnish the motive for the violent appropriation of raw materials from other countries. In contrast, a responsible use of raw materials, as part of an ecologically-oriented lifestyle and economy, reduces the risk that policies of violence will be pursued in our name. The pursuit of ecologically responsible policies within a society provides preconditions for a reduction of tensions and increases our ability to achieve peace in the world.[157]

She saw her work as being informed above all by a respect for all life forms and an understanding of their interconnectedness.

Kelly engaged with issues at a global level, whether they related to human rights, women's oppression, the environment, the structured violence of the military and nuclear complex, or the divide between rich and poor. She saw herself as speaking for the poor and oppressed: 'To my mind, the purpose of politics and of political parties is to stand up for the weak, for those who have no lobby or other means of exerting influence.'[158]

In marked contrast to most such non-violent activists, she was not only involved in party politics as a founder member of Die Grünen, but was also served as a member of parliament. She claimed that Die Grünen was what she called an 'anti-party party'. Kelly took this concept from the Hungarian philosopher Gyorgy Konrad, who called for what he called an 'anti-politics' which 'strives to put politics in its place and make sure it stays there, never overstepping its proper office of defending and refining the morals of the game in a civil society—where a civil society is the antithesis of a military society.'[159] Kelly believed that party work within the legislatures should be carried on in a close symbiosis with action on the streets. Such a programme required that Die Grünen remain a perpetual opposition, the assumption being that any holding of office would lead to inevitable compromises with power and the violent apparatus of oppression controlled by the state. There was much in this that echoed Gandhi's sharp critique of the corruptions of parliamentary power. She was also trying to create a culture of Gandhian-style civil disobedience that would permeate all levels of the polity: 'All of us in Germany would benefit if we were to learn at last the liberating and constructive art of civil disobedience—not just in the extraparliamentary movement, but also within parliament and political parties. Civil disobedience has to be practiced in parliament or even within our own party if we become too dogmatic, powerful, or arrogant.'[160] There were, however, many within the party who did not envisage this as their prime aim and role. This group, known as the *Realos*, hoped to gain enough strength to become partners in a governing coalition, from which position they would be able to push through green policies. Joschka Fischer was the leading figure in this

group—he was elected to the Bundestag along with Kelly in 1983. Those who rejected this line came to be known as the*Fundis.* Although Kelly tried to project herself as being above the two factions, she was in practice more in tune with the *Fundis* than the *Realos*.

Another very serious tension within Die Grünen concerned the role of the leader. Kelly wanted to create a party of people who were committed to a thorough non-violence in thought, word and deed. Its members would, ideally, be free from any egoistical desire for power, their motivation being a selfless and genuine desire to further the interests of the socially excluded and oppressed and to forge a society which would nurture rather than exploit its environment.[161] In Kelly's words, their party was 'based on human solidarity and democracy among its members and on the rejection of a performance and hierarchy-oriented approach governed by rivalry hostile to life.'[162] Power within the party was to emerge from the bottom up, rather than from the top down, as in conventional party politics. Activism within civil society would be valued as much as parliamentary work. To further this aim, Greens who were elected to the Bundestag were to relinquish their position after two years, handing it over to another party member.

However, although Kelly supported this idea when it was formulated, she soon turned against it and refused to stand down when her turn was up. One reason was personal. She had given up her job to serve as a member of parliament, and had moved her house and home to the capital, Bonn. The Bundestag gave her a superb platform for her particular form of oppositional politics, and she found that her demands and the many causes she championed were taken with greater seriousness both in Germany and internationally, in a way which brought many solid gains. In several instances, she managed to obtain cross- party support for her proposals as a result of her committed and painstaking advocacy of the issue. She felt that the requirement for her to give up such work in two years would also be counterproductive for the party. Kelly also observed that the process of

rotation generated a poisonous sense of rivalry between members of the party. She dismissed the argument that rotation helped prevent the concentration of power in particular hands—the real power coteries survived in spite of it.[163]

Although most of the *Realos* within the party accepted that the two- year rotation principle was in practice not workable and soon accepted that it had to be abandoned, it was clear that Kelly and others within the party had not thought through this particular strategy adequately The way she changed her position in a unilateral manner, forcing the party to accept her turnabout, opened her up to the criticism that she had ditched her principles in pursuit of her political ambitions.[164] There was a strongly anti-hierarchical and democratic culture within the party that stemmed in part from the profound and understandable suspicion there was on the German left of charismatic leadership. The fact that Kelly was popularly regarded in Germany and beyond as 'the leader' of Die Grünen added to their fears in this respect. By 1986 a strong antipathy to such 'celebrities' had developed and she found herself increasingly isolated within the party.[165]

It was widely accepted by political commentators that the attempt to exercise power in a plural and decentralised way had meant that the party lacked any clear structures of power and means for delegating authority. Party members had become wary of taking initiatives. Political work became fragmented and there was a lack of unity in policy pronouncements, which caused widespread confusion in Germany.[166] Its parliamentarians operated in an amateurish and ineffective manner. Kelly's partner and fellow Green, Gert Bastian, stated that there was what he called a 'dictatorship of incompetence' within the party.[167] This all raised the question as to whether or not it was possible in a system of liberal democracy, party politics and media-driven political debate to abandon the figure of the 'strong leader'. The whole system craves such personalities, even trying to create them when no such talent is about. It may also be observed that in all spheres of public

life, leaders who can provide a sure, courageous and visionary leadership can give a powerful sense of mission and direction to a movement, a political party or other form of institution. One that fails to value and nurture such leadership is unlikely to flourish. In the USA, Malcolm X was, for example, subjected to a ruthless campaign of cutting to size within the Nation of Islam, to the severe detriment of that body in the long term.

Kelly herself was a great media star, and this provided further ground for distrust within the party. Many in Die Grünen displayed a contempt for the media which infuriated her. As she stated in an open letter to the party in 1991:

> One of the great weaknesses in both the parliamentary group and in the party has been that of media relations. The party must have the courage to appoint really independent, bright, and audacious media spokespersons who are very experienced and competent in dealing with the national and international media. One thing must change very quickly in the Greens' public presentation. We have to try to brighten up our party's image because until now we have appeared unremittingly gloomy and intolerant. We are no longer able to laugh or show a bit of enthusiasm and zest for life. This is particularly evident at the national party conferences, and it is very depressing.[168]

Like Gandhi, Kelly not only appreciated the importance of a good press, but also knew how much the media loves a leader who can project a feeling of inspiration and conviction. In this way, a moral activist could gain crucial publicity and support for her or his cause.

In 1990, Die Grünen found no place for Kelly on its list of parliamentary candidates for the general election of that year. They insisted on running a 'personality-free' campaign. The internal fighting within the party had however lost it crucial electoral support in West Germany. This was the first post-war election in which both East and West Germany voted together, and Die Grünen failed to forge an alliance with the Greens of the East. The latter

gained 6.0 percent of the vote there, while the former gained only 4.8 percent in the west. Under Germany's constitution, a party had to win at least 5 percent of the vote to gain any seats in parliament. If they had been formerly allied, they would have gained 5.1 percent of the vote and around 40 seats in the Bundestag. As it was, Die Grünen got nothing.[169]

On 19 October 1992, the police entered a house in a suburb of Bonn and discovered the decomposing bodies of Petra Kelly and Gert Bastian. They had each died of a single bullet wound to the head, inflicted on 1 October. It appeared that Bastian had shot Kelly as she lay sleeping in bed and then committed suicide. Although the police claimed that they found no evidence to contradict this assumption, there were inevitable doubts. There were no suicide notes or any intimations of a suicide pact. Friends insisted that Kelly was not a suicidal type, and— even if she had been—that she would never have participated in a suicide pact without leaving an explanation for her family and for the world. Forensic evidence showed that she had been deeply asleep when she was shot in the head. Some suspected that her fight against the military- industrial complex had led to her murder by the 'nuclear mafia', by shadowy government agents of either the capitalist or communist blocs, or perhaps by neo-Nazis. Others suggested that Bastian had become depressed by his own sense of mortality (he was sixty-nine years old), the down-turn in the fortune of Die Grünen and the rise of neo-Nazis in Germany, and decided that it would be best if both died together.[170]

Glenn D. Paige, who edited a collection of speeches and essays by Petra Kelly that was published just before her death, commented in his introduction: 'conventional problems of political leadership are compounded for non-violent leaders who seek to question, challenge, and change the policies and institutions of violence-prone societies— political, military, economic, social, cultural, and ecological—not only locally but also globally. The lonely paths to martyrdom of Gandhi and King provide prototypical examples.'[171] By a deep irony, before that year was out, Petra Kelly was also dead, killed by a lethal shot. One more person of fearless

integrity and champion of non-violence in an ethical politics had died suddenly and in shocking circumstances.

If, as could be possible, skilled and trained assassins carried out a double murder so as to leave no trace, then Petra Kelly was a martyr in the same way as Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Malcolm X and Steve Biko had been—killed by political foes. From the evidence, however, this appears unlikely. Kelly's activist career was in the doldrums at that juncture, and with the easing of the Cold War, it hardly seems likely that any secret service would have seen her as a threat that had to be eliminated. Most probably, Bastian murdered Kelly without any foreknowledge or consent on her part. This conclusion accords best with what we know about both Petra Kelly and Bastian. She was a person of principled non-violence and could hardly have allowed her life-message to have been negated so absolutely by choosing to die in such a way (her bedroom was splattered with her blood from the point-blank shot). Gert Bastian on the other hand was still, in himself, a man of violence.

Born in 1923, he had been a fervent member of the Hitler Youth organisation in his teens, a soldier who was decorated for valour in battle during the Second World War, and a successful army officer afterwards. In 1980, while commanding the 12th Panzer Division, he decided to resign from the army in protest at the stationing of nuclear missiles on German soil. Only then had he become a peace activist.[172] Within a couple of years he was quoting Gandhi and Martin Luther King with facility.[173] Yet, he had kept his guns from his army days, and took them with him into the house he shared with Kelly. She knew about this, but rationalised that they were needed as she had received death threats. His non-violence was in fact a sham, something he parroted without belief.[174] The deeply troubling thought is, therefore, that he had lived for over a decade in intimacy with a woman whose whole being exuded the deepest abhorrence of violence and yet he could still go ahead and violate her deepest convictions so blatantly and for the world to see and judge.

What seems to have driven him to carry out this act was the fact that STASI files relating to him from East Germany were about to be made public. These may well have revealed that he had double-dealings with the former East German secret police. He had a strong sense of honour, inculcated in his upbringing and military career, and realised that such an exposure would have exposed his 'honour' as a sham. Kelly had strongly condemned people who had had dealings with STASI, and he must have feared her censure, and a possible end to their relationship. On the day he carried out the act, he had received a telephone call that his personal file was about to be opened. Once a person was dead, only a family member could demand access to such a file. His sense of military honour was also one that valorised suicide through a shot to the head as an act of redemption when all seemed lost.[175]

In a very Gandhian gesture, Kelly had in the past refused to accept police protection, despite the death threats, on the grounds of her commitment to non-violence.[176] She had however allowed Bastian to maintain his guns. She did so to accommodate a man of violence who was her lover and, ostensibly, her protector. This was to prove to be a fatal compromise. Her life, we must conclude, was brought to an end by an act of assassination, but in her case it was carried out not by a political opponent, but by a person of intimacy who felt he had a moral right to carry out such a crime in order to maintain his own warped and violent sense of honour. Kelly's death represented a profound failure for the principle of non-violence at the most personal of levels.

10

The Moral Activists' Lonely Path to Martyrdom

Gandhi sought to forge an alternative modernity. His programme was rooted in part in various Indian traditions, such as that of the bhakti movement, with its critique of caste exclusions and oppressive hierarchies. But also he took from the internal Western critique of the imperialism and autocracy embedded in the dominant strands of post-Enlightenment theory and practice, with his endorsement of an alternative arcadian sensibility. He related to these various traditions in a dialogic manner, questioning them at a whole range of levels, seeking to evolve a new system above all through practice and experience.

He tried to incorporate subaltern politics into his alternative by purging it of its violent aspects, so as to give it a strong moral superiority as against the coercive and violent politics of both the colonial state and the indigenous élites. He carried out this task in a cautious way, being always aware that the state could crush such a politics if it felt overly threatened. There was also much that he found hard to understand or sympathise with in the forces he

had unleashed, and he preferred to err on the side of caution. He thus sought to build his alternative system slowly, so that it would—he believed—be on firm foundations.

In all of this, Gandhi rejected an intolerant and hate-filled opposition to the Other, whether it was the white Britisher, the Indian collaborator, the Muslim, or the assertive subordinate. He believed that the Other could almost always be won over through a sympathetic and compassionate process of dialogue. There were times when he did not live up to this principle, as when he shunned Muhammad Ali Jinnah in the period after 1920, treated B.R. Ambedkar with disrespect in their initial meetings, or sought to coerce members of his family or discipline women who failed to conform to his elevated model of female purity'. He was at times unjustly opposed to powerful class-based conflicts, as against landlords, usurers or Indian princes. Several people he did reach out to, such as the Hindu extremists in the Savarkar camp, rejected his overtures with contempt. Also, his ideal did not stand for much when the dialogue was conducted from a presumed or actual position of superiority, as was often the case with Dalits and Adivasis. It is wrong, however, to argue that Gandhi's dialogic approach precluded conflict and led to collaboration, as some of his opponents on both the left and right argued. Gandhi's position was that contradictions are best resolved through dialogue, but failing that, a non-violent challenge might be the only strategy of integrity. He himself rarely shied away from such conflict if he judged it to be necessary. However, every effort had to be made to avoid acrimony, so as to make it easier for opponents to live with each other in the future.

After Indian independence, the Gandhian approach was seen most strongly in the Sarvodaya and Bhoodan movements, which were at their height in the 1950s. With their decline in the 1960s, it seemed that the Gandhian model had become outmoded and out of touch with contemporary needs. However, Gandhian-style activism then began to braid with the 'new social movements', such as those demanding lower-class

emancipation, women's rights, environmental protection, and a non-belligerent foreign policy for India. The new social movements have provided a strong critique of the path taken by the Indian nation state since independence. They have shown up the hollowness of a democracy that claims to operate in the interests of the mass of the people, yet fails to provide the essential resources that the poor need for a decent livelihood. They have revealed the patriarchy that is entrenched deeply within the polity, its war-mongering and seeking of cheap popularity through attacks on minorities. They have rejected the hegemonic discourse of 'development', with its project of interlinking nation states within the global circulation of capital by fostering a world culture based on modern technology and communications, with each sphere of life becoming a field for capitalist profit.[1] It is argued that, far from helping the poor, such 'development' has at a global level created an ever-widening chasm, for whereas in 1950 the gap in average incomes between the developed and underdeveloped countries was estimated at 35 to 1, in 1992 it was estimated to be 72 to 1. Today, the annual income of 582 million people of all of the underdeveloped countries is said to be equivalent to only thirteen percent of the wealth of the two hundred richest capitalists.[2]

Gandhian ideas and techniques have played an important role in several of these movements. Environmentalism provides a case in point. Gandhi has been seen as an inspiring figure for many in the ecology movement there, which began with the Chipko Andolan in 1973- This involved civil resistance, with protesters hugging trees to save them from the axes of commercial foresters. Chandiprasad Bhatt, who took the lead in this, described himself as a Gandhian, and another prominent leader, Sunderlal Bahuguna, was a Sarvodaya worker. Similarly with the movement against large dams on the Narmada river, which began in the mid-1980s. The prominent leaders Medha Patkar and Baba Amte both acknowledge their debt to Gandhi. Environmentalists have also engaged in a series of Gandhian-style padayatras—long-distance marches—through areas

threatened with environmental degradation to draw attention to the problem.[3] As Ramachandra Guha has pointed out, not all ecology activists have claimed to be Gandhians—there are socialists, Marxists, Christians and others—but Gandhi has been probably the most important single influence.[4]

The new social movements operate in a number of discrete spheres. A theoretical justification for this may be found in the writings of Foucault, in his argument that hegemonic power is dispersed throughout the social formation in various sites, with each site expressing a particular relationship of domination and subordination.[5] The new social movements seek to challenge these relationships of power at each of the levels at which they operate. They do not do this through the direct capture of state power through elections, but through trying to transform the nature of politics itself. This in itself is a very Gandhian approach.

The problem then becomes one of articulation between the different spheres—an ongoing problem, but a dialogic process. In practice, the issues taken up by the new social movements may braid with each other, allowing for solidarity between movements. For example, the movement against big dams—which is ostensibly 'environmental'—is also a struggle for Adivasi rights. It has parallels, furthermore, with the struggle for land waged by groups such as Vahini in Bihar, both being concerned with access to crucial productive resources for the poor.

We can argue that in fact Gandhi was in the long run very successful in building such an alternative politics, as seen in the modern ubiquity of satyagraha in India. In this respect, we may see people such as Baba Amte and Medha Patkar as the truest successors to Gandhi in India today. They continue to uphold an alternative arcadian, anti-imperialist and non-violent vision, the resonance of which appears to be growing today, with an increasing appreciation of the moral superiority of such values. For many, such a politics provides the greatest hope for India in the future.

Outside India, Gandhi has most widely been taken as a symbol of the struggle against European imperialism and white racism. Even those who have condemned his insistence on non-violence as a moral principle—for example Malcolm X—have admired Gandhi's struggle to assert the self-pride of the colonised and oppressed. Gandhi has provided a template for the modern moral activist—that is, a person who assumes moral leadership of the poor and oppressed in an age that aspires to but falls woefully short of the ideal of democracy Though in the mould of the great saints of the past, they are—in contrast with those saints—people whose work is carried on within civil society This is a political space which exists in a state of tension with government and which is a creation of post-Enlightenment modernity Civil society provides a critical instrumental means to check the excesses of governmental power. Within this space, religion finds a place primarily in terms of abstract notions of morality and conscience. The moral activists have operated within this sphere of politics, and their work has been intensely political.

Such people are, ideally, courageous moral leaders—fighters by nature—who engage with the political in the interests of the subaltern without being sullied by power. They have had a powerful sense of destiny and an ability to inspire a fierce loyalty from others within a movement. They are people blessed with a rare quality of leadership, with personalities that may be described as 'electric'[6] and with a sure ability to communicate their beliefs with passion and imagination. They have strong moral standards that they are known to conform to with sincerity in their daily lives, often living in an austere way and rejecting a desire for personal wealth. Although strong in maintaining their own truths, they are open to counter-dialogues, and are big enough as people to change their minds if they see that they are wrong in a particular matter.[7]

Although these moral activists devote themselves to the poor and oppressed, they tend to come from provincial middle-class families. Although of a local élite, such people are relatively marginal, and they have

to struggle hard to assert themselves in metropolitan cultures. They have generally received a solid education, which includes professional training. Even Malcolm X, whose father was a small-town church minister, had sufficient education to train to be a lawyer, but was thwarted in his ambition by racial prejudice. Only then did he migrate to New York City and become a proletarian hustler and then burglar. He regained his destiny through moral reform and self-education in jail. Their education—often to the very highest levels of academic life—allows them to engage with ideas at a rarefied theoretical level on the one hand, while putting their beliefs into practice in the streets on the other.

Several of these moral activists have followed Gandhi's example by making strict non-violence a principle of their politics. Martin Luther King is the outstanding example in this respect, but another more recent figure of comparable moral stature has been Aung San Suu Kyi in Burma. From 1988 onwards she and her party, the National League for Democracy, have sustained a non-violent protest against the ruthless military junta that has ruled Burma since 1962. The party won over eighty percent of the seats contested in an election held in 1990, but the result was ignored by the junta. Aung San Suu Kyi was placed under house arrest from 1989 to 1995, and has suffered an informal blockade and continuous harassment since then. In 1991 she was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace—the first person to do so while under detention. Although she has been told that she is free to leave the country, she has refused to do so—even to visit her husband when he was dying of cancer in England—for fear that she would be refused re-entry. Many of her comrades have been jailed and tortured, but her personal and moral prestige is such that the junta has not dared to do the same to her.

Like Gandhi, she adopts non-violent civil disobedience as a matter of principle. For her, it provides a most active form of resistance: 'Some people think that non-violence is passiveness. It's not so. I know it is the slower way, and I understand why our young people feel that it will not work. But I

cannot encourage that kind of attitude. Because if I do, we will be perpetuating a cycle of violence that will never come to an end.'[8]

She refuses to hate her opponents, as she feels that she needs to be open always to the possibility that they can be persuaded. Also, she believes that you cannot really be frightened of people whom you do not hate. 'Hate and fear go hand-in-hand.'[9] She is prepared always to hold out the hand of forgiveness and reconciliation. In all of these respects, she is a leader truly in the Gandhian mould.

Although the peace and ecology movements of the richer metropolitan countries have deployed many Gandhian principles to powerful effect, they have been unable to accommodate such charismatic moral leadership. In many respects, this has been a deliberate choice. In part it represents a rejection of the *fuhrer* figure—the leader whose popularity has, in recent European history, degenerated into a dangerous demagogy. It is also a product of the anarchist tradition from which many of these movements have emerged. This antipathy to the leader-figure has been a strength in some respects, allowing as it does for a more democratic practice. For groups involved in campaigns of civil disobedience, it is also harder for the authorities to suppress a movement with multiple leaders. The great drawback has been that potential leaders with great tactical insight and charisma may be silenced. In this way, a movement can undercut its greatest assets, and it might lose direction. The person who more than any other grappled with this dilemma was Petra Kelly.

There are also the great moral activists who do not endorse non-violence as a principle, but whose quality of leadership has parallels with that of Gandhi. Nelson Mandela, Steve Biko and Malcolm X have, in their different ways, been exemplary figures of this sort. They stand for the self-assertion and pride-in-self of the oppressed, being in their own lives outstanding examples of people who have transcended the status imposed on them by white racists and imperialists. They condemn what Steve Biko characterised

as 'the system'[10]—that is the structures of racism and imperialism—while recognising that individuals can transcend it from within.[11] They thus seek to open a dialogue with more moderate elements within the structure of power. This striving has often, however, been denied by those within 'the system' whose fear of any dialogue is such that their only riposte is imprisonment, torture or the assassin's bullet.

The moral activist puts her or his life on the line by challenging the 'system' to do its worst. Too often, the challenge has been taken up, and the activist has been murdered. Each such violent and premature death has been a tragic setback. There is however hope, for people of such ethical power have again and again emerged to pose the questions in new ways and to suggest new answers. They have not been perfect beings—they have had their human weaknesses and sometimes made great mistakes. Their personal family lives have often been sad, even tragic. But still, they are people who in their fierce and uncompromising moral commitment have soared above those around them. They stand for a human spirit that refuses to be crushed by the leviathan of the modern 'system' of violence, oppression and exploitation, and which aspires for a better, more equitable and non-violent future. In this, they inspire huge numbers. In them, Gandhi—their model—still lives.

99. Ibid., p. 235.

100. Michael R. Dove, 'Local Dimensions of "Global" Environmental Debates', in Arne Kalland and Gerard Persoon (eds), *Environmental Movements in Asia*, Curzon, Richmond 1998.

101. The religious sites along the Narmada are described in Geoffrey Waring Maw, *Narmada: The Life of a River*, Marjorie Sykes, Selly Oak, no date (c.1992).

102. Baviskar, *In the Belly of the River*, pp. 214–16.

103. Parita Mukta, 'Worshipping Inequalities: Pro-Narmada Dam Movement', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 13 October 1990, p. 2300. It should be noticed that the Hindu right has, ironically, taken the opposite stance in regard to the Tehri Dam on the Ganga, which it condemns as a sacrilege against that holy river. R. Ramachandran, 'The Tehri Turnabout', *Frontline*, Vol. 18, No. 10, 12–25 May 2001.

104. The process of class polarisation is analysed by Mukta, 'Wresting Riches, Marginalising the Poor, Criminalising Dissent'.

105. Ostergaard, *Nonviolent Revolution in India*, pp. 339–40.

106. Bhatia, 'The Naxalite Movement in Central Bihar', pp. 90 and 96–8.

107. Pinto, *Gandhi's Vision and Values*, pp. 151–2.

108. Ibid., pp. 141–6.

109. W.H. Morris-Jones, 'The Unhappy Utopia', *Economic Weekly*, 25 June 1960.

110. Scarfe, *J.P. His Biography*, pp. 199–200.

111. Khilnani, *The Idea of India*, pp. 104–5.

112. Ibid., pp. 187–8.

113. Bakshi, *Bapu Kuti*, is a recent, popular study which describes several Gandhian projects and initiatives of very diverse sorts which have been carried through with great success in many different regions of India in the past two decades.

Chapter 9

1. Gilbert, *Winston S. Churchill*, Vol. 5, p. 390.

[2.] Patrick French, *Liberty or Death: India's Journey to Independence and Division*, Flamingo, London 1997, pp. 166 & 188.

[3.] Penderel Moon (ed.), *Wavell: The Viceroy's Journal*, Oxford University Press, London 1973, pp. 185 & 236.

[4.] Fischer, *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi*, pp. 356–7.

[5.] Dalton, *Mahatma Gandhi*, pp. 125–30 and footnote 156, p. 227.

[6.] S. Gopal, *The Viceroyalty of Lord Irwin 1926–1931*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1957, p. 98.

[7.] Pupul Jayakar, *J. Krishnamurti: A Biography*, Penguin Books, New Delhi 1986, p. 22.

[8.] Ibid., p. 76.

[9.] Quoted in Fischer, *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi*, p. 365.

[10.] Ibid., p. 369

[11.] Lanza del Vasto, *Return to the Source*, pp. 100–1.

[12.] Ibid., p. 102.

[13.] Eknath Easwaran, *The Compassionate Universe: The Power of the Individual to Heal the Environment*, Penguin Books India, New Delhi 2001, pp. 21–2.

[14.] Lanza del Vasto, *Return to the Source*, pp. 9–13; Mark Shepard, *The Community of the Ark*, Simple Productions, Arcata, California 1990.

[15.] Fischer, *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi*, p. 252.

[16.] Alan Stewart, 'Gandhi in a Cloth Cap', in *I Remember ... the North East: Recollections of Yesteryear*, The Pentland Press, Bishop Auckland 1993, pp. 3–8.

[17.] Fischer, *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi*, p. 353.

[18.] Ibid., p. 366.

[19.] Ibid., p. 360.

[20.] Previously 'pacifism' meant a preference for peace rather than war, and did not imply a rejection of violence in all instances. James Hinton, *Protests and Visions: Peace Politics in 20th Century Britain*, Hutchinson Radius, London 1989, p. x.

[21.] Fisher, *That Strange Little Brown Man Gandhi*, p. 57.

[22.] Peter van den Dungen, 'Introduction to the 1989 edition', Bart de Ligt, *The Conquest of Violence: An Essay on War and Revolution*, Pluto Press, London 1989.

[23.] Fisher, *That Strange Little Brown Man Gandhi*, pp. 58–9.

[24.] Richard B. Gregg, *The Psychology and Strategy of Gandhi's Non-Violent Resistance*, Madras 1929; *Gandhism and Socialism*, Madras 1931; *The Power of Non-Violence*, Philadelphia 1934.

[25.] Ostergaard, *Nonviolent Revolution in India*, p. xiii.

[26.] 'Atom Bomb and Ahimsa', 1 July 1946, *Harijan*, 7 July 1946, *CWMG*, Vol. 91, p. 221.

[27.] 'Talk with an English Journalist', before 24 September 1946, *CWMG*, Vol. 92, p. 234.

[28.] Randle, *Civil Resistance*, p. 55.

[29.] Sara Parkin, *The Life and Death of Petra Kelly*, Pandora, London 1994, pp. 112–13 & 133–7.

[30.] Alice Cook and Gwyn Kirk, *Greenham Women Everywhere: Dreams, Ideas and Actions from the Women's Movement*, Pluto Press, London 1983, pp. 5 and 32–3.

[31.] Randle, *Civil Resistance*, p. 83.

[32.] 'Peace Brigades International: History and Structure', http://www.igc.org/pbi/history.html

[33.] 'Peace Brigades International: What We Do', http://www.igc.org/pbi/workoverview.html

[34.] Scarfe, *J.P. His Biography*, pp. 215–18.

[35.] Ostergaard, *Nonviolent Revolution in India*, p. 383, fn. 72. Presumably, the idea was that huge reservoirs, perhaps underground, could be blasted out by such means. The idea appears bizarre, seeing that such reservoirs would have been highly radioactive and could never have been used to store water which would be safe for human consumption or crop irrigation. Bhave appears to have been very ignorant as to the nature of nuclear weaponry, as well as the appalling consequences of nuclear radiation.

[36.] Ostergaard, *Nonviolent Revolution in India*, p. 97, claims that JP gave his 'full support' to the nuclear test. Narayan Desai, who was very close to JP at that time, says that this is quite incorrect—JP was strongly against it. Interview with Narayan Desai, Vedchhi, 10 December 2000.

[37.] As far back as 1946, Nehru had stated that India should 'use the atomic force for constructive purposes'. In the next sentence he went on to say that if India was threatened she should use any

means of defence available. M.V. Ramana, 'Nehru and Nuclear Conspiracy', *Anumukti*, Vol. 11, Nos. 5 & 6, April-July 1998, p. 5.

38. Praful Bidwai and Achin Vanaik, *New Nukes: India, Pakistan and Global Nuclear Disarmament*, Signal Books, Oxford 2000, pp. 129 and 140–2. In a personal communication of 11 February 2002, Praful Bidwai has stated that: 'Many of us are also especially moved by Gandhi's description of the Bomb as the most "diabolical" misuse of science. His logic, that you can't use the Bomb to fight the Bomb, is unassailable. It contains the seeds of a profound argument against nuclear deterrence. This I consider an especially valuable part of his legacy. However, I wouldn't quite call myself a Gandhian, either within the (Sarvodaya) organisational perspective, or in sharing his absolute—I know this is over-simple—faith in nonviolence, with some of its self-purificatory and spiritual references, etc ... I am a bit agnostic about categorical non-violence, but deeply respectful and empathetic.'

39. Bidwai and Vanaik, *New Nukes*, p. 142.

40. 'Anti-Dam, Anti-Bomb Activists Join Hands', *The Hindu*, 12 November 2000.

41. Dalton, *Mahatma Gandhi*, pp. 101–20.

42. Randle, *Civil Resistance*, pp. 8–9.

43. Ibid., pp. 5–6 and 17.

44. Ibid., pp. 57–8.

45. Ibid., pp. 8–9.

46. This is the judgement of *Time* magazine, 31 December 1999, pp. 24–6.

47. Interview to American Negro Delegation, 21 February 1936, *CWMG*, Vol. 68, pp. 234–8.

48. Krishnalal Shridharani, *War Without Violence: A Study of Gandhi's Method and its Accomplishments*, Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York 1939. Shridharani describes his participation in the Gandhian movement in India on pp. xxxiii–xxxv.

49. Taylor Branch, *Parting the Waters: Martin Luther King and the Civil Rights Movement 1954–63*, Simon and Schuster, New York 1988, p. 171.

50. Ibid., p. 171.

51. Ibid., pp. 171–2.

52. Ibid., p. 172.

[53.] Stephen B. Oates, *Let the Trumpet Sound: A Life of Martin Luther King Jr.*, Payback Press, Edinburgh 1998, pp. 7–8.

[54.] Ibid., pp. 32–3.

[55.] Branch, *Parting the Waters*, p. 74.

[56.] Oates, *Let the Trumpet Sound*, p. 32.

[57.] Howard Thurman, *Jesus and the Disinherited*, Friends United Press, Richmond, IN. 1981, p. 29, quoted in Greg Moses, *Revolution of Conscience: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Philosophy of Nonviolence*, The Guilford Press, New York 1997, p. 182.

[58.] Ibid., p. 10.

[59.] Dalton, *Mahatma Gandhi*, pp. 178–82. The quote is from Martin Luther King, *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story*, Harper, New York 1958, p. 67.

[60.] Oates, *Let the Trumpet Sound*, p. 145.

[61.] Ibid., p. 135.

[62.] Ibid., p. 157.

[63.] Ibid., p. 161.

[64.] Ibid., p. 38.

[65.] Ibid., pp. 188–201.

[66.] Ibid., p. 210.

[67.] Ibid., p. 212.

[68.] Ibid., p. 216.

[69.] Ibid., p. 221.

[70.] 'Letter From Birmingham City Jail', in James Melvin Washington (ed.), *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, Harper Collins, New York 1991, p. 291.

[71.] Ibid., pp. 292–3.

[72.] Oates, *Let the Trumpet Sound*, p. 235.

73. Ibid., p. 237.

74. Ibid., p. 339.

75. 'Letter From Birmingham City Jail', in Washington (ed.), *A Testament of Hope*, p. 295.

76. Oates, *Let the Trumpet Sound*, p. 288.

77. Ibid., p. 282.

78. Ibid., p. 144.

79. Ibid., p. 288.

80. Ibid., p. 283

81. Ibid., p. 306.

82. Malcolm X, *By Any Means Necessary*, Pathfinder Press, New York 1992, pp. 8–9.

83. 'An Interview by A.B. Spellman', in ibid., pp. 5–6.

84. 'Bayard Rustin Meets Malcolm X', *Freedom Review*, January-February 1993.

85. Oates, *Let the Trumpet Sound*, p. 378.

86. Ibid., pp. 392–3.

87. Ibid., pp. 293–4.

88. Ibid., p. 397.

89. Ibid., p. 398.

90. Ibid., p. 400.

91. Moses, *Revolution of Conscience*, p. 191.

92. Martin Luther King, *Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community?* Beacon, Boston 1967, p. 64.

93. Ibid., p. 28.

94. Oates, *Let the Trumpet Sound*, pp. 409–10.

95. Ibid., pp. 412–16.

96. Ibid., p. 418.

97. Moses, *Revolution of Conscience*, p. 149.

98. Martin Luther King, *Where Do We Go From Here*, p. 63.

99. Ibid., p. 37.

100. Ibid.

101. Moses, *Revolution of Conscience*, p. 191.

102. Martin Luther King, *Where Do We Go From Here*, p. 44.

103. Oates, *Let the Trumpet Sound*, p. 182.

104. Ibid., p. 270.

105. Ibid., p. 285.

106. Ibid., p. 351.

107. Ibid., p. 285.

108. Malcolm X, *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*, with the assistance of Alex Haley, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth 1968, pp. 51–2.

109. Ibid., p. 365.

110. Ibid., pp. 289 & 303.

111. Ibid., pp. 397–8.

112. Ibid., pp. 335–6.

113. Ibid., pp. 403–4, 408, 413, 415, 416 & 419.

114. Ibid., pp. 447, 449 & 454.

115. Ibid., p. 479.

116. Ibid., p. 21.

117. Ibid., p. 496.

[118.] He himself in his final days suspected that there was an organised plot to kill him which came from forces other than the Nation of Islam. Ibid., pp. 55 & 57.

[119.] Ibid., pp. 271, 344 & 375.

[120.] For King's launching, in his last year, of a new campaign against poverty which cut across racial divides see Moses, *Revolution of Conscience*, pp. 33–4.

[121.] Ibid., p. 202.

[122.] For a report of 1925 on Manilal Gandhi's work, see Fisher, *That Strange Little Brown Man Gandhi*, pp. xvii–xviii and 46.

[123.] Mandela, *Long Walk to Freedom*, p. 98.

[124.] Ibid., pp. 97–8 and 119.

[125.] Ibid., p. 119.

[126.] Ibid., pp. 146–7.

[127.] Ibid., p. 261.

[128.] Ibid.

[129.] Nelson Mandela, 'The Sacred Warrior', *Time*, 31 December 1999, p. 96.

[130.] Ibid., p. 94.

[131.] Mandela, *Long Walk to Freedom*, p. 272.

[132.] Randle, *Civil Resistance*, pp. 73–4.

[133.] Mandela, *Long Walk to Freedom*, p. 615.

[134.] Ibid., pp. 248–9.

[135.] Ibid., p. 552.

[136.] Ibid., p. 604.

[137.] Martin Meredith, *Nelson Mandela: A Biography*, Hamish Hamilton, London 1997, pp. 347–8.

[138.] Ibid., p. 327

[139.] Ibid., pp. 327–8.

140. Donald Woods, *Biko*, Paddington Press, London 1978, p. 104.

141. Ibid., pp. 104–5.

142. Ibid., p. 55.

143. Ibid., p. 61. Woods (1933–2001) was a white journalist who fled South Africa in late 1977 to escape persecution for his anti-apartheid work. Obituary in *The Guardian*, 21 August 2001.

144. Meredith, *Nelson Mandela*, pp. 339–40.

145. Ibid., pp. 396–7.

146. On the dust jacket of his autobiography he is described as 'the world's most significant moral leader since Mahatma Gandhi'. *Long Walk to Freedom*.

147. Petra Kelly, *Nonviolence Speaks to Power*, edited by Glenn D. Paige and Sarah Gilliart, Centre for Global Nonviolence Planning Project, Hawaii, 1992, pp. 161–6.

148. Gene Sharp was an American who wrote widely on the techniques of Gandhian non-violent action. Parkin, *The Life and Death of Petra Kelly*, p. 106.

149. Petra Kelly, 'Gandhi and the Green Party', *Gandhi Marg*, July-September 1989, pp. 192–202.

150. Parkin, *The Life and Death of Petra Kelly*, p. 108.

151. Ibid., pp. 21 & 26.

152. Ibid., pp. 48 & 65.

153. Ibid., p. 105.

154. Kelly, *Nonviolence Speaks to Power*, p. 33.

155. Parkin, *The Life and Death of Petra Kelly*, p. 114.

156. Kelly, *Nonviolence Speaks to Power*, p. 17.

157. Ibid., p. 33.

158. Ibid., p. 125.

159. Gyorgy Konrad, quoted in Parkin, *The Life and Death of Petra Kelly*, p. 128.

160. Kelly, *Nonviolence Speaks to Power*, p. 148.

[161.] Glenn D. Paige, 'Introduction' to Kelly, *Nonviolence Speaks to Power*, pp. 7–11.

[162.] Parkin, *The Life and Death of Petra Kelly*, p. 131.

[163.] Kelly, *Nonviolence Speaks to Power*, p. 154.

[164.] Thomas Poguntke, *Alternative Politics: The German Green Party*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh 1993, p. 145; E. Gene Frankland and Donald Schoonmaker, *Between Protest and Power: The Green Party in Germany*, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado 1992, p. 113.

[165.] Parkin, *The Life and Death of Petra Kelly*, pp. 138, 159–60, 162 & 173–4.

[166.] Frankland and Schoonmaker, *Between Protest and Power*, p. 218.

[167.] Kelly, *Nonviolence Speaks to Power*, p. 155.

[168.] Ibid., p. 158.

[169.] Frankland and Schoonmaker, *Between Protest and Power*, pp. 220–1.

[170.] Parkin, *The Life and Death of Petra Kelly*, pp. xxv, 4–5 & 12; *Who killed Petra Kelly?*, www.motherjones.com/motherjones/JF93/hertsgaard.html

[171.] Glenn D. Paige, 'Introduction' to Kelly, *Nonviolence Speaks to Power*, p. 9.

[172.] Parkin, *The Life and Death of Petra Kelly*, pp. 93–6.

[173.] Ibid., p. 122.

[174.] Ibid., pp. 180–1.

[175.] Ibid., pp. 186–7 & 200.

[176.] Ibid., p. 180.

Chapter 10

[1] Pramod Parajuli, 'Power and Knowledge in Development Discourse: New Social Movements and the State in India', *International and Social Science Journal,* February 1991, No. 127, pp. 174–6.

[2] These estimates are from *United Nations Human Development Report*, June 2000, reported in *The Guardian,* 29 June 2000.