



Peace and Conflict Studies 164A
2006
Prof. Michael Nagler

Transcripts

[Updated 02/06/2023]

Table of Contents

1. Overview 1: Strategic and Principled Nonviolence	18
Nonviolent Communication	18
Story of Ladakh	19
Story of Bihar	21
Personal Satyagraha	23
Positive vs Negative Energy.....	24
Syllabus Summary	24
Search for a Nonviolent Future	26
Hope or Terror.....	29
Three Faces of Power	35
2. Overview 2: Strategic and Principled Nonviolence	38
Means and Ends are Inseparable.....	38
Three Faces of Power	39
Withdrawal of Consent.....	40
Shifting the Paradigm.....	42
The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.....	42
Differences between Principled and Strategic Nonviolence.....	43
Principled Nonviolence.....	44
Importance of Nonviolent Training.....	45
Moral Boundaries.....	45
Does Nonviolence Work?	46
Etymology of Ahimsā.....	47
Duffy's Satyagraha.....	49
Persuasion vs Coercion	50
Rules of Fasting 1-2.....	51
Etymology of Violence	52
Structural Violence.....	53
Story of the Boy Who Ate Too Much Sugar.....	54
Rules of fasting 3-5.....	54

3. More Background 1: How 'Science' and 'History' Weigh-in on the Possibility of the 'Nonviolent Effect'	55
Applying the Rules of Fasting.....	55
Noncooperation.....	58
Scientific Paradigm.....	59
Gandhi's Epic Fast.....	60
Prejudices in Science.....	62
Primate Studies.....	63
The New Biology.....	63
Three Questions of Matter.....	65
Quantum Nature.....	67
Conscious and Subjective Reality.....	69
Quantum Inseparability and Interconnection.....	71
Study of Life.....	73
Universal Phenomenon.....	75
4. More Background 2: How 'Science' and 'History' Weigh-in on the Possibility of the 'Nonviolent Effect'	77
PITS.....	78
Wealth Distribution in the USA.....	78
Non-responsibility, Obedience, and Violence.....	79
Suffering of Separateness.....	81
In the PITS.....	81
Heart Unity.....	82
Respect and Dignity.....	83
Gandhi and Disrespect.....	84
Violence vs Cowardice.....	86
About the Amygdala.....	86
Dignity and Self-respect.....	87
Nonviolent Communication.....	88
Competition vs Cooperation.....	89
Frans de Waal and the Chimpanzees.....	90
Rosenstraße – Nonviolence vs Nazis.....	92

Human Needs Theory.....	93
Shift the Prevailing Paradigm	94
Mirror Neurons	95
Altruism and the Brain	96
The Influential Power of Empathy.....	97
5. The Vedanta as Old/New Paradigm 1	100
Mirror Neurons and Scarcity.....	101
Round Table Conference 1931	102
Persuasion vs Coercion	103
Paradigm of Abundance.....	104
Investigation vs Injury	105
Behavioral Inconsistency.....	106
The Matter of Paradigm.....	106
Cooperation vs Competition	107
The Science of History	107
Nagler's Law.....	108
Physics of the Vedanta	110
Bhagavad Gita -- Three Parts of the Vedanta.....	112
Dharma	112
Swadharma.....	115
Karma: Gita Theory of Action	119
Detachment from Results.....	120
6. The Vedanta as Old/New Paradigm 2.....	121
Theory of Action and the Three Guṇas.....	121
Clash of Civilizations.....	121
Satyagraha in South Africa	122
Gandhi and the Gita.....	123
Three Modes of Realization.....	124
Karma Yoga.....	125
Detach from the Outcome.....	126
Attachments and Outcomes	128
Gandhi and Renunciation.....	129

Mindfulness of Desire	129
Success is Proportionate to the Purity of Effort	130
Practice of Living in Community	131
Three Gunas	132
The Well-Being of the Whole vs Personal Desire.....	133
Intention and Right Action - Gandhi and the Calf	135
Intention and Right Action - The Angry Sheikh	136
PITS	136
Arjuna's Sva-Dharma	137
The Heaviness of the Sword	137
Action vs Inaction.....	138
Model of the Three Gunas - Tamas, Rajas, and Satva	139
Gandhi in South Africa	139
Gandhi and the Train Incident.....	140
7. The First Phase 1: Arrival in South Africa to the Birth of Satyagraha (1893-1906).....	143
Parallel of Satyagraha and the Atom Bomb	143
Three Gunas	147
Sanskara Model: Three Gunas and Nonviolence.....	148
Cowardice vs Violence.....	148
Gandhi the Lawyer, in South Africa.....	149
South Africa: British and the Dutch.....	150
Miners Strike 1913	153
Gandhi's Beginning of Political Work	154
Gita's Theory of Action and Gandhi's Political Movement.....	155
Constructive Program	156
Gandhi's Encounters with Violence.....	158
1899 Boer War and the Ambulance Corps	160
Gandhi and Gokhale.....	162
Return to South Africa - Influence of John Ruskin	162
Gandhi's Communities	163

8. The First Phase 2: Arrival in South Africa to the Birth of Satyagraha (1893-1906)	165
Neuroplasticity.....	166
Epigenetics.....	166
Growth Mode vs Protection Mode.....	167
Intro to Restorative Justice.....	168
Spirituality and Overcoming Fear with a Mantram.....	169
Religion and Swadeshi.....	170
Compromise on Inessentials.....	170
Persuasion vs Coercion.....	171
Importance of Internal Improvement.....	171
Paradox of Repression.....	172
Zulu "Rebellion".....	174
Commitment of Trusteeship.....	175
People Power, Person Power, and State Power.....	175
The Black Act.....	177
Filling Jails with Satyagrahis.....	178
Gandhi and Smuts.....	178
Baptism in Fire.....	180
Gandhi and Smuts contd.....	181
Gandhi's Mission.....	182
No Fresh Issue.....	182
Hind Swaraj.....	184
9. Success in South Africa 1: Return to India and the Year of Silence	186
Martyrdom and Nonviolence.....	186
Struggle and 'Personal Fruits'.....	187
Paradox of Oppression.....	188
Person Power - Clinging to Principles.....	190
Organizing a Movement.....	191
Gandhian Education.....	191
Gandhi, Gokhale, and Smuts.....	192
Imprisonment of Gandhi and India.....	194

The Maharajas and the Pancayat.....	195
East India Mutiny - Paradox of Repression	196
Patient Bearing of Suffering.....	197
Miners Strike at Newcastle.....	198
Swadeshi and Self-Reliance	198
The Great March of Newcastle.....	200
Gandhi's Multiple Arrests.....	201
Purity of Person Power and Outside Assistance	201
Persuasion vs Coercion	202
Noncooperation.....	203
Non-embarrassment.....	204
10. Success in South Africa 2: Return to India and the Year of Silence	208
Three Grades of Nonviolent Conversion	209
Courage and Self-Discipline.....	210
Three Principles of Satyagraha.....	211
Gandhi and the Caste System.....	212
Fourth Principle of Satyagraha.....	213
Gandhi vs Tolstoy.....	214
Gandhi's Nonviolent Leadership.....	215
Nonviolence in the Northwest Frontier	215
Hind Swaraj.....	216
Peace - Negative vs Positive	218
Vinoba Bhave and the Dacoits	218
Norman Cousins - Bacteria in the Fog.....	219
Nonviolent Protection and Defense.....	220
Culture of Decentralization in India.....	221
Evaluating Success of Nonviolence.....	222
Hind Swaraj and the West.....	223
Spirituality and Nonviolent Leadership.....	224
Gandhi's Medicine and Spirituality.....	225
Gandhi's Objections to Democracy	228
11. Tragedy at Amritsar 1: Rebellion Heats Up.....	230

Early Freedom Struggles of India	230
Two Mandates of Nonviolence	232
Arousal of Courage and Confidence	232
Pattern of Swadeshi	234
Satyagraha and Person Power	236
MLK Jr. and the Law of Progression	236
Rowlatt Act - Paradox of Repression	237
Champaran Trial	239
Higher Law of Conscience	239
Rules of Civil Disobedience	239
Apology of Socrates and Civil Disobedience	241
Means and Ends of Nonviolence	241
Mill Strike in Ahmedabad and Gandhi Fasting	242
Gita Theory of Action	243
Propaganda and Clinging to Truth	244
Amritsar Massacre	244
Summary of Freedom Struggles in India	245
Spiritual Communities	246
Gandhi's Early Victories in India	247
The Keys Affair	248
Chauri Chaura - Suspension of Satyagraha	249
12. Tragedy at Amritsar 2: Rebellion Heats Up	251
Jallianwalla Bagh Massacre	252
Nonviolence vs Structural Violence	252
Sacrifice of the Satyagrahi	253
Gandhi's "Himalayan Miscalculations"	253
Satyagrahis and Structural Violence	254
Gandhi's Fallback of Sacrifice and Constructive Programme	257
Chauri Chaura Episode	259
Addressing the British, Hindu Castes, and Hindu-Muslim Unity	259
Dignity and Untouchability	259
Importance of Sanitation in Self-reliance	261

Teaching Without Words	262
The Beginning of the Bardoli Satyagraha	263
The Patna Surrender - Surrender as a Nonviolent Tactic.....	265
Bardoli Satyagraha	266
The Salt Satyagraha - Dharasana.....	267
The Nonviolent Moment	271
13. The Final Phase 1: Legacy of Triumph and Tragedy.....	272
M.E.T.T.A.....	272
Course Review	272
Results of the Salt Satyagraha.....	274
Commoditization of Natural Resources.....	276
Gandhi's Response to Commoditization.....	277
The Epic Fast of 1932.....	279
Ambedkar's Mistrust.....	281
Differences in Dedication Between Gandhi and Ambedkar	282
The Grand Illusion	282
Effects of the Epic Fast - Yeravda Pact.....	283
Formalization of Constructive Program	284
Constructive Program and No Fresh Issue.....	285
Constructive Program as a Nonviolent Tactic.....	287
Quit India and WWII.....	288
Civilian Based Defense and Third-Party Intervention.....	289
Quit India and Non-embarrassment.....	290
January 30th, 1948.....	291
14. The Final Phase 2: Legacy of Triumph and Tragedy.....	293
Abdul Ghaffar Khan and the Four Myths About Nonviolence	293
Myth 1: Nonviolence Only Works Against the Weak.....	293
Myth 2: Nonviolence is Gentle	295
Myth 3: Islam is No Place for Nonviolence.....	295
Myth 4: Nonviolence Cannot Be a Substitute for Warfare	296
The Khudai Khidmatgar.....	296
The Early Life of Abdul Ghaffar Khan.....	296

Abdul Ghaffar Khan's Village Uplift.....	298
The Muslim League and Indian National Congress	300
Qissa Khwani Bazaar Episode	301
Partition of India and Pakistan	301
Peace Armies	302
Organization of the Khudai Khidmatgars.....	305
Four Myths of Nonviolence - Summary	306
Persuasion vs Coercion	307
More Myths about Nonviolence.....	310
Work vs “Work”	310
Shanti Sena and Civilian Based Defense	313
15. Review.....	315
Forgiveness and Nonviolent Response.....	315
Eugene Anarchists.....	316
The Great Turning	317
DACE System	317
Counterintuitive Concessions.....	322
Rights of Fasting.....	323
Effervescence of the Crowd	325
Doable Demand.....	326
Gandhian Context of Non-Embarrassment.....	327
Nonviolent Courage of the Pashtuns.....	328
Non-Embarrassment and Restorative Justice	329
Awakening vs Coercion	331
Phalam - Fruits of Action	332
Meaning of Mahatma.....	335
Suffering and Progression	335
16. Guest Lecturer - M.P. Mathai.....	338
Lok Sevak Sangh.....	339
Constructive Program -Sarva Seva Sangh	339
Kasturba Trust.....	340
Vinoba Bhave and Landgift Movement.....	341

Total Revolution	341
Kundai Commission	342
Grassroots Movements and Struggling Villages	343
17. Nonviolence in the West (yes, there is).....	346
Three Stages of Religion	347
Faith-Based Nonviolence	349
Scapegoating.....	350
Buphonia - Ox- Murder.....	351
Power Shifting of Sacrifice.....	352
Communal Sacrifice of Sheep	353
Retributive Justice	354
Historical Jesus & Nonviolence.....	357
Gnostic Gospels	358
The Kingdom Movement.....	359
18. Medieval and Modern Nonviolent Christian Sects 1: the Society of Friends (Quakers)	364
Three Institutions of Religion	364
Non- Embarrassment.....	365
Influence of Hinduism on Gandhi.....	366
Non-attachment to Results.....	367
Tolstoy Farm	367
Gandhi's Alternative to Punishment.....	368
Nonviolent Confrontation to Awaken a Perspective.....	369
Religious Peacebuilding.....	369
Nonviolent Principles in Islam	371
The Nonviolent Tradition in Islam	372
The First Intifada.....	373
Dan Ellsberg and the Pentagon Papers.....	374
Negative Lens of Selective Pacifism	375
Jesus' Kingdom Movement.....	376
Origen - Children of Peace.....	377
Gladiators and Commitment to War.....	378

The Importance of Will	380
Violence and Martyrdom	382
19. Medieval and Modern Nonviolent Christian Sects 2: the Society of Friends (Quakers)	384
Posse Comitatus and the Gladiator Redux.....	384
Lack of Purpose to Scapegoating.....	385
Coping with Violence Using Principled Nonviolence	387
Transforming Anger into a Constructive Force.....	388
Martin Luther King Jr. & Christian Pacifism	390
Religion and Conscientious Objection to War.....	392
Quakers and Resistance to Assimilation	392
Strong but Kind.....	394
George Fox - Foundation of the Quakers	395
Tradition of Imprisonment for Moral Virtue	396
Jihad - Inner and Outer Struggle.....	397
George Fox and William Penn.....	399
Penn's Letter of Tolerance and the Great Law.....	399
Strength of Kindness	401
20. The American Civil Rights movement: Guest Lecture	404
Intro to the Civil Rights Movement.....	405
Tradition of Activism.....	406
National Movement for Civil Rights	408
In Friendship for Civil Rights	408
Campaigns of the Civil Rights Movement.....	409
Spiral - 1961	409
Civil Rights and Human Rights.....	409
Leaders of the Civil Rights Movement.....	410
Intro to MLK Jr.	412
MLK and the Mississippi Improvement Association.....	412
CORE and SCLC	413
1959 - MLK's Trip to India	413
1961-62 Montgomery Bus Boycott and SNCC.....	414

1963 - Birmingham.....	414
1965 - Selma - Bloody Sunday - End of the Civil Rights Movement.....	415
MLK Jr's Continuation of Human Rights.....	416
Moral Leadership and the SCLC.....	417
The Leader's Dedication to Nonviolence.....	418
CORE and the Freedom Rides.....	419
SCLC and Birmingham.....	421
Results & Influence of the Civil Rights Movement.....	421
Drum Major for Peace.....	422
Dr. Prasad - Study through Practice with the Intellect, Heart, and Action.....	423
Swaraj, Swadeshi, and Sarvodaya - Rule Over the Self.....	424
Gift Presentation to Michael.....	425
21. Civil Rights Movement.....	427
Connections Between the Indian Freedom Struggle and the Civil Rights Movement.....	429
Swadeshi, Swaraj, and Person Power.....	429
Gandhi's Influence on the British.....	430
Gandhi's Influence on the Civil Rights Movement.....	431
Importance of Training.....	432
Gandhi's Influence on MLK Jr.....	433
A Way Out of No Way - Andrew Young.....	434
Time for Justice.....	435
Inner Transformation - Paradox of Inner Repression.....	436
Michael's Beginnings with Nonviolence.....	438
Response of Violence, Cowardice, or Nonviolence.....	438
Nonviolence Science.....	438
Freedom from Bitterness but not Pain.....	439
Acceptance of the Nondual Reality.....	440
MLK Jr's Epiphany.....	442
Violence, Bitterness, and Gandhi.....	443
Principle of Dignity/Non-embarrassment.....	444
Albany, Georgia and Chauri Chaura.....	446

Overview of the Civil Rights Movement and Indian Struggles for Freedom.....	446
22. Civil Rights Movement II: Kings Last Years 1.....	450
What Makes Nonviolence Possible?	450
Five Questions of Nonviolent Movements	451
Swadeshi and International Attention	452
No Fresh Issue and Vietnam	454
Delegitimate Racism by Delegitimizing Violence	456
Civil Rights Movement and Constructive Program.....	458
Raising Consciousness to a Tipping Point.....	459
The Strides Toward Freedom.....	459
Nonviolent Leadership.....	461
The Ego and Non-Triumphalism.....	462
Greek Example of Non-Triumphalism.....	464
Invalidating Violence.....	464
The Nonviolent Moment	466
Discipline of Energy.....	467
Non-Weaponizing of Fear	469
23. Civil Rights Movement II: Kings Last Years 2.....	471
Differences Between Gandhi and King's Leadership.....	472
Ripples of Albany, GA in the Civil Rights Movement	472
Voter Rights Act - Persuasion vs Coercion.....	474
Cultural Swadeshi.....	475
Power of Renunciation	476
Conservation of Energy	476
Clinging to Truth and Globalization	478
Gandhian Economics and Education	479
Poverty and Wealth Distribution	481
Trusteeship and Stewardship.....	482
Heart Unity at the Intersection of the Environment, Poverty, and Violence.....	483
Economics of War and the Shanti Sena	484
Resisting the Normalizing of Alienation.....	484
Nonviolent Economics.....	486

Trusteeship and Ownership.....	488
24. The 'Wheel of Nonviolence' 1: Gandhian Economics	491
Analyzing Violence in the Marketplace	492
Examples of Violence in Marketing	492
Conflict Model.....	494
Treating Conflict Through Mutual Learning.....	495
Circular Economy.....	496
Domination vs Mutual Learning.....	496
Search for Common Ground.....	497
Illusion of Separateness	499
Separateness vs Dignity	500
Needs vs Wants.....	501
Hind Swaraj and Economics	502
Distinguishing Needs and Wants	503
Economics and Suffering.....	504
Gross National Product vs Happiness.....	505
Human Nature vs Objectification.....	506
Sustainable Economy	507
Mondragon Cooperative - Democratic vs Authoritarian Capitalism	510
25. The 'Wheel of Nonviolence' 2: Gandhian Economics	514
Zimbabwe Nonviolent Resistance	514
Strategic vs Principled Nonviolence.....	514
Violence vs Not Violence.....	516
Hypothetical.....	517
Three Criteria of Nonviolent Violence.....	517
Preparation for Violent Response vs Nonviolence	519
Example of Protech - Violence in Marketing	521
Lack of Reconciliation and Restorative Justice.....	523
Renunciation and Constructive Program for Institutional Reformation.....	524
Reformation of the Caste System.....	525
Viśa Vaidya - Doctor of Poisons	526
Economic Equality and Medicine	528

Uplifting the Destitute.....	529
Domination vs Cooperation.....	530
Differences of Institutional Reform.....	531
Examples of Reforming the Criminal Justice System.....	532
26. Aspects of Nonviolence Since Gandhi and King.....	535
The Nonviolent Worldview in Three Parts	539
Integration vs Reductionism.....	541
Vision - Framework - Beliefs.....	542
Conflicts in the Realm of Perception	543
Three Stages of Religion.....	544
Person Power to Attainment of Freedom.....	545
The Effervescence of the Crowd.....	547
Revolving Evolutions.....	548
Third-Party Nonviolent Intervention.....	549
Civilian Based Defense.....	550
Shanti Sena	550
Nonviolence and the Nazis	551
Creating Fear vs Healing.....	552
Theory of the Three Gunas.....	554
Book of Job and Scapegoating	555
27. Grand Overview	558
Programmed for Choice	558
Difference Between Vision and Frame	559
Four Basic Steps for a Nonviolent Campaign	561
Self-Purification and the Nonviolent Campaign	562
Self-Purification and Direct Action.....	563
Collection of Facts.....	564
Negotiation	564
Four Steps - Review	566
Escalation Curve	567
Non-Attachment to Results.....	569
Applying the Four Steps as a Study.....	570

Final Review	571
DACE and Legitimization.....	574
Criminal Justice Reform and the Nonviolent Worldview	576
Unanimous Violence and Scapegoating.....	577

1. Overview 1: Strategic and Principled Nonviolence

What to Look For

Michael: This is PACS 164A, Theory and Practice of Nonviolence. So, if any of you were here for Chem 8 or something like that, this is your chance to slip out. Okay? You've lost your chance. Years ago, I was starting this course once and I said something which caused a couple of people to get very offended and stalk out.

So, as you know, we have a long waitlist for this class, so I'm going to say it again. And what I wanted to say is that given what's going on in the world today, this might very well be the most important subject that we could possibly be studying. And there I said it, and I'm glad. We do have a full class and a waitlist so what I'm going to do is pass around the attendance sheets while we're going and just check off next to your name. Hand this around.

And I'll try to figure something out by the second week as to getting people in the class. As you probably are aware by now the course is being webcast. That should not impact your life terribly much. What it will mean is – well, if you didn't want your parents to know you were in Berkeley, it might be a bit of a problem. But all it will mean really is that I'm dressed up a little bit nicer than I usually am – as in my unself-conscious way.

Nonviolent Communication

And if I remember I will repeat back the questions that you ask me, which is not a bad thing. You know, within the area known as nonviolence communication there's a practice known as "Compassionate Listening" and that's how it works. Somebody says, "Oh, I think you're a blah-blah." And you say, "I see you think I'm a blah-blah. Very good." And go on from there. So, we'll actually be being nonviolent.

And while we're on that subject, this has been a very good opening semester for me. I've already – I mean the semester is only six hours old – for me – and I've already had an opportunity to practice Satyagraha on a minor level which I'll be telling you about it a little while.

What I'd like to do this year – and we are going to get into the nuts and bolts and who's in the class and who isn't and what the scheduled reading list is like and so forth and all of the usual announcements. But I think I'd like to start off with a couple of very simple stories that will kind of give us a framework for what we're looking at when we go to study nonviolence as I understand it.

One technical thing I'll do before we start that, I have some copies of the syllabus here. I don't have enough for everybody because; A, the copy machine isn't working in my

department. And B, it would be ecologically incorrect to make 80 copies of this when most of you have known for years that you want to study nonviolence more than anything. And you're in it for the semester and want to be here. And the syllabus is in Reader.

The Reader, incidentally, will say on it, "PACS 164B." A, B, very difficult to work that out. But it's actually PACS 164A, okay? So, if for some reason you really want to have a syllabus today and maybe a day or so before you get around to getting a reader, take one of these, okay? Pass that around.

Story of Ladakh

So, I wanted to tell you two stories. The first one involves a region, not exactly a nation-state, and there are regions that are not exactly nation-states. This is not the 18th century anymore. And this little region is called, "Ladakh." It's a Himalayan region. And geographically it kind of borders Tibet and India, so parts of it are considered to be politically part of India, parts are considered to be politically part of Tibet.

And it got a lot of attention recently – well, about ten years ago because there was a woman who went to Ladakh and discovered that they have some very, very interesting patterns of life, in a way. I mean she didn't use the term because nobody uses the term nonviolence if they can help it, but in a way they had a very nonviolent culture with some very interesting attributes which were startling for a Westerner.

Now I should say that Ladakh was not a subsistence economy. They were a little bit above subsistence. They had very beautiful art and artifacts. It's a Buddhist country so that's probably the reason that Helena Norberg-Hodge went there to study them. So, these people aren't starving, but they're living up in the higher slopes of the Himalayas, and it's not exactly like Cabo San Lucas there. And food is an important item. She discovered that, for example, if one family has had a bag of rice stolen – this happened while she was there, and this is serious. This is a major part of their diet – it's a staple.

And so, she expected these people to make some moves to get their rice back –and they didn't. So, she went to them and said, "Well, I guess you have no way of knowing who stole the rice." And they said, "Of course we know who stole the rice. It's a small village. We know everything that goes on." So, she said, "Well, what are you going to do about it?" And they said, "What? Do something about it? We don't do things about stuff here."

And she probed a little further and began to realize that, to these people, community is of paramount importance. And if you take off after somebody and say, "Hey, you know, you stole my bag of rice," yeah, you'd get some rice back, but you'd lose the relationship. When you're living in a small group like that, the relationship, in the long run, is more important than the rice.

So, our concept of justice is not operating here. And people began to realize that, once you got over the shock of these little differences, Ladakh was a very happy place. It took a while to realize that because it was not a rich place. You didn't see a Mercedes because they wouldn't get around very well up there.

But it was a happy little world, really. I mean I don't want to be too corny about it, but it was happy. People had good relationships, they had a religion that they took seriously, that actually involved a certain amount of spiritual practice. Everybody had enough to eat. I think they were probably happier there than the folks that I visited this summer in Nicaragua.

But then because of the interest taken in Ladakh by outsiders – officially Westerners – there's this idea, "Oh, they're such good people. We must help them 'develop.'" So, by now we know that this is a bad idea, but in the '70s and 80's we thought it was a wonderful idea. So, they got in and they tried to "develop" Ladakh because all they had was happiness at this point.

And it's hard to motivate them to do the things that would lead to Western-style development. And one person actually said, "If we're going to develop this place, we're going to have to teach them to be greedy." Sound like a good idea? So, they taught them to be greedy and basically the place is a mess. All the things that they had going for them are breaking down. I'm talking, of course, in broad overgeneralizations. That's what we need to do right now to sort of get us started.

So, relationships are very bad, crime is high, young people don't have any purpose to live for, they don't have seminars on the meaning of life so they're kind of at a loss. And all of the parameters of failure of a modern society are now coming up very fast in Ladakh – health stuff, poverty stuff, alienation of every kind.

So, what happened here? Well, I am a professor, and my job description states that I am supposed to take simple ideas and make them complex enough so that intellectuals can understand them. That's what professors do. Every now and then I step out of my role, and I ask myself, "Is there a simple model by which we can understand what went wrong here?"

Let me read you a quote from the New Internationalist. Is this from the New Internationalist? No. It's from Amnesty International – the first example in false attribution. So, what happens when I step out of my professorial role?

There's a singer in Kingston, Jamaica. Her name is Queen Ifrica and she told *AI Magazine*, "If you're developing a positive energy, no matter where your house is, you can bring that to the community and to your surroundings. And from there we can see if we can bring about a different kind of change instead of taking up a gun." This is written in a very impoverished community, incidentally.

So, she gives this idea of positive energy. And here's what I'm going to do by the way of explaining what happened in Ladakh. And again, I apologize for the simplicity of this

model. It's very insulting for an upper-division course at Berkeley, but don't worry, it's going to complexify from here on out. But I would say you had basically a positive situation and introduced negative energy and the thing tanked. It's that simple. Life isn't that simple, but the model that we're using to understand it is that simple. Okay?

Story of Bihar

So, let's take now a contrasting story. This story takes place in Bihar. About four or five years ago there was an outbreak of communal rioting – that is rioting between Muslims and Hindus. In this case, when you read about it in the news – if you still read the news – one of my hopes for this course is that you'll stop doing that unhealthy habit.

Anyway, if you read about it in the commercial mass media, you read that this was, you know, neighbors who had been seething with violence for a long time. They had risen up against one another, and it's terrible. But I heard a talk from a woman who works with a peace organization – a nonviolence organization in the north of India. She's from Gujarat which is Gandhi's home state. Her name was Nirmala Deshpande, and she came from this area where they had rushed to see what they could do, and she told us two things.

She goes, "First of all, do not believe what you're reading in the papers." I said, "Hey, no problem. I haven't done that since I was 18." "Secondly," she said, "Let me tell you what actually went on in those villages which you will never hear in the mass media. First of all, this was not neighbors. These were mobs who were instigated to do this by the central government. The GOI, Government of India these days has been in the control of the party, which is a very secular, sectarian, pro-troublemaking." I know it sounds like I'm describing another country. But no, this is true in India also.

And they actually instigated these mobs and furnished them with these high-pressured gas canisters and stuff to do this mayhem. So, these are basically "Hindu" mobs. They come sweeping into these little agricultural villages and because they're agricultural villages most of the men are out in the fields when these ruffians arrive, and so it's just the women and some of the Muslim men because Muslims tend to be artisans rather than farmers.

And immediately, without any preparation, without discussing it ahead of time – they had no idea this was going to happen. Immediately, they took their Muslim neighbors into their home to hide them, okay? Well, hide is a euphemism because most of these houses are a single room. So, the Muslim man comes into the house and the woman of the house shoos him under the table, under the altar.

So immediately you have this wonderful situation where you have the statue of Ganesha – I don't know, Krishna or something like that and these Muslims are cowering underneath it. Okay, now here's where we get to the point of our story for our purposes. Home after home, the same procedure was repeated. The mob would come up to the

door, the woman would be standing there in the doorway and they mob would say, “We think you’re hiding a Muslim in there.”

And immediately the woman of the house would say, “Yes, I am.” And it’s a big moment of shock. And they would say, “Well, we want him out of there.” And the woman would say, “First kill me, then you may enter.” And the mob would turn around and go. So, they saved hundreds and hundreds of lives by doing this.

And again, this is people who, you know, if you stopped on the street corner and said, “What is nonviolence? How do you do it?” They probably would not have been able to articulate anything. But I’m going to say, in my simple-minded mode here, that you had a very negative situation – very negative. I’m saying it’s Bihar, it might have been Gujarat, but that’s not material for us. And these women introduced positive energy into a negative situation, and the thing was drastically improved.

So, it was improved in so many ways. I mean you can just imagine what the relationship was like in those villages between the Hindus and Muslims now, now that these Hindu wives had risked their lives to save those men. You can imagine the beneficial impact that it had on those mobs who were being told, you know, these people are going to welcome you as liberators – oh no, I’m sorry. That’s the wrong conflict. I got confused there for a minute.

I was going to say--these Hindus are going to welcome you in. They’ve been meaning to get rid of their Muslim neighbors, and they go in there believing that violence is invincible. They have much more power than the women have. The women are unarmed. They have all these gas canisters. They’re enraged. So, they go in there fully expecting to commit murder and get away with it. They have this complete shock of the type of resistance that they did not expect, and they go away, thinking.

So, for everyone in the situation – everyone in the situation – obviously, the Muslim men who got saved, but for everyone involved, things got better. The women have a new sense of their own power, the mobs who have a different sense of what violence can and cannot achieve, a situation, a communal rioting in general, because these things, as we know, have a tendency to spread. Bad things spread become worse. Good things spread, become better.

So, for everyone there’s a huge improvement in the situation. And you look at this model and you look at the world around you and you’re tempted to say to the world, “What part of this don’t you understand?” It’s so incredibly simple. If you introduce positive energy into a situation, duh, it gets better. If you introduce negative energy, it gets worse. It’s that simple. Don’t tell your parents this is what you learned in PACS 164A because it’s not sophisticated enough, but we’re going to fix that in a little while.

But really, it’s that simple and how people cannot get it – it’s frustrating and amazing. But if you take that question seriously, what part of this don’t you understand? It does have a serious answer. And that is people, generally speaking, do not understand that

there is such a thing as positive energy and there is such a thing as negative energy. As a result of that failure, they keep on trying to fix problems with negative energy, thus making them worse. That's happening in every sector of our society today.

Personal Satyagraha

This brings me to my little Satyagraha this morning. I'm very proud of this. I was in a building where I work, and I was talking to one of the staff people who works there. She said, "By the way, you've got a new arrangement here for you to get out the backdoor or to access the bathrooms before 8 o'clock in the morning." I said, "Yeah, I get in at 7:30. Sometimes I have a cup of tea before I leave the house. It's handy for me to get into the bathroom before 8 o'clock." She said, "Okay, well, these doors are now armed with this device, and you have to plug in a number to get either out to the back – to the back bathroom or the front bathroom."

But she's being very unhappy when she's telling me this, and I'm not being very happy listening to her – and something else is going on. She's handing me this number on a little post-it. She said, "Don't let anyone ever see this because every time you use this number it shows up on my computer." I said, "Wait a minute. I go to the bathroom in the morning, and it shows up on your computer?" She said, "Yes, this is a security issue." I said, "Thanks, but no thanks." And I handed back the little post-it. So, I'm going to be very uncomfortable sometimes when I show up for the meditation class in the morning.

But, you see, for me, the cost is greater than the benefit. And I speak as one who did have his backpack stolen out of his little cubby. And fortunately, I didn't have, you know, my laptop or my ego in it. Sometimes I leave my ego in there – taking that problem. So, I know full well that there is a security problem in our building. And it's not that I have transcended fear or concerns of that kind. In fact, I'll tell you a little story about myself – because I'll be telling you many stories later in which I play a rather heroic role.

So, to balance that, I'll tell you this story. I went in one morning, as usual, 7:30, you know, looking around for the door to the bathroom. I pulled out my mail, and there was a notice saying that from now on there's a new security arrangement. I said, "Oh God, now what?" It said, "Don't trust anybody. Anyone is to be regarded as suspicious if they are, for example, a student or things like this." I'm slightly exaggerating. "If there's an object that you don't recognize, report it immediately to Homeland Security and things like that."

I said, "You know, the hell with this. I'm not going to do that. This is not how I live." And I crumpled up the piece of paper and threw it away. And then I went to my cubby, and I walked in and there was a black satchel in the middle of the floor. And immediately, before I knew I was doing I said, "Call the police! Homeland Security, 911, get the bomb squad in here!" [Laughter] Of course, it was a laptop that the tech people had left in there while they were fixing my computer.

Positive vs Negative Energy

So, what am I saying? I'm not saying I'm an unusual person with regard to courage or anything else. But, for me, I always hear ringing in my ears what the Buddha said, "That there is no fire like desire, there is no rage like anger, there is no relationship better than trust."

And, if you go around degrading the trust in human relationships, you're paying a price which is higher than the price of losing your backpack, losing your laptop occasionally. Sort of an honorary Ladakhi in this regard. So, the point I'm making is that because we never think in these terms is this positive or negative and its impact on human relationships, we solve every problem, but with negative energy – and that puts the word "solve" in quotes and it never gets any better. In fact, it gets consistently worse.

So, we're going to fix all of that in this semester which is why I told you this could be an important course. And basically, if you wanted to define what we're studying, we're studying the nature of positive energy, how to develop it, and how to implement it in the social field, okay? You might almost take that as my definition of nonviolence for right now. I'm famous for my definitions of nonviolence – they have about a 14-day half-life. I'll be bringing in some other ones, but for now, this is what we'll be looking at.

How did those women do what they did? How did it affect them? How did it work in this situation, and finally, how could we capture that energy and make institutions out of it so that our whole world works on positive energy instead of working on about 10% positive energy and 90% negative energy? Okay?

So that's the agenda and I guess I'll pause for a minute and see if you have any questions about what nonviolence is or about these stories, the point I was trying to make with them, and then we can talk about how the course is going to work. We're going to get the books and good stuff like that. Do you have any questions? Okay. That's either a very good or a very bad sign. We'll find out in a little while.

Syllabus Summary

So, you are going to get the reader from Copy Central and that will have the syllabus, which some of you have hard copies of already. And basically, the course unrolls in sections. The first is kind of a background in general principles and then we start with, really, the major part of the content which is the story of Gandhi's career which itself divides neatly into two phases – the South Africa part from 1893 to 1914, and then the big freedom struggle in India from 1915 until 1947 followed by his assassination.

And then that'll take us down to the midterm. And then we're going to look at the West because we've been drawing upon Hinduism and Gandhi's implementation of it and how it made, in some ways, made it possible for him to do all of this that I've been describing in a big institutional framework. And we're going to look at nonviolence in the

West. We're going to look at Christianity – where there's some really interesting scholarly developments in the last 10 or 15 years – basically which make it much more plausible. What Gandhi used to say – he used to say, "The only people who do understand that Jesus was nonviolent are the Christians." We're going to sort of study how that came about.

And then we'll spend about a month with Martin Luther King, and then we'll do sort of an overview where we'll look at what we have inherited from these people. How is it to be employed in economics, conflict management, and health care? All of those things. And that's 164A.

And 164B, as some of you know very well, kind of looks back at the World War II period to get kind of an historical background, and it quickly moves up to see what's been happening in nonviolence for the last 20 or 30 years, which is incredibly inspiring and exciting. In fact, I'll skip ahead a little bit now and mention that I'd like you people to be aware, not involved, but aware – because I don't want you in prison during the course of this semester – that on September 21st, which is International Peace Day there's a rather large civil disobedience that's been organized – primarily in the U.S. but with worldwide support – along very good Gandhian lines.

We're going to– they, sorry I said that. [Laughter] They're going to tell the government sometime early in September that we want to see a plan for a complete exit from Iraq by September 21st, not just the military pullout, but you know, give the country back all of its assets otherwise you'll have to face massive Satyagraha from us. So that's the plan. So, watch that. It'll be a very interesting laboratory for us. So yeah? Question?

Student: What kind of civil disobedience?

Michael: That's being worked out right now. I think the first audience to whom we were going to – sorry – they are going to offer Satyagraha is lawmakers, you know, Congresspeople. But they're also working a lot with ex-military people, you know, Veterans Against War, stuff like that.

Student: If you have an older copy of the Reader a few years ago, will that –

Michael: Yeah, you'll be fine with that. Buddy up with somebody who's just taking the course now because there will be a few new items. But basically, you'll be fine.

Student: If you could repeat the question?

Michael: I'm sorry, yes. I'll repeat the questions. That one was just about what kind of reader device, so that's all right. Other questions? Okay.

So now in the readings, first let's deal with the basic historical information about Gandhi. You're going to have a wonderful book called, "Gandhi, the Man," which has quotes and photos and he's very much a kind of inspirational piece that gives you, I think, the deepest sense of who Gandhi was spiritually without which you can't understand

anything else in his career and his impact, but it doesn't step you through the history in a historical way. And I think it's necessary for us to do that.

So, over the years, I discovered there's an excellent biography of Gandhi by an Indian scholar named B.R. Nanda – Bal Ram Nanda – and it existed in the abridged edition that's perfect for this course. So, you have the best biography of the most important figure in modern times, what do you think happened? You guessed it. It went out of print. So, I can't get the abridged edition. So, for a couple of years, I was using the full edition which costs a little more, but it's good to have it. And I gave people the chapters that they would have to read. Then that went out of print, which I discovered a couple of weeks ago.

So, we have two options. We can fall back on a rather good biography by Louie Fisher which I've ordered and which you have in the bookstore. And would you just read along the necessary chapters for the necessary parts of the history that we're doing. – early South Africa, climax in South Africa, return to India and so forth.

But I actually think that the Nanda book is better. Nanda was actually an Indian after all and he was involved in the freedom struggle. And so, he had a better sense of how certain things were working. And what we've done is we've gone and xeroxed that book, the abridged edition, and it is available at Copy Central – in the reader. It costs \$17 - \$16.96, but who's counting? And I personally don't care which way you want to go. You can get either one of those biographies, okay?

Search for a Nonviolent Future

There's one book which I'm not giving you regular assignments from, but I'd like for you to just be reading at your own pace and basically finish it in the course of the semester. That's my book. Blush. [Laughter] It's, "[The Search for a Nonviolent Future](#)." Basically, that book came out of this course so it will be a very good way for you to follow along with the course.

The reader, I don't use the reader the way some instructors do, that is I don't come in and say, "Now let's look at Section 2B and let's talk about it." I will do that intermittently, but mostly I'm leaving it up to you to follow the third column of the syllabus and just keep up with the readings, okay? So, they're sort of backgrounders. Every now and then we use the reader in class – because this conversation in this course will shape itself in one way or another.

I'll suddenly see, "Oh, I see this is where we're going. We need to have a look at this particular article. I'll come, and I'll say I hope you have your Readers today," which is unfair because I had no idea until a few hours ago that I was going to look at this particular article. So, if you don't, that's okay also. So, I hope that's alright because sometimes people expect that we're going to step through the Reader systematically in a course, and I don't usually do that.

About the webcasting thing let me say one thing. The reason we're webcasting the course is there's a rumor circulating around that I am not immortal – because I choose not to believe it, but some people do – and therefore people really wanted to have a record of this course for people who, you know, terribly unfortunate people, perhaps, couldn't even come to Berkeley. Maybe they're studying at Stanford or something.

[Laughter]

You know, there's all kinds of unfairness and deprivation in our world. We wanted to have this for a record. The reason I'm mentioning it is, please don't use it as a reason not to come to class, okay? Don't say, "Oh, you know, I want to hang out with my friend. It's on the Web anyway," because it's very different when you're actually here and I'm actually here. We're interacting. It's a different experience qualitatively than, you know, opening up your laptop and downloading that particular lecture. If you don't believe that, you're really going to have a hard time understanding nonviolence.

Okay, now this course has an unofficial "lab." It's called PACS 84. It's a meditation class. Yeah, question?

Student: I think it's actually PACS 94.

Michael: You're right, thanks. By the way, this is a very good thing to do. Whenever I'm using a number, chances are I'm getting it wrong. So do stick your hand up. Yeah, it's PACS 94. 84 is the software center. It's a meditation class. It's never overcrowded for one – well, for two reasons because meditation is not all that popular. And B, this class meets at 8:00 AM. So, it's Tuesday – there we go right there. I just lost two-thirds of our audience.

But if you can get there and develop a meditation practice, in some subtle ways, which I would find it a little bit hard to define, you will find it a lot easier to grok some of the basic ideas about how nonviolence works. I actually – because, you know, I'm a troublemaker, Satyagrahi from way back. I actually wanted to get that course called 164L for the lab. Then maybe I can get a National Institute of Science grant or something like that and solve the whole department's problem, be a hero. I'd dream on and on.

But the Committee on Courses wouldn't let me do that. As some of you know they said in order for a course to have a L afterwards it has to be a wet lab. That is, you have to actually deal with chemicals and come in and show that. Sulfuric acid, see? I said, "Kundalini won't be enough?" But no, apparently it was not. I'm mentioning that because the course is open, still has a few seats and a few people want to take it, you know, like if you have insomnia and you're wondering what to do at 8:00 AM, come around to 101 Wheeler, you will find it helpful. You don't have to sign up if you don't want the unit of credit, you know, all this and heaven, too – you can do that.

The nature of this class and of you people is such that very soon, every time I come in here six or seven of you are going to rush up to the desk and say, "Can I make an

announcement? We're about to stop a whaling ship or hug a tree or lock ourselves together in some office in downtown Oakland, and we need some help." So, for a couple of reasons, I made it a policy not to take up class time with those announcements.

One of those reasons is that occasionally we have had some military people in this class. In fact, I like to have them here. And at some point in the semester, I may actually trade lectures with the head of Air Force Military Affairs here on campus. I got to meet the original guy who was in that position because he was on my van, you know, we were commuting together. He made the mistake one day – we were hanging around waiting for the van. He said, "So what do you teach?" I could have a number of different things, but of course, I brightened up and I said, "Nonviolence."

And to his credit he immediately said, "I want to come talk to your class." So, he did. He came and talked to the class and then afterwards in good – like in red-blooded competitive style, I said, "Randy, how about a rematch? How about I come talk to your class?" He hadn't counted on that. And it was really a fascinating experience for me, and I am in favor of reaching out and getting beyond our community and talking to people.

So that person may be here. For all I know some of you are in the Military Affairs Program. And I don't want people who don't share our viewpoint to feel uncomfortable. So partly for that reason and partly because it can really eat up all of our class time. What I usually do is I have just people who drop announcements here or maybe use the board over there – unless it's an event that I really like or that I'm involved in.

So, let's see, I just have a couple of things to go over, and then I think I can stop and see if you have any questions and see how much time we have, and maybe get into a little bit more into the subject. There will be a lot of opportunities for various kinds of volunteer work that come out of this class. So, if you have some time and you like to get involved in stuff, just let me know. We have a relationship with Berkeley High School. They want to do some peace education there so if you'd like to really, you know, intercept some person's wasted career and put them on a right path, let me know. We're going to be developing how we're to do that.

Okay, and then I think the only other thing I have to tell is – well, let me ask you, what's going to happen on 9/11? Why is 9/11 an important day? It's partly a trick question.

Student: It's the 100th Anniversary of Satyagraha.

Michael: That's right. Very good. How did I know you would know that? On September 11th it will be the 100th Anniversary of the birth of Satyagraha. Properly speaking, nonviolent resistance which happened at a big meeting in Johannesburg, South Africa in 1906 on September 11th. Empire Theatre.

Student: Can you write the word down?

Michael: We're going to be into these words up to here. But that's okay, in fact, it's a good idea because who knows who will come in here after this class. We'll put it newspaper headline style, "Satyagraha born, September 11, 1906. Empire Theater, Johan- they called it Jo' burg over there. Johannesburg, South Africa." The theatre burned down the next morning which the Hindus thought was a very good sign. And in fact, eight years later they had achieved their goals.

So, this is – yes, it's the 5th Anniversary of that horrible stuff, but it's also the 100th Anniversary, the Centenary of the birth of Satyagraha. And people all over the world are using the 9/11 hook or they call – I forget the technical term the media people use for this – to raise consciousness about nonviolence.

Hope or Terror

And to do my little part, I wrote this little book called, [Hope or Terror](#), which is very attractive. And for reasons that some of you know – and is basically flying out the door. We have only a few copies left.

And what we're doing is we're using it as a premium if people want to give donations to my nonprofit. So, I'm going to make these available to you. I have an envelope here. Basically, if you want to give us – give that nonprofit of mine \$5, you can take a copy of the book. I have more of them in my office. And what this book does, as someone told me recently, it basically crash-courses Satyagraha.

I'm not saying that this will be a tremendously helpful text for you for this course. If it were, I would require it. We'd all be rich by now. But it could be a help because of what it will give you in 40 pages, right? In 40 pages it will give you an overview of how Satyagraha works, what makes it have its effect, how to do it, what to watch out for. And you know, for a half or our so read, it'll kind of orient you and get you started in this. It will also be handy, I think, in case you have a roommate. Because what always happens in this course is they both come to their living arrangement, and they start talking very enthusiastically about nonviolence and then these questions come up which I know all too well.

And people want to be able to say, "Here, look, read this. By the way, it's five bucks." So, I'm just leaving it here. Go ahead and take one and put in some money in the envelope if you'd be so kind. If you don't have \$5 on you – meaning that you're a Berkeley student, don't give me a check, but bring in the cash next time. It's okay. It's on the honor system, as you know, that's how I operate.

Well, okay, I think I've gotten through all my announcements. So is there anything technical – oh, there's one thing I didn't mention. Yeah. How are you going to get a grade? What's it going to be based on? Well, the "Work" for the course is a midterm.

And a final exam, and a final paper. Really, it's kind of a final exam and a final paper. The midterm is a preparation for the final exam in the sense that if you don't do well on

the midterm and you do well on the final, the good grade on the final basically wipes out the not so great grade on the midterm.

Now I wish that we had the time and the staff to work with you on the papers and really help you because, you know, of all people in the universe you're the people whom I would like to be able to write well. So, I would love to work with you in really due diligence fashion on that, but we can't. So, what we do instead is around two-thirds of the way through the semester, you will hand me a one page description of what you're going to write on.

You know, "I am going to try to show that nonviolence doesn't work for the following reasons and here's a sample paragraph." Like that, okay? So basically, you have an exam grade and a paper grade, and they will basically balance out – or they amount to 50% apiece. What I really want you to get out of the course is the ability to look at an event and say, "This won't work because it has negative energy," or, "this will work because it's got positive energy, but they're doing it wrong over here."

So, in other words, you'll be able to analyze an event with realistic expectations. And like any other science, you'll be able to make predictions that this will be effective for the following reasons. So, you will be nonviolence literate. That's what I want you to get out of this. That's really the main thing. A lot of other stuff can be forgiven, like forgetting dates, the name of Gandhi's dog or was it a Jewish theatre or not in Johannesburg? Some people say it was, some people say it wasn't.

But at the same time, you can't just use these abstract models without a historical grounding. And you also won't be able to convince anybody of anything. You're going to be confronted with people all semester, and then for the rest of your life, who are going to say, "Yeah, but it never would have worked against Hitler." And you'll flip to Page 119 in my book, and you say, "In Schlossgarten in 1943..." No, you won't be that bad, but you will have internalized the counter-arguments, to be able to explain the logic and bring historical examples to the forth.

The fact is that 3.3 billion people on this planet today live in a society which has been materially benefitted by some kind of nonviolent movement or insurrection. That's just about half the people on earth have experienced nonviolence and it has helped them in some way – if you look at the Orange Revolutions and all that stuff. It doesn't mean that any of them was perfect. It doesn't mean that we're all going to be living in Ladakh – the Ladakhoid States tomorrow, but there has been a lot more of this stuff, and the only reason it doesn't take off and take over our destiny is that people don't understand how it works and they can't cite examples that show that it does. Okay?

So now I think I really am finished telling you about how the course is going to work and so forth. I'm going to stop here and see if you have any questions – which I will repeat – and then maybe share with you one other model and we'll call it quits for today. Okay, so any questions?

Student: Approximately how long do you think the term paper should be?

Michael: The length of the term paper is inversely proportional to its brilliance. As a rough rule of thumb, I would say something like if it's shorter than eight pages, that would be really good. You know, Einstein's PhD dissertation was three pages long, but he was Einstein. But if it's more than 12 pages it's going to be difficult for us to work with. And in fact, that's more often the problem. People get very enthusiastic about this stuff. And because I allow you to pick up what piece of it you like, people will really be roaring on.

So, what I suggest is two things; if you have a big topic that you've chosen, like how are we going to fix the criminal justice system in this country? And you've written about 10 pages, and it looks it's going to be 40 by the time you finish, give us a chunk and then continue it later. The other thing you can do with papers – and thank you for reminding me – is this university has, what I believe, the first ever student journal dedicated to principled nonviolence. It's called, "Peace Power." It's very well designed.

And the content of Peace Power is about 80% student papers from this course. So that's what keeps it rolling. I'm happy to tell you that that's been picked up in Italy. It's been picked up in out of the way places – name of that campus down on the peninsula I keep forgetting. And this is something that could have a real potential to spread. So have that in mind when you're thinking about a paper topic, that you could end up being published.

Incidentally, I'd like to introduce Laura who will be one of our two readers. And the other reader is taking his comps at the Graduate Theological Union tomorrow so he – I said, "Okay, that might be a good enough excuse not to be here today." All right, well, I think that's it. Any other questions about – yeah?

Student: How do you get into – on the waitlist – to get in the course?

Michael: How do you get on the waitlist? I will have to look into that. At this point, from what I know – actually, I guess I don't know anything about it. Do you usually go to [Tele-bears]?

Student: Right. Well, it says that this class adds people off the waitlist manually. [Unintelligible 00:49:17]

Michael: Are you asking me how to get from the waitlist into the class?

Student: Right.

Michael: Oh, I see. Well, yeah, that is manual except that as far as I know, the class is full. The class has 80 people enrolled, so I believe that that is the limit. And that's a limit that's imposed by the Fire Marshall. I tried to argue with the Fire Marshall. I said, "You know, we often consider immolating ourselves anyway in this class." But there's not much I can do about that. As I said – I think I said, "I will try and get a bigger room." But I don't think the chances of that are very good at this time.

So, from what I know now, unless that sheet comes back to me and it says that ten people who were on the list were not here today and they're not here on Thursday and they haven't told me why, at that point I will manually drop them and then I can move people up from the waitlist. I do that. And what I do is I start with PACS majors, especially if they're upper division, and I go to seniors, juniors. But there's nothing else I go by.

Student: I just wanted to make sure that someone – nervous freshman – that as of late last night we were somewhere in the middle of the waitlist and this morning we miraculously found ourselves on the class list and actually enrolled.

Michael: If you are on the class list, then you are enrolled. Yeah. Yes. Now I should say this, that if you do not need this particular course showing up on your record and would rather audit it and speak to me about some other arrangement so that another student can come in, please do. I mean I've often three or four people say, "You know, look, I'm a graduate student. I don't need this, but I'd like to be there." As far as I'm concerned, you're one of the students. I'll treat you exactly the way as I treat anybody else, but you won't appear on the class list. And that'll enable me to take a few more people on.

So definitely we will know for wait-listed people or people who are trying to get on the waitlist, we will know at the end of the second week. I'll do all that. Yeah?

Student: What days did you say meditation is on?

Michael: Meditation is Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. I'm there Tuesday and Thursday.

Student: What room is that?

Michael: It's 101 Wheeler.

Student: Okay. We do have a schedule that says like 122 maybe?

Michael: 122 Wheeler?

Student: Yeah. You might want to –

Michael: I will check that.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:52:00]

Michael: PACS84 is a software center. 94, it's all one section. Yeah, we practice unity there.

Student: Is there meditation tomorrow morning?

Michael: Tomorrow morning there will be meditation if you go there. As I remember, I was attending a rally with Dennis Kucinich and people said, "But you're not elected. You're not electable," they said. "If you vote for me, I'm electable." So, I won't be there because I live way out of town. I'm on campus Tuesdays and Thursdays.

And my office hours, by the way, I didn't get them onto the syllabus. They're Tuesday, 10:00 to 11:00 and Thursday, 2:00 to 3:00. But I'm there – I'm in that class Tuesday and Thursday and then they will start meeting regularly and having talks of some kind on Wednesday starting the third week. Yes?

My office is 101 Stephens. That's where you go anyway, and they'll tell you how to find my cubby. Okay, yes?

Student: I'm sorry, did you say 10:00 to 11:00 and 2:00 to 3:00?

Michael: 10:00 to 11:00 on Tuesday. 2:00 to 3:00 on Thursday. I staggered them so that if you have a class on one of those hours you can see me then. No one ever comes to my office hours anyway. People always come at some other time. Yeah?

Student: That's my question. So, what if we can't make either office hour?

Michael: Just talk to me right at the end of class and we'll try to arrange something.

Student: Can you repeat the name of the office?

Michael: It's Stephens Hall. That does appear on the syllabus, 101 Stephens. 101 Stephens is just south of the Campanile. Okay. So, let's just take a few more minutes then and I'll see if I can give you a better sense of what we're talking about.

I've used the term "principled nonviolence." Can you slip me one of those pieces of chalk there? Thanks. Are you able to get those? This is a term that I wouldn't say is exactly the kind of term where if you were in a cocktail party and you say, "Principled nonviolence," a little duck comes down from the ceiling with a \$100 bill in its mouth. Mostly people will not know what you're talking about.

But in the field, those people who have principled nonviolence – and I can speak for all three of us, [Laughter] we find this a convenient term because when you get into this business and start looking at these events you begin to realize after a while they really are two rather different things that are going on and you need a way to describe them. So, the terminology that's been fairly convenient is, "Principled nonviolence" and "Strategic nonviolence."

Strategic nonviolence is mostly a negative thing, that you are not using physical violence. When I first came to Berkeley many years ago I was mentored by an old-fashioned socialist. He was a wonderful guy – until he got involved in translating Karl Marx's poetry. Marx may have been a good socialist, but he was not a very good poet, and I kind of burned out on that project.

But I remember my friend and mentor telling me that he had been at a rally one time – it was a demonstration – and he started noticing that people had these signs. I don't remember what the issue was, you know, fair wages for bears or something like that. [Laughter] And all these placards were nailed to baseball bats. And so, my friend said,

“Um, hey, I thought this was a nonviolent demonstration.” And they said, “Yeah, but it’s over soon.”

Now that’s a very good example – unfair, but a good example of strategic nonviolence. It means, “We are not going to hit you now.” Now you say, “We’re not going to hit you as far as we can tell until the foreseeable future. We need to get a little bit more serious.” If you say, “We’re not going to hit you, blankety-blank so-and-so, even though you deserve it.” You are practicing strategic nonviolence. It’s a strategy with you. It’s not a principle.

So now I am not saying that strategic nonviolence is bad. Compared to violence it can be pretty good. And people can be practicing strategic nonviolence and they can say, “Hey, this is pretty cool. It actually worked. I’m going to find out more about it. What was the name of that course at Berkeley?” It’s still fine to register. In other words, people can grow from the strategic posture to a principled commitment in nonviolence.

However, that is not what we’re going to be studying here. Although, in 164B, we have to study it because most of the nonviolence that has happened has been more or less of a strategic variety. But what these women did in Bihar, because they put their lives on the line and engaged much deeper energies in themselves, I would be happy to call that, “Principled nonviolence.” Not because they didn’t have a violent option. They had probably a variety of violent options, you know?

They could go and get some kind of a weapon out of the kitchen and try and defend themselves. Or they could have said, “Yeah, I am hiding a Muslim in there, as a matter-of-fact. He’s under there.” That would be – I’m going to call that a violent way to do it. So, they had a violent way to do it which would have saved their life. They didn’t know that they would survive when they said, “No kill me first, and then you may enter.” For all they knew, they would get killed.

So, they took a terrific risk in this emergency situation – involves, you know, a very, very deep commitment and that’s what we’re calling a principled approach to nonviolence. Principled means, in effect – in practice it means that you are striving for a kind of reconciliation with your opponent. Yes, in the short term you want to deny your opponent some kind of obnoxious program that he’s forcing on you. That has to come first.

But you want to do it in a way that your opponent can end up being maybe even your friend. You’re not going to do anything to forfeit that outcome. There’s a Greek tragedian, Euripides, who said, “You must never treat your enemy in such a way that he could not become your friend.” That was how you go about things in principled nonviolence.

In principled nonviolence we look at this very first step and we ask ourselves, “What happened inside the person who offered Satyagraha? What happened inside those women? How did they do it? What happened to them when they did it? So, we’re going

to try to understand that on a psychological level for starters. And we're going to say that my other definition of nonviolence is, "Nonviolence is the force that results from the conversion of a negative to a positive state," where a negative state is a potentially destructive emotional posture which basically comes down to fear, anger, and greed. Basically, the three things that drive the economy of industrial nations.

You can easily imagine those women confronted with that situation – there's literally a howling mob armed with these weapons. They're enraged. They're coming up. They don't know you. And they say, "Get out of your way. We're going to kill somebody." It's not hard to imagine that they were experiencing a great deal of fear, okay?

Well, there are three things that you can do with fear. Of which, the modern world is aware of two. You either express it by saying, "Yes, I'm sorry," and you run away. Or you repress it. You pretend that you're not afraid. So those are the two that we, generally speaking, know about. This is kind of the fight or flight arena.

But there's another possibility. And that is to own that you have some fear energy rising, but you are not going to let it drive you into action. I'm putting it in a kind of long complicated way because I'm not saying you are not afraid. If you were not afraid, if you were not angry, there would be no energy to convert to drive the nonviolent process.

Incidentally, how many of you have seen Richard Attenborough's film, "Gandhi?" Okay, in this class it is usually a pretty good average. It's going to be shown on a lot of campuses on September 11th. Student Peace Action Network, I think, is organizing that in D.C. But one of the things that film does not make very clear is these, for want of a better term, let's say these conversion processes that happen. And that is what makes the difference between principled nonviolence and strategic nonviolence at the deepest level. Okay?

Are you good for one more model before we [unintelligible 01:02:58] go back to the rest of our life?

Three Faces of Power

I want to share one other set of terms with you – you'll find this in my book – that will make it easy for you to understand or at least give us a start on understanding how something like these confrontations actually does work.

And the terminology I'm using here was developed by one of the great contributors to peace theory and nonviolence theory. His name was Kenneth Boulding. He's been gone now for quite a while, but he was a world class economist, good poet – better than Karl Marx, if you ask me – better economist and a better poet actually. And he was a life-long Quaker, and he was one of the inventors of peace theory, and he did pay a lot of attention to nonviolence.

The other inventor of peace theory in terms of the English speaking world was Johann Galtung, who's actually going to be in town in October – possibly standing right here if I can get to him in time. But Kenneth Boulding, toward the end of his life wrote a book called, “The Three Faces of Power.” So, you've heard about this already. Let's see. Yeah?

Student: I was just wondering, can you repeat the name of the books?

Michael: “The Three Faces – F-A-C-E-S – Faces of Power.” Oh, here it is. They're disguising the erasers now. Oh, that's the one thing I didn't want to erase. Oh well. We'll leave a few copies of my booklet scattered about. And his proposition is, “If you define power as the ability to get something done, then in human interactions we have basically three ways to do it.”

And the first is called, “Threat power.” People who took PACS164B or who took me out for latte at some point last semester will be very familiar with this model. And it's easy to paraphrase how threat power works. And you just say, “You do something that I want, or I will do something that you don't want.” You know, driving around somewhere in downtown Los Angeles, suddenly the car door flies open, there's a person there with a 9mm saying, “Get out of the car or I will kill you.” Now that is a – I'm not going to use the word “good” – that is a clear example of threat power.

Not all human interactions are this demoralizing. There's also something known as exchange power. And what you say there is you give me something I want, and I will give you something that you want. You make a donation to my nonprofit, I give you the booklet. It's a good example of exchange power – happens all the time.

But there is a third kind of power, because if you think about it, none of those kinds would explain what went on in Bihar or in the other 100 or so examples that we'll be talking about in the course of the semester. So, there's got to be another kind of power. And he calls it, “Integrative power.” It's actually been proposed that we use the term “integrative power” instead of nonviolence. There's that close of an overlap. And the paraphrase of integrative power is a little bit more complicated.

You are saying to the other person who is involved in the interaction with you, “I am going to be authentic. I am going to represent truth in this exchange with the idea in mind that we are going to end up closer, more integrated.” Okay? Now think about that in terms of our story. These men, they come up and they say, “Are you hiding a Muslim in there?” It would have been so easy to say, “No. No, I'm not.” It's a perfectly natural reaction.

But when they didn't say that they did something very authentic. In this case, we can see it very plainly. The truth is they were hiding a Muslim. The truth is they were not ashamed of it. They may have been scared to death, but they were going to represent the truth. And in the interaction, the confrontation between the lie of this wacked out

mob and the truth of these single women something happened that changed the situation. All the parties involved end up closer, right?

The mob is going to just sweep this woman away and get at their victim. They end up with a new respect for that person. As we've already mentioned, there's a much closer relationship between Hindus and Muslims in that village – all these villages, actually because there's actually a chain of these things happening – at least ten villages. Okay?

So, the other thing to be said about this model is take a look at the world we're living in today. Threat power is studied by political scientists. I'm not saying they're wrong to do that, but you know, they've got a whole building. It's got some interesting graffiti on it right now. It's all retrofitted, very expensive, and has beautiful lecture halls. I often like to lecture there. They never let me – possibly because of what I say about their field.

But you have these whole class of individuals called, "Political scientists." Well recognized distinct discipline. I'm not saying there's anything wrong with that. If you go to American Political Science Association meetings, you've got to rent whole hotel complexes to house them. Yes, I'm jealous. [Laughter] But other than that, I don't feel there's anything wrong with this.

Now you want to study exchange power, obviously you have this vast crowd of individuals. Not crowd – discipline. And they're called economists, right? You sweep out the whole Cal-Health Hospital and turn it into a business school. Oh, these people – give them Nobel Prizes – all this stuff. Yes, okay, it makes me personally unhappy, but that's not the point. The point is that we put a lot of energy and a lot of effort into studying threat power and we put a lot of effort into studying exchange power, okay? So, you see where I'm going with this?

So, who studies integrative power? Almost nobody. What's the name of the discipline that studies that? Even in Peace and Conflict studies a lot of people don't have that particular interest. So, you have this contradiction in the Marxist sense, that this is the kind of power that we need. If we keep on trying to fix problems with negative energy, we make them worse. They get more and more negative. We must learn how to fix problems with positive energy, and that's what we call, "Integrative power," because then we've not only fixed the immediate situation that we're in, but we've also improved the relationship of everybody involved.

We've sent a better signal out to the world in general, that what the human being is capable of. So yeah, we work on our little problem that we're faced with, but we solve it in such a way that it has a beneficial impact on the whole situation. So, we must learn how to do this, and yet, we've expended the least amount of effort to figure it out. Okay?

So, people, that is our challenge, and I will see you back here on Thursday. Here's the books, here's the envelope. Any questions about the course?

2. Overview 2: Strategic and Principled Nonviolence

What to Look For

Michael: All right, so let me start off by just recapping a little bit what we did last time. The point I was trying to get across, I thought of a better way of expressing it to you, and that is that the historical content of the course – Gandhi’s career, King’s career, is going to be done systematically – structurally. That’s how the course is organized. We just go chronologically through the two main phases of Gandhi’s career and then the much shorter career of Martin Luther King. And then we look at what we can do for the future.

But as I said, this chronological look is a close second and not quite the main thing that will give us, I think, the greatest benefit. And that main concept is going to come out more organically. And that main concept is a repertoire of the basic concepts underlying the science of nonviolence – the criteria that will enable us to analyze a nonviolent situation and so forth.

Means and Ends are Inseparable

Now what we did so far was I put on the board a very basic model of positive and negative forces, and what I have in the back of my mind was a contemporary example, namely, Iraq. Here’s people, they don’t have democracy. We want them to have democracy. Or that’s what Ancient Greek history writers would call, “A prophesis,” – that’s what we tell people is what is that we want.

But let’s take it on face-value. We want them to have democracy so we go and, you know, bomb them a lot and that will give them democracy. And there’s actually a statement by a high ranking military officer who’s charged with a large district of Iraq, who actually said, “With large enough doses of violence and terror and enough money for projects, I think we can convince these people that we’re here to help them.”

I guess you could not have a clearer expression of the worldview, which those of us who adopt a nonviolence worldview, do not believe in. You’re looking for a really clear criteria and it would set the two things apart. And now I’m going to use the term that’s very commonly used throughout the field. If you’re okay with violence, then you believe that you can bring about positive ends with negative means. If you believe in nonviolence then you say, “That is absolutely impossible. The ends and means have their own inner dynamic and you cannot possibly use negative means to bring about a positive end.” You cannot use cruise missiles and 500-pound bombs, which are essentially destructive – and don’t just take my word for it because we had the head of Air Military Science in here. He started off his talk by saying, “I’m going to tell what we

do in the Air Force.” He says, “We blow stuff up.” Now that’s essentially a destructive activity. So, I mean they wouldn’t disagree that it’s destructive activity. But they believe that you can use destructive mechanisms to get to a constructive end. Whereas we, I’m not trying to make like sheep and goat communities out of us. When I say, “We,” I mean those of us who – at least provisionally – are willing to accept the framework of nonviolence. We don’t believe that that is possible.

Conversely, we do believe that if you use constructive means you will have a constructive end, though it may not be exactly the one that you were aiming at. And that’s a very important principle. I won’t give a name to it right now, but we’ll get to that later on. So, this is a pretty good example of how I’d like us to work. Let’s take things that people say, the things that people do, and put them through this frame of nonviolent criteria. And I think if this frame is valid then we already have an explanation why we did not reach “mission accomplished” in Iraq when we said we did. In fact, I saw a bumper sticker a few weeks after that famous statement by the President. And the bumper sticker was, “quagmire accomplished.” So, if you believe in the violence paradigm, it’s very puzzling why that didn’t work. We have plenty of violence, how come it didn’t bring about what we wanted it to achieve?

But if you’re coming from our paradigm – and this makes us look pretty good – we have a perfect explanation for why that didn’t work. It was totally predictable, and nobody who understands the logic of this would ever have imagined that you could bomb people into democracy in any country.

So that was that a very simple, but so far pretty effective model that positive energy brings about positive results. Negative energy brings about negative results. Again, I apologize for the simplicity of this model. It’s just quite inappropriate for an upper-division course at Berkeley, but we’ll get into it more deeply.

And I’m starting to qualify what I mean by “positive” and “negative” and that is, you know, constructive versus destructive. We’ll be saying a lot more about that. And then we begin – within the nonviolence world – we begin to talk about differences between strategic and principled nonviolence. And I’m going to get back to that in a second.

Three Faces of Power

And I shared another model with you and started to apply it to one episode, and that is the model that Kenneth Boulding calls, “the three faces of power.” We have threat power, exchange power, and integrative power. And I said – I think I said – anyway, I’m about to say, that threat power is basically violence. Though there is room for ultimatums in nonviolence, you know, you can say, “If you do not,” for example, “start withdrawing from Iraq, you are going to have to face civil disobedience from us.” Let’s call that – I hope I’m not just playing a game with words here, but let’s call that an ultimatum rather than a threat. The real threat is if you depose the head of your state, we will bomb you. In other words, you threaten people with really harmful force.

And integrative power – the example of the women in North India who faced down that mob as a perfect example of how integrative power works – you are authentic, you hold onto truth, and it has a salutary effect even on people who are threatening you very seriously. And exchange power, I would say, is somewhere in-between. Exchange power by itself is neutral, but if you have a negative reason for using it, you can do a lot of damage with exchange power.

Have any of you read Perkins' book, "Confessions of an Economic Hit Man?" You know, this is something that better organized wealthy countries have been doing to not-so-well organized or differently organized, not so wealthy countries down the ages. You can use exchange as a way of exploiting people and then you drift into the violence camp. Or you can use exchange as a way of bringing about closer relationships, mutual support, and then you're drifting into the nonviolence camp.

So, for now anyway, for a simplification, we can talk about it in more detail when we get to particular cases. Threat power is pretty much violent. Integrative power is just almost completely nonviolent. Exchange power is neutral. And again, I'd like to emphasize something that Boulding very rightly does emphasize that we have a regular industry for studying threat power, a regular industry for studying exchange power, and we're just beginning to grope with how we might start to explore integrative power.

Okay, so what I'd like to do now – because my computer is on battery and I'm not sure how much time we have. I'd like to do an experiment with you, if we can get the equipment to work, which is to show you a brief clip from a feature film and then see what we can do already by way of analyzing that clip from the point of view of nonviolence. So, Rachel, would you see if this reaches that wall behind you? I have a funny feeling it doesn't. Yeah. Okay.

So let me get back to what I was saying about the divide between strategic and principled nonviolence, not because I enjoy conflict in itself, but because it serves to point up what some of the basic characteristics of principled nonviolence are. And incidentally, we've been having discussions about this throughout the nonviolence community and I'm really looking forward to getting us all together on the same page pretty soon.

Withdrawal of Consent

In the early days when people really didn't know how to approach nonviolence or build a model to understand it, they did see that something was going on, and it could be very effective. They were looking for a sort of negative rather than a positive. This is my – this is the biggest – I'm trying to choose my language carefully here because I don't want to make fights with people. But this was probably the wrong foot to start off on, to look for a negative.

And they came up with a negative assumption about power. Trying to explain how come people could stand up and throw off an oppressive regime, when that regime had all the material resources, it had access to all the media, and it had all of the uniformed repression at its command – you know, the police, the military, the paramilitaries, whatever they were. People could still stand up and throw this off. How did that work? And the definition that they came up with was that it worked by the withdrawal of consent. And then they found, sure enough, some theorists from the 18th Century, especially one in France. His name is Étienne de La Boétie who said that “The strongest power in the world,” talking about governmental power, “requires the consent of the governed. And the minute the governed stand up and say, ‘No, I won’t do this,’ they have no power over you.” And if you saw the Gandhi film, as many of you did – the Attenborough film – someone says, “The government, they will kill him.” And Gandhi says, “Then they will have my body, but not my obedience.”

So there really is quite a limit to what any other outside authority or structure can do to you once you turn around and say, “Go ahead, do your worst. I don’t care.” It’s even been proposed during the Cold War that the rationale for building the atomic bomb was flawed. The rationale at that time was – it has to be called a rationale, not a reason – I’ll tell you why in a minute. The rationale was if we don’t get to this thing first, Hitler will have it, and then he’ll be able to hold us hostage.

Well, it turned out that wasn’t the real reason that people were building the atomic bomb, because the day that Germany collapsed, one atomic scientist on that whole project – maybe out of 120 top notch people said, “Whew, it’s over. We don’t have to build this anymore, right? So, let’s have a meeting. Let’s decide what we’re going to do with our money. Let’s head to Mexico, you know? Have some fun, buy a latte.”

And guess what? Nobody moved. Nobody blinked an eye. Everybody went right back to their desks and kept on working. So, it wasn’t true that the real reason for building the atomic bomb was to stop Hitler. However, that’s not my main point right now. Eventually, some Quaker theorist came along and said, “Okay well, let’s assume that he had a few of those things and we said to him, ‘You know, go ahead. Use them.’ And so, let’s say he took out New York. I mean don’t get me wrong. I’m from New York. I did not like this idea at all. There’re certain neighborhoods in New York which I think would benefit, but by and large, yeah, this would be a blow. But let’s say that he did that to a couple of cities and we coped with it as best we could and we simply defied him and said, ‘You know, you come over here, you’re going to have to fight us from every barn door and this will be the shot heard around the world.’ Or is, ‘The herd shot around the world?’ – donated those cows to Australia.”

Anyway, it is conceivable. I’m not saying that the American people were in a psychological condition to be able to do that at that time, but it is quite conceivable that people could get into that condition, and they could say, “You can do anything you want to us. We are not going to violate our conscience.” Period, end of quote.

And then immediately, all that power, even if you've got the atomic bomb and they do not, all of that power is rendered void. All you can do is crash around like a bull in a China shop and destroy stuff and end up with maybe a radioactive wasteland, and you really gain nothing from this. So obviously, we don't want things to get that far down the road, right? We want to intercept the conflict at an earlier stage.

Shifting the Paradigm

But the point is that there is a kind of power that you realize by withdrawing consent from somebody who is oppressing you. So, my problem with this is that it assumes that power is compulsive and the only way you can avoid it is to withdraw something rather than supply something. By thinking of nonviolence in this way, you don't really get yourself out of the prevailing paradigm.

Now I guess this is the first time I maybe – maybe this is the first time I'm using the word "paradigm" so I'm assuming that most of you are familiar with this term. Do you want me to go over it for a couple of minutes? Does everybody totally know what a paradigm is? Is there anyone not quite familiar with how the term is used?

Okay, you know, it's probably worth a few minutes of review because actually a lot of people misuse it – that is they don't use it the way I like [laughter]. This term entered our vocabulary in 1962 and personally, he was a historian of science. It just shows you, you can come from all kinds of unlikely fields.

The Structure of Scientific Revolutions

Name was Thomas Kuhn and I think he was working at Harvard, of all the unlikely places, and he wrote a book called, "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions," in which he challenged the idea that science operates by accumulating facts and refining theories in accordance with those facts. And he showed while this is going on, there's another process that's much deeper and much more powerful and that is that a given community, let's say the community of physical scientists in the world at large, at a given time. They have a model in their mind of what the universe is, how it works, what the forces are, and so forth.

And if a fact comes in that doesn't match that model and just a few of those facts come in, this is called, "an anomaly." They say, "Well, there must be something wrong with the facts." Like in the late 60's these two fellows working in Bell Laboratories in southern New Jersey set up an antenna on the roof of their lab and they heard background radiation coming from everywhere in the universe at .7 degrees Kelvin. And they said, "Oh my gosh, it's the Big Bang."

So, they went around checking to make sure there wasn't the Big Bang. They were saying, "Maybe it's some bird guano that got on the antenna." So, they crawled up there

and cleaned off the antenna and it was still the same radiation coming from everywhere. So, they treated it as an anomaly at first, though they went to look and see if it was an anomaly, but it wasn't an anomaly. It is an actual fact that the Big Bang is still going on. Sometimes I imagine at 3 o'clock in the morning, if you're very, very quiet – I'm not sure what .7 degrees Kelvin sounds like – but you can hear it.

So, in course of time though, whatever model the community has unconsciously agreed upon to be their working model of the universe, none of those working models has really ever worked indefinitely. And you reach a point where there's so many of these counter-instances – yeah, of these anomalies that you realize that they are not anomalies but counter-instances. They are telling you that the model itself is wrong. And that's very uncomfortable. Most people do not want to go there. So, you enter the pleasant land of denial, and you stay there until somebody comes along and comes up with a model that explains the old facts and the new facts.

Now that process is called first, "paradigm breakdown," when the old model doesn't work anymore and then, "paradigm shift," when you pick up a new one. And the way paradigm shift comes in is very, very interesting because there's never more than about 4% or 5% of the people in that discourse community who conceptualize the new model. And from those four or five percent, you can reach what's called a tipping point – that's a new concept that Kuhn didn't know about. And suddenly everybody says, "I knew that." And they move over to the new model, and the process starts all over again.

So, this is quite pertinent for us because I believe that we're in a condition right now of incipient paradigm shift. It's waiting to happen. The old paradigm, which we're going to look at in some detail next week, which inevitably leads you to a violent posture, is not working. And it's on that very level of you're using violence that it's mainly not working.

But the thing of it is, if you don't have a new paradigm, you're going to cling to the old paradigm no matter what. It's almost impossible not to have a paradigm. Sort of I guess like – I don't know – being on an acid trip forever or something like that – which is not a very comfortable situation. So, the most effective thing that we can possibly be doing right now is giving some coherent shape to the new paradigm which would lead to a nonviolent outcome, where the present one leads to a violent outcome.

Differences between Principled and Strategic Nonviolence

And it's at this point where I get a little bit disappointed with strategic nonviolence because it will explain how a few of these episodes work, but it doesn't, in itself, produce a positive definition of power to counteract the positive but destructive definition of power that we've been operating on in the old paradigm.

So, there's a parallel here that you might be more familiar with, a parallel to strategic versus principled nonviolence that you might be more familiar with in the area of peace

theory. And that's the good old concept of negative peace. You know, two states which are not actively at war with one another are experiencing what we, in the nonviolence world like to call, "negative peace." It's peace defined as the absence of war.

And this is not exactly a very inspiring state. There's peace right now of this kind right now between let's say, the United States and Uganda because we're not having a fighting war right now. Or you can even say between the U.S. and Iran at this point, with all this saber-rattling, but there's not outright, you know, hot war going on. And this can get, you know, pretty absurd. A number of years ago there was a peace group that was giving an absurdity of the year award to various organizations. And they gave their award to the U.S. Navy for its definition of peace. The U.S. Navy's definition of peace at that time was, "perpetual pre-hostility." Okay, you can have perpetual pre-hostility, but I'm not going to work my head off trying to make a major out of it for UC Berkeley because I don't think it's very inspiring. It's not worth it. It doesn't get out of this mess. Perpetual pre-hostility has a tendency to slide into non-perpetual pre-hostility and actual hostility.

Principled Nonviolence

We want to get to what's called, "stable peace." That, again, is a term coined by Kenneth Boulding – wrote a book in 1972 with that title, "Stable Peace." Excellent book. So, another difference in strategic nonviolence and this is one that I did mention on Tuesday, is that it gives you what you might call different moral boundaries. That is, you're standing there at the demonstration, you remember, and you got your placards nailed to baseball bats, as soon as the demonstration is called off, it's over, you're going to use the same old, same old.

Now when you ask people, "what is the definition of principled nonviolence?" They will usually say that it's nonviolence as a way of life. And I don't disagree with that. I think it is true that if you adopt principled nonviolence you will soon find that it starts radiating into every aspect of your life. You're going to start looking at your diet, how you relate to people.

I remember being on a bus one time sitting behind a couple of young ladies. They looked like they might be Berkeley students. We were going from Berkeley to San Francisco. They were talking in not always totally appreciative terms about their respective boyfriends. And one of them said, "I don't know why things go so much better when I'm nice to the creep, they just do." So, I said, "I can use that. Immediately wrote it down and used it in my next book. So be careful what you say if I'm in the next seat.

But see, this is the person who is discovering an application of nonviolence in one-on-one relationships. But because she didn't have a paradigm that would tell her how it worked, she said, "I don't how this works, but I'm just discovering experientially that it works." It was, for her, an anomaly at that point – because I was tempted to jump out of

my seat and say, “that was a counter-instance! Let me explain!” [Laughter] No, I have learned a little bit. Not even in the Bay Area would I do that.

Okay.

Importance of Nonviolent Training

Now another thing about strategic versus principled nonviolence which differentiates them – I do hope to get off this topic pretty quickly – is that in strategic nonviolence you pretty much are just looking at behavior. Whereas for us – again, me and three or four other people who are in this principled nonviolent posture – behavior is important to be sure, but it’s the last thing that’s important. You first want to look at mental states. Then you want to look at training. Then you want to look at organizational patterns and then you look at behavior.

So, we get a lot of joy and comfort from the opening line of the Dhammapada which is, I think, in Theravada Buddhism is one of their main texts. I’m not very good on Buddhist sayings – I’m not very good on Christian ones either – but the first line of the Dhammapada is, literally translated, it says, “Mind is the forerunner of all states.” So, if you try to explain everything in terms of behavior that is the visible outcome of these mental states, you’re perpetually at a loss to explain why it doesn’t work.

And then in the infamous words of Ted Roethke, who’s a historian who used to teach at Santa Cruz, he lives in Berkeley now. He said, “People try nonviolence for a week and when it doesn’t ‘work’ they go back to violence, which hasn’t worked for centuries.” And we just see this cycle repeating endlessly because you don’t have a way of explaining to yourself what you mean by getting nonviolence to work.

Okay, so for them it’s pretty much only behavior, for us behavior comes last, although it’s important.

Moral Boundaries

Now I’ve used the term “moral boundaries,” but I want to make it clear that moral vocabulary doesn’t seem to work very well anymore and it’s not a set of terms that I normally use to try to explain how nonviolence works.

I’m going to come at this strictly from a scientific perspective. To give you an example of what I mean when I say, “moral terminology doesn’t work that well anymore,” there was a survey. I think it was Redbook Magazine that carried this survey. They asked 70,000 of their readers to list the 15 most important sins – that must have been an exciting edition – in descending order of importance. And war was, I think, 15 out of a list of 17. Very, very unimportant sin. For most people responding, wearing lipstick to church on Sunday was much more serious than waging war.

Now, okay, if you had stopped somebody on the street and said, “Hey, you know, come on, let’s be real here. What hurts people more? Wearing lipstick to church on Sunday or dropping a cruise missile on a house?” They would say, “I guess I would have to admit that a cruise missile is a little more harmful than misapplied lipstick.” But if you approach them and say, “let’s think in terms of moral categories,” they come up with this absurd ranking. So, I’m not going to use that term very much after this. I will try and use a completely scientific approach.

Does Nonviolence Work?

A couple of things I’ve noticed that make it difficult for people to get into understanding how nonviolence works, seeing an episode, learning from it, is for some funny reason – and I guess it’s not so funny, I guess it just has to do with the paradigm that we’ve got. When you present people with a case where nonviolence worked, for some reason their mind immediately jumps to a situation in which it would not have worked. Probably see from your nods that some of you have experienced this already. So, what do you do with such people? I mean you’re not going to grab them by the collar and shake them and say, “take Nagler’s course.” You need some nonviolent way of approaching them.

No one is saying – I mean no one in our camp is saying that nonviolence always works perfectly, and none of us is saying that if you use a little nonviolence it will solve everything. What we’re pleading for is symmetry. I’m using a somewhat technical term from the social sciences. People are very asymmetrical in the criteria that they apply to violence and the criteria that they apply to nonviolence.

Okay, let’s just go back to Iraq for an example. And we have a situation. We’ve reduced a substantial country to utter chaos. We’ve killed probably – it looks like more than 100,000 noncombatants. But as Arundhati Roy said, “Who’s counting? Because we don’t even count them.” Killed almost 3,000 of our own people. We have upwards of 20,000 Americans who are severely traumatized either physically, or mentally, or both – and nobody is even talking about the mental traumatization – and I’m going to be saying something about it next week.

All of this damage, but I don’t hear anybody saying, “gosh, I guess violence doesn’t work.” On the other hand, if you try a little bit of nonviolence, like in the Civil Rights Movement, as we’re going to see, it was a mixed success. People look at the mixed success and they say, “That shows that nonviolence doesn’t work.”

Well, all I’m saying is, this is not scientific. This is bad science. If you’re going to generalize from one case, you should do it in a parallel way in both instances. If you don’t say that violence doesn’t work in cases when it doesn’t work, if you don’t generalize, you shouldn’t generalize from nonviolence either. And you shouldn’t look at all the results and expect them all to be positive.

As you can imagine, this is a kind of question that I get all the time all over the country talking about this stuff. I don't get this question in Europe very much because they've hardly thought about nonviolence over there for the most part. But here, people feel more challenged by it, and they very typically say, "Oh, but look at India today. It's such a mess. This is a direct result of Gandhi."

Well, we need to be a little bit more sophisticated than that. And as we step through that history, we'll take a look at the differences. So, I want to do now a couple of other things. I want to, for our first example, talk about the etymology of a word because it will, again, help us to understand how it is that we look at nonviolence in a much deeper than behavioral level. And then I want to talk about a nonviolent episode, since we didn't get to see one, and start an analysis of it.

Etymology of Ahimsā

The word for nonviolence in Sanskrit was "ahimsā." All of this is in the first couple of chapters of my book, and I think it's really useful for you to see it in writing, or to read it and then to hear us talk about it where we can have some exchange back and forth because that's the way these unfamiliar ideas really get to be part of our mental landscape.

So, the question before us, "why is Nagler so excited about this word?" Partly, it's a simple enough word, "a" is what is called a privative. It negates the rest of the word. So, it's like "acephalic" in biology means some poor critter running around without a head. Acausal – something that has no cause, and so forth. Sanskrit had the same prefix. So ahimsā is the absence of himsā and right away you might think this contradicts what I was just talking about because it's a negative term. It is really almost literally non-violence. But the fact is that at this early stage of the Sanskrit language, negatives didn't work quite the way they do in our language. There were some concepts which were regarded to be primordial, fundamental to the nature of reality, but elusive. They are sort of beyond the veil of Maya, if you will, and of things which are very difficult to describe directly. So, what you do is you negate the next thing up to it and hopefully you fall into it by default. And this is a fairly common practice. So, for example, courage. The term for courage in both Hinduism and Buddhism is often "abhaya," which means "non-fear."

And sometimes even for love they would say, "advesha" which means "non-hatred" which, of course would not work in modern English, right? If you come up to somebody and say, "I don't hate you. Should we get married?" I don't think so. That would be back in perpetual pre-hostility. So, although this work looks like a negative – and I guess I haven't mentioned this before, but the word "nonviolence" itself has been a terrific problem for us because it is a negative. People think you take away violence and you've got nonviolence. It doesn't work that way, and if there was a substitute for the word nonviolence, I would be the first to adopt it. Of course, there are some, but they're not in our language.

So, one thing to know about that word is that although it looks like a negative, it really isn't, and you can translate it by saying that which comes into play when all hostility is removed. Okay, that's step one. I got another card up my sleeve. It's a short sleeve, as you can see, but there's room for one more card.

So, the next part is about the term "himsā" which means injury or hurting. And it comes from a root "han" which means "to strike" or "to slay". You maybe have heard in your walking up and down Telegraph Avenue about the "unstruck sound." I guess Shambhala Bookstore isn't there anymore, but you go in there and I'm sure you'll hear – you can buy a CD with the "unstruck sound" on it. It's kind of easy to produce those CDs. There's no signal. The term for that was "anahata shabda," the not-struck sound. So okay? "Han" means "to strike." And "himsā" means "injury." But as you'll notice, this word looks rather different from that root. So, at this point philologists get worked up – this is called etymology, what we're doing now. It means study of the original basic root meanings of words. Philologists, as linguists, get very excited. They say, "I sense a PhD dissertation." And they try to explain why himsā looks funny.

And the prevailing explanation is it's not 100% sure, but it's probable, that himsā is what we call a "desiderative." Look how much we're learning already and it's almost relevant. [Laughter] A desiderative means it doesn't express the root meaning of the verb, but the desire to carry out the action of that verb.

So let me give you an example. In Sanskrit the word "jivāmi" means "I live." But there's also a form, "jijivisāmi," which means "I want to live." So, by now you may see why I am doing all of this. It's because it looks as though this very, very ancient word actually did not mean injury or violence. It meant the predisposition towards injury or violence. In other words, the desire to harm someone. So, we can go back to ahimsā and say that there is a positive power which is released when a person has been enabled to convert all desire to harm.

It's a mouthful, but unfortunately, to render this into English adequately we really have to do that. For example, Martin Luther King, who, as far as I know, did not know this about this word, in explaining what happened to anger felt by people in the Civil Rights Movement, he said, "we did not repress anger, and we did not express it as such. Rather, we released it under controlled conditions for maximum effect." That's a perfect psychological description of what nonviolence is.

There is anger – namely the desire to harm. You get yourself into a state where that desire is channeled into something else, into a positive form of energy for which there isn't a very good word and that's the nonviolent process.

Student: Can you repeat that quote, please?

Michael: Yeah. I can repeat the quote, I think verbatim. He said – I'll get this for you next time in his exact words, but he said, "It is not that we expressed anger or that we repressed it, but that we put it into action through –" we released it – there we go – "we

released it under controlled circumstances for maximum effect.” Yeah. And it is incredible what that actually meant in terms of what people did in that movement. And we’re going to be discussing that in due course. It’ll be a lot of fun. Okay?

So, we’re going to do this etymological thing again with the word “Satyagraha” and a few other words, but I think, if I can, I’ll leave that until we get to the coining of the word “Satyagraha” in 1908. And I’d like to switch gears a little bit now and tell you about a nonviolent episode that I witnessed and see if we can analyze it. Unless you have any questions about this before I go further on? Okay. You get .005 credits in Southeast Asian 10 for taking this course. You’re going to know about six Sanskrit words by the time we get out of here.

Duffy's Satyagraha

Okay, in the community where I live there was a family that had two small children whom we shall call, “Francisco and Sita,” for such were their names. And their father’s family owned a little dog whom we will call, “Duffy,” for the same reason. Duffy – I actually had a picture of Duffy, but I wasn’t able to get it on my laptop yet. I’ll bring it in, and it’ll be very expressive once you’ve heard this story.

Duffy is not like a Pit Bull. He doesn’t stand four feet at the shoulder, you know, he’s a little sort of a terrier kind of dog, about yea big – brown and white. And the parents who owned this dog were going away for a week. They asked the family who lives in my community, would they look after Duffy for a week. So, of course, they said, “Yes.” You know, the children like Duffy, Duffy likes the children.

And they took care of Duffy for a week – building up to this very dramatic – we have until 12:30, right? We may need various nonviolent mechanisms here to keep going. And one day the children were walking across the meadow followed by Duffy, and I’m looking at them from about 100 yards away and I said, “There is going to be a lot of trouble when Duffy’s owners come back because those kids are so bonded with that dog, and the dog is so bonded with those kids that they’re going to have a hard time prying them apart.”

But, you know, no one is asking me. I’m not saying anything. Sure enough, in due course, the parents came home, and they collected Duffy, and that lasted exactly two days. They called up and they said, “Could you possibly take Duffy?” And the family said, “Why?” “He hasn’t eaten for two days.” Okay? So, this is our first example of dog nonviolence. [Laughter] We’re going to have another one in a little while. In fact, maybe today, unless they come crashing through the door here before I get to them.

But this is an interesting case because this is like the first case of a hunger strike that we’ve seen all semester, right? And partly, I’m doing this to illustrate that there are certain things about nonviolence which are deeply embedded in nature. Not even human nature, they’re deeply embedded in nature. However, I’m not trying to make the

point that animals can be nonviolent in any meaningful sense that we would be using here.

Animals, in the sense that I'm using the term, animals cannot be violent because they do not have – they're not harboring a desire to harm. They're just reacting. I had a dog once, he's a very, very fine dog, and we had a very close relationship, this dog and myself – at least I like to think so. But one day he bit me rather seriously, and the reason was we were going over a barbed wire fence and Mukha got caught and his paw was stuck in the fence. In order to get his paw out, I had to hurt him a little. When I hurt him, he bit me. I was not shocked. I cried. [Laughter] It's just the physical pain, see? I did not hold it against him and say, "You're biting the hand that feeds you, quite literally Mukha, what's your problem? You know, we're going to send you to dog obedience school," or something like that. Now I know that, you know, the dog has a button. You push the button, it bites you. So, I'm not calling that violence. It's just a destructive response.

Now for that same reason, the poor beast was not capable of nonviolence either. In fact, Mukha was not capable of much sense control on any level. We had to tie him up during certain seasons of the year and so on and so forth. So, this is by way of telling you that although there are certain aspects of cooperative force and even the persuasive power of nonviolence embedded in nature, for us as human beings, it takes on a qualitatively different dimension. So don't think I'm saying that Duffy was nonviolent. Duffy was a very nice dog, and that's exactly what he was supposed to be at that stage in his evolution – was a very nice dog.

But it turns out that what he did was one of the most potent and best-known mechanisms in the nonviolent arsenal, so to speak – call it that. And that is the refusal to partake of food. The fast, which is different qualitatively from a hunger strike – a hunger strike is just protest. But a fast – there are actually two types. One type is really for your own self-purification, and that's not the type that we're interested in here. The second type of fast is one where you actually attempt to change another person's behavior through integrative power. And Gandhi is, as in so many other areas, he is the foremost experimenter with this stuff. And if you read around in his works – I don't think in any one place he sat down and said, "Here are the rules," but if you put together different things that he said in one place or another, you'll see that he came up with five rules for fasting which will help us understand the power of the thing and, by extension, how nonviolence works.

Persuasion vs Coercion

So, I've already used the term that I want to elaborate on, and that's "persuasion" versus "coercion." In coercion, you get somebody to do something whether they want to or not. In persuasion you make them want to. It's still a kind of power, but as you can see, you both end up on the same page. Whereas if you coerce somebody into doing

something, they're just looking for a way to get back at you – stop doing it the minute your back is turned. We'll come across many, many examples of that.

But this vocabulary is useful. And it's particularly useful here because if a fast doesn't work well, it becomes coercive. And that's why the British were always saying that he's doing a hunger strike, he's trying to coerce us, we're going to show that we cannot be coerced. And then usually they turned around and did what he wanted, but they kept on saying, "we will not be coerced."

Rules of Fasting 1-2

So, in order for a fast to really work on the deep level to persuade another person, bring them around to your point-of-view, it turns out that there are five rules, as I was saying. The first is you have to be the right person for the job. Not just anybody can do this. On several occasions, you know, Gandhi would announce that he wasn't taking food. The people would be deeply struck by this, and they would send him telegrams saying, "We will not eat either, Bapu, while you are not eating."

On many occasions, he answered these people back and he said, "Please don't do that. This is for me to do," particularly for Nehru on one occasion said, "I'm also going to fast along with you," and Gandhi shot back a telegram immediately saying, "don't do that." So, we'll have to think about what exactly the criteria are for knowing that you're the right person, but for the time being let's say that that's Criteria Number 1. It's not to be used by just anybody.

Secondly – I realized this is beginning to sound like the Buddha's 8-Fold Path here – Right audience. And the criterion here is simpler and we can use the term that Gandhi used to that, "You should only fast against a lover." Meaning someone who was in sympathy with you on a very deep level. And we'll come back to this, by the way, as soon as we get into the history and we see him doing this stuff, we'll be trying to fit it into this pattern. But if you look at all the fasts that he undertook – I think it's probably about 12 of them and maybe about 3 out of those 12 were just for him and they were not directed at anyone. So, let's say we got about eight or nine of them in the course of his career. He started this, incidentally, in India, not in South Africa. So, you look at all of those, he never fasted against the British because they were not on his page. They would not have responded correctly.

So let me pause here to throw in an example that illustrates how badly this can backfire if you don't observe Rule Number 2. And incidentally, these are in no particular order. This is the order in which they happen to come to me at the moment, and I'm just hoping I can remember all five, is what I'm actually going through. But the second rule, "fasting against the lover," about 20 years ago there was a particularly nasty period in the Irish struggles. And there were some IRA members who had been arrested and they were being held in an infamous prison – Long Kesh Prison – and they decided to stop eating and Margaret Thatcher, who was the Prime Minister at that time said, "oh, they're

just terrorists and thugs. Let them starve themselves to death.” And in fact, they did. About three or four of them died. One of them, Bobby Sands, I seem to remember. And as far as we can tell, it produced no effect on the intended audience. And one of the things I’m trying to illustrate here is that nonviolence is not a feel-good operation. It’s very scientific. You have to know when to do what. And they didn’t know that. Question?

Student: So how can you predict whether the audience is going to react to you?

Michael: How can you predict whether the audience is going to react? I think you have to have established a rapport with them beforehand. And you just have to use your judgment and your sense of where that relationship is at. Question?

Student: Well, someone who cares about your well being [unintelligible 00:53:02]?

Michael: That’s what I actually mean. Not a “lover.” In the sense of someone who cares about your wellbeing, yes. Not your significant other or something like that, yeah. So that was his term, and he’s using it in his sense. In other words, someone who would not only be affected by what you are doing, but they would be affected on such a deep level that they almost couldn’t help themselves. And that’s again, a very interesting borderline that we’ll be talking about when it comes up. It’s called, “The Law of Suffering.” Yeah?

Student: I was just wondering if you know if Gandhi would let himself starve to death?

Michael: I believe – he never did let himself starve to death so we can’t be quite sure, but I’m just about positive that there were a number of occasions, particularly in ‘31 and another one ‘34 where, if he had not succeeded in persuading people, he simply would have let it all go. Yeah. Yeah. There’s even precedent for that. It’s called, “Yogic death.” I’m not recommending it for anyone. Yeah?

Etymology of Violence

Student: In regard to your definition of violence and nonviolence in animal nature, I kind of got the sense that you meant according to Sanskrit that animals aren’t violent because they don’t plan and intentionally do harm in any meaning. But what about like violence in, you know, everyday life that can happen, that happens by accident? Like car accidents or they’re not intended, but it’s like violent.

Michael: Yes. For these purposes – and remind you, I’m giving you a particular vocabulary and it’ll line up 90% with the way other people use words. But this whole field is so new that people use different words in different ways. But the way I’m using the word violence, going back to the etymology, it has to really be a downright desire to harm. I can say even a lion jumping on a lamb is not doing it to hurt the lamb, it’s doing it – well, it’s not even doing it for a reason, but it’s just programmed to eat lambs when it gets hungry. Similarly, an accident is also not violence.

Structural Violence

Now, having brought that up, however, there is a very interesting in-between category. And I am aware that we're only two-fifths of the way through – and we are going to go back. But there is something – and again, this is due – this term was coined by Johan Galtung, the other great nonviolence theorist – peace theorist – “structural violence.” How many of you have heard that term? Okay, good. So, we do have some passive interest. Somebody want to try to define it? What's structural violence?

Student: It's where like it's stuff like [unintelligible 00:55:53] where inequality is there. Like physical violence isn't necessarily taking place, but the system is set up in a way that it could take place.

Michael: Yes. That's right. It's not necessarily the case that physical violence is taking place, except on those occasions when a policeman goes down the bowery, you know, hitting drunks. But violent harm is built into the system in some way so that violence could take place. And there's even a category in law called, “negligent...” what's it called? What is it that I'm thinking of? “Criminal negligence.” You set up a situation in which somebody can get hurt, someone, sure enough, does get hurt, and you are liable for that in law. And we're considering that a form of violence in our scientific system here also. In fact, let's face it, people, most of the violence in the world today is structural violence. You know, you live in a world where, I think, between 1990 and 2000, the 200 richest people in the world doubled their wealth. So, they added, I think, a trillion dollars to their joint wealth. And they now are more wealthy than the 200 million lowest people. Maybe it's even worse than that. It's like 2.2 billion or something like that. There's this enormous, enormous – you have to call it almost, an obscene inequality, is an example of structural violence. Yeah, there are lots of others. So, I'm glad you brought that up. Yeah?

Student: I just have a question about what you said, when you said, “Gandhi would let it all go.” What do you mean?

Michael: I mean – what I meant by saying, “Gandhi would let it all go,” is he was prepared to let the body perish. I'm quite sure because he never lied about major things. I mean he was a terrific Boy Scout in that regard. If he said something, he tended to believe it. And he often said, “If you don't do this, or if you keep on doing this, I'm not going to take food, and I'm not going to live.” So, I'm quite sure that he really meant it. If he hadn't really meant it, it probably would not have had that effect.

I know that this book “Gandhi, the Man” is out of print or they haven't gotten enough copies. By the way, is there anybody who wanted a copy of that book and wasn't able to find it? Okay, I'll get a few copies in. There's a story in that book which is picked up by Al Gore, incidentally – and we're very proud of this – in “Earth Imbalance.” It's one of those stories.

Story of the Boy Who Ate Too Much Sugar

It's very hard to tell whether it actually happened, but it almost doesn't matter because it's so characteristic that it may as well have happened.

The story is that a woman came to Gandhi with her 5 year-old boy in tow – or maybe he was 10 or something. Again, remember, me and numbers – very bad. So, there's a boy. [Laughter] That much I know. And the woman comes to Gandhi with a boy and, you know, he was – you know, he had office hours all the time. Anybody could come to him. And he never said to them, "You expect me to deal with such a trivial problem? You know, only one individual is involved." Totally not in his worldview.

And the woman said to him, "Bapu, this boy is taking too much sugar. I can't control him. Please tell him to stop taking so much sugar." And Gandhi said, "Okay, come back in three days." I'm trying to – if I can remember how to say come back in three days in Hindi, but I can't, so we'll go on from there. So, you know, the lady walks away with her boy, comes back three days later, presents the child and Gandhi says, "Stop taking so much sugar." The boy says, "Haan, Bapu." I know how to say, "Yes," at least. "Yes!" Situation solved. Mother is very grateful. But she does say, "With all due respect, Maharaj, why didn't you say that three days ago?" And does anybody know?

Student: Because he hadn't stopped eating sugar.

Michael: Yeah. He said, "Three days ago I was still eating sugar." So that's what he was like. He didn't – you know, he may have said a lot of things that we disagree with. He may have been hard to get along with in various ways. In fact, there's some good documentary evidence of that. But he was incredibly truthful. And if he said, "If you don't stop, I'm going to die," I take that at face value. Okay?

Incidentally, this is a typical example of how we're going to proceed. We'll take an episode, we'll hit into a general principle that's embedded in that episode. We'll stop and take it apart. If you have questions, we'll go in different directions with those questions. Guess what? We have three minutes to do the next three rules. Why don't we just do this? I'll just put them on the board, and we'll discuss them a little more next time.

Rules of fasting 3-5

So, the third rule is, it has to be a doable demand. It has to be reasonable. The fourth is that it has to be a last resort. You've tried every other means of communicating. And finally, it has to be consistent with the rest of your campaign. And ideally, consistent with the rest of your life. So, what I propose we do by way of a bit of an exercise over the weekend is we rate Duffy. Ask ourselves, "How many of these rules did he get right?" And then we will go on from there, start talking about science and history and how we can bring that onboard.

Thanks very much. Have a good weekend.

[3. More Background 1: How 'Science' and 'History' Weigh-in on the Possibility of the 'Nonviolent Effect'](#)

Michael: Fascinating subject this week - I know it's superfluous to say that. I know they're all fascinating. But this week you get to watch me talk about something that I know very little about so that should really be a lot of fun. Just to go over a couple of things, I have extra syllabi here if you don't – if you're using last year's Reader, that's very green of you and I approve of this kind of thing, but I'm going to try to keep track of which articles are new. But I think it's a good bet every now and then to look at somebody who has a new Reader and see what you don't have and xerox those articles and just fold them in.

So, one of the things that I've done is I now have a two-sided copy of the syllabus here for everybody. Now as far as getting in the course, I think that if you are on the course list and you've been coming here, you don't need to sign up today. So, we can dispense with that kind of, you know, grade-school activity. If you're on the course list and you haven't been coming, we got to talk. If you're on the wait-list, I have the new wait-list here. I'm handing that around. I'd like to get – check off that you're here today, of course. But also tell me what year you're in and what major you're in. The situation is, that at this point it looks like I can add six people from the wait-list and there are 13 on it. So that's what the situation is right now. So let me just pass this around. Okay. I think that's all the announcements that I need to make.

So, we're going to start talking about science and then eventually work our way up to history. And next week we will talk about an Eastern view of science – namely, the Vedanta, which was Gandhi's background and it's an interesting segue to the new paradigm that we're trying to construct. Before we do that though, we had something left over from last week.

Applying the Rules of Fasting

If you remember, we were going to rate Duffy, which was our first example of dog satyagraha.

Duffy had undertaken a spontaneous fast. Now in satyagraha we don't like to say that he was fasting against his owners. Gandhi liked to say he offered a fast to his owners. But I'm not sure what rhetoric Duffy was using, but it was a very successful fast. And if you remember the five criteria – okay, let's do that over here. So, the first one was that you had to be the right "person" to do it. Now, of course, you have to put the "person" in quotes.

[Sasha], if you want to take a seat right up here, that's fine because you'll be closer. And I don't know why – this isn't a yoga class, so I don't know why they push the seats back so far. People, when you come in here to start, move the front row up. It will probably involve me in a life and death struggle with the person who's teaching a course in here, but I don't like to have all this white space between us.

Anyway, I propose that we just kind of pass over this. Duffy was not a person at all. I hope I'm not getting into trouble with animal rights people, but the fact is, he was a very small dog. And obviously, he did what he did quite spontaneously. That's one thing we know about animal nature, is they don't have the kind of choice that human beings have. Now I don't remember what order I put these in last time, but, "The Audience." You have to – remember, what's the key word here? If we say, "Against," you have to fast against a lover. Right.

And we didn't mean that in a modern sense, which has gotten very specific. But in the sense that it has to be someone who cares what happens to you or else the gesture has no meaning. What you're saying to a person - remember, we're trying to make two distinctions here when we talk about fasting within satyagraha. One, it's not a case of suicide. You're not killing yourself, you are risking death. And what you're doing is actually putting your life in the other person's hands.

So, in a way, it's an act of extreme intimacy. It's an act of love, in the non-modern sense of the word. You're actually putting your life in that person's hands. You are not killing yourself, but you're saying to the person, "Your behavior is so unacceptable that if you continue it, it's going to kill me." So, this is simply an extreme case of taking on the suffering that's in the situation. We're going to get back to that principle at some point. I'm sure it will come up very soon. The other distinction we need to make is this is different from a threat because what you're saying to the person is, "I am going to exhibit to you, I'm going to mirror back to you the ultimate consequences of what you're doing."

So, you're not saying, "If you don't do what I want, I'm going to die and then you'll be sorry." It's not quite like that. It's like this is an act of truth. You're killing us. You're killing us. You're killing our people, and I'm going to show you that you're doing it to wake up your conscience. And once you realize what you're doing, you'll make your choice whether to continue doing it or not. So that's why you have to be carrying on this conversation. And incidentally, nonviolent actions can be thought of as conversation on a nonverbal level with someone who's not listening to you verbally anymore.

So, in the conversation you have to, obviously, keep that person in the loop, and you're not coercing them. You're getting them to listen to a different kind of rhetoric, okay? So, I think we can check this off. Duffy obviously fasted against a lover in the sense that it was his owners, and they didn't want the poor critter to die, and that's what constituted the awakening or the persuasion of them. Okay?

I'm going to get you more involved in the rest of the answers. So, the third criterion was the request, I suppose, has to be doable. I'm thinking of a case in the early 80s when there were two people who were upset about the Cold War and the arms race, and they decided to fast against Premier Khrushchev and President Eisenhower to make them stop having the arms race. And that was kind of ridiculous. It was just two people that these presidents had never heard of, so it was the wrong audience. They were the wrong people. It was not doable.

They could not say to their respective constituencies which were, you know, several hundred million people, "Oh, there's two guys in America who don't want us to do this, so we're going to stop." So that's an example of violating all – just basically all the basic rules of fasting. Needless to say, these two guys lost a lot of weight and then they stopped, and the arms race went rolling on. Okay, so was the act doable? Yes, of course. In fact, they did it.

And fourth – was it consistent with the entire campaign or the entire relationship between Duffy and his owners? What would be our criteria here? I'm thinking - to put this in relief, let's take a look at the case that we mentioned briefly, those hunger strikers or fasters in Long Kesh Prison during one of the severe Irish troubles. These were people who were members of the IRA, who had used violence repeatedly. Again, this is not to condemn them. It's just the fact that they had used violence.

And then because they were in prison and had nothing else to do, had no other recourse, they decided to go on hunger strike, and it was a complete failure in the sense that they died, rather than get any kind of an opening on the part of Margaret Thatcher and the rest of the regime. And I was saying that this fails on the grounds of consistency because if you had let them out of prison they would have immediately picked up guns or power drills or whatever they used for weapons and gone back to using violence.

So, you cannot use nonviolence as a tactic in the context of a violent struggle. If you try to do that it's what's called, "Nonviolence of the weak." You're using violence because you don't have it at that moment. And that's part of what we were calling strategic nonviolence before, but not part of principled nonviolence.

So, I don't know if this is going to be terrifically illuminating, but yeah, I mean Duffy was a sweet dog. He never – he did not go around viciously biting these people and then had decided to go on a hunger strike on this particular occasion. This was very consistent with his entire relationship with them.

And finally, "Last resort." This means that because of the ultimate nature of the sacrifice and because you are drawing the other person into a very serious – what shall I say? You're either putting them up against a very serious decision that they have to make – you do not do this off the crack of the bat. You have to have tried everything else first. And again, most of the fasts that we were talking about, that we see – that is around us – people go into it much too early.

Noncooperation

On one occasion, Gandhi was attacked by some black flag people. You know, these were actually people who are running India right now, but this was the Nationalist Movement, people who thought he wasn't being political enough or angry enough or something. And they attacked him – I mean literally attacked him. He was stepping down off a train and they came after him with these staves.

And he looked at them and laughed and he said, "What are going to accomplish by breaking this head? It doesn't even have any hair on it to protect itself." There's many ways in which I've been imitating Gandhi. This is one of them. And so, they were startled. They didn't know what to do and this is a very common opening gambit in a nonviolent emergency situation. You get people flummoxed. They came after you expecting you to be frightened, submissive, and you simply stand up to them, and you aren't. And they're flummoxed. They don't know what to do.

So, they had an opening, and then they said, "Okay, what do you expect we should do?" And he said, "Well, first you should submit a petition to me, telling me what your grievance is." And they said, "No, no, we're not into that and you wouldn't listen anyway. And, you know, we can't spell. This won't work." So, he went on, and stepped through about six or eight things that they should do against him. And finally, he said, "Then if all of that fails, you should undertake a fast unto death against me."

And they looked at one another and said, "No, we're not ready for this." And then he said, "Well, then I can't help you." It was a funny kind of conversation, but Gandhi always had funny conversations with his opponents. We'll see a number of examples of that. But how about – I mean let's take this quasi-seriously now. Here's Duffy, you know, he wants his owners to give him back to the children. What else could he have done? I mean I imagine that he had tried to communicate with them in every way possible. The problem being that they didn't speak modern terrier or whatever he was, that Duffy was trying to communicate in.

He had no other way of communicating with them except through that extreme act. So is the case where I would say it was appropriate for Duffy to do that. But it would not be appropriate for a person who had not tried in every way possible, first, to communicate with the person, then when they refused to listen to you, you move into various forms of civil disobedience. Or in other ways, you take on the suffering and the situation. And finally, when all that has failed – if all that has failed, then you move into something drastic like refusal to eat. Okay?

So, I give you this whole model partly – well, partly as a joke, really, but partly also seriously, to show that there are patterns, very deep in the evolution of behavior, which move in the direction of nonviolence rather than the direction of the "nature read in tooth and claw," which was the old motto about what people thought that nature was up to

until recently. Okay? So, I hope that you found that terrifically amusing and extremely illuminating.

Scientific Paradigm

So, let's get back to the world of people and start talking about the scientific paradigm that we're in. And before we actually get into it, I'd like to share a reflection with you – be a little bit philosophical here. Something that occurred to me over the weekend, that it seems that we human beings are unwilling or unable to believe things that are – thanks. Do you want to take a chair? Has everyone now, who's on the wait-list, signed in?

We seem to have trouble grappling with things that are like extremely horrible. They're off the deep end in terms of how horrible they are. And we seem to have the same difficulty grokking things that are extremely wonderful. It's a curious observation that I made. I just made it on Saturday. So, it's not like this has stood the test of time. But I put this out for us to contemplate. Let me give you one example of something that's going on right now that's pretty horrible, all right. And in a weird way, nobody is paying attention to it.

Fortunately, we don't have to deal with the horrible stuff – the rest of what we're going to be talking about is stuff that's too wonderful to believe. But I thought we ought to balance the picture. At Sonoma State University there is a project called, "Project Censored," and what they do is they pick up stories that did not get into the mainstream media. And every year they publish a little book with the 25 most important censored stories of that year.

So, for this year, Story Number 18 is a story about Professor Steve Jones at Brigham Young University who is a physicist. And he put together a group of 50 top-ranking scientific experts from various appropriate disciplines, including someone who was on President Bush's – not in his cabinet, but in his administration during the first four years. And these people are telling us, in the plainest possible language, that it is against the laws of physics that the Twin Towers collapsed in the way that the official story says that they collapsed.

The official story is that they were hit by airplanes. In an hour the metal structure melted, though steel doesn't melt at that temperature, and then it pancaked down. You know, the top section hit on the lower floors and pancaked on down. But unfortunately for this theory, that process actually has been filmed and that's not what happened. What happened was there was a series of explosions and the steel frame of the building collapsed first and it went into, basically, freefall.

And then the third tower, WT7 collapsed in 6.6 seconds. It would have taken 6 seconds in freefall, and it would have taken, I don't know, 25 seconds – a minute or something if it happened in the way that they predicted. So, we're shocked, right? What the hell are

we supposed to do with this? Here's this huge public story and it violates the laws of physics. It could not possibly have happened the way they say that it happened. And yet, we had FEMA and we had something else, and we had an official commission. People came in – I'm sure they were wearing business suits, and they were very rational, and they pay their taxes and they sat around a table, and they consciously or unconsciously ignored all the facts that didn't fit into their story. Okay?

So, I felt I wanted to share that with you as an illustration of how when things get so bad that we can barely cope with them, we don't want them to be true, somehow we back away from it. And now, as I say, fortunately, it's not our business in this course to go there and explore what happened. We're not investigative journalists. We're trying to look at the new paradigm in which this kind of thing won't happen anymore.

And in fact, I might just say, by way of introduction, this is my way of going about solving the problem, is creating a paradigm in which the problems that need to get solved can get solved in a constructive way and not in a way that leads to deeper – leads us deeper and deeper into the problem. So, the rest of what I'm going to be talking about are examples of things that are really mind-boggling in the opposite direction, and yet, they do not make it into the official story – which is extremely frustrating and that's something I think that we have to solve.

Gandhi's Epic Fast

And I'd like to introduce this by sharing with you a statement that Gandhi made in 1933. Now the background for this is, again, we're tying into the fast technique. In 1932, in September, the Viceroy – the head of the paramount power in India, the British Haraj, decided – and this is one of these cases of really “mad decisions” made by people in power. We're going to look at several of them. He decided that there should be separate electorates in India for the untouchables – that is the non-caste Hindus – and the caste Hindus.

And we don't know what motivated him. He was not basically one of the worst of the viceroys. He was a pretty good person. He had communication with Gandhi most of the time, but what he must have been thinking with this wacked out idea, I don't know. Gandhi was not in a position to do a whole lot about it. In fact, he was in prison – been in prison since he came back from the Round Table Conference the year before.

And to him this meant the vivisection of India. If you made it a statutory reality – that's his language – that untouchables are different kinds of animals from caste Hindus, this would deepen the rift between them. And he had been working his whole career and was going to go on focusing for the rest of his whole career on reintegrating these people into Indian societies. It's one of his relative success stories – that this would kill him, so to speak.

And so, he took the decision to fast unto death. This was an open-ended, unlimited fast. And he tried to make it clear that it was not directed against the viceroy, though he was the cause of the problem, but it was directed at his fellow Indians to rouse them so that they would come up with some kind of compromise and do something about this. This is sometimes called, “The Epic Fast.” It was his second most famous fast. It’s a strange way for a person to look back at his career. You know, my most famous was – the most famous one was in ‘47 against the communal rioting in Bengal. And there’s a little book by his secretary, Pyarelal, called, “The Epic Fast.” It’ll give you the whole detail.

But we’re going to get to that when we get to it. I just wanted to focus on how he made this decision and what he said about it because a lot of people argued with him and said, “This is a bad decision.” And he said, “Sorry folks, you’re out of luck because it wasn’t a decision. I’m just following orders. God told me to do it.” And they said, “What do you mean God told you?” He said, “Well, I heard a voice. I was in despair, in the middle of the night, I heard a voice and it said, “Thou must go on a fast.”

I really like this story because it shows something that I’ve believed for a long time now, that obviously God was a Quaker. “Thou must go on a fast.” And Gandhi said, “How long?” And the voice said, “Open-ended.” And he said, “Okay, when I do I start?” The voice said, “Let’s make it tomorrow at 10:00.” So, he said, “Okay,” and off he went. See, his best friends could not argue him out of this because this did not come from people. This came from God. So obviously, and incidentally, the fast was a huge success.

He got his people rallied, and they hammered out a compromise. I think this was from September 20th until 26th or something like that. He was snatched back from the jaws of death. It’s very dramatic and we’ll maybe get a chance to talk about it a little bit more when we get to that point. But the point here is that he then gets into a long discussion with various people who think that he’s nuts. And there still are a lot of people in that category. Perhaps – anyway, let’s not finish that sentence.

They accused him of having a hallucination. Said, “You know, there’s no way to tell the difference between the voice of God and hallucination.” He said, “Yeah, there’s a way. If it’s the voice of God, it’s going to lead to life. And if it’s a hallucination it could easily lead to death. And so, you see what happened here, it led to my risking life, sacrificing my life, but not losing my life and nobody else losing theirs either.”

And they kept after him, you know, this is a hallucination. And finally, he made this amazing statement. He said, “The claim that I have made,” namely that this was the voice of God, “The claim that I have made was neither extraordinary nor exclusive.” In other words, it’s not just me. He said, “God will rule the lives of all those who will surrender themselves to Him without reservation.” Period. And he said, “There is no question of hallucination. I have stated a simple scientific law which can be tested by anyone who will have the will and the patience to carry out the necessary preparations.” Which are again, incredibly simple to understand, and easy enough to practice where there is determination.

Now I'm making two points with this story. First, that this is an example of something that we find it difficult to believe because it's too good to be true as opposed to difficult to believe because it's too bad to be true. And secondly, that obviously, he had a different conception of science and what science is and who uses it and what you do with it than we have. And he actually was typically Hindu in this regard.

Prejudices in Science

And I think we're going to see that we have inflicted on ourselves two huge prejudices about what science is. The first is that science deals with the outside world. Period. With the objective world. Do you remember back in the beginning of the semester I told you because nobody else – I have nobody else to complain to, so I inflict all of my woes and sorrows on you people. And you've been very patient, and I do appreciate it.

If you remember me kind of whining up here that I wanted the meditation class to be called PACS 164L and they said, "It's not real science. Real science, it would be a wet lab. You have to show us the chemicals, you know?" And since I couldn't put it in a bottle and paint it green, it wasn't real science, so it wasn't a real laboratory. Okay, well, you know, I have a lot of battles to fight – some of them here at this university. So that was not one that I – I decided not to undertake a fast unto death against the Committee on Course of Instruction on that particular point.

But it does show up, the fact that, for us, for something to be scientific, it has to deal with the outside world – of the objective world. And the person who's been very helpful in helping us see the limitation of this recently is the Dalai Lama. He has been working a lot with scientists – even went down to Stanford and had a day-long conference there which I thought was very generous of him. And he is constantly saying, "You guys are terrific at the objective side of reality. I mean my hat is off to you. If I were wearing a hat, I would take it off to you for what you guys have discovered." It was really incredible, and nobody is knocking this. You know, you can have laser surgery for your cataracts and go home that same afternoon. It's wonderful. But it's only half the story and you know a bird cannot fly with one wing. You also need to do science on the subjective side of reality.

Well, how do we do that? Well, that, of course, is where the people come in. And that's where Gandhi says, "You need will, patience, and determination." And what we say is, "We'll do it if we can get a grant, but we won't do it if it needs will, patience, and determination." We're not going to change. So that's one big, as I say, kind of a prejudice or a limitation that we've imposed on ourselves.

And the other, which we're now getting over, is this notion that the more negative something is, the more likely it is to be true. It's very strange. I'm going to be illustrating this repeatedly as we go up the line. But science has been successful using the technique of reductionism in two different senses. One, that you break things down into smaller and smaller parts, try and understand what makes those parts tick or if they're

too small to tick, what noise do they make when they bang into each other and then build back up the big picture from that. But it's also reductionist in the sense that the less we can discover meaning in nature, the more we think we're being scientific.

And just to give you one illustration here – I'm jumping ahead a little bit because I was going to build this up slowly from physics to biology to behavioral sciences. But I remember seeing a documentary once about chimpanzees. I don't know why I was watching it. It was before Jane Goodall, so that was not the reason. Maybe we used to have a president who had a close relationship with a chimpanzee, maybe that's what put me in this frame of mind.

But anyway, these scientists were following these chimpanzees and recording their behavior and narrating what they're seeing. So, at one point, as it turns out, chimps are pretty aggressive critters. And that's, in fact, one of the problems in primate behavior is that they studied chimpanzees almost exclusively and they came up with this skewed model of how nasty it is to be a monkey or an ape.

Primate Studies

Anyway, here are these chimps. And sure enough, there's a big blow-up and they're running around and banging on one another. Say, "Oh yeah, your mother is an orangutan," and things like that or whatever chimps do to insult each other. And the narrator said, "The animals are angry." Thank you, that's very good. [Laughter]

And this went for a while, and they "decided" – if that's the word that I want – they decided to make-up. So, they were doing all the things that chimpanzees do when they want to stop fighting. Not exactly the kinds of things that you and I would do, you know. "Got any lice? Can I scratch your back?" And things like that. Then the narrator came on and said, "The animals are exhibiting signs of affectionate behavior." You get the subtle difference there?

When it looks like they're angry, they're angry. But when it looks like they're loving, they couldn't possibly be loving. There's no such thing as chimpanzee love. There's only chimpanzee anger. They are exhibiting signs of affectionate behavior as though they actually had affections. But, you know, they could. So, this is only one of thousands of examples that I began to notice myself when I got interested in this field. We're going to talk about that bias a little more systematically in a bit.

The New Biology

Okay, so in what follows, I'm going to accept the model that you have in your Reader, from the book "[The New Biology](#)" [Page 21] by Stanciu and Augros who say – and I'm not going to contest it for the time being – "That the basic building block of our knowledge validating system is physics." Physics is the fundamental science. We start

from there, and we go onto chemistry, especially if we're med students. And then we get up to the life sciences like biology, which are getting softer and less, and less secure.

Actually, one of the problems with the life sciences from the point of view of developing a formal hard science based on mathematics is that the essence of life – I'm going to tell you something and I'm going to back up a little bit and tell you why I'm telling you it. The essence of life is diversity. Now here's the background for this little statement. When we were starting Peace and Conflict Studies we had guest lecturers. I brought a friend of mine who is from the engineering school, but – I shouldn't say, "But" – engineering school and is a deep thinker. And he was interested in peace and wanted to talk to students, so I brought him in. "Give us a talk."

So, he came into what was later to become PACS10, our introductory course. We weren't even on campus at that point, by the way. We were meeting across Bancroft – you talk about marginalized. But anyway, you've given me enough sympathy today. So, let's get back to my story. He started by putting a lot of equations on the board and the students and I were panic stricken. I mean we were in absolute despair. We're supposed to remember this stuff?

But fortunately, he was getting somewhere with these equations. He's getting from the equations to the regularities in nature from which we can derive laws. And then he asked himself and us the question, "Why is that physics and biology, which started at about the same time, are now in such utterly different places in regard to the fact that physics is one of the most brilliant theoretical structures of any human enterprise?" Even Einstein has been surpassed now in some ways. It's incredibly brilliant what people have come up with in the world of theoretical physics.

I understand there's a particular coffee shop on the North Side where they're working out String Theory between the hours of 8:00 and 10:00 in the morning. You can go down and hear for yourself how incredibly brilliant these guys are. Now biology started at the same time. And yeah, they've discovered a lot of facts. They have a lot of Latin names for different insects, and they can tell you how they breed and stuff like that. But as for a theory of what makes life work, by comparison, it's juvenile. I mean Darwin was a tremendous genius in terms of biological theory, and he was wrong – or he was partly wrong.

I'm not seeing there isn't evolution, by the way. I'm not from that part of the country when I say that. [Laughter] I'm a New Yorker so we knew about evolution up there. We didn't know about – there wasn't any nature, but we knew about evolution. Anyway, so then my friend got to the climax of this presentation. By now – whew, we didn't have to memorize the theories – I mean the equations. And we were sitting on the edge of our seat, "What is the explanation for this? Why is biology so behind with regard to physics?"

He said, "Because physics operates on the assumption or looks at nature from a framework of uniformity." Suppose you have something that you want to study, and you

call it an electron – it turns out that they don't exist, but that's okay, you can study them for a long time before you find that out. An electron, that's what? That's here on this desk and there's probably quite a few of them, even though they don't exist. I will explain all of this.

An electron here on the desk is going to be identical to an electron in that poor hunk of rock out there called Pluto. We should give a little support to Pluto because it's just been terribly downgraded and prejudiced against. [Laughter] You took this electron that's very far away – you know me and numbers. I don't know how far away it is, but it's really far away. And the only thing different between these two electrons would be their velocity and their position, both of which are relative.

Anyway, but they have exactly the same mass to the extent that an electron has mass. And they have exactly the same charge. And we know from beginning physics classes they're tiny, tiny little yellow balls, right? With a minus sign on them – we know all this. But they're absolutely identical. And the model that physicists use to describe the universe is one of unity and uniformity. They're looking for laws that will apply to electrons anywhere – and all electrons are the same.

And somehow our brains are so constructed that we find it easy to work with that kind of model – the uniformity model. However, if you had tried to apply the uniformity model to living systems you go straight into fascism. It does not work. The essence of living systems is their diversity. You know, it's not that there aren't patterns. It's not there aren't laws of a kind that you can derive, but if you missed the diversity, you miss everything about the life sciences.

So, the life sciences are, quote, “softer” and what we believe to be true about them has to rest upon the beliefs of physics and then build up from there to the even softer sciences like psychology and then onto the softest and most dismal sciences of all, which are little political science and things like that. Now where are we going to peace studies in all of this? I'm not sure. Maybe we're just off the chart. We're sort of Gandhi, and we're tying the two ends back together.

Three Questions of Matter

So, let's accept those levels, that we have the physical sciences, the life sciences, and the social sciences in that kind of a hierarchy. Let's accept that for now. And I'm going to be posing three questions, and we'll get around to answering probably late Thursday or next week – Tuesday. And those three questions are, “What is the nature of matter?” Not what is the matter with nature, what is the nature of matter? What is matter? And the second question is sort of a scarecrow you're going to see, obviously. What the answer to it is, you'll probably know already. That question is, “Is competition the dominant force in evolution?” Because up until recently this was believed implicitly. And thirdly and finally, “What does the historical record say about the presence and the viability of nonviolence?” Okay?

Student: What's the third question?

Michael: Yeah. So, the three questions are, "What is stuff? What is matter? What is it really?" And secondly, "What is the role of competition in evolution?" And thirdly, "What does history say about nonviolence?" Maybe I am spending more time on that third question than necessary but coming from a slightly traumatized background here where I would talk my heart out about nonviolence and then I'd run into some student who had dropped the course and I would say, "I notice you're not in the course anymore." And the student would say, "Oh yeah, I thought about all that stuff you were talking about is really nice, but you know, I read history." And so, this is what I'm trying to overcome. Maybe it's not necessary for you, but it will possibly be necessary for your roommates, significant others, your parents, and so forth.

Okay, so now let's talk a little bit – now this is the part that I really love most and understand least, what scientists are really saying about matter – stuff that has mass and energy and stuff. I expect there's probably several of you who know this story better than me. So, if you wish to raise your hand and politely tell me that I'm talking through my hat, you just go ahead and do that. I'm interested in the stuff, and I like it and I read about it, but obviously, I am innocent of mathematics. Third semester of calculus was taught by a Hungarian refugee who could barely speak English and I was so terrorized by the middle of the semester that I stopped. And that's the story of me and mathematics.

However, the story begins at the beginning of the 20th century, and it's kind of fascinating. Some day somebody is going to have to study this. Maybe I'll study it because it looks like you'll probably get a Nobel Prize for this. I could use the money. Something happened between 1898 and 1912. Everything. The whole world turned upside down. This was the very period when Gandhi invents – or presents to the public satyagraha – on what date? Let's get some exact number here? Right, September 11th of 1906. Question?

Student: How do you know it was exactly 9/11?

Michael: Oh, he kept very careful records through that whole period. And he wrote two books in 1923. One was called, "My experiments with Truth," which is his autobiography. And the other was, "Satyagraha in South Africa." See, this is the interesting thing about Gandhi. Here he is, he's so out of the box that nobody has caught up with him yet. And it's like 100 years later. But at the same time, he was a *bania*. He was the equivalent – the Gujarati equivalent of an MBA in accounting. That was his background.

So, he kept very careful financial records. Every penny had to be accounted for. And a great advantage that he had was he didn't sleep. Now think of how much time we lose every night sleeping – hours and hours. You know, he only slept about two and a half hours a night – two and a half, three hours – at least by the time he came back to India.

So, what are you going to do? Can't sleep. Everybody else is asleep. You can't text message the viceroy because they haven't invented it yet. So, you write your memoirs.

So, every day an incredible correspondence. The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi are 98 volumes. And it's been calculated – friends of mine in India have told me that this is 2/3 of the output. That, you know, somewhere in some little ashram, moldering away in somebody's box there's letters and newspaper accounts, and all that stuff. So, he was quite meticulous about that. So where was I?

Quantum Nature

In this 14-year period he's making these incredible discoveries on the very, very soft end of the scale, human behavior, and scientists are making these incredible discoveries on the hardest end of the scale. And as I understand it, it started like this, first of all Einstein showed that matter had to come in atoms. His laboratory was his study. The way I imagine it happening, he's playing his violin and this beam of sunlight coming through the window and these dust particles are dancing around. He's saying, "*Och, Gott.*" He says to himself in the middle of this Brahms Rhapsody. "God, those dust particles," he says, "*Sie sind klein,*" you know, "They're so small. What is making them bounce around?"

And he did some calculations in his head about the force necessary to make a dust particle go "bop-bop-bop" instead of "zip." And he came out that air has to consist of atoms. People had been saying this since the ancient Greeks, but he gave it mathematical formalism, and therefore, you have to believe it. That's the way it works. You don't have to accept the prizes, but you have to believe what mathematics tells you. And I'm not quarrelling with that. I don't know what mathematics tells you, but tell me what it says, I'm willing to believe it.

So okay, this is a great breakthrough because here are people trying to understand what makes – I mean for example, the Greeks had worried about this problem. You have a horse. The horse eats grass. How does the grass turn into a horse? You have to break it down into very, very small parts. Therefore – and these parts are smaller than you can see. Therefore, life has to be atomic on the material level. And it's amazing that within ten years of having discovered that matter has to be atomic, they discovered that it can't be, that atoms don't exist.

And the way it happened was this, as I understand it. There was a problem. The problem was if you heat up a piece of metal it doesn't turn yellow right away. It goes to blue and red and yellow. Something like that. Each of these colors has a specific energy to it. And you know how much energy you're putting in with the flame and you should be able to predict which light waves are coming out. And the predictions aren't working. According to what they were understanding, it should be yellow right away. What's this blue?

So, a man named Max Planck, who was a fairly good pianist and had gone to his physics preceptor at one point, and said, “I’m torn between – I have to make a career choice here.” Does this sound familiar? “Should I go into piano or physics?” And his professor said, “You know, physics is a sucked orange. We’ve discovered everything about physics. I think you should do piano, Max.” Well, Max, although he was German, was not one to always obey what his teachers told him – very dangerous move. Always obey whatever your teachers tell you. [Laughter]

And he said, “No, you know, maybe there is something to this physics after all. And he was a little bit intrigued by why the blue, yellow, red thing. So, he said, you know, the only way to solve this is to put in a factor in the equation, so that it isn’t real, but it would cancel with itself out. And he came up with something absolutely brilliant. [Writes “h” on the blackboard] You can see how brilliant it is. This stands for Planck’s Constant. And the implication of it is that energy changes are discontinuous. It goes in jumps. Which the implication of that is that everything is discontinuous – that time is discontinuous.

Now Planck had no way of knowing that this was a major Buddhist theory called, “The Theory of [Chana-kavada] or dependent origination. He didn’t know that at that time. And so, he figured that when he did the math, the little H’s would cancel out and you’d have your answer. Well, he did the math. He had to do it all by himself. The computers were down. No, they weren’t up yet. That’s right. And darn it, the little constant wouldn’t cancel out. So, he went back, and he did it again, did it again, very thoroughly. The darn thing would not cancel out. He had to come to the conclusion, reluctantly, that it was real. It wasn’t just a mathematical convenience, and that meant that nature actually was discontinuous. And it came in what they decided to call, “Quantums,” which is a Latin word for “An amount.” Things are quanta – is the plural. And that led to a fantastically different way of looking at the material world.

And let me just put into contrast here. Sorry, I thought I had these quotes in your Reader and they still may be there, but I wasn’t able to find them so you may not either. Let’s go back to the beginning of the 18th century and Sir Isaac Newton who was, you know, the greatest genius in physics up to his time. 1704 he wrote a book called, “Optics.” And it is kind of interesting how many of these basic, basic discoveries had to do with the nature of light. You come up to David Bohm, for example – who passed away recently – and one of his most brilliant formulations was, “The universe consists of frozen light.” Basically, everything is light acting as if it were matter, energy, and so forth.

Anyway, and also Goethe, the German poet, thought that his greatest contribution to life was not Faust or any of these poems that people memorize and recite and enjoy and are so proud of, but his contribution to the theory of color. “*Farbenlehre*,” that’s what he wanted it to be known by. Anyway, Newton in his “Optics” said, “God, in the beginning, formed matter in solid, massy, hard, impenetrable, moveable particles of such sizes and figures and with such other properties, and in such proportion to space as most conduced to the End” – capital E – “For which He formed them. And that these primitive

particles, being solids, are incomparably harder than any porous bodies composed of them. Even so very hard.” And you have to love 18th century English. “Even so very hard as never to wear or break in pieces. No ordinary power, being able to divide what God himself made one in the first creation.”

Now this is the physics – this is 1704, but this is the physics that I learned in school a few years ago, and I think you’re probably still learning versions of this. In fact, I learned it three times. I learned it in public school, and then I learned it in high school, then I learned it in college. I never heard the word quantum mentioned once. That was like 50 years after the discovery of quantum theory and 30 years after its ultimate triumphant conclusion in what’s called, “The Copenhagen Interpretation,” in the middle of the 1930’s. And nobody told me a word about it.

Fortunately, because wouldn’t you rather have me be a successful nonviolence professor than a failed physicist, which I surely would have been. But anyway, this was the basic paradigm of science, that matter comes in solid, massy, hard, impenetrable...yada-yada...never broken-apart little particles. And then I went to school, I was told that, you know, there were large black ones with a plus on them and very, very small yellow ones with the minus on them and then little brown ones with an N on them. And these things coming apart and recombining made the experiences of chemistry and life. And the reason you decided to come to Berkeley was programmed in these little solid balls.

But what Planck was discovering was shaking this whole thing to bits. And, for example, it is now known that when an electron shifts to a different shell in an atom, it doesn’t say, “Bye-bye. I’m living in Shell A. I’m going to Shell B.” And it doesn’t travel from Shell A to Shell B. It disappears from Shell A and instantaneously reappears in Shell B. There’s that kind of discontinuity.

And now to read you some quotes from Henry Stapp who actually works up the hill here in theoretical physics [*** Page 8] “According to the orthodox quantum theory of nature, the actual things from which the universe is built are not persisting entities,” as in classical physics. Not these little hard, massy, impenetrable particles, “but are rather events. The world consists of events called, “Quantum jumps.” Now at this point you’re like me, likely to be thinking, “What the hell are you talking about? How do things consist of events?” And I’m sorry, but I can’t explain that. And at least I have the satisfaction of knowing that nobody else can either.

And this is part of the problem with quantum theory. That’s why I wasn’t taught quantum theory in school. You cannot build a simple model to explain how we get a solid world out of what is, in effect, a shifting foam of probabilities. But scientists believe that this is the case.

Conscious and Subjective Reality

I don't know if any of you saw "What the bleep do we know?" Some of you see it? How many of you saw that? I'm just curious. Okay. Yeah, it was kind of a cult classic, and I think that as far as the science goes, I don't think it was wrong.

I may find out differently because a week from Wednesday I'm going to be attending a day-long conference called, "The Science of Peace." So, I may have to come back and contradict everything that I'm telling you today. But I think the uses made of that truth were ridiculous in that movie, but the scientific part of it is true. I mean the reason that we're sitting here on the second floor of Wheeler and not plummeting toward the molten magma at the center of the earth because of gravity, in the classical model, is that we're solid and the chairs are solid, or the floor is solid, and these two solid objects come up against one another, and they can't go any further. But no scientist believes that.

Rather, the case, first of all, the problem is that the amount of matter in what we call, "An object," even if you believe in the nucleus of the atom being material, is so small that if every human being on the planet could get condensed so that all the matter were squished together and there's no space in between, the entire human race could be fitted inside a peanut shell. That's how spread out this stuff is, even as matter. It would still weigh the same. The burden on the earth would be exactly the same, but it would be concentrated in one peanut shell.

So, what's really happening when I don't fall through the floor and you're sitting on your chairs and why we're going to be very careful to open the door when we leave this classroom, is that the force fields of the electrons in the molecules that compose our body repel each other. And that's what's happening. It's not a concussion of solid objects against one another. So even when you run your car into a telephone pole, it's a lot of electrical charges repelling each other and not solid matter.

But worse than that, the ultimate conclusion of quantum theory, which up to now has been the most securely established theory in science. I'm going to talk a little bit about that. How some people tried to defeat it, and they failed. The ultimate conclusion is that basically, there is no objective material world. All there is, is experiences. And Max Planck himself, said, "Everything is consciousness. Without consciousness, nothing can be said to exist." If you clip this statement out and who said that? You would say, "The Buddha," or some flipped out person like that. But actually, it was a physicist.

So, this led to some distressing conclusions. I mean it's distressing enough to think that the world isn't real. I think that's kind of – that's a bit alarming. But it also leads to the conclusion that we cannot have definite, certain knowledge about anything because we thought that if you knew where all the atoms were and what forces were acting at them, you could predict from Moment A, where things would be in Moment A+1. But you can't do that because there's probability waves that come in between, and scientists are hard put to describe how come we have like 80 different people sitting in 80 different chairs listening to a brilliant, fascinating lecture on quantum theory when all it really is, is these probability waves fuzzing out all over the place.

And they have – they really can't quite explain it, but one of the theories is called, "A collapse of the wave function." And that says that when you decide to make an observation, the probabilities on a gross level, coalesce into an observable world. Now why am I telling you all of this? I'm getting to that.

Quantum Inseparability and Interconnection

"About these jumps," this is Henry Stapp again, "About these jumps, there are sudden changes in the 'Heisenberg State' of the universe. The first basic property is that these jumps are not controlled by the mathematical laws analogous to the classical laws of motion. The second basic property is their nonlocal character." Let me talk about that one.

Once you've figured out the realities and the rules of quantum theory, one of the distressing, but in a way kind of intriguing conclusions that they came to, was that any two entities that are ever in connection of any kind would remain connected. And in other words, if two atoms were part of the same molecule their probability waves are linked forever. Now this led to a really startling conclusion, which begins to sound more like mysticism than science, that the universe is nonlocal. That means that anything that happens, happens everywhere.

This is again, is pretty mind-boggling. I mean I think – okay, here, look, I'm going to drop these glasses on the desk. It makes a very small noise. If I were Armstrong up there on the moon with my space helmet on listening to whatever those guys listen to in their space capsules, whether it be rap, bluegrass, whatever they like, he would not hear that. The sound would not get there. But according to quantum theory, everything that happens is a shift of the entire universe simultaneously. Everything is totally interconnected. The quantum jump, these events that make up reality, is intrinsically a shift of the entire universe.

Einstein hated this. You can sort of see why. He said, "There is only room in one given century for one bad joke and relativity was pretty sick already. And now you're telling me that I can't make observations about nature and that you have what he called, "The spooky effects at a distance." You know, Nagler drops his glasses here, and Armstrong, eight light years away goes, "Oh! Gently, quietly, please."

So, Einstein got together with a couple of his friends – and you have the story in your Reader, but I enjoy telling it anyway. And they came up with a way to disprove the nonlocal character of the universe. The two friends were Podolsky and Rosen. I always like to say this is Jewish physics carried to its ultimate conclusion. Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen. And they said, "Imagine you were able to fire photons, light beams. A photon is a packet light – life energy. Well, okay. It's a packet of light energy. And enough photons hit your retina you say, "I am seeing something." But a photon is a quantum of light energy. If you fire them in two different directions in such a way that

when they reach a target, they will make a choice and as it were, they will be up or down, and they don't know that until they hit the target.

There would be no relationship between whether it were a west bound photon – what a westbound photon does and an eastbound photon does. They cannot be in contact because – because why? They're traveling at the speed of light. You are not allowed to go faster than that. So, by the time the westbound photon hits Oakland it cannot send a message to the eastbound photon in time to tell it which way it went. Therefore, you perform this experiment – Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen said, “And you will be able to prove that these two photons are not connected and therefore you'll be able to prove quantum theory is essentially flawed and therefore the universe will have only one bad joke in the 20th century.

And they felt very good about that. They probably – I imagine them having a glass of schnapps and Einstein playing his violin, and they all go home, and they think, “Okay, that takes care of quantum theory.” But then along came these two guys at Berkeley. Wouldn't you know it? Berkeley, the big trouble making place. And they figured out – their names were Clauser and Freedman. They figured out a way to do it.

If you fire a certain kind of light made by a calcite beam – this is on Page 75 of your Reader, but I'm going to simplify it a little bit. When these photons hit their targets they would go in one direction or another. And according to quantum theory, they are still interconnected. They are exhibiting what's called, “Quantum inseparability.” And that means that the up photons would be correlated with up photons on the other side, 75 to 25. Whereas if Newton was right and if the world was built on a classical model, it would be a local universe, there would be no connection between these things, and it would be 50/50, right?

If I toss a coin here in Wheeler, I catch it. It goes “heads.” You're standing, I don't know, in Milano's. You're standing in line, bored, waiting for your latte, and you toss a coin. It's going to be heads 50% of the time, tails 50% of the time. That's because these coins are huge. They're huge macroscopic objects, and they don't follow the laws of quantum reality. But photons are very small, and they have to obey those laws.

So, they actually performed the experiment. There should be a plaque somewhere around campus. I'm sure the chancellor's next trivia quiz will show you a little plaque of these photons hitting the wall. And guess what? The correlation was like 74.693. In other words, well within the range of experimental error. It showed that those photons were quantumly non-separate, and therefore, the universe is nonlocal. Everything that happens, happens everywhere at once. Okay?

So, I hope you don't have any questions about all of this because it's not entirely certain that I'd be able to answer them, but do you have any so far? If your question is what impelled me to talk about it, I'm getting to that. Yeah?

Student: I just wanted to know what your definition – you said before that the life sciences are a soft science. And I just wanted to know what you meant by that.

Study of Life

Michael: When I said, “The life sciences were a soft science,” it’s because it’s difficult to be mathematical about them. And most of the most important features of life cannot be accounted for by physical laws. What about altruism? Why do animals exhibit altruistic behavior? What’s affection all about? You can see the role that it would play in evolution, but you can’t see how it comes about mathematically. And the most mathematical part of the life sciences is probably genetics. And okay, well let’s stop and consider that for a minute.

Here’s Gregor Mendel out in his little pea garden somewhere in Belgium and he’s building this nice mathematical model showing you that genes inter-combine and that they determine absolutely whether an ear of corn will be brown or yellow, things like that, you know. And consequently, whether you’ll be blonde, if you have recessive genes. The whole theory of evolution was put on a mathematical basis by Mendelian principles.

But then along comes this lady named Barbara McClintock. How many have heard of her? I would like to get that number up in the next few years. And she goes out into her corn patch, and she does – now if she were Indian, what she would say is, “I’m performing some *yama* on the corn. Intense concentration. She said, “What would it be like to be an ear of corn?” And she began to suspect that something was going on whereby the organism was actually controlling the genes, not the genes controlling the organism.

Needless to say, everybody told her that she was crazy. But in her case she lived long enough for them to figure out that she was not crazy. She was part of a new paradigm. And if I’m not mistaken, she actually got the Nobel Prize. So, the one attempt to put animal morphology on a mathematical basis, in fact, failed. And we see that it is not a complete description of how genes are going to be expressed in an organism. Something extremely “soft” is going on in the sense that the organism – we even run out of language. How are we going to put this? The ear of corn wants to be yellow, and it says, “Send me up about eight yellow genes, will you?” And it turns into a yellow ear of corn. Yeah?

Student: Well, I mean it sounds like biochemistry just talks about like the processes. They don’t say, “Why does this happen?” They just say, “Well, it happens that way.”

Michael: Yes, biochemistry and the new molecular sciences of biology, what they’re doing is they’re studying the molecular aspect of the life sciences. But our point is that that is the aspect of them which has the least to do with what they are. Whereas in a physics lab that’s a complete description. You fire a couple of, I don’t know, beams of

high energy protons at one another and they go through a cloud chamber. I'm sure it's much more sophisticated now, but in my day it was a cloud chamber. Now it's the Stanford Linear Accelerator. Billions of electron volts. They use these things.

And the way we think of those atoms is that this is a complete description of what they are. Now you can study that aspect of living bodies, but what are you saying about life? Less and less and less. It's like you know more and more and more about less and less. Okay? So that's why people say these are softer sciences. Now this is a prejudice. And look at my late, lamented friend Norman Cousins, for example.

Norman Cousins, who's the editor of the Saturday Review of Literature and he was a big peace person. I mean he was passionately in favor of peace. And at one point in his career, he got a terrible illness and doctors weren't helping him that much and he decided to fix it on his own. He got himself a hotel room and showed Charlie Chaplin movies all day long and laughed himself well. I was going to say, "Laughed himself sick," but in fact he did the exact opposite. He laughed himself well.

And he got so interested in what had happened to him that he decided to go into health sciences for the rest of his life - ended up at UCLA. And he said, "You know, it's an interesting thing about the soft side of medicine," things like faith and will to live and things like that, "the soft side has been the same for 5000 years and the hard side changes every time somebody at Berkeley goes into his lab and comes up with a new experiment. So, this is a prejudice. We think it's harder because it deals with matter, evacuated of consciousness and life. And we think we can say things about it mathematically which would be complete. Yeah?"

Student: So, you mean a reductionist aspect of it is flawed because it can't consider the whole system?

Michael: Right. I wouldn't even say it's flawed. The reductionist approach is superb for what it does. But what it does is very, very little and the more important the stuff is that you need to decide, the less the reductionism is going to do it for you. And the tragedy is that because the reductionist aspect is so solid and secure people have tried to explain life sciences and life on the basis of these reductionist processes. That was the point that I was going to be getting to right now.

And the results of that have been kind of disastrous. I have a quote here from – I thought I had a quote here from – yeah. From Robert Oppenheimer, "If you are a scientist you believe that it is good to find out how the world works." Okay? So far, I have no quarrel with this. You want to find out how the world works, hey, you know I'm all in favor of that. "You want to find out how the world works, that it is good to turn over to mankind at large, the greatest possible power to control the world." That's where you get to from taking a completely reductionist approach to life.

You give mankind at large, which means ending up – it ends up meaning giving a bunch of nuclear scientists the greatest power to control the world. What you're going to get is

what we've been getting for the last 20 or 30 years. So let me share one other model with you really quickly because I've had so much fun telling you about this part that we're way behind where I had hoped to be at this point.

Universal Phenomenon

If we take one thing on which the classical model and the quantum theoretical model, let's call it, "New science," can agree. It's that the universe consists of three big domains, three different kinds of phenomenon. And I'll just put them up here in alphabetical order. And they are consciousness, energy, and matter. Okay? Now matter being the part that's easiest to deal with. And as it turns out, it has less and less to do with anything important – interesting. And the classical view of the world is that matter is the ultimate reality as according to that quote from Newton and then you go from matter to energy somehow. And somehow when there's enough matter and energy, it starts to behave as if it had consciousness, right? That's when you say, "The chimpanzees are exhibiting affection behavior." But we know they're not really having affections, they're just chimpanzee molecules bouncing around in an affectionate way.

So, I'm purposely making fun of this – and it is unfair, but you know, what can I say? I'm an angry young man – at least I'm angry. It really does not work very well. You cannot explain anything very satisfactory based on this classical model that the ultimate reality is matter. And somehow it creates an appearance of energy and somehow that creates an appearance of consciousness.

And so, what happens is, the sciences of consciousness like psychology, not to mention religion and things like that, they split off, and they become divorced from science. And then you have poor Mr. Galileo standing in the dock, and they're accusing him of saying that the earth moves. The Bible didn't say that, and we know perfectly well it doesn't move. And they force him to recant, and he says, "Okay, okay. *Allora*, it doesn't move. All right? You satisfied?" And then he turns to get off the dock and someone hears him mumbling, "*Eppur si mouve*, but it moves, damn it!"

So, you have this complete divorce. Now what basically we're aiming at now is to start from consciousness as the ultimate reality and to see if we can account for energy and matter. This also is not easy, but at least it's more possible. And the way that you account for matter in a C-E-M universe [Consciousness, Energy, Matter], which is where my head is – as opposed to an M-E-C universe is that matter is basically a question of appearance. Energy is perceived in a way that gives us the impression of matter.

And you'll find that you're now in sync with modern science – I mean real modern science. And you're also in touch with the wisdom tradition that has been the greatest human inheritance going back over thousands of years. The wisest people have always been saying something like this in their respective languages. Now very quickly, just to show that all of this is relevant, in fact – and I'm going to get back – going to elaborate

on this on Thursday. In this kind of model that goes from matter to consciousness, there are two extremely unfortunate results with regard to human life.

And one is determinism, which we've been talking about. Okay? If you think that everything that you're experiencing is determined by where bits of matter are in your body, that leads eventually to a deep sense of despair and helplessness and lack of responsibility, and we're finally getting relevant. Thank you for bearing with me during this whole long rap. But most of you are probably aware that one of the biggest topics in violence and how violence is inflicted and made to happen to people, is by getting them to not have a sense of responsibility.

And this is where the Milgram Experiments that you've probably heard about at Yale, where it shows the extent to which people are dependent on authority. The more you're dependent on authority and the ideas of others, the more violence there is going to be. And that's only one of the routes by which you get from determinism to violence. And the really sad factor of this kind of universe is scarcity. Because you say, "Yeah, there's a lot of matter in the universe. I once saw a number somewhere and the number of molecules in the universe. 1×10^{86} or something like that. It was a huge number of molecules. But the number of molecules that you can use in a life sustaining system is extremely limited.

There was a 100 – it took 100 million years to put enough petroleum in the earth that we have run through in a little under a 100 years. So, if you think the universe is all material, that leads to a paradigm of scarcity. Quoting from a social theorist named Ivan Illich who lectured here about 15 years ago. You go from scarcity to competition. You go from competition to violence. Those steps are absolutely inevitable.

So once you have kind of pitched your worldview and what you think the world is on a material basis, ala Newton and all the rest of them up until Einstein and Planck, it's going to be nearly impossible to avoid violence – strangely enough. Okay? So, if this doesn't seem absolutely absurd to you, let's unpack it a little bit more on Thursday.

4. More Background 2: How 'Science' and 'History' Weigh-in on the Possibility of the 'Nonviolent Effect'

Michael: Okay, well good morning everybody. I hope you have noticed that we have a huge display of things for you to pick up today – lots of freebies. There are announcements about the UC-D.C., University of California's program at the nation's Capitol. There are some informational meetings at the lower right-hand corner there, and I have some brochures here with the contact people. On September 11th – I don't know why that date sticks in my mind – there's going to be a concert and a speech by Jim Wallace. He's the Director of "Sojourners," the editor of that magazine. Shows you you don't have to be a neocon to be an evangelical Christian. He's probably the point man for that whole movement, and he'll be here at the First Congressional Church of Berkeley, where I hope that we'll have an office one of these days.

And then there's this thing here from Matthew. Now as far being in the class, the way things stand right now, I was able to get all the seniors on the wait-list onto the rolls – and one junior. So, if you are a senior and you were on the wait-list, you're now in the course. But at this point, I don't have any wiggle room. But we can try next week to see if somebody dropped out or wants to take it under other auspices or what have you. If you are in the course and you're registered, even if you're a freshman, I'm leaving you strictly alone. I think this is a good way to start your career at Berkeley. I have a few sarcastic comments coming up in the back of my mind, but I think I won't go there. So those are those two things.

Yeah, there's a documentary film called, "Ground Truth," which is about what has been happening to Iraqi veterans psychologically. The focus of the film is on how they're not getting much of the attention that they need from the Department of the Army, but that's not my concern. Our concern is with what happens to people who injure other people. This is the negative side of something that I'm going to be talking about in a little while. There's some new scientific evidence. And that film, which I've seen, is a very powerful film. There's going to be a special preview this Saturday and a showing in San Francisco on the 15th. Now I didn't quite get the email that had the exact information, so what I'll do is send it to you on CourseWeb. So, if you're free these days, have an eye out for that.

And the only announcement remaining that I can remember – I'm sure in the middle of the lecture I'll probably be, "Whoa, wait." But the only thing that I can remember is that we've been approached by a teacher from Berkeley High School who wants to interact with us. He wants to have more connections between PACS students and Berkeley High students. We don't know exactly how this is going to work yet, but maybe at this point, I would just ask how many of you would be interested in getting together with

some Berkeley High students talking about nonviolence and stuff like that? Okay. That's more than enough to get something started. So let me pursue this with him. Yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:03:31]

PITS

Michael: The film is called, "Ground Truth." It's some kind of military expression that I don't remember exactly what it stands for. The concept that we'll be talking about is called, "PITS," P-I-T-S which stands for Perpetration Induced Traumatic Stress. We'll get to that in a little while. Okay, I hope that Tuesday's talk was okay. I don't know if you've been reading about this young man who got killed in Oakland, but one of my students was a close friend of his, and she had been in to talk to me just before I came to class. And I'm not sure I was totally all there on Tuesday. I was hit pretty hard by the grief that she was going through. But I've processed it, and I've come out more determined than ever to work for nonviolence. So, we should be in pretty good shape.

Oh, thank you. Oh, you got both copies. You are the best. Thanks a lot. Excuse me one second while I look up something here – don't want to have to stop in the middle of a sentence when I get to the point here. Yeah. Okay, good. Thank you.

Now what we were talking about toward the end of Tuesday were some of the consequences. We're starting to come off the topic of what the physical universe is or is not which is, you know, something that I don't know anything about. But that never stops me from lecturing on subjects. And I guess I should tell you what I want you to come away with from all of that – and let me get to that now.

Wealth Distribution in the USA

We were talking about some of the consequences for ethics and behavior of having that belief. And I mentioned two negative consequences that will have a direct impact on our belief system here. One is scarcity and the other is determinism. And I was saying very quickly at the end there, if you are operating under a paradigm of scarcity, it is not going to be possible for you to avoid competition for scarce resources. And resources are inevitably going to be scarce because if you're in a materialistic paradigm, you can never be satisfied. That's just a fact of human nature.

One of the Sanskrit Upanishads says, "*Na vittena tarpaniyo manushyaha*," which, of course, you are aware means, "The human being can never be satisfied by wealth." Once you start trying to be satisfied by wealth there will be no end to that process. And I don't know if you've seen this slideshow that an astronomer has put together. He was trying to illustrate for his students the concept of a billion. A billion is a very big number and we have a hard time wrapping our minds around it.

I don't know if you've seen this cartoon of a manager in some corporation saying, "What, a billion is thousand million? Why wasn't I told this?" Very difficult number. So, to illustrate it he used the distribution of wealth, or income rather, in the United States. And he said, "Imagine you have a football field, and everyone's wealth is represented by a stack of \$100 bills. So, the poorest people are over here at the Stanford goal on the left and their stack of \$100 bills would not even show up on a computer image because it's not even one pixel. So, you have the poorest people on the left, the richest people on the right.

So, what do you think that line, that curve would look like? You think you'd go along for a while and then it would start climbing around the 80-yard line and then get pretty high and then in the end-zone – the Cal end-zone, it would shoot way up there. But actually, do you know what it looks like? It's absolutely totally flat until the end-zone and then it shoots up like this. That means the second wealthiest people in the world still don't have enough \$100 bills to show up as one pixel on a computer screen and there's very, very few individuals, like 40 or 50 of them, who have so much wealth that the line goes off the computer screen, and you have to back up because it is higher than Mount Everest.

So, what he stumbled upon was this incredible mal-distribution of wealth in an industrial society because, as Gandhi would say, "There's enough in the world for everyone's need, but there's not enough for everyone's greed." And people have modified that of late to say, "There's enough in the world for everyone's need. There's not enough for anyone's greed." Because once it gets loose it's just going to suck up more and more material. So, under this kind of paradigm, you go from scarcity to competition and from competition, of course, to violence. And it's just hard to avoid that in the prevailing paradigm.

The other bad consequence is determinism. The idea that everything that you feel and think, who you are is determined by something outside yourself and that leads to a feeling of non-responsibility. And this is very closely connected with violence.

Non-responsibility, Obedience, and Violence

Most of you are probably aware of the Milgram studies. You know, after WWII everyone was shocked by the way that ordinary German people had participated in horrendous acts of inhumanity and so psychologists got interested in studying what makes people follow orders like this. Because that was the cliché, [German accent] "I was just following orders." If you're my age you have seen a lot of very corny movies in which these poor Germans would be brought out in front of a camera and made to say that.

But Milgram's study used not Germans, but Yale students, because he was at Yale and those were the handiest students. So, he did these studies. I don't think we need to go into the detail, but it is appalling the degree to which people will follow orders, even if those orders violate your humane sensibility if they're put in some kind of structure of authority. In this case, all it was, was a person wearing a white lab coat. Same kind of

thing, that you buy cigarettes and used cars and toothpaste, because somebody in a white lab coat says, “This product...” and stuff like that.

So, there’s something innately destructive about thinking that you don’t have to take responsibility for what you do. It seems to lie much closer to the core of violence than we might have thought. It’s been pointed out that one of the biggest mistakes in modern industrial civilization has been treating a corporation as a person, which was not even a judicial decision. It was just some kind of a casual step that was taken very late in the 19th century. It was decided that corporations had rights.

And then it was decided that people, when they acted in corporations, did not have responsibilities. So that I can invest a lot of money in a corporation that will be exploiting people in Thailand, say. In fact, if I had a lot of money, that’s probably what I would be doing because I’d invest it somewhere and who would know? Who knows where that stuff would go? And I’m not responsible for what happens to those poor families in Thailand – under the law.

And it’s been proposed that one of the best ways to fix the whole modern enchilada would be to take rights away from corporations and give responsibilities back to individuals. The name for a corporation in German is – you’ve probably seen GmbH. You’ve seen that? You know, you go to buy a Mercedes – you remember the last time you bought a Mercedes? It says Mercedes GmbH. It stands for, “*Gesellschaft mit beschränkter Haftung*,” which means, “Institution with limited responsibilities. That’s what a corporation allows people to do. So, but in deeper ways also, this idea that we think, we feel, we act because of something outside ourselves over which we have no control, and which does not even have a meaningful pattern is very demoralizing – very depressing. And so, in various ways, this utter falsehood about human nature has created a great deal of violence.

And I want to add one more – oh, now before I go off this distressing topic and to milk it for all the misery that we can get out of it, I wanted to recollect. Bring back to mind, because we’re coming up to 9/11, what one of the things that President Bush said right after 9/11 when he went on the air to reassure people that things were going to be all right. Remember him saying, “My job is to protect American people.” And one of his suggestions to the American people was that we should take the kids to Disneyland. That’s what he wanted people to do right after 9/11.

Now on the surface that meant, “Don’t worry. Everything is all right. This is normal. Just go about your normal idiotic activities that you always do.” But under the surface what he was saying and what he has continued to say very consistently is, “That you have nothing to do with this. You leave it all up to me.” And that’s part of the non-responsibility, the determinism paradox that we’re into.

And now I’d like to add a real biggie, as if these things weren’t depressing enough. But this is all what happens, remember, if you believe that matter is primary and energy comes along somewhere and there’s an appearance of consciousness, but

consciousness is not a primary reality, which has led science to make terrific discoveries, but has brought us into a very, very depressing paradigm.

Suffering of Separateness

The third one I want to cite right here is separateness. It's very hard to spell when you're at a blackboard. Way too close. I hope that's all right because this is going out all over the world. If you believe that you are essentially physical, remember what Newton said about those atoms – those little particles. They're radically separate from one another in our conception. They're little spherical, very tiny, utterly hard, indestructible pieces of matter and there's nothing between one piece of matter and another. There's empty space. None of those things are believed anymore by real physicists.

But now we're coming up to one of the problems that I've just barely hinted at before. There are two different things going on here. There are the findings of science, real science with which, I for one, have absolutely no problem. And there's the story of science – what people think science is saying and what they agree to believe science is telling them. And unfortunately, those are two radically different things.

Now obviously, if you are in a paradigm of separateness and you think that you are radically separate from another person, violence is the way that you're going to get them to do what you want and it's going to seem perfectly plausible that you could hurt another human being and that hurt would not affect you.

In the PITS

And that's what the film "Ground Truth" starts to take apart. To get into that very briefly, it's being discovered that the people coming back from Iraq, veterans, are much more traumatized by what they have done than what has been done to them. And in the prevailing paradigm there is no accounting for this. Why should it bother me?

So, this is a good segue for us to get into the new paradigm that includes nonviolence and then we're going to try to build. But just to give you one glimpse at that, there was a set of [articles](#) in the New Yorker by a man named Dan Baum. And again, his point was that the Veterans Administration is ignoring these traumatized vets. But if you read between the lines, a much deeper and much more poignant story comes out. And Dan Baum describes going into a VA hospital and talking to these amputees. You know, one guy has lost a leg. Another has lost a hand and so on.

And they're joking about how their hand blew up and stepped on a claymore, lost their leg. And it's all, you know, boys – boys will be boys, clapping each other on the shoulder and having a lot of fun with this. But then he said, "Did you kill anybody when you were in Iraq?" Immediately, the conversation stopped. They could not go there.

They would not talk about it. They did not want to hear about it. Because what they had done to people traumatized them much more deeply than what had been done to them.

By the way, is [Jeanne Yu] here? There you are, okay. Don't let us go the whole day, Jeanne, without getting to your question. It was really good, and I want to discuss it pretty soon.

Heart Unity

So, the opposite of separateness that nonviolence proposes – now we're going to go the other way with this – is a concept that we haven't mentioned here yet. So, here's one of our typical examples of getting into one of the major concepts that I really want you to grok and be familiar with – heart unity.

Gandhi – actually, Jeanne, I'm going to use this as a segue to get into your question. This is going to work very well. Gandhi was faced with a situation of immense diversity in India. You know, we talk about America being a melting pot and all of that. And sure, you look around a classroom in Berkeley you see a lot of diversity, but in India there are like 200 mutually unintelligible languages. You have a whole sector of Indigenous people. Diversity and communal discord was a huge problem.

So, in order to get out of it, he invented this concept of heart unity. Again, it's incredibly simple and I really apologize for that, but it goes very, very deep. And heart unity simply states that, "I want your welfare. I want you to thrive." Period. It doesn't matter whether you agree with me or disagree with me, whether you look like me, whether you're in the same religion that I am, whether you have the same amount of wealth isn't going to bother me. Even – and here's where we're getting closer to Jeanne's question. Even if you have more power than I have, I want you to thrive.

Now that means that we're going to be establishing a very deep bond which will enable us to negotiate differences that we have without those differences becoming a cleavage plane for conflict. Now having said that I want you to thrive – please, let's be careful here – it doesn't mean I want your agenda to thrive if it's a wrong agenda. If you're exploiting me, the best thing that I can do for you is to get you to stop exploiting me. And Gandhi said that he wanted the British out of India as rulers because they were ruining themselves. They were with this unrealistic, unreal relationship of master to servant.

And there's a famous Hadith – a Hadith is an oral story about the life of the Prophet Muhammad – that he was riding along with his companions one day and he said, "You know, as I've frequently said, you must help everyone." And the companion said, "Surely, you don't mean that, son of God. You mean we must help a brother, right, but not an oppressor?" Because Islam is really down on oppressors. "So surely you mean we help a brother and not an oppressor," and the prophet, peace be upon him, said,

“No, we help everybody.” So, this very stunned person said, “How are we supposed to help an oppressor?” And he said, “By preventing him from oppressing you.”

Student: Where some people that they have [unintelligible 00:21:41], you know, like a sociopath or a psychopath. I mean that seems like they’re disconnected from that? So how could they benefit from – I mean it doesn’t matter what they do.

Michael: Okay, the question is – your name is Joy? Joy’s question is, “What about someone who is so psychotic that they just think – all they know is that they want to hurt you. They have no concept of separateness. I hope this isn’t a good academic cop-out, but could we postpone that question a little bit, but that’s the way this class works. It’s not going to go away. It’ll be there. I’m just waiting for it to come up at a point where we’re better equipped to deal with it. But I promise you – trust me – that there is a way. There is a way to talk about that and deal with it.

But what we’re talking about here, heart unity is a way of overcoming separateness without sacrificing diversity. That’s what makes the formula so powerful. Because our first impulse, when there’s a feeling of separateness which always makes us uncomfortable, even though we think that it doesn’t. Somewhere inside us there’s this writhing, squirming, I want to get back on the page with that person or persons, whoever they are. What we usually do is we pretend to all agree on something. In fact, that’s how unanimous violence comes about – just jot down that term “unanimous violence.” We’ll get back to that in about 8 weeks, I think.

But for right now I wanted to talk about heart unity and the way that it enables you to keep your connectedness with a person who is not only different from you, but who might conceivably be trying to hurt you in some way. And you’ve got to be able to stop them from doing that. And that brings us to Jeanne’s question. Do you want to say what it was, Jeanne, and I’ll repeat it for the –

Student: [Unintelligible 00:23:59] They sort of treat you as though you’re not human or your feelings don’t matter. [Unintelligible 00:24:10] My question was how do you separate, how do you find a way to have your mind and spirit [unintelligible 00:24:23]?

Respect and Dignity

Michael: Great. So, Jeanne’s question is this – she works as a waitress, which I also have done my share of that. Lots of Berkeley students do this at some point or another and you may have noticed that customers don’t typically sit you down and say, “You know, so what are you majoring in, Jeanne? Let’s talk about this.” They treat you as a functionary and then worse than that, restaurants sometimes have owners. And they look even further down on people who wait on tables. It’s as though no one ever heard of John Milton who ends his famous sonnet on blindness. “They also serve who only stand and wait.” But they don’t notice that.

So more generally and more seriously, the question is, “How do you deal with people who are disrespecting you?” And why I thought this was a great place to stop and deal with that question is that this is essential in the whole question of nonviolence – respect. And the reason, you remember, we were a little bit startled about Gandhi putting himself in a position where he might starve to death where no amount of waitresses would have helped in that situation. There comes a point where even the sacredness of life is not an absolute, and it doesn’t mean preserving life in your physical body at all costs.

It seems that there is something to him which is more sacred than life. And that is honor. It may ring a little bit strangely in our ears. But you must never let anyone “dis” you. A friend of mine, a psychiatrist, who has studied the kinds of people that you were just talking about, Joy – psychopathic individuals, multiple murderers, sometimes these people are so sick that they brutally injure themselves just to make sure they can still feel and stuff like that. And he’s, you know, he’s a very good psychiatrist. He’s sat with a lot of these people and tried to get down to what it is at the very basis of their problem. In every single case he finds that disrespect is the most potent factor in turning a person into this kind of criminal.

That in their family they were not treated as a human being and they just never got – the term “dis,” you know, to “dis” somebody has become very common because disrespect precipitates a huge amount of violence. So, this fits in very well with what we were just saying in this Hadith, that you cannot allow someone to disrespect you because it hurts them.

Gandhi and Disrespect

And Gandhi was insistent that if you disrespect someone – I love it. This is going to tie everything together beautifully. The whole – today is really going to make sense.

If you disrespect another person, you are damaging your own respect, your own value. In fact, the way he put it was, “I have never understood how a person could believe that by insulting another human being, he would be gaining in respect.” And that was a very important thing that Gandhi said because Richard Attenborough read that. And as he said, “I was so stunned by this, that the hair stood up on the back of my neck.” That’s how theatrical people talk, you know, they always have very powerful emotions about everything.

But in his case, he went on to do Gandhi. He wrote that film 25 years and \$25 million later because of that one insight that Gandhi had. And James Baldwin also said, “It’s a mysterious fact that when I disrespect someone else, I disrespect myself.” So, you can’t let them do it. What are you to do? Well, again, there’s an interesting interchange between Gandhi and a questioner, which is not too dissimilar, Jeanne, from your question. Someone wrote to Gandhi and said, “I’ve been reading all your stuff in your newspaper about nonviolence and then I encountered this bully, and he slapped me in the face. What should I have done?” No, sorry, I have to add one thing. “He slapped me

in the face, and I felt humiliated. What should I have done?" Anybody want to guess what Gandhi told this man to do?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:29:02]

Michael: Yes. That's the second most important thing is not to – or the second thing that comes up anyway, not to have felt humiliated. But what Gandhi actually said first – hold onto your seats now – he said, "You should have slapped him back." Yeah. Because once you've felt humiliated, it was – you lost it anyway. It is much better to defend your honor than to walk away like those characters – you guys are probably too young. You never saw Charles Atlas advertisements, did you? Maybe they would be camp enough to come back.

But in these cartoons somebody would be sitting on the beach with his girlfriend. Somebody that looked actually sort of like me. And a big strapping football person would come by and kick sand in this guy's face and take away his girl. And it goes, "I was a skinny 98 pound weakling." And it tells a story. But then this person goes and takes Charles Atlas lessons and he's pumping iron and he comes back looking like this. He finds that bully and taps him on the shoulder and dukes him out and gets his girl back. And that's an American success story, sort of in this area here.

So, I suppose that's almost totally irrelevant, but I thought it would be a good story. [Laughter] But I guess it shows, you know, if you're not in a position where you have power, what are you to do? And Gandhi purposely said to this guy, "You should have slapped him back because he knew that he was weaker and smaller, and it was not a question of overcoming the person physically." It was a question of getting back his own respect.

But then he immediately said, "Why did you feel humiliated?" If you really are a follower of nonviolence, somebody slaps you in the face, you would feel sorry for that person and say, "You probably have some kind of problem." Yeah?

Student: I know that Gandhi or yourself, no one's –

Michael: Gandhi or myself. I like that.

Student: I know that nobody endorses violence, I mean is it sort of like you're saying if you're not prepared to be nonviolent, then it's, you know, it is better to confront problems instead of –

Michael: Running away from them. You could very much say it that way. If you're not prepared to respond with full nonviolence, and the only choice you have – I'm going to put this into Gandhi's language. You got a question?

Student: But how does that interfere with violence – physical violence versus strategic nonviolence? It seems sort of like that's a principle of strategic nonviolence versus principled? You know what I'm saying?

Michael: Yeah. Again, I'm going to ask your indulgence, if we could put the question of principled and strategic nonviolence in a separate category. This happens a lot. You want to take all these terms and line them up and it doesn't really work. I don't think we're there yet, where all the terms, you know, the nonviolence terms in one column and the violence terms in another column. We're groping with these concepts because the field is still relatively new. So, for now, let's keep the strategic and principled thing as a separate matter.

Violence vs Cowardice

We still have a very serious problem. What are you going to do if someone is oppressing or especially offending you? And let's say you've just signed up for PACS 164A, you don't know all this stuff yet. What are you to do? The way Gandhi put it is, if you have a choice between violence and cowardice, if that's your only choice, choose violence. I know that's very shocking from a person who devoted his entire career to nonviolence. But what he was saying is that cowardice is a form of violence. In fact, it's one of the worst forms. It's a form which makes violence possible. If there were no cowardice, there would be no violence. Nobody would threaten. There'd be no threat power. Okay?

So, but then you should also do something else, and that's to get back to your comment over here. You should, at the end of the event, when you go home and recollect in "tranquility" like Wordsworth, you should say to yourself, "This is not too great. I better learn how to respond with nonviolence because I don't want to go around slapping bullies in the face just to restore my honor because they can really pommel a person." In fact, we're in the science part of the course.

About the Amygdala

So, let's go back to animal behavior here for just a second. There's a part of the animal brain called the amygdala, which as you've noticed, we're going to be talking about – if we ever get back on track – in a little while.

But you stimulate the amygdala, and it triggers fight or flight responses. And there's a way to stimulate it so that you can get animals to respond with aggression. Now if you take a bunch of animals they'll usually spread themselves out in a series of dominant to – what's the non-dominant? Whatever they call that. Poor – what do they call it? Submissive, thanks. You have the most dominant animal, so I'm the biggest rat in the pack, you know? And then you have a little mousy rat who's the most submissive. Now if you take a submissive rat. It's in its little group and put an electrode into its limbic system and shock the right part of the amygdala, it's going to be aggressive. And you know what the poor critter will do? It's going to get itself killed. It's going to run around

and bite all those other rats until finally they say, “What? You got some kind of problem?” And they will take out that poor submissive rat. It’s very maladaptive.

If you do this to primates they can function a little bit better. You do this to a submissive monkey who’s in a cage with some tough monkeys, the poor creature won’t know what to do. His brain is telling him, “Fight,” but his culture is telling him, “You can’t fight with these people.” The poor creatures, they get under a table and have a nervous breakdown. It’s a way of coping. There’s no simian version of Prozac so that’s what they have to do. Of course, you don’t go around doing this to human beings. But on one occasion, when a woman was being – a woman’s brain was operated on and she was not asleep, she was conscious – they accidentally triggered this thing and they asked her later on, “How did you feel?” And she said, “I felt like slapping the surgeon, but I decided not to.”

So, it’s very interesting. As you go up the hierarchy you get different layers of control over these animal reactions. But we’re now in a situation – yeah?

Student: But what exactly is it that is being triggered?

Michael: I believe it’s the amygdaloid nucleus in the limbic system in the brain. I left medical school after one year, but that’s what they were calling it back in my day. So where were we? Jeanne is still standing there in her restaurant wondering what to do when these customers and these employers are disrespecting her.

Dignity and Self-respect

And I guess I’m taking a long time answering your question, because A, I’m not really going to answer it. And B, I want to get out the basic principle here, and it’s a very, very important one. That if you allow a person to show you disrespect out of cowardice, you are actually doing something which is even worse than being physically aggressive in terms of violence.

Next week, we’re going to talk about actually an Indian theory of energy states which will kind of correlate with this and maybe make it a little bit clearer. So, what are we saying? What are we not saying? We’re not saying that Jeanne should throw her tray down and smack any customer in the restaurant who shows her disrespect, but we are saying that you should not let that situation just slide. You should first of all solve it in your mind and then decide what to do in the situation. And it may be that your relationship with these people is so casual that you end up doing nothing.

But the one thing you should not do is to internalize the disrespect. You should never do that. When, you know, this is the problem with racism. This is why racism evolves is that people internalize what they’ve been told about themselves. If you refuse to do that, that is the beginning of the solution. Now the way you actually work the solution out will depend on the situation. Okay?

So, this has been very rich, and I think it'll help us understand a lot of things that Gandhi said and did. If you realize that human dignity, respect, and self-respect are all tied together. It's one of the most powerful ways that we connect with one another on the level of dignity. To disrespect a person is to break contact with that person existentially. To respect them is to be able to reconnect with them no matter what your social situations are – your respective places in the hierarchy. Kevin?

Student: Can I give an example of a thing that I did when I was a waiter?

Michael: Yes, a lot of waiter/waitress stories now. Yeah?

Student: But the same thing happened to me. It's always the same, is that one thing that I saw, and it was after [unintelligible 00:39:23]. And it was that everyone's suffering, but they were trying to [unintelligible 00:39:28] to me. So, I was a server. I tried to serve my – to really make them a good time. So even be nicer. Eventually I saw that some people were like when you weren't being nice and then like they were just being mean because [unintelligible 00:39:44].

Michael: Yeah. This very often works. If someone is being nasty to you and you don't answer them with nastiness, their own nastiness starts to dissolve. That doesn't make Joy's question go away. There's some people who are so psychotic that the nicer you are, the more they're going to take advantage of you. So, we will have to deal with that. I want us to lead up to it. Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:40:13]

Nonviolent Communication

Michael: Yes. Using words in situations like this before they come to blows is, of course, a good idea. And we – next semester we'll hear from a group called, "Nonviolent Communication," and this is exactly what they do. They figure out systematically how you can deal with a situation. As a matter of fact, the founder of Nonviolent Communication, Marshall Rosenberg, told me the following story, which I don't think he's published anywhere, but it gets us pretty close to your problem, which still is a big challenge. Of course, it might take us all semester.

But Marshall was in a prison – doing work in a prison – and he was asked to talk to somebody who was a difficult case. He had killed seven people, number seven being a prison guard, and nobody knew what to do with him. So, this crazy Jewish guy from Detroit comes in and says, "I deal with conflict." They said, "Okay, deal with him." And the next thing Marshall knows, he's sitting in a little room with this person who is not making eye contact with him. And the atmosphere in that room is not very comfortable.

And Marshall couldn't figure out what to do. So, he came up with this one. He said, "So say, I hear you've killed seven people." The guy looked up and said, "Uh huh." And Marshall said, "Well, what do I have to do not to be Number 8?" The guy was really

taken aback. He said, “Huh.” No one ever asked him that before. So, he said, “Don’t call me a liar and don’t call me a son-of-a-bitch.” So, Marshall said, “Okay.” Pulled out his notebook, “No liar, no son-of-a-bitch. Good, okay.” And then they had a perfectly good conversation. Perfectly good, I mean the guy is a psychotic murderer, but you know. But they had a conversation.

So, what he basically did was he took that person seriously even though the person was crazy. Dangerously insane. There’s – I can think of only – no, no, no. Not going to go there. But this person was a homicidal maniac and yet Marshall said to himself, “This guy has got to have a point-of-view. It’s not my point-of-view. I’m not going there, but it’s his point-of-view. And he’s not capable of coming and looking at my point-of-view, so it’s my responsibility to see things from his point-of-view.” And give him some respect. Make him feel like a person and then they could start talking.

So, toward the end of this semester and onto next semester we’re going to talk about the criminal justice system and how it does the exact opposite of what it’s supposed to be doing. So, is that okay, Jeanne, for starters for your question? Good.

So, let’s now be a little bit more systematic about why it matters what kind of physics and so forth that you believe in. And I want to try a simple little schema with you that would be a way of differentiating between the prevailing paradigm, sometimes called, “The dominant paradigm.” I hate to call it the dominant paradigm, even though it’s true – because I hate it that it’s dominant. And let’s go roughly, physical sciences, life sciences, and the social outcomes. Okay, we’re going to be fine.

In the prevailing paradigm, the physical model people use is material. So, let’s call that, “Matter physics.” And mind you, I’m not talking now about what real physicists do or believe, but I’m talking about this distressing fact that it’s been a hundred years now that they’ve discovered that matter isn’t real in the sense that we thought it was. There’s not an objective universe made of inert entities that we just casually observe. That isn’t what’s going on. They don’t know how to describe what is going on. But for sure, that isn’t going on.

That correlates with – and I’m being purposely vague about this because I don’t know how to be any more specific. It correlates with competition biology. Those two things seem to fit pretty well together.

Competition vs Cooperation

So, Darwin comes up with this statement that he’s worked very carefully on, and he spends a lifetime formulating it in a very subtle way and immediately people snatch it away from him and the interpret it very crudely to mean, “Survival of the fittest,” on the one hand and, “Random mutation,” on the other hand. And they say this accounts for life. That’s why you have things like Berkeley students walking around today, is because, you know, 900 million years ago there was some primeval slime somewhere

around La Brea and it was hit by a cosmic ray and these molecules started accumulating in a certain way and sticking to one another and it developed into life.

And you can see why a religious person would feel uncomfortable with that model. In fact, there was a famous debate between Darwin and a bishop in which Darwin won. And that breach that's been created between science – what people thought science was saying, what they were interpreting to say – and faith is with us to this very day. Very, very damaging thing that's happened in Western civilization.

So, you have matter physics, competition biology, and you get all kinds of structural and interpersonal violence in the world. If you can't read this is, this is the way these three things kind of correlate with one another. If you think that nature is consisting of inert physical matter knocking around without any rhyme or reason, this is what I'm calling, "Matter physics." It correlates with a biological theory based on competition that is called, "Social Darwinism," the output where you say that anyone who impedes, let's say, economic competition is against freedom, and they must be godless communists and things like that. People must be allowed to compete with one another because that's what gives the world order.

You let the competition go on for a long time and then you look who's on top and you say, "This was the winner." And that gives you a sense of structure – order. I'm sorry if I'm being a little bit sarcastic and flippant about this, but I do think it's an extremely stupid model and it's been very, very harmful. And what would be our equivalent in the emerging paradigm? We started calling it, "The emerging paradigm," back in the 70's and it still hasn't really emerged. But it's trying to. You have a consciousness physics and a cooperation biology and PACS 164A. Nonviolence is the outcome. Again, these two things can be pulled apart in a very stark and simple way on this level.

Frans de Waal and the Chimpanzees

So let me talk about the cooperation part of it a little bit. I want to begin that by reading you a quote from a very helpful naturalist, originally Dutch. Now he's living in Chicago. His name is Frans de Waal, and he had an experience in the Arnhem Zoo. It's the kind of experience which German behaviorists call, "*Ein aha erlebnis*," it means – well, "Aha, experience." They originally coined this term about chimpanzees. You give them three or four cartons and hang a banana pretty high up in the ceiling and they sit, and they look at it and they look at the banana. They look at the cartons. And they look. And then suddenly one chimpanzee goes, "Aha!" They pile the cartons on top of another, climb up and get the banana. So, this is about Frans de Waal's banana. He's watching a bunch of chimpanzees, and they're having a terrific row. And as I said, chimps are pretty aggressive. This can be kind of scary. They're also humongously powerful so you don't want to get in the cage with them.

And then they work it out. You know, probably there was one chimpanzee who had a nonviolence communication workshop or something, goes up to the dominant chimp

and says, “You seem to have a problem with me. Is there something I’m doing that’s bothering you?” In their chimpanzee way, they work it out. And de Waal is standing there watching all of this with his notebook, very careful scientist. And he says, “Oh my gosh, this is interesting. This looks like a reconciliation scene.”

So, he said, “I guess I’ll go back to the library.” They had these things called, “Libraries,” in those days. You couldn’t Google stuff. So, he said, “I’ll go back to the library and do a literature search on reconciliation among primates. And so, he went – you know, here’s this Shelf Number 1, “Aggression in Chimpanzees.” Shelf Number 2, “Aggression in Chimpanzees.” On and on and on. All of the stuff on aggression and reconciliation, absolutely nothing. And yet, as he said, “Every time a fire starts, it has to go out otherwise we’d all be dead.”

If the first fight that ever happened, if there was no way for it to stop, it would have wiped out the world. The fact that it didn’t shows that there is also a way of stopping fights, and it may be as least as important as starting them, but we’re terribly asymmetrical about studying it. So, he writes – and this is on page 56 of my book, “I speak from years of frustration with the literature on human behavior except for reports on preschool children,” one of which I may be talking with you about, “and an occasional anthropological account.” Hooray for anthro. “I am unaware of data in this area. I recently asked a world-renowned American psychologist who specializes in human aggression, what he knew about reconciliation. Not only did he have no information on the subject, but he looked at me as if the word were new to him.” That’s Page 56.

So, de Waal has started systematically studying this and he has shown that there’s a full spectrum of behaviors among chimpanzees and monkeys for getting into and out of fights. In fact, one of his early books was called, “Chimpanzee Politics.” I thought it was sort of like the predecessor of the “West Wing” or something like that. But no, he was talking about the politics of chimpanzees, not the chimpanzee-like behavior of politicians.

And it seems that these animals have very complex and very sophisticated ways of negotiating difficulties among each other. And yet, we systematically pick out the violence part and ignore the nonviolence part. There used to be a theory that was very popular called, “Innate aggression,” sometimes called, “The Tarzan theory of human behavior,” that we have to be aggressive because of our genes. And people were making very popular books out of this – making lots of money. Books were sold in airport bookstores.

And a group of scientists got together in, I think, 1980 in Seville and wrote something that became known as the Seville Declaration. And they said, “It is scientifically false to state that we inherit only aggression from nature. It’s scientifically false to state that we are doomed, that we’re condemned to follow out anything that we inherit on this level from nature.” And that was a pretty influential booklet.

And let's see, okay. I think I'm going to skip around a little bit here. But you can see one of the possible reasons why we resist things that are too wonderful. And that is that they can be challenging. Let me give you an example here. What I'm saying is that this model which makes you not responsible can be a more comfortable way to think about yourself and what you have to do.

Rosenstraße – Nonviolence vs Nazis

Once you start thinking that you have a choice between competition or cooperation, it's challenging. An incident which anyone who takes the course from me knows about within about six weeks is the Rosenstraße [Rosenstrasse] Prison Demonstration. This happened in 1943. I understand that a film has just been made about this called, "Rosenstraße," but I haven't gone to see it because the description of the film didn't sound like something I wanted to see. But what happened was – this was the end of April, I believe, in 1943 in Berlin.

There were about 5000 or 6000 Jewish men who had not yet been arrested because they were "*mischlinge*," as the Germans called them. They were half-breeds. They were married to Aryan women. But the time came to arrest them so before dawn these trucks rolled out, collected all these men, and took them to a detention center which had been the Jewish Community Center on Number 2 Rosenstraße – and got sort of processing them for deportation to death camps.

But what happened was their wives and mothers and daughters and sisters, they got upset. And they went down to the Rosenstraße Prison and started to have a demonstration. You've heard of demonstrations. And they kept accumulating. And the Gestapo – Gestapo Headquarters is only a couple of blocks away. They came out and said, "This is an illegal demonstration." I'm sure it sounds even scarier in German.

They could have come out there with a machine gun and mowed these women down. "Go home!" Not only did they not go home, they started getting on the phone and calling other people. By the end of the night there's like 6000 women there. And people in charge of the operation didn't know what to do. They called Hitler and said, "What do we do with these people?" Hitler said, "I wash my hands of it." Interesting. "I'm not going to make a decision." And eventually three days later Goebbels, I guess it was, had to make the decision. He said, "We have to release them." Because they couldn't – propaganda-wise – they couldn't cope with having a demonstration by loyal Aryan German women against something that the regime was doing.

So, this is a good case to know about because if you start talking with your significant others about nonviolence, they'll say, "Oh, yes, but it would never have worked against the Nazis." And then you say, "Oh really? Well, how about the Rosenstraße Prison Demonstration?" And they'll say, "The what?" And then you can tell them the story, which you'll also find in my book. But one of the points made about this is when it was discovered, what had happened – and it wasn't discovered until years after the war, one

of the points was, “Why didn’t we know more about this?” If we had figured out what happened there, if we had realized that the Nazi regime was vulnerable to nonviolence, we could have stopped the whole thing. There’d be like 45 million people would still be alive today and all that never would have happened. You know, it would have been much, much better for Germany.

I mean – never forget during the Nuremberg Trials one of the Nazi generals saying, “This guilt of Germany will last for a thousand years.” So, you know, we could have saved them all of that pain, not to mention all the people who got killed. Because apparently they were much less powerful than they let on. So why didn’t we know more about this? Why didn’t we learn from it? One reason that’s been proposed is that this is a terrible thing to think about. “My God, we could have stopped that whole thing if we had just been more courageous and stood up.” That’s a frightening thing to think about, to know that. So, for that reason, this whole episode was repressed. Okay?

So, let’s move on to actual studies of human beings. I think maybe I should stop here for a second. We’ve been going pretty quickly. Anybody have any questions, comments about things that have come up? Okay.

Human Needs Theory

In the last – I want to – I guess I want to talk about two things in this connection. I’ve talked about the opposite to separateness being heart unity. I want to talk about the opposite of scarcity. And that comes from a part of psychology called, “Human Needs Theory.” And the way it works is when I was in school, I was taught that – and mind you, I’m not against education, although I do occasionally pick quarrels with it – I was taught that human beings have three basic needs, for food, clothing, and shelter. And that was a model which was taken for granted and worked with for a long time, but it is not a very rich model. It’s not very explanatory. It says nothing about disrespect and things of that kind, which from a Gandhian point-of-view – once you got the food, clothing and shelter taken care of – that’s what you need to be a human being.

So, starting with Abraham Maslow, who’s a well-known American psychologist, people have been exploring different levels and different kinds of human needs and putting them into hierarchies. And one model that is particularly useful for understanding nonviolence comes from a woman who was a recovering biologist – she was a biology teacher down at San Diego – began to realize that violence was the thing that people should concentrate on if we’re going to get out of this alive. And she did her own work, and she came up with three terms which I find very useful.

And in addition to, you know, getting about 1500 calories a day and enough clothing to walk around on a spring day in Berkeley without humiliating yourself, which is not a lot, admittedly, having some place to stay other than some newspapers. What human beings really need to become fully human is bonding, autonomy, and meaning. Bonding means no one can live in isolation. You have to be part of some kind of group. Now this

is – to make it clear, this is just one version of what human needs beyond the three basic ones could be. Bonding, autonomy, and meaning.

Meaning correlates directly with the respect part. Autonomy correlates directly with the separateness part. Bonding – I’m sorry, let’s slow down here. I’m getting myself confused. Autonomy is more or less the answer to the determinism part because it says, “Even though you have to identify yourself in community and not just as an individual, there are certain decisions that you have to make that have to be authentic. They have to come from you, and you have to be allowed to make them, even if they’re wrong. Which is why Gandhi said, “If you believe something to be true, even if you’re wrong, for you it will be right and proper.” Follow?

Shift the Prevailing Paradigm

This is – remember when we talked about persuasion versus coercion? This fits into that model too. You should never coerce somebody to do something which they secretly believe is wrong because they’re just going to wait for a chance when you’re not looking to get back to it. Plus, you have damaged them by making them feel dishonest, cowardly, and inauthentic. So, you find these strange, almost shocking episodes in his career where he will encourage people to do things that he knows are wrong because they don’t know it’s wrong.

If they do it, they may find out that it’s wrong. But if they don’t do it because he told them not to, they’ll never find out that it was wrong. See the logic there? So, we can come back to most of those things, but the part that I was just emphasizing here is, the strange thing about human beings is that each of us has to be autonomous in some levels and bonded in other levels.

And the other thing that we need is we need to have a meaning in our life. That’s why I’m teaching a sophomore seminar right now called, “Why are we here? Writings on the meaning of life.” Now the interesting thing, the reason I bring this up in connection with scarcity is, take a look at these needs, the wonderful thing about them is that they’re inexhaustible. You know, they are not anything like crude oil or copper or stuff like that. In other words, if I have a bond with you, which I do, I’m not losing anything. If I respect you, which I do, I’m not disrespecting myself. Respect is not a finite entity which I have to take half of my respect and give it to you. It’s not like that.

The fact is that when I respect you, I grow in respect because you’re a human being, so I’m a human being – last I checked anyway. And in respecting you, I’m respecting all humanity and that includes me. So, the wonderful thing is that the higher human needs that psychologists have been thinking about and testing and coming up with, bring us into an area where we escape from the problem of scarcity. The things that human beings really need, not only are not scarce, but they seem to grow with use.

You know the more you love and respect people, the more you respect their autonomy, the more you feel that there's a meaning in life, they benefit, and you benefit. So, you have what's known – and again, this is the first time we are mentioning this, but we can get back to it later – you have what's known as a positive sum situation instead of a negative sum situation. In other words, for me to win, you do not have to lose. On the contrary. Whereas once we're stuck in the prevailing paradigm, we're going to have that all the time. It'll be one winner and a lot of losers which makes the perfect television program. It's called "Survivor" as a matter-of-fact. Okay?

So, so much for the scarcity part for now. Again, we can come back to these higher needs in different connections, but I just wanted to show you how we're systematically trying to get out of the prevailing paradigm and everything that it teaches.

Mirror Neurons

Now for the next trick I'd like to tell you about three studies which have become possible only recently because people have developed non-invasive ways of making some crude guesses about what's going on in your brain.

I told you about this poor woman who was being operated on and they accidentally zapped her amygdala and she felt like smacking the surgeon. That's, you know, you can't do those experiments very often. There's something called, "Human subjects regulations." So, you know, I'm reminded of a book by Tim Ferris about cosmology. It's called, "The Whole Shebang." At one point in his book he says, "Now if I were to enter a black hole, or more realistically to send in a graduate student." [Laughter] Now this is not something that is very easy to do – brain stimulation things. But they have now something called EMR, Electro Magnetic Resonance where they can tell which parts of your brain are being activated without carving you up, just by putting electrodes in your vicinity.

So, I want to tell you about three discoveries. And I've given you just one entree into the literature on these studies. This came up this morning. I wasn't able to CourseWeb them to you. So, this will give you start on tracking down the actual science that I'll be talking about.

The first is a concept called, "mirror neurons." I gave a lecture tour in Germany a couple of years ago. I got out of the train; my host was waiting to greet me. He rushed over. He was so excited that he forgot to say hello and shake my hand, which is a very serious thing for a German to forget. But he was so excited because he had just discovered mirror neurons.

So, all the way back to the university we had this long conversation, in very rapid German, by the way, about mirror neurons. And it turns out that there is, as you know, the central nervous system has a lot of neurons. I mean it's just neurons all the way down. And there's a subset of these neurons whose specific function it is to mirror your

behavior or your mental state. And as this has been explained to me, here I am, standing up here in front of the room. Most of you are awake, to my observation. And of those who are awake, most of you are looking at me. If I go like this, as I just did, the neurons that would trigger that movement in your arm, they fire off. Now at that last minute, you catch them, you know, so we don't have the whole class going like this, nor like this, any of these funny gestures that people use.

But the fact is that anything that I do up here is being reflected in your central nervous system and heading out towards the striated muscles and stopping just at the last minute. Moreover, if I were to have an emotion, say, up here – let's say – pick an emotion. Like if I were to get angry, which is not very likely. I have nothing to get angry about. If we stay off certain subjects, I should be just fine. But let's assume that I were to lose it up here. Someone uses a four-letter word starting with B, and I get very upset and angry.

You would start getting angry physiologically. Your neurons, your mirror neurons would be picking that up. If I were to start weeping, fortunately, is not very likely right now. I'm a guy. I don't cry. [Laughter] If I were to start weeping your whole physiology up to the point of lacrimation would be fired off. And then at the last minute there would be a conscious process that would intervene, and you would maybe not cry. Or maybe you would, you know, this does happen. People cry, other people see them cry and they cry.

So, it turns out that this response is not just something that we pick up consciously with our brains and interpret and we say, "Oh, Jeanne, she's been dissed again and in sufficient grounds and she's crying, so I'm going to cry with her to show my sympathy." It doesn't happen like that. It comes up from below through the entire nervous system. This is a very interesting fact. And it's only about 10-20 years old.

So now Einstein, God bless him, this would have made him rather upset or he would have said, "Maybe I was wrong about spooky effects at a distance. They do actually happen. It's not just photons that are in quantum inseparability, but consciousness is unitary. And what one person does with their consciousness immediately impacts the consciousness of the observers." Okay? So that's mirror neurons.

Altruism and the Brain

Now I want to move onto studies that were done in cooperation work in the general area called, "games theory," which has a lot of interesting things about conflict and cooperation, but I can't follow the math, so I don't use it here. But there is an interesting game called, "Prisoner's Dilemma." And it puts the person in a situation where they have to choose to be selfish or altruistic vis-à-vis another player. In other words, you can risk having a loss on your own side for the benefit of that person. And of course, mathematically it interests us because if you do that in a consistent coherent way that the other player can pick up, both of you end up way, way ahead. It's a very robust system.

But the part that I want to focus on here is they did some EMR on people who were playing “Prisoner’s Dilemma.” Now mind you, this is not a very intense, emotional situation. It’s not like having an argument with someone whom you’re close to. As far as you know, the person against whom you’re playing could be a computer in some other laboratory. So, it’s not like there’s an emotional bond there.

But the interesting thing that they discovered is that when a person makes the decision to do something altruistic and benefit the other “player,” even if it’s just an old Apple Macintosh in the basement of somebody’s laboratory. That very decision to do something for another, “*Parallels de más*,” as they say in Spanish, fires off pleasure centers in your brain which are only seen to be active when people are, say, having you know, a drug experience. I mean a real drug experience like cocaine and things like that.

Or to quote the discrete language of some of these workers out in the field, certain other intensely pleasurable experiences. Okay, IPE’s. So, this is your body – your brain is having a reaction, an intensely positive reaction even to a relatively low grade chintzy, little active act of altruism. So now you can imagine if you’re in a novel like “Tale of Two Cities” and you actually give up your life for somebody who looks like you. You stand up there and stay, “‘Tis a far, far better thing I do than I have ever done before.” This is physiological reality for the person. Okay?

One more fact and then we can – one more type of scientific discovery which really – which I like even the best. That’s why I saved it for last. And we can wrap this up and wrap the whole topic up. [Trillina]?

Student: Do you have the opposite reaction, like if the participants are selfish?

Michael: You know, I haven’t read any work on that, but I know for a fact that, you know, it’s only good science that it must be true. If you do something selfish you’re going to have an ulcer or, you know, the start of it. That’s how science works. If you have one side, you’re going to have the other side. But that’s interesting and somebody should look at that. I don’t know if they’ve identified the brain center that makes you unhappy and neurotic the way they’ve picked out the pleasure centers.

The Influential Power of Empathy

Okay, for my third and final card that I want to play in this deck. There was a discovery, okay, as you know, we have this spinal column. I can’t draw to save myself. Okay, so let’s not take this too seriously. But there’s a bunch of stuff called, “the low brain and midbrain.” And there’s the cerebellum on top of that, okay? This is the part we use to take PACS 164A or design computers or things like that. This is new on the evolutionary scale. But this limbic brain here, which we have at the base of this cerebral cortex is inheritance where we’re not too dissimilar from animals that are way, way further – much earlier on the evolutionary ladder.

And in this lower brain there's a limbic system which is responsible for really primal emotions. And in the limbic system there's a little almond shaped thing. An almond, the word for "almond" in Greek is "amygdala." So, some very highly cultivated physiologist discovered this, called this, "the amygdaloid nucleus." And now it's called, "the amygdala." And as you may be aware, it's very rare that there's a direct correlation between a part of your brain and an experience or a behavior. Most of the time the picture is way, way more complicated than that.

But down here, if you stimulate the amygdala, it fires off the fight or flight response. So, you call up the endocrines, get some more ACTH down here or adrenaline. And, you know, if you're walking through the woods and you come around a corner and you see a mountain lion – which can happen in my part of the country – the amygdala will fire off immediately. Okay. So, there was a very unfortunate discovery made, probably, I think is about 15-18 years ago, that if you show a person – you have a subject sitting in a lab and you can monitor what parts of the brain are firing off electronically and you show them a picture and that picture is of someone from a different race, the amygdala fires off. It's an unfortunate fact. If you're a white person, you're sitting there, a black face comes up on the screen, "Dot-dot-dot-dot-dot-dot-dot." It's sending these messages.

Now there was a very insightful, very thoughtful team of researchers at Princeton – both women – Wheeler and Fiske who said, "You know this can't be the end of the story. There must be a way to get around this." And they designed a brilliant experiment which had a marvelous result. The experience was very simple. Before they showed you that picture, they would ask you a question which would distract you from the fact that the person was of a particular racial out-group. So, they would ask you, "Okay, we're going to show you a picture now of a person. We want you to guess how old he is." Or "Does this person like spinach?" Or "Can you find a dot that we've put in this person's face somewhere?"

So, what are you doing? You're looking at the person as an individual, not as a racial stereotype. So, they sit there with these machines and guess what? The amygdala response was completely negated. It did not happen. It was very dramatic. And this teaches us two things. One, that as we started saying a while ago and we'll be saying it over and over again, violence is dehumanization. The minute you put a person in a category and stop seeing them as an individual, you're on your road to violence. And you're also going to be doing it yourself. You're going to be thinking of yourself in some kind of category. Like, "I am a soldier." Not, "Hi, my name is Joe and I'm from Detroit and let's talk."

The second thing it shows is that you can influence very, very deeply programmed negative responses through culture. So now let's back up and look at all three of these things and what they teach us. The mirrored neuron thing establishes scientifically that when you change your mental state, you affect the mental states of people around you. This is huge because here we've been saying this in nonviolence all along and we had

no vocabulary, no way to prove it, and of course, if you believe in matter, physics, competition, biology, and the prison system, there's no way to account for this.

So, this proves that when a person – we're going to be looking at like a hundred examples of this. Somebody comes up and threatens you and you decide not to be afraid. You decide not to hate that person. I mean I was walking down University Avenue one time and suddenly I saw a biker – he was really a very dramatic biker. It was with leather and metal and swastikas and clankety-clank. And I thought he looked ridiculous, and I started laughing. Then I caught the expression on his face. "I want to stay alive. I will not laugh at the biker." And I could see, you know, he was [Puffs up] getting ready to take me out and he immediately relaxed.

So, we can affect one another by our mental state. Two, it's psychologically extremely healthy to do something altruistic. Therefore, when Gandhi says, "Make your life into a sacrifice, *ayatnya*," and all this stuff which we'll be talking about. He's not saying we have to go against human nature. He's saying, "This is the highest evolution of human nature." And finally, to repeat, science is telling us that even deeply embedded negative reactions, fear, anger reactions can be diverted by culture.

Okay, now what we're going to do next week is look at an emerging paradigm. I'm going to be trying to show you that the emerging paradigm already emerged about 5000 years ago and that it is directly relevant also for Gandhi's background. Okay? Have a good weekend.

5. The Vedanta as Old/New Paradigm 1

The Gita on Human Action and Life's Purpose

Michael: Okay, let me also add my good morning to that of Eli and Laura. I hope you had an interesting experience of some kind yesterday, which was a triple celebration. Most important one being the 9/11, 1906. And I'm wondering did any of you, perhaps, go and see the film? And if so, did it raise any questions for you that we could discuss here, perhaps? My general take on the film is that it was pretty accurate except there were certain things about the characterization of Gandhi that I thought were off-base, but nobody was asking me.

I did write a letter to Attenborough while he was making the film, but he didn't follow my suggestions. That's why he's wealthy and I'm not. And I also felt that the film did not actually portray a nonviolent effect happening on anyone. So that's why I got together with some students. We made a documentary and a DVD called, "The Nonviolent Moment." We're trying to get permissions now for the clips that we've taken from feature films to put together a story. I tried to show some of it to you last week, but the technology gods were against me. It turned out to be the cable, by the way. That was your first guess.

So okay, you have no questions about the film. I have two announcements to make. One is an unimportant announcement which is positive. And then there's a fairly important announcement which is negative. So that's how life goes. Unimportant – I'd say it actually could be pretty important. The Bazaar of India, which I mentioned to you down on University Avenue, they have six copies of the Nanda biography in stock. So, if you haven't bought the Roger Fisher yet, or are wondering what you're going to do, you can go down University, pick up a really nice new sari if you're in the market for one. Or, you know, a poster of Gandhi or something. And while you're there, buy a copy of the Nanda book.

I don't know whether he has only the abridged or only the full copy, but either way we'd be in pretty good shape. And he can order more of those from India. So, if you get there and those six have been taken or you can call them up and those six have been taken, tell him to go ahead and order some. The other thing is there's some confusion now about the limit on this course. And at this point, I'm still not sure. Although I had hoped to have all the seniors off the wait-list and onto the course by today, there's been a glitch, and I have to try and work that out this afternoon. So, what I'll do is I will email – there's only four people left on the wait-list. I'll email them at the end of the day and tell them what I was able to come up with.

Okay, well Jocelyn – is Jocelyn here? Oh, there you are. You weren't wearing black last week. That's why you confused me. Jocelyn did a radical thing. She came to my office

hour and asked me a couple of questions. And then several other people have been asking me similar questions. So, I would like to address those few questions right now before we get back to the subject. So, Jocelyn, do you remember what they were because if you don't I do.

Mirror Neurons and Scarcity

Student: I was wondering about the mirroring neurons and how that compares some of the ideas of scarcity that made me feel like my body was controlling my emotions instead of my emotions controlling my body.

Michael: Yes. If you didn't hear that question, or for posterity, I was saying that when one person has – any person's mental state is reflected in the physiology, in the nervous system of another person observing. And this is a very important dimension for the nonviolence effect. And, of course, we're leading up to a big point that is that science supports nonviolence. We're going to sum that up in a bit.

But Jocelyn had an interesting take on it, and we had a fascinating repartee because she said, "This makes me feel bad. This makes me feel like it's my limbic system that's deciding whether I should like somebody or not or be nonviolent or not. And this is opposite of what you've been saying all along." It wasn't really that accusatory. And here I am arguing against determinism from Day 1, and this sounds like determinism. And I pointed out it sounded like that to you because we're so trained to think that the body calls the shots.

And when we see the body doing something we think, "Oh, this must be why I'm having that emotion." But there's nothing in any of that research that says which caused which. And in fact, the scientists make this mistake all the time. They show that there's a correlation. They've got 100,000 cases of correlation between mind and body. And they have decided in 99,999 cases that it was the body determining the mind's experience. It could easily be the other way around.

And in fact, although it's extremely difficult to tell because you're dealing with nanoseconds here – it's extremely difficult to tell, but some of the evidence is starting to indicate that, in fact, it's the other way around. It's the mind. When you have a deep thought it affects your whole body. Which from the point-of-view of quantum theory is not surprising since it's also affecting the whole universe. So, it is interesting that we're so habituated to thinking in terms of physical determinism that when we see something going on in the body, we think that it must be controlling us, but it isn't.

So, Jocelyn had another question which was about Gandhi's statement that if you are, in fact, forced to make a choice between cowardice and violence, choose violence. And he was very consistent about this throughout his whole career. He never said, "I'm sorry, I was wrong. Let's go back to cowardice."

And Jocelyn said, very astutely, I think, that this could easily be abused. Somebody could say I'm not going to be a coward. I'm going to store up some weapons and use them if I'm attacked. And my response to that was – and this again, is something that Gandhi faced, and this was Gandhi's response, "We do the very best we can in our attempts to communicate clearly, but that's where our responsibility, more or less, ends. I cannot control how someone is going to manipulate my words." Within reason. I have had colleagues whom I admire very much who stopped doing scholarship because the State Department was misusing their research to do things that they did not approve of, and they just plain stopped their careers rather than have that happen.

But by and large, we have to just do the best we can. And if our actions and our speech and our thoughts are consistent, we've done the best we can to get people to try to accept these things in good faith and not abuse them. But anything can be misused, and it's not a reason not to say the truth. There is a reason – be careful, be consistent.

Round Table Conference 1931

There is this famous episode, in 1931 Gandhi was at the Round Table Conference in London, and he gave, apparently, one of the most brilliant talks of his life. It went on for two hours, but the government wouldn't allow anybody to take notes, so we don't know exactly what he said. But everyone who was there said it was incredibly brilliant.

He came out and these reporters surrounded him, and they said, "Mr. Gandhi, you're talking for two hours. You had no notes. You had no secretary." Well, actually they asked Nehru – or they asked Mahadev Desai, his secretary, "How does Gandhi do it? How does he talk like that for two hours without notes and stuff?" I've been here for seven minutes, and already I've referred to my notes three times.

And what Mahadev said was, "What Gandhi says, what he does, and what he thinks are all the same. Now you and me, we say one thing, we think another, and we do a third. So, we have to keep notes to keep track of what we're saying or doing at any given moment."

Okay. So, I've had some other questions too. I'm going to wait on those [unintelligible 00:09:02]. And I had a very exciting moment this weekend. I walked past the reading room in our community. The paper was out on the table, and I didn't realize it was the sports section, and I glanced at it, and it said, "Gore eager to carry full-time load." And I said, "Oh my God, Al Gore is going to run again." So, I read down and it says, "SF hopes running back." I said, "Yes, yes, he's going to run." Of course, there's a running back, whatever that is, whose name is Frank Gore and that's what the article was saying. [Laughter]

So, this reinforces my message that we should never expose ourselves to the mass media. [Laughter]. But while I was there my mind strayed to some of the "news" items, and I picked up an interesting thing. I never believe what they say, but I can always use

them. And it shows you how these truths of nonviolence, which we are studying and which, incidentally, the end of this week I'm going to see if we can kind of put together a list of which are the basic elements that we've hit upon so far. So be keeping track of those. But if these things are laws they should be showing up everywhere, not just in nonviolence classes.

Persuasion vs Coercion

And sure enough, there was an article about one particular very unfortunate Al Qaeda operative – I don't think there are any fortunate Al Qaeda operatives, but he was particularly unfortunate because he got captured, and he happened to be sick and wounded at the time. And he was questioned by the FBI. And the FBI does – you know, they gave him a bath. They gave him some food. They sat him down. They said, "Can we cooperate?" And they were getting a lot of information out of him when the CIA came in and said, "This is no good, this isn't working." And they proceeded to torture him in particularly bestial fashion, and they got no information out of him at all.

And so, the FBI said, "Persuasion rather than coercion was succeeding." Well, you know, they hadn't taken PACS 164A, but this is exactly what we were talking about from Week 2, as one of the main principles. The fact that it's working doesn't seem to succeed in convincing people that they should use it though because people operate on a paradigm and their cultural code. They do not operate, as a general rule, as a generalization, we don't operate by what we see and understand. We operate by certain patterns that have been laid down in our minds, unfortunately.

Okay, I'm working my way – I love to come in here with little things that I've picked up over the weekend, so I'm working my way through my little list. We talked about respect a great deal and how for Gandhi it was absolutely primary that you could even give it, under certain circumstances, a higher priority than life, than your own life. If it came to Hobson's choice where you either have to submit to a serious indignity or face death, he would respect the person who chose death over indignity. And you never, never use humiliation as a tool to coerce an opponent. These are things that – you'll never change his opinion on these two things at any point.

So, we're looking at it that way as a negative, but we can also look at it as a positive. And that's why I brought up that story of Marshall Rosenberg and the person who had killed seven people, to show that you can really get very far with people if you say, in your words or in your actions or both, "I respect you, but I cannot accept what you're doing." That's a much more powerful way to approach a person than to say, "You are a _____" and then hang a label on that person. Whatever it be, communist, terrorist, what have you. [Two hands of nonviolence]

And then I recall that Johann Galtung who's one of the real stars of peace research, did a lot of work on this conflict between Islam and the West. And some are saying it is a civilization clash. He went in there and interviewed people in-depth and he came to the

conclusion that what we need here in the West is we need their oil. In fact, it's our oil, what they're doing, hiding it under their countries, I don't know. But we need access to that oil, anyway. And what they need is respect for their religion.

So, there is no reason in this world why we have to be having this conflict. All we have to do is get down off our high horse and get over some of our egotism and say, "For all I know, you've got a perfectly good religion. I've never studied it. In fact, I've never studied any religion. But I'm willing to accept that Islam is a real religion. Now let's talk about the price of crude." And there's absolutely no reason why all this death and destruction has to be happening.

So, I started thinking about this because of the respect issue, but it led me to another issue because I do a lot of free associating. Not just over the weekends, but particularly when I'm picking blackberries on the weekends. It's a good time to do that.

Paradigm of Abundance

And it occurred to me that this also brings in one of our really major elements of the nonviolence theory. And we sort of touched on it or we created a frame in which to discuss it when we talked about the conflict between the prevailing dominant paradigm and the one that the nonviolence community would rather have instead.

We said one of the elements that differentiated them was – the dominant paradigm is a paradigm of scarcity. And once you're committed to material realities and materialism, you can never get away from that. There'll never be enough to go around. Even if there is, you'll not believe that there is. On the other hand, our paradigm is one of abundance because we believe that the essential needs that a human being has are not material and that they're basically inexhaustible. And it shows you how this connects with a very important aspect of nonviolent standpoint, and that is that there's no conflict which is really irreducible.

You can have one of the most intractable, destructive conflicts going on in the world today and you really look at what people really need as opposed to what they say they need, what they think they need. There is no reason in the world why we couldn't give them what they want, and they couldn't give us what we want. And our belief – I'm using the first-person plural here, as being a spokesperson for the nonviolence worldview. On behalf of all of us, our belief is that every conflict is really like that. There is no conflict which cannot be resolved if you can only get the ego element out of it.

Then with my next group of blackberries I had another connection I'd like to share with you that we're going to explore later when we get to Gandhian economics toward the end of the semester. Because his view on economics was very similar, which is part and parcel of the same thing. That, "There is enough in the world for everyone's need. There's not enough for everyone's greed." Greed is an artificial exaggeration of needs. And as he said, "We've got an economy of wants and that is unsustainable. We've got

to get back to an economy of needs,” which is easy to work with. We’ll never run out of stuff.

So, I guess in all of these things we’re saying that we, human beings, find ourselves in a perfectly workable, meaningful, well-organized, well-stocked universe. And then we go and mess it up because of mental factors which are not absolutely essential. That’s where nonviolence comes in and says, “We could fix this stuff.”

Investigation vs Injury

And then I was interviewed. This didn’t come to me while blackberry picking, but I was interviewed on a radio station in Boulder. Boulder is sort of an east version of Berkeley, as you know. Higher mountains, more Tibetans, otherwise it’s basically the same place.

And in this interview the interviewer shared with me something that Vice President Cheney had said about the attacks on 9/11, 2001. He said, “They meant it personally and we’re going to take it personally.” So, this is absolutely the opposite of our approach in nonviolence. In nonviolence we never take it personally. We’d like to say, “What is the real issue here?” Remember that story about Gandhi being written to by somebody who was slapped by a bully? And the person said, “I was humiliated. What should I have done?” Gandhi said, “If you were humiliated, you should have slapped him back.” But he then went on to say, “Why were you humiliated? That’s where you lost it. That was the whole problem.”

Okay. Let’s see. So let me recap a little bit what I was trying to develop with the three-stage model of the two paradigms, the competition versus cooperation. Well, sorry. Let’s back up a step. Material versus consciousness physics, competition versus cooperation biology, and the violent versus the nonviolent outcome. I wanted to add that nobody really understands what the connection is between these discoveries that physicists have made about the material world, or the objective world, and what we like to say about the interconnectedness of humans. Is this just an analogy or is there some real connection here? Nobody really has doped that out yet. I think there’s a Nobel Prize waiting for somebody to figure this out. Except you better have a pretty smart committee because the first three or four people who figure this out, nobody will understand anyway. So, it’s going to wait until we build up a culture.

But I want to make it clear that I’m not saying that now that we know that matter does not come in separate, irreducible, non-connected little packets, that proves that human beings interact with one another on a level of unitary consciousness. We can’t really quite go that far. All I’m trying to say is two things. One, the analogy is compelling. In fact, I believe that there’s something going on there that’s more than just analogy – a parallelism. But as badly as I would like to have the Nobel Prize - I could really use the money – I have not sat down and tried to figure this out.

Behavioral Inconsistency

The other thing that I'm saying is although people are capable of harboring incredible inconsistencies, last semester we talked about this 72-year-old man who was being executed by the state and he had had heart troubles. And as he was being led up to the death chamber he said, "If I have a heart attack on my way in, don't bother resuscitating me." And the warden and all the staff said, "Of course we'll resuscitate you. There's no way that we could fail to respect the sanctity of life."

So, back up and start that sentence again. Although it is possible for human beings to harbor the most incredible inconsistencies, there's something powerful about a consistent model and these two models, each of them is consistent with itself. The material physics resonates with competition biology and that resonates with the present welfare system in the sense that, you know. That health care is not an entitlement. That resonates very well with the neo-Darwinian theory that competition is a driving force in nature and that resonates very well with the idea that life is independent, disconnected, and meaningless.

Similarly, going over to a different paradigm, in any one of those compartments should help to spread the acceptance of nonviolence. And we have a colleague here in Berkeley, Henry Stapp, who said that this discovery of quantum interconnectedness and non-determinism must lead to a deeper, finer conception of what the human being is. Must. But it hasn't done so yet. So okay, I just wanted to clarify those two things.

So let me move on – well, sorry. Before I move on now to the actual topic that's on the syllabus that we're supposed to discuss, there's one more thing I wanted to do, and that is get back to those three questions that we had in the back of our mind and sort of answer them. And the questions were, if I remember, what is matter according to the new paradigm? And then is – this next question is a real straw-man – is competition the driving force of evolution as most claimed by neo-Darwinians? Darwin himself never said that. And this is often the case. And the third question was – anybody remember what the third question was? I mean those two are pretty good. We can actually spend a lot of time.

Oh yes, yes. Thank you. What is the – that is why I bring you all here. What is the verdict of history about the possibility of nonviolence? And we didn't really get to that part yet. So, let's succinctly answer those first two and then let me talk a little bit about history as a whole, which we haven't had a chance to look at systematically.

The Matter of Paradigm

I would say that matter – and I just made this up this morning, so check me again on Thursday, see if I still believe this – matter is a way in which reality is experienced by

observers who consider themselves to be separate. Actually, felt rather good about that – started smiling right there in the van.

Student: Can you say that again?

Michael: I was sure you were going to ask that. Yes, I can repeat it, and I would be happy to. Matter is an aspect of reality as experienced by an observer who thinks that he/she/it is separate. In other words, it has to be a subjective, objective, world for you to perceive reality in such a way that you come to the conclusion that Newton came to. That it's hard, never to be spoken in pieces, separate, and so on and so forth.

And then you try to explain the rest of your experiences on the basis of these hard little particles rucking around for no particular reason, and you can go only so far. You cannot account for consciousness with that approach. So, at that point you either decide, "Oh well, we just won't account for it." Or even worse, you say, "It doesn't exist since I can't explain it." Or you get humble and say, "Let's consider this."

Cooperation vs Competition

And then about competition versus cooperation in nature – this will really be coming from the readings because we didn't have a chance to discuss it very much. But we have a colleague here at Berkeley who studied mammalian evolution. And he came to the conclusion that if mammals had not developed cooperation at a very early stage, we would still be at the level of the marsupial today. We would be hanging by our tails from trees. And you know, there'd be some pluses. We wouldn't be having any wars or stuff like that. We wouldn't have to pay taxes. No long registration lines. None of these things.

But I think, on the whole, we would agree that we have advanced considerably. And that advance has been made possible by cooperation. And there's no question that both cooperation and competition drive evolution and behavior in nature, but there's also very little question anymore that of the two, cooperation is much more powerful. It's much more important. So, the readings that you'll do from Franz de Waal, I think, will be your way of getting a scientific backing for that.

The Science of History

And that leaves us with the question of history, and we're going to have to get back to this in a little while when we come to Gandhi's classic little text, "Hind Swaraj, Indian Home Role," because this is one of the first things that he had to deal with. And it's one of the first things that you, perhaps, already have had to deal with if you tell anybody that you're taking a course in nonviolence. They'll start giving you all kinds of trouble. And one of the things they'll inevitably say is, "Yeah, but what about history? Has this ever happened?"

So, the one thing that we have to reckon with there is that once you adjust history – the science of history – for its enormous bias. It has exactly the same bias that we saw in naturalism – in the natural sciences. Once you adjust for that and start looking for cooperation and nonviolence, it looks at this point, although we've only just begun doing that, it looks at this point as though we're going to find just as much, if not more. The difficulty is that when we study history we do the same thing that a journalist does studying an event.

Let's take a classic event. About 15 years ago there was a protest at Columbia. I don't know, my guess is that a couple of Berkeley students went to Columbia and started this whole thing. Anyway, whatever the issue was, the protest went on all day long, 24 hours. And during that 24 hour period there was exactly one minute when things got out of control. It was kind of a fracas. People were throwing stuff at the cops. The cops were being unkind to the demonstrators. It's not even clear that it was the demonstrators who were doing it, because it's often the case that non-demonstrators come in and mess things up. And there's even such a thing as *agent provocateur*. Did I pronounce that correctly? Where somebody comes in and deliberately causes violence.

I mean I had a friend of mine -- was standing in front of an embassy one day in Paris and there was some kind of a crowd there yelling things he couldn't quite understand. And somebody handed him a brown bag and said, "[*Jete l'ai*]." So, he said, "[*Jete l'ai*]. Throw this." "Okay." He lobbed at the building and, of course, it was a bomb. So, there was one minute of violence in 23 hours and 59 minutes of peaceful demonstration. Television cameras were there all day long.

That evening on the news they gave it exactly one minute of coverage. Do I need to even finish the story? You know perfectly well what they did. They took the one minute of blow up and said, "Here's the event that took place at Columbia." This is an extreme example, but it's typical in the direction it goes. Yeah?

Student: I remember learning about the Seattle protests against the World Trade Organization and how it was mostly like very, very nonviolent. But there were a couple people who broke Starbucks windows and the media just like kind of honed in on the destruction of property.

Nagler's Law

Michael: Yes, there's actually a law that some of you are familiar with. It's called, "Nagler's Law." Do you remember how it goes, Kevin?

Student: Violence plus nonviolence equals violence.

Michael: Yeah. You can see why I'm not going up for the Nobel in math. But this is the sad fact of it. That if you mingle in a little bit of violence in an otherwise nonviolent episode, you will totally vitiate the effect, or almost totally vitiate the effect. And the media will exaggerate that by picking it up and saying, "This is the story." Well, just as

this happens in the small compass of the daily report, it happens in the long view of history also. When you start looking for something else, you find something else.

In my book, "[Search for a Nonviolent Future](#)," there's a passage from one of the Jesus scholars – and we're going to be getting back to those people in about five weeks, I think. He started looking at Jewish uprisings under Roman rule from the point of view of nonviolence. He looked at seven uprisings that he classified as nonviolent. Three of them were successful. Four of them were – successful – meaning they achieved their ends without any loss of life.

Two of them, I think, were pre-empted and one of them – two of them were not successful. Something like that. I don't remember the exact breakdown, but it's clear that here you had someone who had standing as a historian, actually asking himself about nonviolent events in the ancient world. This is brand new. And when it's been going on for a little while, then I think we'll be able to say, "The jury is back in," and we can decide whether history says there's such a thing as nonviolence or not.

Okay, so let me pause here because we're shifting gears now a little bit, and we're going to talk about the "Vedanta." Any questions that have come up that you'd like to have clarified before we go on.

Student: How was that historian subjected to his fellow historians? Like was he ostracized because of this?

Michael: Dominic has been ostracized, but for other reasons. I think the whole Jesus Seminar is kind of – people haven't decided yet whether it's – if I may use the word "kosher" science or not yet. These are the people who are trying to dissect the Jesus of history from the Christ of faith, which I think has the potential for being an extremely [important] development. And we'll be getting back to that.

But I can give you another example within political science. We have a very good friend named Glenn Paige from Hawai'i. He's retired now. But at one time the University of Hawai'i at Manoa had three nonviolence scholars on the faculty, which is three more than almost any university in the world.

And he had been a standard political scientist, and he wrote a book called, [The Korea Decision](#). Which was a study of the decision-making process that led to the American intervention in the Korean conflict in 1953. And then something happened to Glenn. And we still don't know exactly how it happened, but he "got" nonviolence. You know, like you "get" religion? He was walking across campus and someone hands him a Gandhi biography or something. He says, "Lord, I believe!" [Laughter]

And so he went back to that book that he wrote, and he said, "Oh my gosh, what a crock." I mean he probably even used stronger language than that.

And he wrote another book called, [The Korea Decision Reconsidered](#). And he said, "Here's the path that we could have taken, and here're all the mistakes that we made."

And I have to tell you, he was ostracized for doing that. So, it's a little early to say because if we're – Crossan – Crossan was not writing as a historian, but as a theologian and a Bible scholar so it's a little bit different.

So, what am I promising you? I promise you that you will be ostracized if you take a career in nonviolence. But remember Gandhi's famous formula which gives me comfort and inspiration every day. He said, "If you're doing the right thing, it'll go through four steps. First, they ignore you. Then they laugh at you. Then they fight you. And then you win." That's the path. Any other questions before we move on? Okay? Great.

So, my promise to you was that this emerging paradigm that we're trying to get a handle on, that it already emerged and that it emerged probably about 5000 years ago and that it is directly relevant to us in another way because it was basically Gandhi's background. And so, this means that we don't really have to reinvent the wheel, but we only have to adapt this ancient wheel to some new roads that we always have to do. And even Gandhi said, you know, "Don't follow slavishly what I'm doing, but adapt it to your own conditions."

There was one American person who came to visit him, and he had been spinning homespun cotton and gave Gandhi this gift of a hank of cotton that he had spun, and he said, "I'd like to start a spinning association in the United States." And Gandhi said, "That is the craziest idea I've ever heard of, and I've heard of a lot of crazy ideas. You have a totally different economy in your country. That absolutely does not make sense for you." So, we have to try to grasp the principles and apply them to our given situation.

Physics of the Vedanta

I want to start off with a quote from an Indian physicist who became the head of the energy commission for the government of India a while back. And he's talking about the quantum revolution, that we also were talking about in our remarkably amateurish way. And he said, "This revolution has knocked the foundations out from under every thought system known to mankind. Only "The Vedanta" has survived." I think that was a very true claim.

Let me say a little bit about the word "Vedanta." [Gesturing to the chalkboard] Oh look, "Violence." Somebody was teaching a relevant subject in here. Let's find out who that was. Okay. [Writes "Vedanta"] This term has various meanings, and I don't think it's necessarily for us to go over all of them. The way I'm using it here is as a general term. Sometimes called a portmanteau term, you know, briefcase term, for the consensus worldview that emerged in ancient India.

And it's remarkable how strong this consensus was. If you wish to be taken seriously as a philosopher, as a traditional philosopher in India today, you have to show that what you're teaching, what you're believing, saying, resonates with Vedanta. Not that some people did not. There were also people called, "Gnosticas" or naysayers who were

materialists. They didn't believe any of this stuff. So, you're allowed to believe whatever you want, but if you want to be considered part of the serious discourse community, it goes back to this very, very remote period in history.

"The Vedanta" is your touchstone. And there are various reasons why this physicist said that "The Vedanta" was not shattered by the quantum revolution. For one thing, they had already hit upon the idea that phenomenal reality, you know, things you can see and measure – this stuff – is discontinuous. They hit upon it in the subjective world. We hit upon it several thousand years later in the objective world.

In other words, their discovery was that thoughts are discontinuous. This was kind of embedded in the Hindu concept of momentariness and then it was elaborated by the Buddhists, called, "The doctrine of [China-kavada 00:39:40] or independent origination." But you don't have to remember all of that for this course. So, I'm not writing it on the board or anything. For our purposes the important thing is that they felt that the thought process consists of discrete units. And if you can slow that process down you would actually begin to perceive the space in between thoughts.

And in between those two thoughts there would be absolutely nothing in exactly the same way that there is absolutely nothing between two Heisenberg states of the universe. I hope I'm saying that correctly – or if I'm not, that none of you knows. Anyway, just as the end result is that we cannot argue for classical determinism in the real – in the material world, phenomenal world.

Somehow the world looks as if there is determinism. I mean you hit a baseball with X amount of force, it will go Y amount of yards. But that is some kind of an illusion, and nobody has figured out why large macroscopic objects act that way. That's exactly what the Buddha said about the thought process, that you think I'm angry. There's nothing I can do about it. Meanwhile, you have a billion opportunities in between these thought bursts where you can go in an entirely different direction. And your next thought is not determined by your previous thought. So that's one of the reasons. Another reason, of course, was the enormous priority that Vedanta gave to consciousness. Decidedly, a consciousness, energy, matter model. Not a matter, energy, consciousness model.

I'm reading you a couple of passages from a remarkable text which I just love, but I'm probably almost alone in this particular preference. It's like – for one thing, it's like most Indian texts. It's incredibly long. My abridged edition in English is 750 pages. It's called, "The Yoga Vasistha." I love this book! I've been reading it for years. It keeps – it says the same thing on every page. But I still don't get it, so I try again, you know?

And here's how this text goes on – this is a very ancient piece of writing. "The division created by objective consciousness ceases when the knowledge of the indivisibility of consciousness arises." Translated, "The minute you perceive consciousness as a whole, as a single totality, all division appears as what it is, which is an illusion. Pots do not exist independently of clay, for pots are but modifications of clay. In the same way objects are of consciousness. They are not different from consciousness. As objects of

consciousness, they are consciousness. If they weren't, you would not be able to perceive them." Isn't this great? It goes on and on and on like this.

Bhagavad Gita -- Three Parts of the Vedanta

Now there is also – to give some aspects of this, I'm going to be talking to you about three things that are parts of "The Vedanta." I'm going to talk about the concept of order. For which their term is "Dharma." And as you know, we're going to be focusing on the theory of action, especially as it's outlined in the "Gita" because that, again, exactly where Gandhi is coming from. So, we sort of have a rhyming word here, "Karma." Everybody has heard these terms. And by the way, a lot of what I'm going over here with you, you probably are somewhat familiar with, but it probably bears repetition. Like I say, I've been reading the same thing about 85 times a day for several years now, and I'm still enjoying it.

And then I want to talk about a model of energy states called, "The Three Guṇas" because we can tie that in, in a neat way to nonviolence. Okay?

Dharma

So first of all, this idea of Dharma, the word has an etymology which is very clear. It comes from a root which means "to uphold, to bear." So, this is order not in an abstract sense or a static sense, like you know, sometimes we talk about world order models and should the world be a circle or a pyramid or something like that. It's not like that.

It's an upholding principle. Everything depends on dharma. And you can translate that word in a number of different ways and they're all going to be helpful for us. You could say that dharma means – [Gestures to the chalkboard] I hope that was Martin Luther King. It probably wasn't given that God is up there at the top. Okay. So, dharma can be translated as, "Order", as I say, or law, or religion, or nature. All these things are included. They all come out of this root, to uphold.

Now they had said in the ancient world, I mean even before the concept of dharma was well formulated, there was a refrain, a motto, which goes way, way back to the Vedic period and that was, "*Ekam sat bahudha vipra vadanti*," which means, "Reality is one. The wise have called it by many names." The reality is one. The wise have called it by many different names. And there are two important outcomes from starting from this position. Quite aside from the fact that underneath diversity we can find our way to unity. That may be the most important thing but notice that the people who call reality by different names are themselves designated as wise.

This is very different from saying, "Reality is one. Fools have called it by different names." In other words, there's an underlying acceptance of diversity in this tradition which I think, myself, is way cool. There's a section in "Bhagavad Gita" in Chapter 7

where Krishna is speaking. He happens to be the supreme reality. He's talking to a warrior friend of his. And he says, "Whatever form, whatever god a person wishes to worship, I strengthen his faith in that form." This is remarkable. Instead of saying, "If he chooses the wrong form, he goes straight to hell." God himself says, "I support his faith in that form – or her faith in that form."

Now he doesn't go on to say, but which is pretty clear from other contexts because it's only by following what you truly believe in that you'll discover whether it is your truth or not. And in fact, in this passage in Book 7 in the "Gita" it goes on to say, "They can do whatever they want. I will help them get to the goal, but the goal will be transitory if they've made a choice other than choosing the central unity."

So, there's this incredible acceptance of diversity. That's what I'm getting at here. Now let me unpack that a little bit. There is an eternal dharma which is one and unchanging. And there are phenomenal expressions of that dharma. Now what is the eternal dharma? Well, by the time you get down to the period of the great epics, "Mahabharata" and "The Ramayana" are the two great collections of epic poetry in ancient India, but way after the Vedic period. There was a refrain that occurs in "The Mahabharata" over and over again, which is *ahimsā paramo dharma* – there's our word again. [Writes "*ahimsā paramo dharma*"]

Okay, so what this means is that the highest dharma – and we can translate that as ultimate religion, the supreme law, any of these translations would be appropriate. The highest, the ultimate, the supreme dharma is nonviolence. The absence of all desire to harm. So, the whole "Mahabharata" is about this question of what is dharma? These warriors are out there fighting. In the middle of the battle one of them will say to another, "But wait a minute. Is this dharma?" And they'll sit and they'll have a little discussion of 300, 400, 500 lines and then they'll go back into the battle. And most of those discussions are going back and forth. Sort of like rabbinical discussions. So, they're inconclusive.

But the one thing that people cycle back to that they feel they can pin themselves on is that nonviolence is the ultimate dharma. And in fact, if you go back into some earlier texts like "The Upanishads," you find remarkable statements. Like in one of "The Upanishads" there's a description of creation. And it says the supreme reality is creating all these things, but it doesn't feel he's quite gotten there. Just doesn't feel fulfilled. So finally, he creates dharma. "This excellent creation," it says. And it goes on to say, "Dharma is the *chakram* of the *chakradharia*." That means even the *chakradharia*, the warrior, who relies on force and coercion, dharma is the essence of his power.

And it goes on to say, "Therefore, by dharma, even the weak can prevail over the strong – even over the power of a king. Dharma is truth itself. So, if one speaks truth, we say he or she utters forth the dharma, they are but one." This is a very early text, "The Brihadaranyaka Upanishad," and what's remarkable about it is it's saying that this

underlying ordering force in the universe is superior to physical – physical power or political authority.

In other words, you have an unrighteous king, and you fasten onto dharma, which is the same as truth, which is going to be called, “Satyagraha,” a couple three thousand years later in South Africa. If you get hold of that, that truth will enable you to prevail over the highest political authority. So, it’s really remarkable that you have this testimony that early. So that, all that is being said about the eternal dharma, but the fact is we also have to live in a phenomenal world. A friend of mine said this morning, “You’re a PACS major. You learn how to deconstruct Western civilization, but you still have to live in it.”

And what you find is that this dharma radiates out in various ways. For example, let’s take the question of time. The eternal dharma doesn’t enter into space-time. It’s out here somewhere. But time comes in divisions. Like we have *yuga* which means “eras.” *Kali-yuga* which we’re living through right now – and other *yugas*. And every *yuga* is said to have a *yuga dharma*. That is the dharma of the age. In every age there’s a particular way that we have available to us to have access to this power.

And in fact, Gandhi said – and several people echoed him – that the dharma of our age is truth. In fact, I belong to a little group called, “The Tomales Peace Café.” And we had a presentation one night in Tomales Peace Café after we had our potluck dinner and played bluegrass, we had little peace discussions. Somebody showed a film. This person who goes around the U.S. asking a question all over the country. And the question was, “What does America need?”

And on one occasion, somewhere in Chicago, I think – yeah, maybe it was Chicago. He asked a young lady, “What does America need?” And she said, “Truth.” And then she stepped up closer to the camera and said, “Truth!” And then she practically swallowed it and said, “Truth!!” There’s a tremendous need that we feel because there’s been so much going away from it. It’s said that we are exposed to between 1500 and 3000 commercial messages a day in this civilization.

Student: Well, I’ve heard some people are [unintelligible 00:54:36].

Michael: Yes. There is an argument that truth is relative, and that’s another question. And we can certainly circle around to that. As soon as we get a breathing space, at some point, bring that up again. But the point I’m making here is that if we were in a different era, that young lady instead of saying, “Truth,” she might be saying, I don’t know, “Kindness or Fair-Trade Coffee or vegetarianism,” or something like that. But in our age, the central thing that we need to hold onto, and we can gain power by reorienting ourselves to, is truth.

And then it breaks down and breaks down and you even get to what’s called – I really love this one – *nimisa* dharma. *Nimisa* literally means “eye-blink.” And it means “the dharma of the moment.” Because even if you break time down in a quantum way, so

you get to a single [trina-mere 00:55:37], a single time burst, a unit, whatever you want to call it, at every moment there is a specific dharma to that moment.

And there's a way of being on with that dharma and being off of it. So, there's a choice between dharma and adharma, every moment. Okay, please, if your head itches, scratch it before you come to class, or I get very confused. I'm only kidding. Scratch all you want. Okay, so you see the pattern here. There's an eternal unchanging dharma, and the closest we can come to defining it is in this mantram of the epics. But for every part of time that you're in, there's a specific dharma for that time which resonates with the eternal dharma. Okay?

So now the next spread is going to be even more interesting. Everybody got this? Let's call this, "Space." I guess I'm really talking about social space. For all creatures there's only one dharma. But life has one dharma. But different forms have different dharmas. There's a story about a sage who is meditating on the banks of a stream and a scorpion climbs up the tree next to him and goes out on a branch and falls into water. And the sage picks up the scorpion, whereupon it viciously stings him. He puts it back on the ground, tries to get back, "Where was I? Lord make me – oh no."

And this darn scorpion goes back up a tree – if this were India we could do this a hundred times, but you get the point. Scorpion keeps falling in the water, keeps stinging him. Finally, a villager sees this and says, "This guy is crazy." He goes running after him and says, "Blessed one, don't you realize what's happening? Every time you pick that poor creature up, it's going to sting you like that." And he says, "It's his dharma to sting. It's my dharma to save him." So, the human race, as such, has a dharma which is to rescue life.

Now human beings are very diverse, as you've noticed, and they come in classes of one kind or another. I'm using that word very generally. In India, of course, this would be codified. They tend to be very systematic about stuff like this. So either the four social functions define four different classes. But each of those classes has a dharma. And different groups of people have a dharma which is specific to that group. In fact, they're beginning to get the idea – and the Buddhists will say this very frankly – that anything that exists is a dharma. It is the expression of a specific dharma.

That's why if you go to Tassajara, one of the Buddhist retreat centers, they will stand around and say, "The dharmas are enumerable. I vow to realize all of them." Stuff like that.

Swadharmas

And here's the part that I really like best. This whole thing has been leading up to this one delicious point. Every individual has a dharma which is called, "Swa-dharma." This is an important little prefix by the way. It's "Swa," meaning "One's own." Cognate with

the Latin word “*Suus, sua, suum.*” They’re related languages. *Swa*-dharma means “own dharma.” It means that every single one of us has a specific dharma.

And as a matter-of-fact, in “The Gita” we are told in no uncertain terms that to discover what our dharma is and carry it out is the ultimate purpose of human life. In fact, “The Gita” says, “Your own dharma is infinitely preferable even if you’re terrible at it, then to use somebody else’s dharma with great skill. Because all you’ll do is you get to the end of it and discover, “Oh my God, that wasn’t my dharma, and now I’m too old to go back and get a PhD in another subject and start all over again in some way.”

So, “The Gita” even goes as far as to say you’ll be better off dying in your own dharma than thriving in somebody else’s. It’s felt to be that important. Now sometimes when I bring this up people say, “Yeah, okay. Well, what if your dharma is to be a serial killer or something like that?” That question has actually been raised. Well, that’s impossible because these divisions are all expressions of the general dharma, and they must resonate with it. They cannot violate it. Okay? Yes, question?

Student: I can’t help but avoid that this is starting to sound really deterministic all over again, with each of us having our own eye-blink dharma, you know, a right and wrong to every moment of our lives.

Michael: Yes. That’s a very good point. If we have an individual dharma and there’s a dharma that we have to fasten onto to discover every moment, how is that not deterministic? I’m practically stumped, but I think I can say that at least – hang on one second, Jeff. At least it is not determined whether you’re going to strive even for that. That’s not, you know, you will always have the choice of whether you’re going to make an honest attempt to discover it or not.

So yeah, it doesn’t mean that your behavior is determined. What it means is there’s a law such that when you find the right behavior it will be remarkably fulfilling and satisfying for you. And if you don’t find it no matter how often, how good at it you become, it won’t work for you. Jeff?

Student: Well, I don’t know, it’s just I think a good way of – I think according to – think about it. It’s not a fate or a destiny. It’s just more of an ethical, perhaps - if you want to put it in Western terms - or just something that is right in the world, is how I understand it.

Michael: Yeah, it’s something that is right in the world, and it’s not a destiny. It’s not a predetermined –

Student: You still have a choice to follow your dharma or not.

Michael: Yeah. You have your choice whether to follow it or not. All that this is saying is that your choice is meaningful. And it is not all over the map. You can’t simply decide I want to be something that I’m not. I mean you can, but it won’t work for you. At some

point you'll say, "I did that, and it was boring. And now I've lost all that time and energy and I got to go back and find the other one." Yeah?

Student: I think you can make a choice to follow your own dharma. And like you do it because it's right for you. But then just because it's your dharma doesn't mean it doesn't affect everyone else around you and because that's what deterministic means, that your actions are completely different. And even though the actions that you're doing are because you want to follow the right path for you, that doesn't mean that it doesn't affect everyone around you.

Michael: This is very well said. Even though – suppose I discover what is my *sva*-dharma, to be a nonviolence professor, and I carried it out. It doesn't mean that this is in isolation. We're not saying here that my discovering my dharma is unconnected from the needs of other people. In fact, the way I like to think about it is your *sva*-dharma is actually a set of capacities. See, it's not exactly a path to a goal, it's a set of capacities that you have. You have – every single one of us has, according to this model, a specific responsibility to find out what our strengths and weaknesses are. And to struggle against the weaknesses and to develop the strengths. That's what it's saying.

You shouldn't get the impression that *sva*-dharma equates to an occupation. It's not quite that simple. I was born with a certain particular package of drives. And there are things about that particular package which are not exactly the same as anybody else's package. "Thank God," you might say. I mean that's why we are individuals because there are specific energies, capacities, weaknesses, that have come to this planet to be worked out. That's what the model was saying. Yeah, there was some other?

Student: Well, just also was wondering – a helpful way of thinking of it is – again, not deterministic, but as an optimal potential.

Michael: Optimal potential is a good way of putting it. Yeah.

Student: [Unintelligible 01:05:27]

Michael: Optimality.

Student: Optimum state.

Michael: Optimum state, yeah. That's good because it's not dualistic. It's not saying like there's a right one or a wrong one and if you choose the wrong one, that's "*Finito la musica*," as they say in Italian. No, there are gradients and you come closer or further away. But there's definitely an optimum. And for you not to understand what your optimum is, is to lack in self-knowledge, and that will make your life, to that extent, somewhat inefficient.

Student: I think it also, in that perspective, leads, for me, into how the dharma can be spoken to in relation to peace theory. And what peace actually is [unintelligible 01:06:17]. It's the society expressing its optimal potential. It's as society at its peak of [unintelligible 01:06:25].

Michael: That's great, yeah. Peace is a society operating at its peak as optimum. How did you put it? Society operating at its optimum potential. Yeah. And we can also say this, that – I'm adding a little bit to that - that one of the elements of this theory that I haven't mentioned yet is that given that this is all dharma, when you're on track with your own dharma, it will not be competitive with anyone else's. This will even work its way out into Gandhi's economic theory.

So, one of the grave dangers in missing your dharma is you're going to be crowding out somebody else's dharma, getting in between them and their dharma. As long as you are trying your best to fulfill your own, there'll be no competition for any kind of resource with other people. And that's another way that the system leads to a peaceful outcome. But yeah, you're quite right. The society also has a dharma. America has a specific dharma. Between you and me, I don't think we're getting on track with it right now. That's just my own personal opinion.

But I think one of the ways of thinking about what we could be doing to fix this, would be to ask ourselves, "What are our specific strengths and weaknesses and how can we capitalize on the former and reduce the later?" Well, I'm glad you brought that up because there will be several different tie-ins between what we're saying here and peace theory and ultimately, nonviolence.

Student: Where does dharma come from? God or our karma?

Michael: Well, the dharma is simply an expression of the supreme reality. That's what this Upanishad text was about. I don't know if I can say that much more about it. But if we're going to have a phenomenal world, which we might regard as a tragedy to begin with, but if we're going to have an outside world and all the rest of it, a relative world, there's an ordered way for it to be. And that emanates from its source in the supreme reality.

This reminds me – you might find that this is a bit of a leap, but by now you're probably used to me leaping around a little bit – this reminds me of a wonderful thing that Emerson once said, speaking about American dharma, in his essay "The American Scholar" he said, "I am going to be a perfectly free independent person. Have no dependencies on anyone."

And so, people asked him, "How are you going to do that?" And he didn't say, "I'm going to find a cave in the Berkshires somewhere, go up there with a 30-pound sleeping bag and never talk to anybody again." He said, "I'm going to be a perfect husband to my wife, a perfect father to my children, a perfect friend to my friends, a perfect teacher to my students," and so on.

In other words, by – there is a frictionless way that we can carry out relationships so that they are not entangling. And that way is our *sva*-dharma and the dharma of the social unit that we find ourselves in. Question?

Student: What did he mean by perfect?

Michael: What did Emerson mean by perfect in that connection? My guess is that he meant that he would fulfill his responsibilities toward people without asking anything from them. So, you know, being a perfect husband, even in New England at that period of time, did not mean, you know, I demand that you get on the dinner on the table at the right time and so forth. In fact, the word for “husband” in Sanskrit is “*bharta*” which means “supporter” which is very related semantically to dharma. Okay?

So, I find this a very rich concept and I think probably have shared it with you even in another course, if I were teaching another course. Why are you laughing over there, Zoe? Why weren't you laughing? But it's also relevant for us as students of nonviolence in a very specific way, and we'll see that slowly unfolding as we go along. Okay.

Karma: Gita Theory of Action

So, if we're all right with that for the time being, we're going to start discussing “The Gita” theory of action. We don't really have a whole lot of time for this, but we can get back to it on Thursday.

And I've asked you to read specific passages in “The Gita” to put this together. And I know that, you know, maybe not all of you have quite finished the reading yet, but maybe we could – I could start off by just asking you – those of you who have read around in it, what are the elements in the theory of action? Given that this all has to fit within the concept of dharma in all of its manifold parts. Let's just make a list.

What is human action all about? How to do it correctly? You know what, maybe before we start, I'll just clarify as I did with dharma, this – where karma comes from is a similar root. *Ker* – which means to do. It's not as complex as the dharma situation. *Ker* just simply means to act. And this word has about three meanings – two of which will be very relevant for us. The first meaning meant a ritual action. I'll be saying a little bit more about that later on, but for now I don't think we need to worry about that. But a person's karmas are the rituals that he is obligated to perform as a member of his or her specific family and class and so forth.

But the two meanings we're most concerned about are, *A* – karma simply means “An act. A thing done.” That's what the word etymologically means. And it also means “the residue of an act. The spiritual residue of an action which is key to the intention that created it in the first place.” And this is why when you go down Telegraph Avenue and you have casual conversations with people, they will say – let's say you're going down the avenue and somebody asks you for a couple of dollars for a latte and you don't give it to them. They will say, “Okay, it's your karma.”

What they mean is if you had an unkind intention, whatever maybe the outcome of the action, that intention is left in your consciousness. It's a part of you. It's a part of your personality from that point forward. And to be entangled in a lot of bad karma is a very serious spiritual, existential problem. And that's why Arjuna starts off by saying to

Krishna, “You’ve told me not to get tangled up in all this bad karma. On the other hand, you’re telling me to go back into this horrendous action, the Mahabharata War. What’s going on here?” And that’s how the whole conversation gets started.

Okay, so just see if we can put a couple of ideas up there on the blackboard and discuss them more fully on Thursday. What have you noticed about that teaching? Anyone? No head scratching now, it would be a very serious mistake at this point. Let me start you off – yeah, okay?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:14:44]

Detachment from Results

Michael: I was going to – I was hoping to lead up to that as a terrific climax, but since you brought it up here, let’s enjoy it. And it is detachment from results. That’s probably the most important thing that we can get out of all of this, and which will be a key to how Gandhi operated. And the word for results – detachment from results. I’m glad that leapt out at you. The word for result is “*phalam*. Fruit.” The fruit of the action is you do the action and then a benefit comes from that action, let’s say, and you collect the benefit.

Now the Gita is very, very strong – it uses very strong language, almost cuss words, describing people who do things for the specific benefit that will accrue to them personally. In other words, anyone who believes those 1500 to 3000 commercial advertisements a day is an absolutely miserable wretch according to “The Gita.” Okay. Well, this has been a lot of stuff. And we’re out of time. Let’s get back to this Thursday. I’m glad we started off with the people.

6. The Vedanta as Old/New Paradigm 2

The Gita on Human Action and Life's Purpose

Michael: If you're a PACS major there's a reception this afternoon from 4:00 to 6:00 on the PACS terrace. I think we haven't done very well in terms of the weather. But if you're there, try to be there for the first hour and come say hello if I don't [know] who you are already. I had three minor technological triumphs in the last couple of days which made me feel terrific, but one of them was not my attempt to send you a CourseWeb message early yesterday. So, you may not have gotten it, but what I'm planning to do today is continue speaking about what I'm calling, "The theory of action." What's the meaning of human action in this text "Bhagavad Gita?"

Theory of Action and the Three Guṇas

And we're going to fold into that discussion the Theory of the Three Guṇas, which on many levels will be useful for us. And then if we have enough time we're going to start showing you some maps and stuff and begin to lay the background for the history of the discovery of Satyagraha in South Africa, which I think is the greatest story ever retold in the 20th century. And so, we're going to be really shifting today from the theory and model building and frame setting to the history and how we get nonviolence information out of that history.

So, in other words we're going to attempt something that I've never before attempted in this course or any other course of the same price range – and that is we are actually going to try to get a little bit ahead of the syllabus – if that works. But this is not to be at the expense of any questions, clarifications you want to ask. I know you have some left over that we haven't really talked about yet.

So, in other words what we won't be doing – today anyway – is going over that list of what are the elements of nonviolence that we've stumbled on so far. And because of that I'd like to start off by going back to the one we mentioned on Tuesday which was the non-scarcity part which ultimately states that not only is there enough in the world for everyone's need, but it goes on to say that there is no such thing as an irreducible conflict.

Clash of Civilizations

There is always going to be conflict and conflict resolving people, and nonviolence people do not run away from conflict. We do not actually aim for a world in any short-term realistic future in which there wouldn't be any conflict. But rather we're going to look differently on conflict. We're going to treat it as a way for parties to get to

understand one another. And so, both of them can grow and they can grow closer together in the course of resolving that conflict. Now that would not work if there were a real need that two groups both had for the same resource. Whatever kind of resource that was.

And that's why I brought in Johan Galtung's insight into the so-called "clash of civilizations." He said that what the Muslim world needs is respect for their religion and what we need is access to their oil. When you really get down to – take away all the egos and the lines in the sand and the vice president saying, "We're going to take this personally." And the president saying, "We will be terrible in our vengeance." They're trying to sound like Jehovah. Oop – not supposed to mention the word, "Jehovah." Sorry.

Anyway, take away all of this posturing and egotism and drain all the testosterone out of the situation, and there's absolutely no reason for these two groups of people to be fighting. There is a clash of civilizations all right, and we're going to get into that when we talk about Gandhi's classic text that he wrote in 1909, "Hind Swaraj," or "Indian Home Rule." There's a clash of civilizations. But it's going on in the heart of every human being, not between two human groups.

And along with that, the non-scarcity and non-conflict part of the paradigm kind of hang together. It's important because obviously you're not going to strive for reconciliation in any given conflict if you don't believe it's possible, if you believe that there's an irreducible conflict that can only be resolved by dispute and reducing of the other person.

Satyagraha in South Africa

Okay, so by way of getting us back into our subject I want to quote for you probably pretty close to original, word for word, something that Gandhi wrote at the end of Satyagraha in South Africa. Up until 1926 when he finished his two books, [Satyagraha in South Africa](#), and [My Experiments with Truth](#) which is what he subtitled or called his autobiography. And incidentally, I was thinking about it this morning and I realized I'm going to write a book. It's going to be called, "Our Experiments with Untruth." It's going to be about modern civilization." But it's still in the gestation stages so we don't need to worry about it.

But get back on my little track here, in 1926 he completed the writing of these two books based on very careful notes. If we had more time, I would really base the course on those two books, but we don't have time. At the end of "Satyagraha in South Africa" he says, "And so after 21 years I left South Africa with a pang, the land in which I was born and the place where I discovered my vocation in life." Okay? Does anybody have a little flag going up and saying vocation in life? Why, I know what that's called in the "Bhagavad Gita's" theory of action. Anybody want to? Sva-dharma, right. Your particular "vocation" would be a reasonable word for it. I mean that line has always jumped out at

me because I think it's the greatest understatement of the 20th century. Here somebody realized God, became a Mahatma, and decided he was going to end colonialism. And he said, "I discovered my vocation." Okay? Very good.

So, let's back into the "Bhagavad Gita." And by the way, Joanna, Kim? You had asked me for an extra copy, and I have one here. I have some copies you can use here today to follow along. Does anybody need some? Okay. I should have brought a few more. You guys can share. Sashi, if you would take those and pass them back, thanks. Let's make sure I have a copy though – yes, I do.

Gandhi and the Gita

I didn't have a chance to mention when we started this conversation on Tuesday that there is this intense relationship between this particular scripture, "The Bhagavad Gita" and Mahatma Gandhi. "The Gita" occurs – it comes down to us in tradition in the middle of this Mahabharata epic where as I mentioned last time, there's this endless discussion of dharma, what are human beings supposed to do, what are we doing here? What's our purpose? And in the middle of that there's this long conversation between Arjuna, a warrior prince who suddenly discovers that this is not the car I bought. He's about to go into battle, and he has a kind of breakdown. It's called the "Vishad Arjuna" or the dejection of Arjuna because he sees his relatives on the other side that he has to kill, and that's very tough if you're Indian.

And then he sees something even worse – that I've always appreciated – his teacher. I cannot bring myself to do this. He drops his weapon, his AK-*gandiva*. And he sinks to the floor of the chariot, and he says to his charioteer, "*Na yotsya iti govinda*. I'm not fighting Krishna." Period, end of quote. His charioteer happens to be God. So, this leads to a very interesting discussion in which Krishna re-encourages him to pick up his weapon and get back into the battle. And at some point, if we need to, we feel as uncomfortable with this, we can get into why he's being exhorted to fight when ahimsā is the supreme dharma. It's not really that puzzling or that confusing.

But anyway, the "[*Pagla-gita* 00:09:25]" which has long been regarded as a piece of very, very ancient wisdom that got implanted in the "Mahabharata." It has been extremely important for modern devotional Hinduism. And Gandhi discovered it only late in life. And when he discovered it, it was mind-boggling for him. He learned enough Sanskrit that he could read it in the original and he memorized large portions of it. And often, at his prayer meetings, he would have his secretary Mahadev Desai recite the last 18 verses of Chapter 2 which he thought summed up the whole thing. And there's a very good description of what actually happened to Gandhi on those occasions when he would be listening to these versus in "Gandhi, the Man."

And so, I go so far as to say that if the "Bhagavad Gita" took on a pair of rather scrawny legs and became a human being in the 20th century, it would become Gandhi. Or if Gandhi were a book, it would be the "Bhagavad Gita." So, you can very often see where

he's coming from if you understand the message of this text. Which anyway, it's a great message anyway so we're not wasting our time.

Now we're trying to isolate one concern, namely what does "The Gita" say about human action? And I'm sure you found it a little bit difficult to pick out the pieces and follow this argument because the way argument is developed in the "Bhagavad Gita" is different from what we're used to. It does not say, "Okay, now let's talk about action." So, we have a chapter on action. Now we're going to talk about practically nothing else. And we finish, we get to the end and say, "I told you what we're going to say. I said it. And I told you I said it." And we've ended. We got closure. Move onto another topic. It never does that.

Three Modes of Realization

It is concerned with three modes of realization. Action, devotion, and wisdom. And it constantly weaves these three things in together. So even when Arjuna, for example, says, "Krishna, my head is spinning. I can't dope this out. For God's sake, tell me about action." Krishna will say, "Okay, my boy, I'm going to give you the skinny on human action." The next thing you know he'll say, "The wise are truly devoted to me." And he'll get around to actually – in other words, he'll never treat the subject in isolation because he doesn't want it to be taken in isolation, but rather in its relationships with all the other considerations that keep coming up. So that's why I gave you whole chapters to read instead of pulling out chunks. I know it's a little bit tough getting used to. Yeah, question?

Student: What was the third one [unintelligible 00:12:14].

Michael: I'm sorry, I didn't catch it. Action, devotion, and wisdom. Actually, there are four paths, classically. This is worth spending a little time on, I guess. This is called, "Karma yoga," is realization through action which is basically what we're talking about. Then "bhakti yoga" is realization through intense devotion to supreme ideal. And "jñāna yoga" is the cultivation of intuitive discrimination between the real and the unreal, okay? That's my definition by the way. Don't try this out in Southeast Asian Studies 10. You might get queried on that. But that's how I would define it.

You can't just say, "Knowledge," which is etymologically "*jñā*." Knowledge. Because it's much deeper than knowledge. It's the kind of knowledge that allows you to look at the phenomenal world and not be fooled, the see-through, *maya*. And it's said that there is a fourth path which is called, "Raja yoga," which means "The royal path." And that really means weaving together all three of these on the basis of meditation. Okay? Now this is a little bit – it's interesting for us because in the 20th century there was a figure who represented jñāna yoga par excellence. His name was Sri Ramana Maharshi – who passed away, I think, in 1954.

Bhakti yoga you could say, you know, later part of the 19th century you had Sri Rama Krishna. He was so devotional that you had to be careful not to use a word with the letter “K” in his presence because it would remind him of Krishna, he would go into Samadhi, fall down, have a dislocated shoulder. It would be very serious. And raja yoga, there was a person called, “Aurobindo – Sri Aurobindo.” Interesting career. He was Bengali and like most Bengali’s, he was a revolutionary. And he escaped to Pondicherry which is the French enclave – it was on the west coast of India. And the British said, you know, you’ve got a terrorist in there. We want him extradited. And the French said, “We do not export mystics or sages,” which enabled them to get back at the British just a little bit. Anyway, so here you have this preeminent representative at a really very high level of each of these three paths.

Karma Yoga

But the one that had almost never been represented in the past was karma yoga, and I think it says something about the 20th century that for the first time we had somebody who said, “I’m going to do it. I’m correction action.” And now for 64 rupees, can you guess who that person was? Yes, of course, that’s our man. Or as they say today, “He’s the man.” So, it took a while for Indians even to recognize him, you know, get used to this because no one had ever done this through action before – realize God.

Okay, so let’s – so we started with the point that I wanted to end with. So, let’s start there again. It’s framed as kind of a conundrum. “I know what inaction is,” Arjuna will say. “And I know what action is. But what the hell are you talking about?” He says to Krishna. And, you know, we can describe action in very simple language. We can describe inaction in very simple language. I mean just look at some political leaders. You’ll see terrific examples of inaction.

But when it comes to what Krishna is actually talking about, he’s forced to resort to a paradox. He says, “What I’m talking about is action in inaction and inaction in action,” which isn’t that easy to say, much less understand. And so, he spends a lot of time and section after section trying to circle around this idea and look at it from different angles. And one of the things that he calls it is, “*Niṣkāma* karma.” Karma we know. It means “action.” “*Kāma* means “desire,” usually without any modifier. It means “personal, selfish desire.” In fact, often without any modifier it means “sexual desire” which is the strongest example in that category.

And so, if you can act without desire, then it can truly be said in this philosophical sense that you are not acting. And I look at – if you’ve got this little edition of ours – this is a good translation by the way because it sort of interprets as it goes along. This is Chapter 3 which I think I didn’t ask you to read. No? Okay. Okay, well, do no harm. Chapter 3, Verse 15, “Every selfless act which is an act devoid of selfish desire, Arjuna, is born from Brahmin, the eternal infinite god-head.”

Now you can read statements like this a lot without quite grokking what the point of it is. The point of it is that this is an action which – we’re probably going to have to restate this several times to get it clear enough. But let’s try this. This is an action which the universe is undertaking, and you are just the instrument. The action did not arise from your personal desire. It was something that had to happen in the course of nature. You happen to be there with certain capacities and you’re going to let it take place through you, but it didn’t start because you wanted it to, and as we were saying on Tuesday, you’re not going to latch hold of the fruits of your actions and say, “These are mine because I did the deed.” Jocelyn?

Student: Isn’t that a little bit like determinism?

Michael: A little bit like? What kind of “ism?”

Student: Determinism.

Michael: Determinism. It keeps coming back in – determinism. Ah, no. And for the same reason – I’m glad we had this discussion on Tuesday. It isn’t, and it isn’t for the same reason as what we said on Tuesday. You can decide out of pigheadedness, stupidity, or what have you, that you’re not going to do that act. And guess what, friends?

Detach from the Outcome

This is exactly what’s happening to Arjuna in Book 1. He said, “Yes, I’m a warrior, but I don’t like this war.” And Krishna says, “I didn’t ask you.” Now this will take a very strong form toward the end of the poem. Krishna will actually say to Arjuna, “You are not killing your enemies. I’m killing them through you.”

So, he doesn’t want them killed, and therefore he’s not entangled in the results of their having been killed. So, he doesn’t get the bad karma in the third sense – is the mental entanglement in the desire or the outcome of the action. So that’s what he means in Chapter 3 when he says, “A selfless act – in a case of a pure act – you are just being a conduit. You’re not doing it because you have a personal agenda that’s involved. And you’re not going to latch onto the fruits and take them for yourself.” This is subtle, and I don’t mind if we take a little time trying to chew it over and understand it. Because if you just stop by what we said on Tuesday, we were saying –

“You’re not interested in the results.” Now that’s not entirely true. I assure you Gandhi was interested in the fact that India won its independence. But he didn’t – and I would go so far as to say that it made him happy. But he didn’t do it to get happy. See how subtle this can be? He did it because he saw that this was the right thing to do. That he had the capacity to do it. Hold onto your question because I don’t want to miss it, but I’m backing up here a second.

A major figure in the world of conflict resolution, Roger Fisher at Harvard wrote a book called, "Getting to Yes," which some of you may have seen.

He tells a story about being in the Air Force at the end of WWII. He was asked to participate in test-flying a bomber. It was this very crude bomber. It had propellers. It could only kill relatively small numbers of people. And they were supposed to take this thing up and stop one of the engines and see how well it would handle. Easily worth 20,000 gallons of high-octane airplane fuel to – anyway, let's not get me all tangled up in my little problems.

He goes up in the plane, and the pilot says, "Feather Number 4." They shut off propeller Number 4. They tool around a little bit; it handles very well. They're very pleased. So now they're supposed to start it up again and go back to the base. But the pilot, you know, boys will be boys. He says, "Yeah, I wonder how well this baby would handle on only two props." So, he says, "Feather Number 2. Feather Number 2." And you can sort of see where I'm going here. It still handles pretty well.

Gosh, you know, why not go for broke? Long story short, they shut down all four engines. They're gliding over the rocky coast of Newfoundland, about 15,000 feet up. And they say, "Wow, we're really impressed. Okay. Terrific. Let's start this thing up and go back home." Oh, then they remembered...in order to start the engines you need electricity, and you only have electricity when the engines are running.

So, they realized this, and the co-pilot said to the pilot, "Boy, are you in trouble!" Which is an odd comment, you know. There's nine of them about flying. And so, they start strapping on their parachutes and repeating their mantras like crazy, I'm sure. And then somebody remembered that there's an old Briggs-and-Stratton 50cc engine down in the bomb bay. So, they scramble down there, get that thing out, wrap a cord around it. Yank, yank, yank – sweat running down. It starts! Plug it into the generator, start one of the engines, start the other three, go home. Whew! End of our story.

Now Roger Fisher though is a professor at Harvard. So, he says, "What is the meaning of this story?" And he asked a very neat question which I find helpful for us right now. He said, "Okay, the person who remembered that there was a motor, an old gas motor in the bomb bay. It was – he did not get us into this trouble. It was the pilot's idea. Was it his responsibility to save the crew?" Now the way most of his think about ethics, we would say, "No, it wasn't his responsibility. He didn't cause the trouble, so he was not responsible for getting us out of it."

But Fisher's answer is, "It was his responsibility because he had the capability. You are responsible to use your capacities when your fellow human beings need them." And if you can imagine Gandhi thinking, you know, "Here's 300 million of my fellow human beings who are suffering in bondage. Our culture is on its last legs. We're losing faith in ourselves. Not only that, this is a part of man's inhumanity to man. This has to do with colonialism and the whole conflict of civilizations as he saw it. And I can do something about it." And that's the ultimate reason why he did something about it.

Now that doesn't mean he had to be unhappy when it worked. There were also parts of it that didn't work so well, which we'll be talking about later on. But it didn't mean that he should say, "Oh, what do I care? What's my next job?" You know, step into the phone booth again, kind of Super Gandhi. It didn't mean that. He could get happy, but he didn't do it to have that personal happiness. He did it because there was a match between his capability, which was on a different order of magnitude from most of us, and the need. Okay?

So, it's like sometimes when we talk about altruism in terms of animal behavior, we think in order to be altruistic you have to suffer. Not necessarily. It just means you should be motivated for the wellbeing of others. Okay, question?

Attachments and Outcomes

Student: You kind of sort of answered it already, but I was just wondering, for example, of something [unintelligible 00:26:26]. Would it necessarily mean that you don't have any stake in the outcome?

Michael: Good question. Does it mean that you have no stake outcome? I would modify that just a little and say it means you don't have a personal stake in the outcome. In fact, we can go on and add – this is a very good example of this – after independence, Gandhi could have become prime minister, he could have rewritten the Constitution and made himself the Maharaja of India for life or whatever. He had the country in the palm of his hand. They owed him this incredible debt – except for the RSS people who hated him.

But he said, "No. I want to go and live in Pakistan. I want to be that human link between these two parts of the country that were torn asunder." So, you know, he did not take any personal reward. His reward was the success of his action.

Student: But what about the personal satisfaction that comes along with altruistic behavior? Is that what you're saying, is that it's its own reward, but it's still you're rewarded with...

Michael: Yes. And that's why I say this is a kind of subtle thing. There's no problem in being satisfied. In fact, if you're satisfied, you're probably going to make less trouble for other people. But the thing to do, I think, is to learn to be satisfied in the wellbeing of others. Rather than – because remember last time I was saying that you're renouncing, what you're not attached to, is a rather special Sanskrit term, "*Phalam*," which on one level simply means "Fruit." There's fruits that grow in India called, "*Sitaphal*." You know, *sitaphal*. *Sita* is fruit. But it takes on the connotation of the benefit to you personally as opposed to the benefit to – feed into the wellbeing of the larger group.

So, to the extent that you're getting your satisfaction from the wellbeing of the larger group, you're home free. Your desires are kosher – I'm not sure they'd use that word – but you can want as much as you want. As Saint Augustine would say, "Love God and

do whatever you want.” But it’s very difficult for human beings to keep focused on that. I mean even without the 1500 commercial messages a day that we’re exposed to – between 1500-3000 commercial messages a day – every one of them has a subtext, “Be you. Grab this for yourself. This is all about you.”

It’s very hard, even without all of that propaganda, to be confident that your happiness is going to be completely satisfied in the happiness and wellbeing of the whole. So that when you can – I mean to the extent that you can reach that orientation, your actions will be free from entanglement of karma. And we can say that the actions are desireless. And to get back to what we started with, we can say that, “You know what? In a way, you are not acting.” That’s what I said, it’s the “force” – I hate to sound like Star Trek – but the “force” is acting through you.

Gandhi and Renunciation

On one occasion – I’ll be back to you in a second – on one occasion Gandhi was asked, “Do I really have to renounce all my possessions?” And he said to the person, “No, you don’t have to renounce all your possessions.” The guy was ecstatic. He said, “You’re my Mahatma. I’m going with you.” But then Gandhi finished the sentence. He said, “You don’t have to renounce any of your possessions. All you have to renounce is the possessor.” Do you see what I’m driving at? That little self that says, “This is mine.” You put the little bumper sticker and say, “My child is a Number 1 in the 8th Grade in [Winnesocket] Public School or something, you know. This is my personal possession, my personal benefit. Okay? [Devia]?”

Student: So, what you’re saying is, it’s okay to get satisfaction out of the action because [unintelligible 00:31:04] the issue in regards to the happiness.

Michael: Exactly.

Student: It’s only an issue because you [unintelligible 00:31:12].

Mindfulness of Desire

Michael: Yes. That’s exactly what I’m saying. It’s perfectly all right to enjoy the satisfaction that comes from the successfully completed action. I’m going to add to that a little bit though. It’s perfectly all right to enjoy that satisfaction, but it’s not all right to be motivated by that personal satisfaction. Because that means you’re going to be angry if you don’t get it. You’re going to be disappointed if you don’t get it and so forth.

Gandhi had tons of disappointments at the end, but he didn’t let them depress him because he didn’t let the satisfactions get him elated. I guess what’s happening is that eventually your personal happiness lines up completely with the need of those around you. And at that point, you could say, in a sense, that there’s no “you” anymore. There’s

no small private “you,” you know, that has needs that are distinct from the needs of the whole. Okay? Yeah, Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:32:18]

Success is Proportionate to the Purity of Effort

Michael: The “you” to the extent that there’s a “you” anymore becomes a detached observer of all of this. That’s exactly right. And that’s why it’s good to note that we’re not saying, “You’re not interested in the results.” You’re interested in them by way of evaluation. Like for example, there’ll be a campaign – see, I’m thinking of a thing about 1926, they tried some campaigns. They had partly worked, partly not. And Gandhi said, “Our action was – the success of our action was mathematically proportionate to the purity of our effort.” And then, of course, a few years earlier there’s a famous episode where he called off the whole thing because of an outbreak of violence, the Chauri Chaura episode that we’ll be looking at in a few weeks. And he said, “I made a Himalayan miscalculation. You know, other people just make small mistakes, I made a Himalayan mistake. I thought India was ready for this. I was wrong.” So, he was acutely interested in the outcome, but he was not interested in possessing it, you know, instead of putting on the back of his bullock cart, “I liberated India.” Okay?

Okay, just by way of a shocking contrast, this is going to be a sort of downer here, but on one occasion, Adolf Hitler was making a speech and he said, “In 15 years I have rescued the German nation through my fanatical will.” That is not the kind of statement that Mahatma Gandhi would ever make. I guess probably fairly obvious, but, you know. [Laughter] No, but you could easily imagine someone going – I mean in the Free Speech Movement that took place on this campus, that movement started off with the – our eyes were on the prize of enabling free speech on campus. We thought it was part of democracy, part of education.

In the course of that action over the four – eight months people started getting more interested in the fact that they were – whether they made it into the picture on the front page of the “Oakland Gazette.” The “Oakland Gazette” doesn’t even exist anymore. Can you imagine what a ridiculously transitory goal? But this is a liability in human nature, that we can get pulled down to smaller rewards which will always be ones that benefit us personally. And eventually, you go – this is a slippery slope. Eventually go one step further and you’re going to find that other people have to suffer in order for you to have the reward. The minute that happens you know you’ve gone way too far down the wrong road. John?

Student: Is this just kind of like on a big nonviolence level? Or is this like every tiny little thing that we do?

Michael: Very good question. Is this only on those punctual occasions when you’re having an uprising, like who knows, something like that maybe starting on this

September 21st. We will see. Or does this apply to your everyday actions? That is an easy question to answer. It's absolutely the latter. And in fact, in a little while – I keep saying in a little while we'll be talking about such and such, but at this rate we'll never talk about anything but what we're talking about. That's okay. I'm getting a lot out of this. [Laughter]

Practice of Living in Community

In a little while, if things go back on course, we'll be talking about Gandhi's communities – the four living communities that he founded. The whole purpose of those communities was to practice this stuff in everything. Even in what you ate. In fact, it was a big thing – big part of it was what you ate. There's a story about – I forget who it is now, but someone came to join Gandhi in one of the big ashrams in India. And so, he sat down, and Gandhi was telling him the routines. You have to do this; you have to do this. Everything was fine. You know, we have prayers at 5 o'clock in the morning. He said, "Okay."

Then he started to describe what they would eat. "We have this neem tree in India. It's like gall and wormwood put together. It's like so bitter. You know it's got to be good for you. So, we grind it up and we eat it three times a day." The guy is sort of appalled. And he leaves the hut thinking, "Can I really do this?" And quickly, Mahadev Desai, who knows the score, comes running over to him and says, "Actually, what you're going to eat is this, that, and that."

And he said, "But Gandhiji just told me." And he said, "Look, in matters of food, you will obey me. In all other matters, you do what the Mahatma says." So, they had worked it out that it was doable for ordinary human beings. But the whole point of living in those communities was to practice, "This is what we're talking about." In every single compartment of life. Arun Gandhi, Mahatma Gandhi's grandson, tells a story about – he had a little pencil and it had worn down to a very small stub and he didn't like it, so he threw it away.

And his grandfather said to him, "Where's your pencil?" He said, "It was too small, grandpa. I threw it away." He said, "This will not do." And they went out, without a flashlight even, crawling around in the grass, like the whole ashram shut down for four hours before they found that little pencil and wore it down to absolutely nothing. This is the training in Aparigraha, you know, non-possessiveness and no wasting, things like that. Yeah, so that is a good question. In fact, one of the definitions of principled nonviolence is, "It's a way of life and not just something you do in an action." Yeah?

Student: Back to Tuesday's lecture, I was wondering if you could discuss the relationship between karma and dharma because it's sort of ambiguous and it seems like karma is sort of like the past and dharma is the future, but that like karma is a type of dharma.

Three Gunas

Michael: Yeah, I'm really sorry that these two words sound alike because it's not helping. I would actually say that there is an interlocking – there's an overlap between the two terms. But it's probably not terribly important that we work that out. The basic idea behind dharma is that there is an underlying principle governing and sustaining and supporting all of life. And the principle behind *sva*-dharma is you figure out how you fit into that principle. And the non-determinism – like I see the questions already starting – the non-determinism is because you actually have a small measure of choice, you can decide to knock your head against a stone wall for the rest of your life by not discovering your own dharma. Or you can discover what it is and follow it.

But karma means, broadly speaking, the question of human action. And they consider this a very important topic. In Chapter 7 there's a definition of illumination. And Krishna says, "The illumined person understands the relationship between God, the individual, and action." It's really that important.

And so, what we're saying here is that there's one appropriate way to act. Now there's no question that these two things are not contradictory. When you have found the right way to act without personal desire and all the other things we're going to list – yeah, we're going to list pretty soon – you will inevitably be on target – I shouldn't use that image – be on your path as far as *sva*-dharma is concerned because the universe fits together, and it all makes sense in this model.

So, if you float away from your *sva*-dharma you'll inevitably find that you're being motivated by some personal desire and your actions will not be clean and disentangled in the sense that we're talking about here. And there are many, many cases that you can think of, of people who followed a career because they could be very "successful" at it only to discover sometimes tragically late in the game, that it did not fulfill them and was not what they were supposed to be doing. They'd be much better off being a miserable failure at what you're supposed to be doing than being a spectacular success at something you're not supposed to be doing, in the sense that it doesn't enable you to overcome your drawbacks and implement your capacities. Okay? Yes, John?

Student: So, I was just looking at the theory of action. Did Gandhi see it as like most of the world was living the wrong way?

Gandhi's Perspective of the West

Michael: The question, did Gandhi see most of the world was living the wrong way? And I'm afraid, yes, he did. And especially he saw the Western world was going over a cliff in a handbasket or there's some metaphor like that. And he was very unhappy that India was following them because India was a kind of alternative. That's what we were talking about on Tuesday. They had discovered the alternative paradigm that we're looking for. So, if India lost it, it would be gone. So, it was not just for India, but for the world, that he wanted to rescue that culture before it went under.

Now, you know, having said that, it's mostly a matter of degree, you know. Like, as I was emphasizing last time, they tended to take a non-dualistic approach to life. So, it's not like when the rapture comes you're going to be saved, and you're not, you know. It's a matter of degree. So, some of your actions will be on target, some not – for anyone. But what he considered to be a real human disaster was not to get interested in learning from your experiences and purifying your actions.

So, staying stuck where you were, even if you're in a relatively good place, is a very non-human thing to do. We're going to get back to that in a little while if we get to the question of the Three Guṇas. Okay?

The Well-Being of the Whole vs Personal Desire

So, let's move on a little bit. I guess we could say that the question we've been asking ourselves is, "When is an actor not an actor?" And the answer is, "When he or she is not motivated by personal desires which will pull away from the well-being of the whole." And that's a pretty profound secret. I think the rest of them will be relatively easy. And it's because we're a little bit short of time, instead of going to particular passages in every case, let me just summarize some of the points that he's going to be making.

In Chapter 4, if you look at the section from – the chapter is called, "Wisdom in Action." And it starts on the bottom of Page 86, if you have this, Verse 16. What is action and what is inaction? This question has confused the greatest sages. However, it no longer confuses us. I feel pretty good about that. And the wise see that there's action in the midst of inaction and inaction in the midst of action, namely when your personal desires are not driving you into that action.

And then he will go on to talk at the bottom of Page 87, the process of offering his Brahman, that which is offered is Brahman. Brahman offers the sacrifice in the fire of Brahman. Okay, this might mean absolutely nothing to you at first blush. What it means is that he's now lining up the concept of perfect action with the model of the sacrifice. Even if you got away from sacrificial religion in India you never dropped it completely. You always used it as a model.

And the term that comes in from ancient vocabulary for sacrifice is "*yajña*" which means "to offer." Offer, give up, something like that. From a root, "*yaj*" meaning to give away, to make something available to someone else, and mostly to the gods. And you'll find that he will actually call some of their campaigns in India, "A *yajña*" This is not a political campaign. This is not a project. This was an offering, a sacrificial offering. Particularly the spinning campaign, when you're sitting at your spinning wheel spinning out your cloth, you are offering a *yajña*. So that's one model that helps us understand a little bit what perfect action is all about.

But there's another that's – it's going to come up in a few more lines that's more useful immediately to us – and that is the concept of service. And this doesn't take us very far

from what we've just been saying, that the dharma of the human being is to find a way to be of service to others. And a fair number of social scientists are coming around to the realization that the reason that there's so little job satisfaction today is that even when we're in a service profession, it's being retooled to be a cash cow for somebody. I have – my son-in-law is a doctor. You know, "My son-in-law, the doctor?" And he and I have the same conversation every week.

It's like me reading "The Yoga Vasistha" over and over again and just – we love this conversation, but it's always the same. And what he says is, "Medicine is going to the dogs." And I say that education is going to the dogs. And it's both for the same reason, that he doesn't have like a little office, and he knows all of his patients and so forth. My daughter is in a little situation like that, but he works in a big hospital. In fact, he's an administrator now. And every move he makes, he's looking over his shoulder for the insurance cops.

Horror story – someone was walking down the corridor in his hospital. There was an obstetric problem and the doctor said to the doctor who was walking by, "Hey, can you give me a hand here. I can't quite figure out how to help this woman." The guy came in, gave some advice, walked out." The baby was, I think, still-born or there's something wrong with it at birth. That woman sued everybody in the hospital, including the guy who just came in and gave two minutes worth of advice.

So, despite Hillary Clinton's best efforts, medicine is an industry. And this is something that's been happening for a long time. If you look at "Medical Nemesis" by Ivan Illitch. So even those – and just to finish this conversation I have with my son-in-law, what I always say to him in the end is, "Rick," I say, "you and I are both in the same boat, but you can do something about it because you're a doctor and I can't because I'm just a professor." That makes me feel a little better, but it has not gotten us anywhere in terms of solving the problem.

So, what we're saying is that another way of looking at the ideal action – inaction in action is when you're doing what you're doing as an act of service, not as an act of gain. Okay? So, it fits together very nicely with the things that we've been saying so far. Okay.

And there's one other element that he adds to this, and this will come up in the beginning of Chapter 6, if you have time to look at it later, and that is "renunciation." I know that this is a kind of chilling word, but what it actually means is disentangling yourself from things that are going to hurt you in the end – either because they're transitory and you think that they're going to last forever, or because they get you entangled in personal desires which can never, never be fully satisfied. For some reason you're renouncing stuff that actually hurts you, though at the moment you don't realize that.

So, all three of these elements are brought in by "The Gita" to shed light on what is meant by that elusive concept of action in inaction and inaction in action. Okay? Now

say a little bit more about this. Let's compare, briefly, what we said about the definition of *himsā* in the very beginning of the semester – I realize we're still pretty close to the beginning of the semester, but remember we said that *himsā* or injury doesn't mean the act of injury, but the intention to injure. Actually, perceiving that another person's wellbeing is inhibiting yours and wanting to hurt that other person – that's violence right there. Even if you never pick up a gun or even say a harsh word, that very act of alienation is violence.

And a beautiful line from Saint Augustine is where he says, "Imagine people thinking that their enemy can do them more damage than their enmity which they harbor against that person." In other words, your alienation from a person does you more damage than the person can ever do because it's a lot closer, for one thing. Now in a similar way what we're saying here about action is what determines the status of an act is not – I'm going to say not purely and simply what the act is – but your intention and your mental state in carrying that action out. That's what "The Gita" is exploring.

Intention and Right Action - Gandhi and the Calf

And this will help us to understand little things, like for example, in South Africa there was a calf that was hit by a car. There's not a whole lot of cars in the world at that time, but that's all right. I've read that in 1895 there were three automobiles in this country and two of them collided in Saint Louis. We should have read the handwriting on the wall at that point, but we were too excited by the toys. Anyway, this calf was hit by some kind of vehicle, and it was obviously not going to live, and it was in great agony and Gandhi put it out of its misery.

And, you know, according to strict orthodox interpretations, killing a cow is approximately the worst thing you can do. We'll get into why that is maybe at some other point, but you can do a lot of bad stuff that you might think would be absolutely horrific but killing a cow would put you over the top. So, he got a lot of flack from the orthodox community. "You killed a cow. You call yourself a Hindu."

And he said, "Yeah, that animal was in agony. There was absolutely no point in prolonging its misery and I had it killed." So, for him, you see, the action was nonviolent because it was motivated by compassion – purely. And of course, no attachment to the results. The results were a disaster for him because he has all these people on his case now telling him that he's not a Hindu and so forth. Shannon?

Student: In terms of today, like with mercy killings and things like that, how does that sort of apply to nonviolence?

Michael: So how does mercy killing work into nonviolence? Well, I would say there'd be no problem if the person ordering the mercy killing were a Gandhi. But since it's ordinary human beings for the most part, it becomes problematic and it's just really hard to know what motivates us at deeper levels. Because don't forget, this nasty little karma

equation is not just applying to the motivations of which you are conscious. That's part of getting liberated is to understand your own mind so well that you don't have these unconscious negative forces that are driving you into thought, speech, and action, and entangling you in karma.

Intention and Right Action - The Angry Sheikh

For some reason this brings to mind a story – it's a Sufi story about – Sufism being the mystical tradition in Islam – about a warrior who was on the losing side and was captured. And the sheikh who had captured him ordered him killed and said to somebody, "You kill him." So, this person goes over and draws his sword and the victim who was going to be decapitated spits on him. At which point the person who was about to kill him, puts up his sword, turns on his heel and walks away.

Many years later, they meet. Here they are, you know, drinking coffee on a rug somewhere in the desert. And he said, "You know, I'm not querying your motives or anything. I mean I thought that was great, what you did. But do you mind my asking why you didn't kill me? I'm not saying you should have, I'm just saying why didn't you kill me?" And he said, "I couldn't because I got angry." Do you see the point?

It's not the action, it's his mental state. As long as he's carrying out an action and he thinks he's doing the right thing – I mean I would argue with him. This wasn't the right thing to do. That's a different issue. But as long as he thinks he's doing the right thing and he harbors no ill will against this person, he's not going to entangle himself. But when that ill will is roused, he can't allow himself to act. Yeah, Joanne?

Student: In nonviolence, can you apply this to soldiers in war?

PITS

Michael: Yes, you can apply it to soldiers in war, and we will be doing that in various ways. And in the course of this semester, especially when we get to nonviolence in the West and look at what happened in the early years of Christianity but let me cite one application now – which I've mentioned already – and that is the appalling rate of psychological trauma that Iraqi vets are coming back with. Something that does not fit into the prevailing paradigm. And there's actually an Army psychiatrist who said, "The Army will not discuss this. Period. Because it would problem-atize an absolutely necessary action."

But the thought that a person could do an atrocious action and not be scarred by it just turns out in experience to be entirely wrong. So that's why in the early days of combat people did not really shoot. When we "retrain" them so – I think we've gone over this horrible discovery that this Lieutenant Colonel Dave Grossman made – that up until the Korean War, the firing rate in an average platoon was about 10%. If you have ten men

in a squad and they're in an action of some kind, one of them will actually be shooting at the enemy and the others will be – [Covers face with arm] they're either going like this or not firing at all or stuff.

And when the Army discovered this – this isn't a very happy story – but when the Army discovered this they said, "We've got to fix this." And they got in and they started offering recruits video games. The same video games that your kid brother is watching right now while we're here in this course. And they got in – they started in the Vietnam conflict, and they have now got the firing rate up from 10% to 85%. But the question that no one is asking is, "What does that do to the men who have been conditioned to now hurt or kill other human beings?" And the Army's answer is, "We're not going to go there."

Arjuna's Sva-Dharma

So that, in a way, is an application of this question of the Law of Karma and selfless action and so forth, to modern day combat. I should probably briefly say that the reason Krishna's exhortation to Arjuna to go back into battle is not a violation of ahimsā, is that this is allegorical. Actually, Gandhi had two explanations for this. It's an allegory. It doesn't mean you should all rent a chariot and pick up a bow and go and kill your nasty cousins.

What it means is, you should carry out your dharma. Arjuna is a *Chakravyuha*. He belongs to that class whose responsibility it is to protect society. And he's saying, "I don't want to do it." And Krishna is saying, "You don't really get to make that choice. This is the most shameful mistake that you could possibly make." So, the lesson to us, who are not necessarily warriors, is not that we become warriors, but that we carry out our dharma – whatever that is.

Gandhi also pointed out that Arjuna was not a conscientious objector. He was not saying, "Oh, I've read the "Bhagavad Gita." I'm not going to fight anymore." He was saying, "I don't want to kill these people." And Gandhi was saying that Krishna wasn't going to accept that excuse.

The Heaviness of the Sword

Tuesday night I was having a conversation with some friends, and we remembered this episode, this anecdote from the life of William Penn who was an earlier follower of George Fox. We'll be talking about all of these people.

And Fox was very nonviolent. Penn joined him. But he had come from a military background. And so, he's walking around along – walking around with this big sword. And suddenly it starts to bother him, and he says to George Fox, "Should I be carrying this sword around?" And now if you were to ask me I would say, "No! No, I'm glad you

asked. Get rid of the bloody thing.” But Fox is much more astute than that and he said, “Sir,” which is the 18th century, “Sir, wear thy sword as long as thou canst.” In other words, as long as you haven’t reached the point of awareness where you yourself realize that the thing is wrong, it would be sheer hypocrisy not to wear it. Because what’s going to happen? Somebody’s going to attack you, you’re going to say, “Where’s my sword?”

So, you have to reach the point where you yourself are going to rely on something else other than that sword. Then it becomes appropriate to put it down. What I propose to do now, because otherwise Jordan and I have to carry all this heavy equipment back another time, is let me quickly summarize what the rest of the theory is – this is really the hard part, the inaction in action. Once we’ve grocked this part the rest of it is easy.

Action vs Inaction

It just relies on a few simple principles. Oh dear, and then there’s the *Guna* thing in Chapter 18. Okay, we’ll have to see what we can do about that. One [1] pure simple inaction is not an option because even if you lay there saying, “I’m not going to do anything,” you still have the main doers going on in other parts of your mind which is your desires, your dissatisfactions and so forth.

Arjuna says, “What about I don’t do anything?” Krishna says, “Forget it. You lie there on the floor of the chariot, and you’ll be having all kinds of horrible thoughts and they’ll be involving you in the same karma almost as if you go out and do them.” So, you have to act. So, then the question becomes [2] choose the right act to perform. You’ll see all of it in the text if you go back now. And this is where the question of your *sva-dharma* comes in. One place anyway.

[3] Do it with the right means – and you’ll never guess what those are – hint [nonviolence]. And finally, the big one, [4] detached from results. That’s the one that we spent all the time on. I’m going to say – I’m going to use the word “fruits” because, again, it’s not the result. It’s the fruits that you’re detaching from. The personal advantage that accrues to you from what you’ve done. You know, you see these billboards, “First the work, then the reward.” Have you ever seen it? It’s a big bottle of Smirnoff lying on its side, mostly empty. And it says, “First the work, then the reward.” This is not “The Gita” theory of action. Okay? You’re not motivated by a fifth of Smirnoff, but by what the good outcome of your efforts might be.

Okay, I think it will work now if – I’m going to go over something kind of quickly. And if it’s confusing, we can get back to it. But how does the question of action come up in Chapter 18? Which really spends a lot of time on it. It comes up in the context of a model of the phenomenal world, the theory, which is very powerful in the technical sense. You can explain a lot with this theory. It comes up early in “The Gita” around Chapter 16 through the end of the text. It deals strictly with this model.

Model of the Three Gunas - Tamas, Rajas, and Satva

And it's called, "The Model of the Three Guṇas." Guṇa, for our purposes, means "a modification." So really what we're talking about are three possible energy states in the phenomenal world. And this will apply to everything.

And you can – let's start with the lowest of them. The worst state to be in is called, "*Tamas*," which means – let's say – let's use the word "sloth." It's sloth, torpor, something like that. You know there was a joke about an ethics class where the professor says, "Okay, which is worse, ignorance or apathy?" And nobody raises their hand. He says, "Come on, come on. Which is worse? Ignorance or apathy?" And finally, one – he calls – he yanks one student and says, "Which is worse?" The student says, "I don't know, and I don't care." [Laughter] This is a good definition of the *tamasic* state. This is the lowest energy state that you can be in. Nothing happening. This is rarely encountered in Berkeley, okay?

Now there's a higher state. I'm going to draw this with an arrow because these things are progressive. They're evolutionary. You can take little pockets that are *tamasic* and you make them *rajasic*. *Rajasic* means "energetic activity." Not necessarily with any particular goal in mind. I always think of that famous line from "The Wild Ones" where Brando is on his Harley and about to leave town and some woman who was fallen in love with him, which women frequently did – both on stage and off – comes running over and say, "But where are you going?" And he said, "We don't go places. We just go." That's *rajas*. So, this is the Marlon Brando *Guṇa*.

But above that there is something a little harder to define. We'll just call it "*satva*" which in fact has the root *sat* in it which we're going to be talking about pretty soon – which is the root in the word "Satyagraha." So, this is energy [Writes *rajas*] and this is balance, law, nature, stuff like that [*satva*]. And with regard to the theory of action in particular, *tamas* is, of course, not acting. This is what Arjuna is about to do. Like the worst possible state. *Rajas* is acting but doing the wrong thing and being entangled in the results. And *satva* is pure action which isn't on your own personal behalf and does not entangle you in the results.

Gandhi in South Africa

With your permission, I'd like to just move on and start introducing the South Africa portion because I have a few slides that will help us get started with that and it takes a couple of minutes for that machine to warm up, if I remember. So, you tell me as soon as it's ready. While it's warming up, is this model pretty clear? And this is why Gandhi says, "If you don't act, you're in the worst possible state because you will never find out whether – who you are. You'll never find out what your responsibilities are, whether you've done the right thing or the wrong thing."

It's much better to act and do the wrong thing than not act because in the former case, you stand a chance of discovering what was wrong with your actions. Okay, all right. There's [Magdi-aily 01:08:26]. We'll get back to this model. Thanks. No, we won't need the CD. Oh actually, you know what? I need to come around and do a few things. How is this going to work?

[Michael sets up the slide show presentation]

Michael: [Satyagraha: the first phase 1893-1914] So there we are. This is the first phase of Gandhi's career. I hope you can get some of these with the camera. 1893 he lands in South Africa thinking that he's going to be there for a year working as a clerk in a law case. And he's going to end up spending 21 years of his life in this part of the world. And he later says, "I was born in India but made in South Africa."

And basically, what he did there was discover Satyagraha, put it to the test, and realized that he had a tool that was powerful enough to take back to India and apply it to the big question, the question of colonialism. Okay. [Map of South Africa] So here's the part of the world that we're talking about around the turn of the century. And the Republic of South Africa didn't exist yet as such. His life will be entangled with four colonies. This is the Transvaal. And you can sort of tell from the name that this is mostly Dutch. This is the Orange Free State here. This little state here is Natal. This is Durban, where you land when you're coming in from India by ship. And that's the capital of Natal.

Now the South African phase of his life also is divided into two phases, because the first few years it's mainly focused in Durban and around Durban. Here's Phoenix, right near Durban. And that's where he's going to start his first community. And there won't be any particular individual who emerges as his adversary in these first few years. He's going to go India and come back and then the scene will shift to the Transvaal where he will be basically faced off against Jan Christian Smuts whose testimonial to Gandhi you have in your reader.

Gandhi and the Train Incident

So, this is where it all happened. He arrives in Durban, gets on the train in the train station. This is like the end of the first week of his visit to the country, to this continent. It's a long trip to Johannesburg which is where he's headed for, but he does not get very far. As you know that evening in Pietermaritzburg he is thrown off the train and spends the night on the train station wrestling with titanic emotions and really – I would say he is really on that cusp of, "Is this my fight or is this the world's fight?" And he decides to renounce his own personal stake in it and dedicate himself to solving this kind of outrage.

And then he gets back. He won't ride the train anymore. He's completely traumatized as far as trains are concerned. He gets a stagecoach and goes all the way to Standerton where people beat him because they don't like where he's sitting in the stagecoach. He

has never been treated this way in India. He's never been treated this way in Britain. The racism in those two parts of the empire was very much more controlled.

This is also important. Charlestown and Volksrust will come into our story because the border between the Transvaal and Pretoria goes between those two little towns. It's almost like Buda and Pest. Or Saint Paul and Minneapolis. There's a little – what the Dutch call, “The [*Sprout* 01:13:16” which means “Little Creek.” And one side is Transvaal and it's at a key point in the struggle. It's illegal for Indians to enter the Transvaal, especially from Pretoria. So, there will be a big scene where they'll just step across that creek and get themselves arrested and that'll be an important satyagraha.

Okay, so that kind of orients us geographically. Now I thought I'd show you a couple of political cartoons from the era. This is a local application of the old rule about the invincible force and the immovable body. This is the latter half of the South Africa adventure. And this is Jan Christian Smuts. In fact, you remember from the movie – what is his name, that Dutch actor? He's also a playwright in his own regard. But the guy who plays Smuts, he did look a good bit like Smuts, actually. And this is a period steam engine. And, of course, the elephant represents India. Cartoons have to be pretty simple.

And so, the elephant is saying, “Stop, you're tickling me, Jan” So all over the world people were watching this and they were fascinated by, you know, here's the power of the government which is one kind of power represented by technology, a railroad engine. And then there's the power of something else – that they were just trying to figure out how it works. And the next slide will show you one of their attempts to understand this.

This, you can tell, is Gandhi looking very pious. He never really looked like that, but this how the world thinks of him. It actually kind of infuriates me, but I don't think we need to go there. And if you can't read this, here's a desperado – a desperado with a revolver saying, “Prepare to meet your end.” And then the passive resistor, the term they're still using for what Gandhi is doing, he says, “Yes, brother Smuts, I am prepared. Pray, do your worst.” And the desperado says, “Heaven's man, don't say that. The blooming gun won't work.”

Now it's difficult to tell from this cartoon and it's difficult to tell from a lot of cartoons and a lot of humor, do they mean this seriously or not? Is this a testimonial to the power of passive resistance or are they holding it up for mockery? It's very hard to tell.

Well, I have a few other pictures here which are not from the South Africa era so maybe we could just cycle through them quickly. This will be – actually, this one is earlier. This is Gandhi in London at the Vegetarian Society. This man, Dr. Pranjivan Mehta entertained Gandhi in 1908 in London. And he is the person for whom Gandhi is writing “Hind Swaraj.” Mehta was saying, “Where the British are choking the life out of us, we have to fight back and the only power that we know is violence.” And Gandhi actually was more terrified by that than he was by the British oppression. So, he wrote “Hind

Swaraj” for his fellow Indians who were on the verge of attempting another mutiny like they did in 1856.

Okay, so the next one is just the famous shot – Gandhi looking at leprosy germs in his ashram. People always use this – this is much later than our period, but people use it to illustrate the fact that Gandhi was not a Luddite. He was not against technology or science. He was against the abuse of both of those. I think we have one more – two more. This is Gandhi at a prayer meeting. And this is a rare photograph of Abdul Ghaffar Khan who was Gandhi’s chief Muslim follower. And we’ll be saying quite a bit about him. And one more shot just to sort of send us out on our way. Okay, thank you very much. Have a good weekend.

The people who are on the wait-list, please come see me for one second. Don’t forget to pick some posters if you think you might be interested.

7. The First Phase 1: Arrival in South Africa to the Birth of Satyagraha (1893-1906)

Michael: I want to start off with a bunch of new announcements, as usual. Up until yesterday there was not much happening, and I was proud and happy that we could just roll right into the new material. As you know, we're changing gears a little bit. We'll be talking about history at this point, but the point that we're trying to get out of it is the same that we tried to get out of the theory discussions. And that is, "What are the basic elements of nonviolent worldview?" And we will probably take some time on Thursday to review what we've covered so far with that.

But then suddenly there was an explosion of wonderful newsy events. And I wanted to remind you that there is this progressive festival taking place in Petaluma, California, which is about 45 minutes north of here. Egg farming country - egg and potatoes, but then they silted in the bay and so now it's just eggs. And at the progressive festival, which is more to the point, there will be a presentation on a new book called, "The Impeach Book." And you can, perhaps, begin to guess what that book is about. There'll be a panel on that and then some really interesting folks from Progressive World. It's a remarkably hip event considering that it's Petaluma, California.

And my non-profit is having a booth there, and we'd love to have some people who'd like to be there, help us with selling books and stuff. And several of you have expressed an interest. Jordan, who's over here, will be coordinating that. So please, if you feel like having this kind of fun – it might be too exciting, I know. But if you feel that you could stand it and would like to do that on Sunday, please talk to Jordan at the end of the class. Great, thanks.

So, I hope that some of you got the CourseWeb announcement that I sent out. I think it did work. Who got it? Who got the CourseWeb announcement? Okay. So, what I'll suggest is – I'll have a pad here. Anyone who is not in the class or on the wait-list, but you're here and you'd like to get these announcements, put your email on this pad, and we'll get that included.

Parallel of Satyagraha and the Atom Bomb

I came across the following fact that there was an interesting conversation that took place in 1949 between Nehru, Jawaharlal Nehru, who at that point was the Prime Minister of India, and Albert Einstein. As you know, people had tried to arrange a meeting between Einstein and Gandhi. But that meeting didn't work because Einstein, when he got to India, they treated him like a celebrity and all these places where he had to wear these monkey suits and stuff. And he said, "Och, too much pressure!" And he went home.

As you know, he owned two above the waist outfits. They were both gray. One was a sweatshirt, and the other was a sweater. The sweater was for formal occasions. And the sweatshirt was for informal occasions. So, he never did get to meet Gandhi, but he was a tremendous admirer. And his testimony is one of the most famous. And in this conversation, Nehru – I don't remember what they were talking about, but Einstein pulled out a piece of paper. He always had a scrap of paper on him in case he would discover relativity or something like that. He needed a little napkin or something to write the equations down on.

So, he pulled out this piece of paper and he drew a chart. I would pay large amounts of money to have that chart, but it was crumpled up and thrown away. And the chart was the development of the steps towards the discovery of the atomic bomb in one column with the dates and Gandhi's progress in working out Satyagraha in the other column. And they were just *pari passu*. Stepwise, kind of paralleling each other. It's really an amazing thing that at some time, at some point later on in this century or later on, people will look back at those first couple of decades of the 20th century and say, "This was an axial age. These tremendous discoveries were going on in the physical and in the spiritual world. Something connects them somehow, but I wouldn't know how to do that."

Also wanted to mention that in connection with the Declaration of Peace which starts – the actions for this start on Thursday – people applied to the New York Police Department and asked for permission to march. And the NYPD, New York's finest, denied permission. At which point the group announced that they would march anyway, even if they went to jail. And then the next day they received permission to march. So, this is a nice little example of low-level Satyagraha – on the low-level of the escalation curve. So that's all the Satyagraha you need.

And when we get to the end of – we're actually at the beginning of the selection that you have in your Reader from Satyagraha in South Africa, which I know you've all read, practically memorized because it's for this week. You will see that at the beginning of that, Gandhi, in a very astute way, charts the steps that led to the escalation of Satyagraha in India. And he just goes – there were like six stages by which that escalated. And that's very typical. And the early stages – in the early stages the mere threat of Satyagraha was enough. And if the threat isn't enough, you have to be ready to go through with it.

And then the third thing is what the CourseWeb announcement was about. And apparently, while we were sitting around picking blackberries or whatever we were doing over the weekend, there's this explosion going on in India and it's partly in connection with this film, [Munnabhai Lage Raho](#), which means "Keep it up Munna Bhai," which is an extremely funny film. I haven't seen it, but it is showing around. It's in – it has English subtitles, Kevin?

Student: Yeah, I'm going to see it tonight. I have some Indian friends. We're going to go see it in Fremont.

Michael: In Fremont, yes. That's right.

Student: It's playing there.

Michael: It's playing in Fremont. There's more Indians than any other ethnic group in Fremont, so that's the logical place for it to be. But yeah, I've heard that it's extremely funny. And these two friends of mine who saw it are pretty into Gandhi. One of them used to work with educators for nonviolence, and they said they were not offended. Now that's a big statement. For one of us to see something about Gandhi and not be offended it means two things. It means that they spelled Gandhi correctly - this is pretty important. And they sort of got it. So that's amazing. And so, hook up with Kevin and carpool out to Fremont and see the movie and let me know on Thursday how it works.

But the main thing is that this film because it's an on-time film – borrowing language from my grandchildren. It's even better than Attenborough's film. It's much, much better than the way the Government of India has been trying to present Gandhi. That is, you build a pedestal way up in the sky and up there you see this more-than-human figure. Actually, somebody wrote to Attenborough and said, "You shouldn't show Gandhi on screen. He's much too exalted a figure. He should just be a voice coming out of a temple." [Laughter] And Attenborough, you know, being British said, "I'm not going to show a film with some sort of a bloody Tinker-bell.

Anyway, that made Gandhi inaccessible for this whole generation of Indians. And this film in which the plot line, I gather – or the frame story is about a boy who's trying to romance a very attractive female journalist, and she asks him if he knows about Gandhi. And he says, "Oh, of course." He knows nothing about Gandhi. So, the rest of the film is he's trying to keep up with Gandhi information so he can impress this lady, but in the meantime he gets pulled into the Gandhi story.

So, this – it's not just the film, but whatever is doing it, it's just the time is ripe or whatever. This whole generation of Indians has experimented with cell phones and gadgets and all of that stuff, as you know perfectly well every time you call up for tech support. You have someone saying, "[With accent] Hello, my name is Fred." I think they've had it with that. And this may be a very, very important breakthrough. Via Gandhi, they may be getting back to their traditional values which might even save us. Yes?

Student: What is the name of the film?

Michael: It's called – the Hindi title is, "*Munnabhai Lage Raho*," That's a person's name. "Moun" means the silent brother, but it probably doesn't mean that. I think this is correct. *Lage Raho*. Which – keep on trucking, *Mounnabhai*. It doesn't matter. Just hook up with Kevin, and he'll take you out there.

And the third or fourth item – I don't know, I've lost track, but we'll get – this will be the last news blast before we get back to our subject. There is a new book out called, [Nonviolence: 25 Lessons from the History of a Dangerous Idea](#) by a person named Mark Kurlansky. The limiting factor for us is that Mark Kurlansky is evidently a pacifist as opposed to someone who's dedicated to active nonviolence. But he is – this is very timely for us because, you know, we didn't really have a lot of time to go into the history part.

He is a straight from the shoulder revisionist historian. And he makes the point that the following three conflicts were unnecessary and did not accomplish what they were said to have accomplished. The American Revolution. And by the way, there have been revisionists who recently – the American Revolution, which say that independence was a guarantee before the conflict started. Definitely, those colonies could not be held onto by King George III. In fact, there's a letter that Adams – this is Adams the president, not Adams the beer brand. Adams writes to Jefferson.

And he says, "The revolution was in the minds of the people and in the union of the colonies and both of these were accomplished before the hostilities commenced." I think it's interesting that people still had minds in the 18th century. That was before advertising got so big and that someone was recognizing that this would have happened with or without bloodshed.

And the second – and this also something that revisionist historians have been saying, but they've been ignored, the Civil War did not emancipate the slaves. Lincoln said, "If I could win the war without freeing a single slave, I would." He used that issue, but it was not the main point. So, the Civil War, you know, it goes without saying that the Union could have kept without a war – I mean what a horrendously stupid way to keep united. Kill one another until you can't stand it anymore and then say, "Let's reconcile." Why not have the reconciliation first? Then you don't have to have the war. Maybe that's simple-minded of me to say that.

Anyway – and finally, WWII. WWII did not rescue the Jews. There is a terrible book. I'm not recommending you read it because it's way too depressing. It's called, "The Secret War Against the Jews." And I think, if nothing else, that war will make it plain that it was in nobody's interest to – nobody thought it was in their interest to rescue the Jews. They did not bomb the concentration camps in any of the things that they could have done.

Moreover, and this is not part of Kurlansky's book, but you may come across an extremely upsetting, challenging statement that Gandhi made in the middle of WWII. He said, "The Allies are going to win this war, but in order to do it they are going to have to be more brutal than Hitler because they have chosen to use his methods." So that's how he saw it. You choose the wrong means, and everything is lost. You do not get to the right ends. So, because we chose to fight the war with his weapons, we had to be more aggressive, more potent in using those methods than he was in order to prevail.

So, this is, as I say, minus that last observation which I couldn't help making, Kurlansky is a very good example of someone who's doing history in a way that shows that we have been learning and teaching history in a very skewed way which makes it look as if war is inevitable and useful. And when you really step back and look at the big picture, it is neither. Unfortunately, I don't think this will work. We were discussing last time whether this would fly in the historical community and that would tell us something. And I don't think this will work for that because Kurlansky is apparently something of a popular writer rather than fully documented seven PhD Berkeley, Harvard, Yale historian – I think.

Anyway, okay, so that was my exciting weekend. And one other thing happened over the weekend that will be relevant for you and that is I had an "aha elatedness." We've discussed these. German chimpanzees have this all the time.

Three Gunas

I realized that the model that we'd been talking about, the model of the Three Gunas, the free energy states, the three action dispositions could help us solve one of the problems that we've talked about.

So, let's look at work first of all. *Tomas* is inaction. And this is ruled out right away. And the first thing that Sri Krishna tells Arjuna about action is you can't not do it. He says, "I understand the impulse, but forget it. It's not possible." Even if you're a Berkeley graduate student and you needed to earn a little extra money and you signed up for one of these sensory deprivation experiences that they used to do in Tolman Hall where you float around on an inner-tube in a completely darkened room and a pool of warm water.

They did this for all these graduate students, and they gave them their \$4.50 an hour or whatever you give a graduate student. And are you here Jolina? Yeah. And then at the end of the experience they asked them, "You know, well, what went on in there?" And they said, "My mind was racing like crazy. I've never been so agitated." So even if you are not active physically, the karma producing engine, known as the mind, will be active and even more active.

So that's *Tamasic* action. *Rajasic* action is, let's say, ill advised. Call it that. It's action without a well-chosen goal. And more important than that, more important than anything, it's attached. You're personally attached to the fruits. The minute you're saying, "Oh, boy. I accomplished this." You are acting *Rajasically* and that also – it's much better than inertia. Right? Because if you're not acting you'll never discover whether you're attached, or you're not attached. Whether it was the right action or the wrong action, whether your means were right. You'll never discover anything.

So at least, you know, get out there, make big mistakes and then realize then and recover. In fact, St. Augustine said something which is a bit risqué, but he's a saint so I guess he gets to say that. He said – now they didn't have exclamation points in Latin,

but I'm going to give him one. "*Pecca fortiter!* Sin staunchly." Don't get out there and nickel and dime yourself to death. You'll never discover anything. Make huge mistakes and realize it and suffer and correct the course.

So, in this sense *Rajasic* action is a step better than *Tamasic* action. But *Satvic* action is, of course, the type that we were talking about last time where you are not attached to the personal benefit of your work. So, the three kinds of action that the Gita lays out – they are knitted together with this Guṇa theory in Chapter 18.

Sanskara Model: Three Gunas and Nonviolence

There's actually several other very neat things that that text says about action, but we are a little pressed for time. But now with regard to violence/nonviolence I suddenly realized we could also use this model. *Tomas* is cowardice. And I'm not just saying that because in Chapter 3 of the Gita – which I didn't ask you to read, but it's very neat – Arjuna asks Sri Krishna a very poignant question which many of us can relate to. He says, "Why is it that I keep doing things that I know to be wrong?"

And when Krishna answers him he says, "You are being driven by *Rajas* and that becomes two things in your consciousness. *Chāma* means selfish desire and *crodna* means anger. Now these two very deep sanskaras that we all inherit from our animal background, they're part of a list – the list of three, *chāma*, *crodna*, and *bia* is the third one. *Bhāya* means fear. And why didn't Krishna mention it in regard – in response to Arjuna's question because Arjuna did not say, "Why is that I don't do things that I know to be right?" That would be the result of the Guṇa of *Tomas* expressing itself through our deep sanskara of fear.

Rather, he asks him, "Why do I do things that I know to be wrong?" And that's the next guṇa up. And that expresses itself as anger and greed. And, of course, there's no sanskara involved here actually, but I would say that the mood of peace lines up with the guṇa of *satva* and the disposition of detachment from the fruits of the action.

Cowardice vs Violence

So, this explains – let's see. Cowardice, anger, violence up here and nonviolence here. And this helps us to understand why Gandhi said, "If you have a choice between violence and cowardice, if it really is your only choice and that will happen, but on rare occasions. If that really is your only choice, he said – I hate to say this – but "Go for anger. Go for violence every time." Because as he will point out you cannot have nonviolence unless you renounce the capacity for violence.

You can't go from cowardice directly. You cannot pass go. You have to go – I forget exactly, but do not pass go, do not collect \$200 if you played Monopoly. You cannot do an end run around violence. You don't have to act violently, but you have to have the

capacity for violence. You have to have at least enough courage to be violent and then decide not to use it, and that will get you to nonviolence. But there's no short, direct route from cowardice to nonviolence. Did you have a question?

Okay, so that's why when someone wrote to him in India, said the police had come and raided their village and this man wrote and said, "Oh, Bapu, you'd be so proud of me. They came in. They were impolite to our women. They molested them and took our animals away. Did all this stuff, and I didn't do a thing. Aren't you proud of me?" And Gandhi writes – prints this letter in his newspaper – whichever it was at that time – he said, "When I read this, I hung my head in shame, that somebody should do such a thing in my name, as to watch his women be affronted without defending them."

So, I think this is sort of a neat grid that helps us understand better why he was so absolutely down on cowardice, and he was so down on it that it was even worse than violence. And this was constant throughout his whole career. Okay, this is a good stopping point because the next thing we're going to do is start – get back to – or get to the history of Gandhi in South Africa. Anyone have any questions about all of this stuff? Several people did last week so that's why I went back to it.

Okay, this is not your absolutely last chance, but it's your last chance for right now. So good. Let's change into historical gear and talk about the unfolding of the story. I'm not going to say much about Gandhi's early life. You'll find a good account of that in any of the biographies. And if you do remember, if you go down University Avenue to Bizarre of India – a couple of blocks below Milvia, below Martin Luther King – they have copies of the Nanda biography there. I imagine all these books are going to be coming back into print now thanks to what's going on in India. Gandhi books are walking out of the stores there.

Gandhi the Lawyer, in South Africa

So, you'll find an account there, a very adequate one in "Gandhi, the Man." And everybody has that, I think. We got enough copies of that. And it'll make it perfectly clear that Gandhi accepted this job in 1893. It was really sort of a last ditch for him. He had been basically a failure. He came back from England with a law degree. A law degree in England required you to have dinner at the Inns of Court every other Thursday with your fellow law students. It's not like the most rigorous degree in the world. Nothing like Boalt Hall.

And he found that he could not work. He was basically tongue-tied. He has this terrible scene where he has a brief to present in court and he gets up to speak and he can't utter. The man who would later defy the biggest empire the world had ever seen without weapons – he couldn't talk. It's very – it's quite impressive, the change that came over him. And it kind of shows you, if you do not find your sva-dharma, nothing is going to work for you. But here he comes to have basically a glorified clerkship in South Africa,

lands in Durban – that you saw on the map – May of 1893 and he has to go up country to Pretoria, doesn't get very far.

His first week in the country he is confronted by a white passenger on the train saying, "What are you doing here in first class?" There's no evidence that he said what he says in the movie. "I am a barrister, and I have a ticket. Therefore, you may deduce that there is at least one coolie barrister in South Africa." There's no evidence that he actually said that, but it's in character. Most of what he said in that film is in character. Some of it was not. So, he hits up against racism.

South Africa: British and the Dutch

Now let me just back up a little bit and explain the social situation that he was in. The Dutch are tremendous seafarers, as anybody knows who has visited that country. In fact, if they don't go out to the ocean, the ocean comes in to them. So, they have to build these dikes and things like that. And in the early 16th century, imagine that they started landing in South Africa, subdued the "native" population. As it turns out, there were not a lot of Black Africans living in that part of the continent, but there were some. So, these Dutch turned them into slave laborers and began to exploit the beautiful fertility of the soil and the kind nature in South Africa. I have some South African friends who tell me that San Francisco is more like Cape Town than any place they've ever visited. So, it was really nice weather like we have here.

And then in the 1850's – a lot later – the British start arriving. And as you can imagine, there never had been all that much good-will between the British and the Dutch. In fact, there's one dialect of Dutch languages which is comprehensible to one dialect of Anglo-Saxon, and it said that Frisian and Anglo-Saxon fishermen would meet one another out at sea, and they would curse at one another in their respective languages. The British went around saying, "In matters of business, the fault of the Dutch is giving too little and asking too much."

So, there's a little rivalry here which in itself is not surprising, but I want to underscore it because not only does it show you what the complexities of the situation are – okay, I guess I want to say two things about it. Everyone who is non-European and is in a minority is going to be caught between these two big mill wheels. And we have seen that over and over and over again. British, they don't want to fight the Dutch because the Dutch have modern weapons. And, in fact, they fought fantastically well and hard in the Boer War. That's coming up – the first guerrilla war, actually.

They don't want to fight the Dutch? So, what do you do, you say, "Let's, you and me, hate the third party. There's a minority, can't fight back, and that'll temporarily resolve our tensions." And we'll talk a lot about this when we talk about scapegoating later on. And it'll hurt nothing because it's only people who don't count and don't have a voice. We've seen this over and over again. "Let's you and me hate them."

And in fact, it goes back to animal behavior. Konrad Lorenz who's an expert on aggression. He points out that if these two greylag geese meet on a narrow path, it's sort of like high noon for geese. And they're very – they fight very hard, these animals. They're very aggressive so they need a way to not fight, or they'll lose too many feathers. So, they've worked – nature has provided them with a way. They go into a victory dance. And they say, "Boy, did we hand it to that sucker. Watch him run! Ha ha." And of course, there is nobody in sight, but just by putting yourself in the "you and me against them" mode you avoid fighting with one another.

My last article that I wrote when I was still having an honest job as a classics professor on this campus – and I'm not necessarily recommending that you go out and read it because it doesn't put any money in my pocket – there's an article about the Odyssey in which I showed that heroes who are kind of building up to a fight, one of the ways that they avoid it is that they say, "They struggle over who is better at controlling the women. And whoever can oppress the women wins the struggle between the two male warriors." Okay, so that's one thing.

There's a basic underlying dynamic here which is going to put the "Asiatics" in South Africa. Not even get into what happened to the native inhabitants, although they will figure into Gandhi's story. But the very large number of Indians and small number of other Asians who were there are really going to be caught in this tension between two, for them, to all intents and purposes, superpowers.

The other aspect of it is, at least as encouraging, is that out of this struggle grows WWI and WWII. And the only reason that it hasn't grown into WWIII is that one of the parties couldn't afford the weapons and there was no triumph dance that anybody knew how to perform. Certainly, President Reagan was not about to do that. So, it kind of collapsed leaving one superpower.

But this is the system that sometimes has been called, "Mercantilism," which means the use of military forces to enforce market advantages. Okay, so you use – like you go into India with the East India Company, goes in as a trading company. Next thing you know the East India Company has hired its own army. Next thing you know, India belongs to Britain, and they're under the queen, and the British Army and the Royal Fusiliers – all the rest of it – are over there. So, this system, we can see it on a small scale in South Africa already.

So, the British and the Dutch are there. The Dutch were there first by a long shot. And they have this frontier ideology that is – their response to the landing of British who are better equipped, better organized, there's a lot more of them. Their response was to go up country and operate these farms. And they called themselves farmers. The Dutch word for which is "*boer*." At least that's how it's pronounced in Modern Dutch. I don't know how they pronounce it in South Africa because within a hundred years or so the South Africans – South African Europeans from Holland were speaking a language that was almost incomprehensible to Dutch as it's spoken in Europe. I have watched a

Dutch speaker and an Afrikaan speaker trying to have a conversation and eventually they switch over to English.

So, when the English settlers came in, they had a slightly different – oh, I'm sorry. I was in the midst of saying that these Boers went up country and lived in the countryside, you know, sort of like going up to Morningside Ranch if you were a hippy in Berkeley in the 70s. And they had this ideology of the Great Trek. And they called themselves, "The *Voortrekkers*," the people who had left their settlements and trekked up-country to get away from these aggressive British.

Now when the British arrived they wanted to do sugar cane, coffee, and of course, tea. So, wherever you go in the world, if you're British, the first thing you have got to do is assure your tea supply, which is better done by planting it than by importing it. So, for this purpose, the African – native African workers weren't working out very well and they say, "Well, we can import workers – laborers – from India because that's what an empire is for." You have resources over here; you need them over there. Just switch them around. These resources happen to be human beings, but – oh, another problem was that by this time we're talking about 1860 now, slavery had been abolished so that made it a little bit difficult to use the native Africans for the tea plantations and the mines and so forth.

And in November of 1860 – in fact, November 16th, 1860 – the first group of Indian laborers arrived in Natal, since slavery had been abolished and, in fact, it had been abolished first by the British.

And I hope that at some point you read this history by Adam Hochschild, "The Abolition of Slavery." It's a very important story for us. If you want to abolish a bad institution, it's important to know that this has worked, and it has been done.

You couldn't enslave these Indians because it was against the law, but as you know, having a law that says you can't injure someone has never prevented someone from injuring another person if they really want to. So, they worked out this system called, "indentured labor," which means you would sign a contract and you were obligated to work for let's say, a period of five years.

And then at the end of five years, very clever arrangements would be made whereby you can be free provided you pay the government 25£. Well, you know, that doesn't sound like a whole lot. What are we talking about here? 60 – 70 bucks maybe? Just write home to your older brother and he sends you 70 bucks, and you're off the hook. But as a matter of fact – we're talking about 1860, 25£ was unreachable for the vast majority of these people. They were from simple peasant class people anyway back home. They could not pay 25£. So, the result was you'd sign up for five years and guess what? Every five years you would discover that you were there for life. So, you might as well be a slave when it really comes down to it. It amounted to slavery. Yeah?

Student: Did they promise the Indians coming from India that they were going to get land? They were just taking a ride to South Africa?

Michael: Yes. And work. And they did house them. And so, for example, if you were a mine worker, the company would give you housing under not the best of conditions, but at least it was work and subsistence and maybe a little bit over subsistence.

Student: So, they just offered subsistence, pretty much?

Michael: Yeah. Subsistence and transportation.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:37:28]

Michael: The prize was you now had to pay the government. I mean look, my grandfather, he runs away from home in the early teens and he's bumming all over Europe and finally somebody offers him a terrific deal. "If you can scrape together a lot of money," which is probably the equivalent of what we're talking about here, "we'll bring you over to America. When you get to America you'll have a job waiting for you and an apartment waiting for you." So poor grandpa, he says, "Oh, such a deal." So, he gets on the ship, he pays his money and lands somewhere in Chesapeake Bay, I think, only to be told that he now owes the company the same amount of money that he already paid.

So, he ends up literally – this is literally true – he ends up working in a salt mine in America. So, it was the same sort of thing. You can make promises, but they don't have the power to make you fulfill those promises. So, I don't think the promise was elaborately more than what they intended to provide, but they provided housing and a little bit of subsistence.

Miners Strike 1913

This will be important because when the miners are going to go on strike in 1913, they lose everything. They have no access to home, shelter, water, anything.

So, this is the situation. On the heels of these laborers, these indentured laborers, there will start to come in only ten years time, some enterprising Indian merchants because they figure these laborers, they need to buy a little food. The Afrikaners are not going to feed them food that they can eat. They're not going to give them clothing that they can wear. We'll come in and, you know, without ripping them off, we'll make a profit, and we'll see how we can do.

And as a matter of fact, these merchants who were mainly from – partly from Gujarat – but mainly Tamils, were very good, assiduous, hard working, honest people. And in a short period of time the Europeans began to resent them and feel that they were losing the economic benefits that they had come to Africa for. So, at one point Gandhi will say, "But look at us, you know, we don't make any trouble. We're hard working." And they will say, "That's just the problem. We hate you because you're successful and clean, and upstanding, and not because you're a troublemaking class."

Gandhi's Beginning of Political Work

So, Gandhi is 23 at this time when he makes this trip up country and he experiences this shock and because he has been brought there to do a job, he decides that he's not going to get into political work and fight back against this tremendous affront until he's about finished with what he was doing.

And when he's getting ready to go back into India in 1894 someone puts a copy of the newspaper in his hand, the "Natal Mercury." This is taking place in Natal. And it has in it what's called a disenfranchising bill which is basically going to strip Asiatics of their rights, specific rights in Natal. Even though it's illegal under the empire, the Orange Free State is a Crown colony, Natal is about to pass into independence from that same status. It's technically illegal, but they're about to do it anyway.

This is at a farewell party when he's going to go back to India, but God had other plans in store for him. And he turns the party into a working party. Gandhi was probably not the funnest person to be around. He was probably wonderful in various ways, but fun was not probably one of them. There was this party, everybody was getting ready to have a good time. And he says, "Okay, you'll be on this committee, and you'll be on that committee." Sounds like Berkeley.

And he agrees to stay a month or so longer and he arranges a telegram to be sent to the government for the postponement of the bill. And this telegram is in the form of a petition with signatures. And you might think this is not a big deal. This is very low-level resistance. This is, you know, we're still in Stage 1 of Nagler's famous Escalation Curve which we haven't yet talked about here, but which is on Page 108 of my book if you want to just jump into that.

However, the important thing is that this is the first petition ever sent by the Indian community to any South African legislature. So, this will kind of be the theme of our story, that as he's going along and inventing these mechanisms, doing things in pretty sequential order that later turn out to be the way to do them for nonviolence, he is doing things which had never been done before and inspiring and encouraging the people that he's working with. Another legal provision that's going on is they're now starting to inhibit the influx of Indians to South Africa at all.

So, it's these two things kind of working in tandem, stripping the ones who are there of their rights and including the infliction of a crushing tax on ex-indentured laborers and then blocking the door to other Indians who come in. In the Transvaal, where Gandhi is not working up there yet, Law 3 of 1885, for those of you who are going on to law school – really impress your professors – stated that every Indian settling in the republic in the Transvaal was required to register at a cost of 25£ again. And that no Indian could own any land or enjoy the rights of citizenship. In the Orange Free State, parliament abruptly passed a law expelling all Indian traders. Giving a very nominal compensation.

I want you to appreciate the kind of – and degree of racism that was going on at that time. You know, we sometimes think the world is in a very bad place. We've accomplished nothing. But I'm going to be arguing later when we get to Martin Luther King part of the course. That at least what we have accomplished is we have delegitimized racism. It's not the same thing as getting rid of it. But we have made it not legitimate.

At this point it was the paradigm. In 1881 the Transvaal Parliament received a petition which stated, among other things, "These Indians have no sense of decency. They suffer from loathsome diseases." This is a standard claim in all schools of racism. You know, sickle cell anemia, all the rest of it. "They suffer from loathsome diseases which makes you feel that you should have any contact with them. They're unclean. They consider women as their prey." I mean this could have been written in Alabama in 1920. "They believe that women have no souls." This about a country where there are two very large regions of India in which God was worshipped in the form of a woman, something which they never, never would allow in any Christian country, and yet, they're being accused of feeling that women have no souls and so forth.

Another – and this said by President Kruger of the Transvaal when he had received the delegation of Indians in his office. And he said to them, "You are descendants of Ishmael and therefore, from your very birth bound to slave for the descendants of Esau." That's us. "As the descendants of Esau, we cannot admit you to rights placing you on equality with ourselves. You must rest content with what rights we grant you." So, I just wanted you to get a sense for what the situation is down there.

Gita's Theory of Action and Gandhi's Political Movement

It was the first time that Gandhi had encountered this in-your-face racism. The British had been far too clever to do that in India or in the U.K. And after sending this petition and agreeing to stay at this party/meeting, he makes three provisions. First, he says, "I'm going to be doing public work." This is what we would call today, "Non-profit work." I'm working for the uplift of the community, for the benefit of everyone. And I don't think that I should receive a salary for this work.

So, what are we talking about in terms of Gita's Theory of Action?

Student: Selfless action.

Michael: Selfless action. And in particular, Amy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:47:20]

Michael: Retraction from the fruits. Exactly, yeah. So yeah, John?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:47:30]

Michael: Well, that's what I was going to say next. Gandhi did eat. He didn't eat much, but he ate. In fact, later on in Indian there's a wonderful statement by Madeleine Slade Mirabehn, who is kind of in charge of victualling him, and she stated to the press or somebody, "Gandhi likes dates from Arabia, oranges from Spain, something else from somewhere else." She said, "It takes a lot of money to keep Gandhi in poverty." So, he did need an income, and he said, "If you'll send some work in my direction, I'll work for you as a lawyer, earn a reasonable amount of income that way. And then I'll do public work without salary."

Second, he said, "We're in this for the long haul." And this is really a shrewd thing for him to observe because from now until May, the end of PACS194B, we're going to see a lot of movements that burst into action, get very excited, and then as soon as they accomplish something – or sometimes even if they don't accomplish anything, they go back to where they came from – it subsides – where the forces of oppression make no such mistake. They feel they're in the saddle, they want to stay there. They have the great advantage of endurance. That's why in South America nonviolent movements used the term, "*Firmaza permanente*. Unending resistance – firmness." So, he said, "We're in this for the long haul, and we need a permanent organization to watch over Indian interests. And therefore, he formed an Indian colony, the Natal Indian Congress was founded in May of 1894. It was modeled on the Indian Congress in India which was basically a talk shop. The British had set it up in their cleverness to let off steam, give people a chance to talk to one another, especially if they praised Englishmen in there.

I've read some of the speeches, early years of the Indian National Congress. Well, they're kind of appalling. So, it's again, the idea of letting off steam without having to accomplish anything. But Gandhi saw that with no body to – no "space" body – to represent them they needed to form some kind of organization.

Constructive Program

And third, his very important observation, "Side by side with external agitation – that is between us and the colonial government – the question of internal improvement was also taken up." Now anybody who has taken a course with me or read a book of mine or hung out in a coffee shop for more than 15 minutes where I was present, will know that I am obsessed – I guess I have to use the word – with something called, "Constructive Programme." We'll give it – this is an important element that we're heading into. Constructive Program. This is what it will be called some decades down the road in India when he formalizes it and creates 18 projects which are pulled together in this overarching programme. So, it's British spelling.

Now the reason that – I mean Constructive Program has many advantages. It's the reason why I consider it so important and why I was thrilled to recognize and learn that Gandhi had started it so early, which is basically almost the same month that he started external agitation against the regime, he started internal improvement. So Constructive

Programme, we'll discuss it repeatedly, but for now in here let's just say it has two humongous advantages.

One, is that you're dealing with your own community. So that's infinitely easier than dealing with a community of people who are oppressing you. They're right there. They trust you. They understand your language. It's just much more efficient to work with your own community. Secondly, as the term would imply, it's constructive – darn it – as opposed to obstructive or destructive.

Obstructive program, destructive program, they all have their place, but as I keep saying in all of these coffee shops and wherever people will pay my way so I can go there and talk to them, it is far more efficient to build what you want than to ask somebody else to give it to you. If you ask somebody else to give it to you, you are more or less implying that you are helpless. And this is a very false and bad thing to say if you are a nonviolent actor, in fact, whoever you are. It's just not true. I am helpless. I need you to do this. I can't do it for myself. It is a bad approach.

And even deeper than that I would say we're talking about a positive force that we were emphasizing from the get-go, from our first time that we were together, I was saying, "We have to recognize that satyagraha, nonviolence, comes from a positive kind of energy." And that's why we use Boulding's model of integrative power along with threat power and exchange power. So obviously, if you're dealing with a positive form of energy, something in which Plato's language is, "*Ontos own*." It's actually real. Existing existent. Then constructing something with this constructive energy is going to resonate with the ultimate nature of that force. Whereas to block somebody and say, "I won't let you do this." Where you have to do it sometimes, it doesn't have quite that same resonance.

So, I think one of the things that characterizes Gandhi's approach to nonviolence, makes it particularly Gandhian from the very, very start, was stumbling upon the power of Constructive Programme. He's not even using the name yet, of course.

So, they submitted petitions. Indecently, they only gained a postponement of one day. Remember they sent this petition saying, "Please postpone consideration of the bill." The government said, "Yes," magnanimously, "We will postpone it until tomorrow." So, in one way, you know, they didn't accomplish very much, but in another way, they did because they sent a petition, and that petition was responded to positively and both of those things have never happened before.

Now Natal was still under the Crown and Lord Ripon back in Britain was the Crown Secretary for the colonies. And after a visit from an Indian delegation, he disallowed the Franchising Bill. This is terrific news. On the other hand, he also disallowed it like the week before Natal was to gain its freedom. So, all he had to do was rewrite the bill the following week and put it back in. So, this is a story of trickery and betrayal, but you're going to see Gandhi never using that kind of device and slowly, slowly, slowly gathering

strength as a result of that. That's another basic principle that we'll talk about pretty soon.

In 1896 Gandhi went back to India for six months to spread the story of what he was doing there because he felt, quite rightly, that he would get support not only from native Indians, but from the colonial government in India who still felt, in some kind of paternalistic way, that they were watching out for the wellbeing of their subjects. Do you remember the Golden Jubilee of Queen Victoria? She said, "You may have had monarchs who were more efficient and effective than I, but you have never had a monarch who loved you more." So that was the attitude. And I'm not being entirely sarcastic.

I think that where it didn't cost them any money, they were perfectly willing to watch out for the wellbeing of their subjects. And it's very easy to say, "Oh, those South African governments. Look at what they're doing to you." If anything, it draws attention away from what's happening to them back at home. So, he goes back in 1896 to talk to the colonial governments there and get their support.

And he traveled around India for six months. He wrote a pamphlet called – later to be known as, [The Green Pamphlet](#). He printed it in 5000 copies. That's almost exactly the same as my pamphlet, "[Hope or Terror?](#)" I just kind of look for little ways where we sort of line up. And then he heads back to South Africa. Now you may have noticed that the press, mass media, are not totally friendly to nonviolent resisters. Probably some of you have experienced this in the flesh, so to speak.

And I guess what we learn from this story is that it was not something that happened like in the last 10 or 20 years. The minute you had newspapers people realized that you could use them to tell the story that you wanted told and that was a lot more attractive than telling what actually happened, in many cases.

So, Reuters, it's still the same company. I get emails from Reuters newsfeeds every day, so the same company. They started saying that Gandhi is preaching sedition and he wants a whole scale uprising of the Indians. And then as he headed for South Africa on the S.S. Courtland, they sent telegrams saying that he had three boatloads of Indians who want to settle in South Africa. None of which was true.

Gandhi's Encounters with Violence

So, when he arrived on January 13th of 1897 – January 13th is very close to Martin Luther King's birthday, but five decades later – there is a mob that's been inflamed by these exaggerations and false reports. And they're standing there on the dock waiting for him. And he's facing this very interesting dilemma.

On the one hand he's read Bhagavad Gita just like everybody else and he knows that cowardice is the worst thing you can do. He wants to go ashore, but he's met by a Britisher named Escombe who advises him not to go ashore. And he sneaks his family

out. It's a very awkward thing. Finally, they claimed that there was a typhoid patient on the boat, and it was quarantined. So, he's sitting there for 21 days. Nobody had typhoid on the boat, to our knowledge.

He's sitting there wondering what to do. Finally, he did decide to go ashore. And if you've seen Philip Glass's opera, "Satyagraha," you know what happens. It's not a scene that was in Attenborough's movie. He went ashore. Somebody spotted him. The mob attacked him, and they beat him unconscious. He held onto a fence to keep from hitting the ground. And it did not look as if he could possibly survive this kind of ferocity. But Mrs. Alexander, who was the wife of the British police superintendent happened to come by and fortunately, being a good colonial wife, she was armed with a .357 magnum umbrella.

She was carrying her umbrella against the sun, you know. Her parasol, she holds that umbrella over Gandhi and says, "Unhand this man." Or words to that effect – nobody knows what she actually said. And so, you know, faced with a woman with an umbrella, this crowd obviously - forget all your principles and your anger and everything. And they melted back, and Gandhi was taken to Inspector Alexander's home.

Then the mob followed them. I'm just telling all these details because he's starting to work out how to actually be courageous and what makes sense to do when you're faced with actual violence. And this is the first of two occasions on which he's going to be beaten unconscious before the actual assassination in 1948.

So, he's taken to the police inspector's home and the police inspector said – he comes out and he says, "What do we want to do?" And he starts leading them in a song. "Let's hang old Gandhi from a sour apple tree." Wish we had the music to that. Send it to Bob Dylan – really write something successful. Anyway, while he's leading the crowd in this rousing rendition of, "Let's hang Gandhi from the sour apple tree," Gandhi, disguised as a police inspector, sneaks out the back door.

So, on the one hand he is not – he doesn't feel that – he's just, you know, beginning to work with nonviolence. Nothing in him tells him that he has to go out and face that crowd and say, "Here I am." This is, however, going to happen later on in his career. In fact, at one point in Northern India he was touring, and his people met him when he came to a certain village. And they say, "Whatever you do, Bapu, don't go to such-and-such a village nearby because the village headman has taken a vow that he will kill you on sight."

And Gandhi said, "Oh, really? What village did you say that was?" They said, "Perhaps you didn't understand. Do not, do not go there." He said, "Let's go." And so, he went to this village right then and there, knocks on the door. The village headman comes out. He says, "Hi, I'm Mahatma Gandhi. I'm here to help you fulfill your vow." And sure enough, this headman, you know, everybody is watching him. "Well, are you going to do it?" He has to do it. So, he reaches out and he starts throttling Gandhi. And Gandhi just

is looking at him without a trace of fear. He's probably repeating his mantra for all he's worth and just looking at him. And this goes on for about half a minute.

Then this person drops his hands, falls to his feet, he begs his forgiveness and turns the whole village over to him. So, this is going to be the mature Gandhi. But I think it's good for us to know he was not born like that, and he worked his way up to it gradually. You know, it's not like one day he went up on top of Mount Tabor and he had a revelation, and he came down and he was fearless. He's working out how to do this.

On the other hand, he does do something in connection with this attack which is vintage Gandhi, and which will be his response to brutality, personal brutality his whole life. And that is, that they come to him, and they say, "Okay, you're a lawyer. I'm a lawyer. Let's really find who was a ringleader of this gang and let's get them in jail where they belong." And he says, "Absolutely not. Those people were not at fault. The only people who are at fault, if anyone, were the members of the press who put them up to this. So, it would be wrong to prosecute these people who were only carrying out what they thought was the truth."

Moreover, he will go this far. I think some months later when he's writing his account of this event, he says, "As I was losing consciousness," he's holding onto this railing. He's being beaten unconscious, falling to the ground, he said, "I was not conscious of any feeling of ill will toward those people." That's pretty far out. Somebody gets in front of me on my way up to the counter in Andronico's, I am aware of ill will toward that person. In fact, I had a friend who was walking up to the counter of one these big grocery stores with milk - that all he had was a carton of milk. And some person came rushing along with a huge cart, piled up with stuff, and rushed in front of my friend who had nothing for it. He had to wait. So finally, he got to the counter and put down his milk carton. "That's okay, he paid for your milk." That's the kind of story I like. That's revenge of the milk buyer.

But it's quite remarkable that at this relatively early stage, here are people who are beating him. As far as he knows he's being beaten to death, and he is not conscious of any anger rising in him against these people. So that's pretty far out. And he will not persecute them. But at the same time, he's willing to use some sort of subterfuge to avoid getting other people into trouble and avoid creating a direct confrontation with violence when he probably doesn't feel that he's really in his best - got a good mechanism for dealing with it as he would feel later on.

1899 Boer War and the Ambulance Corps

In 1899 the Boer War broke out. This is between the British and the Boers. It was to go on for about two years. And from the British point of view, it was eventually going to be a glorious victory. I don't know if you've seen the movie called, "Scapegoats of Empire," but this was the first time where European armies faced a guerrilla war and didn't know what to do about it. They found themselves shooting prisoners and doing all sorts of

ugly things like that which in that day they had not done. As you know, we've gone steadily downhill since then.

But it was very hard fought. And it faced Gandhi for the first of four times. He's going to be in this dilemma four times – what to do when the regime of which you are a part is at war? His instincts are completely pacifist, but at the same time he feels that he's under an obligation. He has gone to Britain and said, "Will you please help me with this petition?" And they responded, more or less – actually they cheated him, but they responded. Having appealed for support to the regime, he does not feel that he has any right to deny his services.

So, he's in this quandary. On the one hand, you know, as students in my seminar know, he does not have any stronger feeling for the British or against the Dutch. He's sort of like Yeats' poem, the Irish airman who foresees his death. "Those whom I hate – those whom I fight, I do not hate. Those whom I guard I do not love." He's more or less in that position. Stronger than that even is his, you know, what we would call today pacifism. He does not want to kill under any circumstances.

On the other hand, he owes an obligation to the regime. And any number one obligation that any male owes to regimes of this type – or nation states – is the military obligation. You say you won't fight for them; you won't risk your life for them, you won't offer yourself up as a sacrificial victim for them, you do not belong to them. You're not part of that citizenry. And that's been the case from Ancient Greece up until – we're just fighting with it now.

So, what's he going to do? Well, he figures out a compromise that will work and he's going to use this compromise at least – he's going to use it three times. And that is he will join the Ambulance Corps. In fact, there isn't an Ambulance Corps, so he's going to found one. And you see all these pictures of him with his like Aussie hat on – really cool hats. I ought to get them at Berkeley Hat Company. Some of you would look very good in those hats.

You see him sitting there with these people whom he collected to be in the Ambulance Corps. And they served very bravely. Going out under fire to rescue wounded people. They are mentioned in dispatches which is, you know, what you want to have happen at that period. And there is an expectation – we have to be very careful here what this is doing, what it's not doing. There is an expectation that when he has served the empire so courageously, when the empire prevails in this conflict, they are going to be recognized and rewarded.

Now here's the point we have to be careful about. He didn't do it in order to get rewarded. He's very clear about that. If that had happened we would be down here in this range of action acting for the fruits. And then also, I think, we would have to say that it would be manipulative. You do not enter into a question of life and death in order to manipulate others. But there was an expectation. This scene is going to be repeated

exactly in 1918. There's an expectation in having fought for the empire, the situation will improve. Well, folks, think again. If anything is going to happen, it's going to get worse.

Gandhi and Gokhale

In 1903, after the conclusion of the war, he goes back to India with his family and sets up practice in Bombay. After spending a month with a very important person, Gopal Krishna Gokhale, who is sort of the guru of Indian nationalism in that era. And the relationship between him and Gandhi is going to get very, very tight and very, very sweet. Gokhale is going to come to South Africa, eventually. Gandhi and him argue about who's the master and who's the servant. And constantly each trying to serve the other. It's a fun story to read about.

But he spends a month with Gokhale which is going to be very important and sets up law practice in Bombay. And within a few months, as he says in his autobiography, "It was all for nothing. Urgent telegrams arrived telling him that the post-war treatment is, if anything, worse than the pre-war treatment of the Indians there." And he has to return after just, you know, setting up his law practice. He has to tear it apart again, go back to South Africa with his family this time. So, he knows he's going to be there for the long haul.

Return to South Africa - Influence of John Ruskin

In 1904 an important little event takes place in Gandhi's development. He's on the train to Johannesburg, I believe, where it's going to be his headquarters for his law practice and everything. And I think the person who did this was a man named Polak. About half to two-thirds of Gandhi's European friends in South Africa are of Jewish extraction. Polak is the first – Henry Polak. Polak says, "Well, Gandhi or Mohandas," or whatever he called him, "I know you're going on a long trip and you're going to need something to read when your laptop runs out of juice." So here, he hands him this book called, "Unto this Last," by John Ruskin.

And this book has a revolutionary impact on Gandhi. So, of course, I ran out and read it. It had no impact on me at all. I'm not sure what the difference is, but this book is the first time that Gandhi found any external support for something that is beginning to become very deep in him, and that is to realize that if you want to have a different kind of impact on society you have to live in a different way. You can't drive your Lexus up to Starbucks and reach out your hand and get a non-fair-trade latte and then zip around and step on the picket line in front of the School of the Americas. You have to have a different attitude towards material work and possessions. Of course, this will become the famous theory that Gandhi will elaborate on. Today we call it "Gandhian Economics," which we'll talk about at the very end of the course.

But he's beginning to realize that in order to cultivate yourself spiritually, you have to live a different life than the kind of life that's being lived by – and mind you, in those days, it was relatively mild compared to the luxuries and the electronic gimcracks that we live with today. And so, when he reads this book of Ruskin who talks about the dignity of labor and simplicity of economic life that would be sustainable – he doesn't quite use that term – it really hits him. And when he steps off the train, Gandhi is a different person.

He says, "We need to form a community somewhere." This is the first hippy farm in the 20th century. And so, Henry Polak – with the help of Henry Polak – he starts a community called, "Phoenix Farm." Let me pause on this a little bit because as an important dimension of Gandhi's life, his career – everybody's got this, I hope and expect? [Erases chalkboard] Okay. And even though it means reaching ahead a little bit it will be helpful for us to remember – and I've got just enough time to wrap it up.

Gandhi's Communities

There are going to be four of these communities. And each one is going to be called something else. So, let's do it this way. Let's go to dates, helper who either puts up the money – usually they do put up the money and sometimes they also live in the community and help you. So, in the first case it is Henry Polak. Well, let's put the name out here. Name of this place is Phoenix Settlement. What he chooses to call it will be important for a reason I'll get into in a minute. Phoenix Settlement, after the famous Phoenix bird who rises from the ashes. And this will – it's important that he's calling it a settlement and nothing more elaborate than that. And what he's going to do is move the newspaper – which we haven't talked about yet. He started a newspaper called, "Indian Opinion." He's going to move it from Johannesburg, about 20 miles out to Phoenix Settlement.

The next one – and we'll talk in greater detail about, you know, how they got voted down and so forth. That's in 1910. And here is Hermann Kallenbach who steps up to the plate. Kallenbach, another European Jewish friend who's an architect. Gandhi – it takes a lot of wealthy people to keep Gandhi in poverty. Kallenbach will buy a thousand acres, which was expensive then. Nothing like today, of course, but it was considerable. A thousand-acre farm with almost a thousand fruit trees on it – maybe much more. I forget how many fruit trees. How many fruit trees is a good example of a question we will not ask you on the mid-term? [Laughter] But it's cool to know that there were a lot of fruit trees, and it was a real farm.

And then in 1915, back in India, when he arrives there he has to get his people into a settlement. Let me just do this rather quickly. This is going to be called, "Sabarmati Ashram," because it's on the banks of the Sabarmati River and it's an ashram. So – duh – you call it Sabarmati Ashram. And the person who helps him here does not have a lot of money. It's his nephew, Maganlal, who was definitely being groomed to be his

successor. Maganlal died young of an illness. It was one the greatest blows that Gandhi ever had to endure.

And finally, in 1934 he found another rich person to hang with. This is Jamnalal Bajaj who – the Bajaj fund puts up a huge prize for Gandhians today. Best Gandhian work in India, best Gandhian work outside of India. Where are we? And this is called, “Sevagram, or Village of Service.” Sevagram Ashram. Now let me just point out one thing of significance, before you go, in the nomenclature, and that is these things are called settlement or farm, but when he gets back to India he decides to – what do we call it today? To come out? Yeah. He starts to come out as a spiritual teacher. And from then on he says, “Wherever I live is an ashram.” An ashram is a traditional spiritual community.

Okay, very good. So, we will continue this story on Thursday and then stop for a bit and take stock of where we’ve – what we’ve covered. Remember, if you’re interested in having fun on Sunday, talk to Jordan.

8. The First Phase 2: Arrival in South Africa to the Birth of Satyagraha (1893-1906)

Michael: This is also the launch of the Peace Pledge – Declaration of Peace in Iraq. I just got off the phone with people in Washington D.C. – not the people inside the White House – the people outside the White House. About 20 people have been arrested so far in civil disobedience actions and attempting to enter the White House to present the petition. The president didn't want to hear from them for some reason, so they had to take things to the next step. And about 300 people are there.

There was a press conference this morning at about 9 o'clock our time, about noon Washington D.C. time. So, keep these people in your prayers or whatever you do because, you know, however accurate or inaccurate we may be doing it – I'm sorry – I mean they may be doing it, this is an attempt to use the power of nonviolence against a – very clearly to them, to us – very clearly unjust and completely hopeless act of violence which is the Iraq War. And I have some posters about the Declaration of Peace here.

There's also going to be a celebration of the International Day of Peace at Sproul. And when I leave here I'm going to try to scamper right over there to rescue Jordan who'll be speaking in my stead until I get there. So, when we finish here, if you don't have a class right after and you don't need lunch or anything like that, you might want to get over to the plaza. There are about, incidentally, about 500 organizations and well over 10,000 people who are taking part in the Declaration actions.

Those of you who were interested in helping out and joining the Petaluma Progressives there on Sunday try to get a hold of Jordan later today by phone. That's the only way we can do the last bit of organizing. Good.

So, as I told you, I was at a conference yesterday called, "The Science of Peace." And I tried to take away some things that would be relevant for what we've been saying. And my main message is, that the main thing that I came away with is – we were so right. Everything that I was saying about science is being amply confirmed and heavily researched – relatively speaking – by this very progressive leading group of people. This is not the American Association for the Advancement of Science. This is a rather special leading-edge group.

And I used to say that it was a rather New Age group, but I think they're actually getting their act together and doing serious scientific research. There are two foundations which have done funding in the neighborhood of millions of dollars on the subject of love. So, anything you want to know about love, i.e., which hormones are involved, they've been doing a lot of research on that.

But in particular for us, what I thought would be efficient, before we get back to our subject – I'm sure we can use this diagram at some point. I don't know exactly how. There are two technical terms I came away with that will be helpful for us. And it's an efficient way of summarizing for you what they're doing in this work.

Neuroplasticity

There's a concept called, "Neuroplasticity," and that refers to the ability of the central nervous system to change and regenerate under environmental or intentional impulses.

Now when I went to medical school – yes, I did go to medical school. It was a long time ago – we were told by the time you're an adult you have X brain cells and that's it. You're never going to get a new one. Enjoy the ones that you've got. Don't drink too much alcohol; it kills them. And they cannot ever be regenerated. We were told this was an absolute, certain finding of science. And I remind you how Norman Cousins used to say, "That it's funny how hard science changes every 25 years and soft science has been the same since the dawn of recorded history."

Well, they now found out that there are stem cells in the brain, in those terrible things that you're not supposed to touch because it's a sin. And these stem cells – let's say you lose a neuron up here for some reason or another and so there's an empty – a gap in the wiring – to use that analogy. I think we've pushed that analogy too far. But there's a dead neuron over here. The stem cell over here will morph into the right kind of neuron and transport itself through the brain to the right place, line itself up, and make the synaptic connections at both ends. It will solder itself into the wiring, so to speak. So, the kind of thoughts that we think create an atmosphere which even shape the kind of tissue we have in our central nervous system.

Epigenetics

The other term I came away with that I hadn't known before is "epigenetics." The name of Barbara McClintock wasn't mentioned, but this was her discovery – that the organism uses the genes. The genes do not create the organism. When the genome project started they figured with the amount of information that a gene possesses and can express to create a human being – this is amazing that they were able to calculate this – but they calculated that to create a human being you needed 100,000 genes. Berkeley student, maybe 120,000. But you're sort of in this ballpark.

And when the genome project was over they discovered that the genetic complement is 20,000 genes. So, it's 1/5th of the amount that would be needed if the process were taking place the way they thought it was – that the genes simply express the phenom – the phenotype, which is their term for the visible human being. So that was one problem.

Then they discovered that a given gene can create 30,000 different expressions. So, it is not at all believed by any geneticist anymore that we are determined by our genes in the sense that, you know, it wouldn't make any difference to us in terms of this research in nonviolence. The organism uses genes as kind of codes or keys to unlock certain doors and create certain things, but we have no idea who the organism is [or] how it decides which genes to use. So, the whole concept of genetic determinism has fallen out, although trust me, it's not going to disappear from the mass media any time soon. And the geneticists who were there were as angry about that as I am. So, we decided that we're going to create a document to set the situation straight.

Growth Mode vs Protection Mode

I also discovered some interesting things, that a living system – a biological system can be either in growth mode or protection mode, but not in both. In growth mode you take in information of one kind or another from the environment. In protection mode, you shut it down. Now if this analogy works socially, then as a society we're trying to be in permanent protection mode. And that's death for an organism. It does not work that way. An organism is not an isolated unit. It's an energy processing unit that thermodynamically takes in energy from the environment and puts it back out to the environment.

So, if we keep saying, "It's Orange Alert, Pink Alert, Green Alert, Red alert, you know, take shoes off and go through this machine," don't crack any jokes. This is a mode that you can only sustain for a very short period. To try to make a permanent policy out of that is probably fatal for us socially – certainly very dangerous.

Another neat thing – research on infants trying to detect how much they have absorbed security from their parents. They have found that the only way that you can test whether an infant is having – is giving you a certain signal is by having a trained researcher there. Only a human being can do this. Like let's say a trained graduate student. They tried all kinds of ways to set up machines or measure oxytocin levels and things like that, nothing works. Only a human being can pick up the signals from a human being of the significant kind that we're interested in.

And then finally, the other stuff will probably be coming to me, and I'll be processing it. It was a very rich day. But I just wanted to share a little story with you. It's probably not relevant to anything, but it's a nice story. You know how an infant has a grasping reflex? You give an infant your finger, it will grasp it. The infant does not care whether you're related to it, which finger it is, if you're the right race or whether you voted Republican, any of those things. It sees a finger, feels a finger, it's going to grasp.

Well, there was a man who had to deliver his own son for some reason. Either he was an obstetrician, or they were trapped on a desert island or something. Had to deliver his son and there was a little problem.. The baby got stuck in the birth canal. So, he

reached his hand in to help the baby out. It grabbed his finger. “Hi dad, it’s me. I’m hanging on. Pull for all you’re worth, dad.” So, I really liked that.

Well, with that, let’s get back to our history. I stopped at the end of Tuesday to give us a list of the history of Gandhi’s four communities. So, what I’d like to do now with that kind of segue is back up a little bit to the year 1894 when Gandhi was not particularly active politically and talk about several things that nonetheless happened for him in the course of that year.

Intro to Restorative Justice

One is he came to South Africa as a lawyer, intending to have a law career, and eventually he would discover that this was not his sva-dharma – though I’m not aware that he ever used the word.

But in the meantime, he made a discovery for himself which is quite significant. A lot of PACS majors do go into law school and very few of them end up practicing law. He made the discovery of what the law was really for. He said, “This institution has the purpose of uniting parties who are riven asunder.” Not to defend the interests of Party A who has hired the lawyer against Party B, who has hired another lawyer, but it is a kind of conflict resolution mechanism.

And later on in the semester we’ll be talking about an anthropologist, actually, who was a literary critic – but all literary critics had to become anthropologists at one point in the 70’s – by the name of René Girard who talks about the extreme importance of law, that when it was originally developed as a means of circumventing the scapegoat mechanism, which was the only way that societies had to limit violence up to that point.

We’re going to get back to that, but the point I’m making here is that the law was originally instituted to, “Unite parties riven asunder.” That purpose had been completely forgotten because you come in, you sense the power. I mean my – as you know, my son-in-law is a doctor. I keep mentioning that. It’s just an old habit in certain communities – my son-in-law the doctor. And he had a patient one time who was a lawyer who had worked on the big tobacco suit and was on the winning side – the government side. Tobacco companies haven’t actually paid anything, but that’s a different matter.

But this is the biggest suit – antitrust suit ever. It wasn’t an antitrust suit, I guess. It was about the health damage of cigarettes and cigarette advertising. And this lawyer was paid 10% of the settlement. And he showed my son-in-law the check. I didn’t actually see this check. It was a personal check made out to him, John Lawyer for a billion two. Now I’ve never seen – the biggest check I ever saw was \$20,000, and I found that lying on a Xerox machine in University Avenue. So once people get a sense of how much power is involved, the original purpose of this profession – noble as it was – gets forgotten.

So that was one thing that Gandhi used, this kind of relatively slow year, kind of a start-up year in terms of his personal development, one of the things he used it for. Another one was – and, of course, this is going to prove to be even more important – he started to delve into religion.

Spirituality and Overcoming Fear with a Mantram

He came from a family where religion was kind of second nature. He absorbed a certain amount of spirituality from his parents, particularly his mother.

And you're probably aware from reading "Gandhi, the Man," or other parts of the early biographies, that he was very, very frightened as a kid. Scared of everything. And the family nurse whose name is Rambha, taught him to use a mantram – just repeat a spiritual formula. In his case it was, "Rama Rama Rama." And this is a very powerful spiritual technique. The only reason people don't use it is that it's too simple, and you don't have to pay for it. If they make it a little more complicated and sell it for a large amount of money, I'm sure everybody would use a mantram.

But he was able to overcome his fears as a child. And then that leveraged into his incredible fearlessness as an adult. He just absolutely was devoid of fear. The worst thing you could do if you were, say, a British official and Gandhi was getting in your face, the worst thing you could do was threaten him. It always had exactly the opposite of the intended effect. And that all came from this constant repetition of a mantram.

Here's this woman, Rambha, about whom we know exactly this one fact. Nothing else. And yet she played one of the most important roles in history. So, Gandhi's spirituality is developing and he's in an area, time, and space – culture space – where religion is very important. Christian missionaries and just Christian people are working very hard to convert him. They sense that he is a, you know, he's a valuable prize. And oh, they worked on him. I mean, "Will you, please, Mr. Gandhi." They tried everything.

I mean to hand it to them, they thought they were saving his soul. And also, part of them thought that they wanted him to be on their team. It was partly selfless, partly selfish motive we have to assume. But even his best friends in that early period, like Reverend Doke, who was the first person to write a biography of Gandhi, which will later be sent to Tolstoy. It was a very important book then. They completely failed to persuade him.

He had had a very bad encounter with Christianity in India where missionaries would be reviling and dissing the Hindu gods. You know, they'd stand on street corners and try to tell Hindus that they were pagans, and they were going to go straight to hell. So, he had that bad taste in his mouth to begin with, but he was open-minded and went to a number of church services, which probably was very enticing for all of these Christians there. But he never felt – there were two things that never happened for him religiously. He never actually had a guru. There was this [Jiang Jewler 00:17:21] in Bombay who was sort of a mentor to him, but he never could quite take that final step, in his own

language, “of enshrining him in my heart as my spiritual teacher.” So, he never met anyone who was the, “The man,” or “The woman.” The living spiritual person for him. And he never was tempted to convert from Hinduism.

Religion and Swadeshi

However, he did begin to feel, even at this early period, that in the modern world, it is wrong for a person to practice one religion and not have respect for others. It’s important to practice your own faith. At one point, years later, E.F. Schumacher will go to Gandhi and say, “I’m so impressed with what you people have worked out. I’m going to become a Buddhist.” And Gandhi said, “Don’t you dare do that. You go back and be a good Christian. That’s where you were born. That’s where you need to stay. That’s where we need you.” This is an important principle called, “Swadeshi.” That we’ll talk about at various points.

And similarly, he never left the Hindu fold, but he spent his whole life trying to reform the way it was interpreted and practiced. And he made it a big point later on in life that every child’s education should include the reverent study of all major religions. Reverent study, not just, “Oh, look what they do.” But really try to get into their head and appreciate and understand why they have certain practices and what we’re all sharing in common as human beings reaching for something that we call, “The Divine.” So that was the second thing.

Compromise on Inessentials

He got his first taste of public life in this period – 1894. And he learned an important little technique which is to compromise on inessentials. And that will be very characteristic of the mature Gandhi and very, very important for the way that he operated. The more you compromised on inessentials, the more you could be absolutely firm on essentials. So, this required discrimination. You have to know what’s essential and what is not. You cling to what’s essential. I guess that actually should come first. And once you are really fastened onto it – this is your Satyagraha, the truth that you hold onto – everything else can be negotiated away. And he would go so far with that that on a number of occasions his people did not understand what he was doing, and they thought he was selling them out and he is going to get badly beaten up in a few years when we get back to the history part because of that.

But the one issue that made this clear for him was he wanted to – he was an attorney. So, he got to present a case in court. And when he appeared at the court, he was almost the only non-European attorney in the whole system.

He showed up wearing his turban and the judge said, “You can’t come in here wearing a turban.” And he refused to take it off. So, the judge said, “Then you have no admission to the court.” And he left. But one year later he decided, you know, I have

very important work to do in there, and it's not about wearing a turban. So, he took the turban off and went into court. So, he didn't cling to that little item of a dress code as this is the whole issue. He was willing to compromise that away and do the work that he had to do.

I mean I, myself, sometimes feel uncomfortable with compromises. I have this image of Gandhi that, you know, he's sort of a Tinker-bell. Not a real human being and that should never, never give away anything. But that's not how he saw it. And his own people have even bigger problems with him.

Persuasion vs Coercion

Okay, thirdly, he developed his style of taking the community along with him. And I guess I would put this under the rubric of persuasion versus coercion. Even where he had the opportunity to get a large number of people to do what he wanted them to do temporarily and then go home, he never wanted them to do it unless they understood what they were doing. I'm going to come up to the very important example of that in the famous meeting of September 11th.

But all along the way he is willing to go irritatingly slowly and bring everybody along with him rather than to leap forward with a large number of people who are not sure what they're doing or why. So, you'll never find Gandhi marching around and chanting, "Hey, hey, ho, ho Western Civ Has got to go." That is a thing that we have all done at various times. It's not pushing people's buttons and getting them to behave in a certain way. He would spend hours with people going over petitions with them, teaching them English if necessary so they could understand what was happening.

Importance of Internal Improvement

And finally, the fourth thing we've already talked about on Tuesday. And that was the famous sentence, "Side by side with external agitation, the question of internal improvement was also taken up." And I got inordinately excited about that because I know this leads to the development of constructive programme.

So, this was an important time for him in terms of his personal growth, and what we're going to see is that he has different – I don't want to say different strings to his bow. That would be the wrong metaphor. He has different dimensions in which he can operate. And that means if you thwart him in one way, he'll just use one of the other ways. So, you can always be moving forward. You can always be growing. And when the occasion presents itself, he'll do it in a public way. When the occasion does not, he'll do it in a private way.

He will go to London in 1931 to be part of the Roundtable Conference. The conference itself was a complete bust. He gets absolutely nowhere, but while he's there he makes

friends with the poor people in the East End, and he meets hundreds of people that even wanted him to meet Charlie Chaplin. He didn't know who Charlie Chaplin was, however, so that one didn't come off. He was always – he always had different ways of making use of his time. And if you frustrated him completely in the outside world – like putting him in jail and stuff – he would come out of jail a deeper person. And some of his coworkers noticed this every time. He would go in for six years, maybe come out in two and he'd be a different person. Because jail was his only time to really practice his spiritual disciplines.

Okay, so then we were up to the reading of, “Unto this last,” and the founding of the first community, Phoenix Settlement, which is where I stopped for a bit and went into the history of the four communities. But now we are in the Transvaal mostly and partly in Natal, and he has his headquarters in Johannesburg. These are the steps that are leading up to the big meeting.

General Smuts, who is becoming his biggest adversary – and he's an interesting person, by the way. The term “holistic” that we use all the time, you know. Like give me a holistic sandwich. It's a very common term for us. He actually coined that term, believe it or not – Gandhi's chief adversary in South Africa. He had pointed out that Indians are disliked in South Africa for their simplicity, patience, perseverance, frugality, and other worldliness. He was the one who would come up very honest on that.

And the Transvaal was trying to limit immigration – further immigration of Indians into that colony. And also starting to crack down on the Indians who were already within in. And there was a department of the government called, “The Asiatic Department,” which was sort of like the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the U.S. of A., in that you're supposed to make sure that everybody got just and equitable treatment, but actually the members of the department were all European and they used it as an organ of the government.

And in the Asiatic Department there was a man named Lionel Curtis who decided under an act called, “The Peace Preservation Order,” sort of like the Homeland Security Act – which is a slightly legal thing. He came up with a law called, “The Asiatic Law Amendment Ordinance,” which is going to be introduced into the legislative council. Now I actually made a mistake last time – I know this is extremely rare. I said that when the first Asiatic Act was disallowed by Lord Ripon in England, that a trick was involved. That was wrong. That was actually straight up, and they actually eventually got that law stopped.

Paradox of Repression

But now here in the Transvaal, Curtis will bring in this law and as one historian points out, “Mr. Curtis, inadvertently precipitated a turning point in the Satyagraha Movement.” And this is a principle which we now have a name for. And you're going to hear a lot about in 164B, and that is called today, “the paradox of repression.”

And the way it works is this – when it works. Because of your repression of another group, you’re getting into a kind of dominance relationship with them, which is inherently unjust and false in the sense, you know, capital T “Truth.” It’s inherently unstable, people never lie down and say, “Okay, go ahead. Dominate me forever.” As one of our commanding officers in Iraq said recently, “We’re making terrorists ten times faster – we’re killing terrorists.” No, how did he put it? “We’re making terrorists faster than we can kill them.” By using a repressive mechanism, we make the problem worse.

Well, a repressive regime will almost always come to a point where it’s starting to lose control, and then it will be tempted to crack down. And when it cracks down, instead of the people buckling under, they fight back, and the thing blows up in your face. It’s a fairly common dynamic that you’ll see in all kinds of conflict. We have a thing called, “blowback,” that the Secret Service, the security agencies use, where we recruit people to help you and they end up – once they get their training – being against you.

Well, the paradox of repression is quite similar to that. And if you are clever – thinking of “you” as a part of the resistance – the resistant community – if you are clever, you can actually lure the oppressors into doing something that has got to lash back at them. In fact, it’s not just nonviolent resisters who do this. I believe that it’s an incontestable, historical fact that President Roosevelt, FDR, knew that the Japanese were going to attack Pearl Harbor. He pulled some of his most modern aircraft out of that island, but he didn’t say anything about it, and he let the attack happen because he knew or felt that that was the only way to get the American people sufficiently roused to enter the war. That was an aside.

But to get back to our story, what’s happening is the Indians are beginning to build up a capacity to resist. The regime includes people in it who are pretty wooden-headed, and they think, “Oh, they’re trying to resist, are they? Well, let’s slam them harder.” And when they slam them harder, they fight back harder. So up until that point the Indians really hadn’t had anything to rally around, but this act was horrendous. Again, he was at a kind of social gathering. Someone handed it to him. He left the house, went up on a hill and read it. And he came back shaken.

He said, “I see nothing in this but hatred of the Indians. And if we let them pass this, then we’ll be finished here.” And this is the act which he describes in that famous scene in the movie. You can enter a person’s home without a warrant, and you have to show your license all the time. You have to be fingerprinted, which would basically be something that they only did for criminals and so on.

And so, the meeting is called, as you now know well, on September 11th. And I keep saying there’s 6000 people there, but that was an exaggeration, apparently. From what I’ve been reading recently it was about 3000 people, but who’s counting? So, a whole bunch of people. Mainly free Indians and some laborers. And Gandhi came in with the idea that he was going to get these people to sign a pledge that they would resist the act. But there was a Muslim businessman in the audience, Sheth Haji Habib who was

deeply moved and sprang to his feet and said, “As God is my witness, I will never obey this act.” And Gandhi was stunned.

He realized that this is deeper than he had bargained for, and he was once again on the horns of a dilemma. Are we going to go for this or are we going to say, “Hey, wait a minute? Sheth Habib, I’m just talking pledge. I’m not talking about swearing an oath.” I want to back up just a little bit here.

Zulu "Rebellion"

In the summer, just a few months before this happened there took place what was known as the Zulu Rebellion. That’s how it is known by European histories, “The Zulu Rebellion.”

Actually, what happened was the Zulus had to pay a certain tax to the colonial officials. At one point there was a village person – head man, I think – who did not want to pay this tax. When the tax collector came to collect it, they had a certain kind of weapon called an *assegai*. It was a very – it was like a .357 magnum spear. He *assegai’d* this tax collector and they – the British colonials, European colonials in general – were furious and they unleashed this punitive expedition against the Zulus.

And the British – or I shouldn’t keep saying British. In this case – again, in this case it was, anyway, under British control. This after the Boer War. The colonials, anyway, would not even treat the wounded Zulus. So, this is, again, the second time that Gandhi forms an ambulance corps. There’s a very poignant scene he will describe some years later when he’s in prison with a Zulu person. They don’t have a common language. They can’t speak to one another, but this person has been bitten by a scorpion – stung, I guess, by a scorpion. Gandhi will come and make a little cross – incision on the wound and suck the venom out. And he said the look on this man’s face, you know, the gratitude and the first time he’s been treated decently as a human being was just transfiguring.

If you don’t mind, I’m sort of in narrative mode today. So, I’m thinking of stories. There will be a story many years later in India – this story is not directly involving Gandhi. It involves Charlie Andrews, C.F. Andrews. He was in an area where there was an Indian who was very loyal to an imperial administration. He had some kind of official – I think he even had military service. He always considered himself a very loyal Indian. Somebody sabotaged a telegraph line. They blamed it on this person, and they came and beat him. And he was so hurt, not by the physical beating so much, as by the offence to his dignity, that he became paralyzed. He could not get out of bed. And Charlie Andrews heard about this, and he said, “I want to go and see this man.”

He came to him, and we walked in, and he said a few words of apology. He said, “I’m sorry my people have done this to you.” The man said, “I don’t want to hear about it. Get out of here. I don’t want to see another white face in this room.” The next thing you

know, Charlie Andrews prostrated himself and took the dust of this man's feet. Very powerful gesture. The man got up out of bed then and there. That's almost as good as the finger clutching story in utero, right?

I just wanted to illustrate that these gestures of respect that cross barriers like that, where a human being has been so severely disrespected that it impacts them physically, even that physical damage can be overcome by an act of respect.

Commitment of Trusteeship

So anyway, in the Zulu engagement, I think, reading between the lines, I get the impression that Gandhi saw for the first time how brutal the racial system really was and how much it was going to take to overcome it. As I said, they weren't even treating the wounded Zulus. They were leaving them there to die and only the Indian Ambulance Corps was taking care of them. And when he began to see really how huge the problem was that he was up against, he did something very typical of him and of Indians who have his kind of spiritual upbringing. He said, "I'm going to have to renounce some stuff to get enough power to deal with this."

And he takes these two horrific vows – as you probably have read, and I may have mentioned – he vowed that from that point on he would not possess anything. Everything that he used; he would regard as a tool. And eventually this would become his Doctrine of Trusteeship which is probably the central part of Gandhian economics. So, we'll come back to this later on. If you don't quite understand it now, that's okay. But from that point on he would never own anything in a normal sense of the word.

And he also decided – he and Kasturba, his wife, had been kind of experimenting with sexual abstinence and he decided to take a vow and lock it in, so to speak. So, he took this famous vow of brahmacharya. And three months later – I see a causal connection here. Three months later he's up against this terrific opportunity, and he feels that his hour has come, and he should really go for it.

So, he says, "Okay, stop." Let's think this through very carefully. And he conferred with the other people up on the stage and they decided to put this thing forward as a pledge. But he said, "For me, once I take a step like this I will never go back. And it does not matter, even if I am the only person doing it. If all 3,000 of you, if the whole community goes back on it, it has no bearing on my commitment. This is an absolute commitment. And, he said, "I want every one of you to look in your heart and see if you have the commitment. If you do, then when I give the signal you stand up and we take this oath together. If you don't, I want you to resist us. Give me some trouble here."

People Power, Person Power, and State Power

Now there's a very important principle here also – so we're getting a run of important principles. And this is a term that I've coined actually – give you the other one first. There is a concept that's pretty well known in nonviolence which is People Power as opposed – I better erase some stuff and put this up higher. People Power as opposed to State Power. You know, State Power operates through mechanisms, armed police and so forth, the army, the legislature, and the media and stuff like that. And it always looks as if it has absolute power, but somehow every now and then it just gets overthrown.

And to explain the kind of popular uprising that overthrows it, people have coined the term, "People Power." And they see the situation as – go over here. State Power, which is one type, organized in one way versus people power which has a tendency to flare up and then go back down. And most nonviolence research is on this subject, on this level of organization. But what I'm trying to add into the mix is another kind of power called, "Person Power," which acknowledges the fact that there is almost unlimited potential within the individual human being if we only knew how to bring it into play.

And at various times Gandhi will actually implement this. In 1942 he wants to have Satyagraha against the British but they're waging a bit of a war and they're a little distracted so he can't quite get their attention and he doesn't want to take advantage of their paying attention elsewhere. That's absolutely ruled out. So, the only way to do so is to have a Satyagraha of one. And he appointed Vinoba Bhave to conduct Satyagraha against the entire British Empire by himself. It was a useful compromise.

You have to have Satyagraha, but you can't really cause them any trouble. You have to show them that you're still alive and you still don't accept the regime. And he would say that one person can make a difference if it's the right person. In fact – so just go down the road about two years, 1908, there comes a lull in the Satyagraha because the power was on the side – time was on the side of the government. They could take away your money, they could shut down your businesses, cancel your license, they could put you in jail. So, they kept on wearing away, wearing away at the Satyagraha and people are falling back.

At one point Gandhi is in prison with a fellow prisoner who describes what happened. He was acting as a secretary – kind of a secretary for the movement and Gandhi said, "Well, how many Satyagrahis do we have left?" And the man did a quick count and he said, "I'm sorry, we only have 40." And that's not enough to overthrow an empire. So, Gandhi said, "Who are they? Read out their names?" And he started reading out these names. And these were his best Satyagrahis. These were brilliant people. It was wonderful. And as the names are being read out, Gandhi's getting more and more enthusiastic. At the end of this readout of the list Gandhi is in a state which made – what he said made such an impression on this man that he writes it down word for word. Twenty-five years later he said, "These 40 will become 40,000."

Okay, in 1912, just before the end of the Satyagraha they did a quick count. Guess what? It was exactly 40,000 Satyagrahis. So, I mean you can forget about the number

part. I'm not trying to claim that Gandhi saw into the future or anything like that. But what I am claiming is that he saw that power had a lot more to do with who you are and what kind of power, the depth of it, than with the numbers.

So once you understand person power – you see, there's really three, not two kinds of power, and that helps. It's not just a duality. My friend Houston Smith likes to say, "The universe can count higher than two." We tend to forget that. So, you have three different kinds of power or loci of power. And it matters because you no longer feel that your first move always has to be to collect lots and lots of people. When you feel you have to do that, your next move is – well, it doesn't matter whether they really go along with it or not.

But do note that in 1906 at the Empire Theatre, what happened was he said, "Please, people, do not join us unless you're willing to do it all by yourself." And he said, "Okay, who wants to stand up?" Every single person stood up. He said, "I've never forgotten that scene." So, person power is not always at the expense of people power. If you have 3,000 committed people, then you've got both. And there are times when you need numbers, no question about it. But we get so fascinated with the number side of things we tend to forget that it's the depth of commitment that matters more than the numbers. So just be alert to that, and you'll see lots of examples of ones that don't involve Gandhi personally, and those that do. So, there we are.

The Black Act

And they decided then that they would not obey this Act which they called, "The Black Act." Gandhi goes to England to see what he can do about getting it forestalled. And this is the event that I was thinking about. Lord Elgin, who's the Secretary of State for the colonies – you know that name because if you've been to the National Museum in London you've seen something called, "The Elgin Marbles." And those marbles actually were born and raised in Greece. The Greek government has been negotiating for quite a few years now to get them back.

But anyway, Elgin disallowed the law, but he forgot to point out to Gandhi that the colony was going to become free by the time he got back to India. And so, he steps off the boat and says, you know, "The law has been disallowed." The next week they just rewrote it under a different constitution, and they had no recourse to the British government anymore. So, this law is scheduled to come into effect in July of 1907. It passed in March of 1906.

At the end of June 1907, there was a meeting in Pretoria attended by 2,000 Indians who were urged by representatives of the Transvaal government to go along with the registration. And they said to the government, "Never." It's a famous – it's like if you've ever traveled around in Greece you probably heard about "Oxi day." Oxi is the modern Greek word for "No." This happened when the Italians were about to invade Greece in 1942 or whatever it was. They said, "You know, we're about to invade your country, and

you're a pushover, of course. But if you want to surrender before we come in, you can really save a lot of trouble." And they sent back a single word telegram which was, "Oxi." It wasn't even in Italian. So, they added insult to injury. And that became a national holiday.

So, it's in that spirit the Indians declared – and this is Pretoria now, not the Transvaal – that they would never go along with the Act. So, in the beginning of July of 1907 the government opened registration offices for people to come in and register. And the campaign was a brilliant success. There are close to 100,000 Indians in the various colonies of South Africa and the total number of registered was 511. So, it was a complete failure from the government's point-of-view.

Filling Jails with Satyagrahis

And then in December the government sent notices to leading community members, and that included Gandhi by this time, that they had to appear in court to explain why they were not cooperating with the law. And they gave them deportation notices to leave within 48 hours. And then in January the court order expired, and Gandhi and the others had to appear for sentencing. So, this is the first time that Gandhi was imprisoned. And it's the first time that the Satyagraha technique of filling jails to show the injustice of the system and elicit sympathy from the public was used.

And within a few days 150 arrested Indians had been jailed in Johannesburg. And this is going to be the story now for the next eight years. Repeated negotiating, jailing, negotiating, and jailing. I guess I just started today by mentioning that we had 30 people arrested in Washington D.C., so this is a story that goes on and on.

Gandhi and Smuts

Then there was a famous meeting which was not shown in the film, but it took place in the same month, January of '08. Albert Cartwright, who was an editor of a Transvaal newspaper, came to visit Gandhi representing Smuts.

In other words, making the first move of the government towards the Indians by way of negotiation. So, this is a tremendous breakthrough. And Gandhi met with Smuts, as you saw in the film. And Smuts said, "I assure you that I will repeal the Asiatic Act as soon as you have undergone voluntary registration." This is a compromise that they worked out. And it's kind of interesting. You might feel uncomfortable with this compromise, but in terms of Gandhian principles it made perfect sense.

He said, "Look," in effect, he said, "what we object to is being told what to do. We object to this stuff being forced upon us. And being deprived of our freedom of judgment. We don't object to the passes as a piece of paper. We object to being told that we have to fill them out. So, here's a compromise. I will get the Indians to fill them out voluntarily.

And it's no insult to us. We haven't perpetuated this power imbalance. This is something we will do voluntarily. And you agree to repeal the Asiatic Act when we've done that. Okay?" So, it looks like a perfectly good deal.

He goes back and tries to explain. He's let out of prison, goes back and tries to explain to the people that they're going to take these passes out voluntarily. They start doing that. And it's on this occasion that one of these Indians whom he has gotten very inspired, who's a Pathan, they tend to express themselves pretty physically – keep this in mind when we're talking about the Phatan story in the 1930's and Abdul Ghaffar Khan. But this Pathan named Mir Alam, he thinks that Gandhi is betraying the community. He's been in there talking to Smuts. "You've got yourself out of prison. You're getting us to all sign these things. I am a Pathan. I will never sign it." And he lays in wait for Gandhi at one of these meetings and falls upon him and beats him up.

Now Gandhi weighs – he's probably a little bit shorter than I am. Same size ears probably. About up to here. And at his fattest he weighed about 102 pounds. And this Pathan is probably like – I'm imagining him as – since I have racial stereotypes in my mind – imagining him as this huge burly, six-foot individual. And he was definitely more than a match for Gandhi. And, of course, Gandhi was not physically defending himself. And again, he was beaten unconscious and taken to the home of Reverend Doke for recuperation.

And again, the minute he became conscious he said he did not want to persecute Mir Alam. And just to finish that story, later on when Mir Alam understands what has happened, they will appear on stage together as brothers and shake hands. So, at this point the Indians are beginning – well, I'm sorry. There's another point I have to tell you about. So, here's the setup. They're going to voluntarily register, which is a big thing to do, you know? It could be misinterpreted. In fact, Gandhi almost gets killed trying to get his community to agree to do it. And Smuts will repeal the act.

Well, anybody want to take a quick guess what actually happened? Yeah, of course he didn't repeal the act. So, this is the first of two or three dirty tricks that we're going to unfortunately come up with. And it's at this point, of course, that they thought – most of the community thought that Gandhi had betrayed them. But they are now starting to take matters into their own hands. And they set a specific date. August 16th, 1908.

It's not unlike what the Declaration of Peace has done. If you don't give us a plan by September 21st to get out of Iraq, we're going to start civil disobedience. So, what they said was, "If you have not repealed the Black Act by August 16th, we are going to burn our registration cards that we have voluntarily signed." August 16th comes and goes, and they show up at a mosque in Johannesburg Park, the Hamidia Mosque. About 2,300 Indians who solemnly file by and throw their registration passes into the fire.

The scene that you saw in the Attenborough film where there's a constable who says, "Those passes are government property." And he beats Gandhi up and the constable screams and tries to get to him. I don't actually think any of that happened. There's no

reference to it anywhere, but it might as well have happened, you know. It's the level of defiance and all of that was accurate as far as that goes.

Baptism in Fire

So, Gandhi called this, "The Baptism in Fire." And it was a symbolic act, but it was also of real consequence. And please note this for our third general principle of the day. It's a particularly rich day for general principles. And that is the difference between symbolic and real or actual mechanisms. This all became an issue for me when at some point I just began – I kind of ran through everything that I knew about Gandhi. And Arun Gandhi, the Mahatma's grandson was visiting us at that time.

It kind of seemed to me that Gandhi had never done anything in his whole career which was only symbolic. As in waving a flag, you know. Sending a petition is not only a symbol because that's part of the legislative process. And in fact, to just overview this for a second, what you'll see is in the course of the whole development in South Africa, the community goes from mute submission to the law until Gandhi steps in. Then it goes into a petitioning phase which was brand new for them. They had never done it before. And then they looked to do things by legislative action. You know, visits to England and so forth to get the Secretary of Colonies on their side. And then when all of that fails they go into civil disobedience.

But at no point in this process – and it's very important that those steps be carried out sequentially – at no point in this process did he do anything that was purely symbolic. And the same is true of the much longer campaign back in India. Burning those passes was a symbol. In fact, okay, here is your authority over me and here's what I'm doing with it. I'm throwing it into the fire. I'm destroying it. Now, of course, to burn something is also a very powerful religious symbol in India. You're sending it up – you're offering it as sacrifice, sending it up to the gods and so forth.

But be that as it may, whether it's a special symbol or only just a general symbol that all human beings can relate to, in addition to being a symbol it was an act of civil disobedience. It was an illegal act. So, you will find that he does some things dramatically. And he often does them in such a way that they have a symbolic resonance. But I think he never relied upon just symbolism. In fact, when this occurred to me I said to Arun Gandhi, "I think your grandfather never went in for symbolism that didn't have some kind of concrete significance along with them." And he said, "You're absolutely right." That's all the confirmation I needed.

So ever since then I've been going back and looking at it. There's only one event that took place in India when the Crown Prince visits and they decided to protest, which you might think is just symbolic because they didn't lie down in front of his carriage or anything. But, you know, there may be some gray areas where it would be a little bit hard to decide, but by and large he was never behind anything which was just an expression of feelings or expression of opinion.

Gandhi and Smuts contd

Okay, at this point Smuts and Gandhi are really squared off against one another. And both men – it has to be said on Smuts' behalf also – both men are beginning to realize that they are engaged in a titanic struggle. This time – let me see where we are with the – he is now involved – I was just checking the date of Tolstoy's death which was 1910. He has gotten involved in a correspondence with Tolstoy and gotten a lot of inspiration and [unintelligible 00:59:13] from the great man who had already resigned his nobility and taken up his farmstead in Yasnaya Polyana where he's kind of like a world guru. All these peace figures are going all the way to Russia which in the early 20th century was not that easy to do – to visit him. And we was very impressed with Gandhi.

And he said to Gandhi, "What you are doing is unique in history." That individual acts of nonviolence have, of course, been a part of human life. What they didn't know – because it's even a part of pre-human life – that always goes on. But to organize it as a social movement on a large scale, this is the first time this has ever happened in history. So, Gandhi will be the first one to admit that nonviolence is, "As old as the hills." It's one of his famous statements. "I have nothing new to teach the world. Truth and nonviolence are as old as the hills."

But what he did do was he organized truth and nonviolence into a political force on a large scale. And that, as far as they knew, that had never happened before. There actually were episodes of this in ancient Israel that we're going to touch upon later. But nobody had recorded them as such. Nobody knew that this was a mechanism that you could use. And I have to add that Gandhi now begins to feel that this is the purpose of his life and everything else is only a mechanism to – use his own language again – to give an optical demonstration. Or an optical – I forget – okay. I said I was going to give you his exact words, and I can't remember what they are.

But he's going to give a demonstration of the power of nonviolence and leave that behind him as his legacy for the world to the extent that in one unguarded moment he even confessed that he was using India. Everybody's thinking, "Oh you want to free India. That's huge. This is the biggest thing I've ever heard of. I can't even free my Women's Club. You're freeing 300 million people." And yet even that was just a means to an end. The end was to make a display of nonviolence so that humanity could learn it. Of course, now it's up to us to learn it.

Okay, so I'm getting ahead of myself a little bit which is not too unusual. This is a statement from Smuts at this time of the crisis surrounding the events of 1908. "Western civilization may or may not be good." This is pretty handsome of him. "Western civilization may or may not be good, but Westerners wish to stick to it." That was true in 1908. "They made tireless endeavors to save the civilization." This is, of course, the euphemism for imposing it on other people. "They have shed rivers of blood for its sake. They have suffered great hardships in its cause. It is therefore, too late for them now to chalk out a new path for themselves."

So, whereas I don't believe that the struggle between Islam and the West today is a clash of civilizations. This was a clash of civilizations. Western civilization was based on certain principles, and it was going to stick to all of them.

Gandhi's Mission

What Gandhi had in mind as a means of building human life was an entirely different principle that was going to mean a different economy, a different criminal justice system, a different way of living in your own home, and of course, a different way of dealing with conflict. It's going to be thoroughly rebuilt.

Now you shouldn't get the impression from this that Gandhi was out to destroy every single institution, but he was going to test every institution against his new principles. "Old as the hills" new principles and decide, could we – do we have to change this one? And if so, how deeply? Can we reform it? If we can't reform it, then let's get rid of it. That was going to be his approach from here on. But you can see there's this titanic clash that's building up, personified by these two men.

And the logic that Smuts uses here is something that was recognized by another peace scholar, Kenneth Boulding, who called this, "The sacrifice trap." Probably the most painful example of a sacrifice trap that I've lived through was the Vietnam War. Because the logic was constantly, "Look, 35,000 American GI's have died in Vietnam so we can't pull out now." In other words, you've expended X amount for this project. If you stop the project, that sacrifice will have been in vain.

That's very compelling logic if you don't step back and think about larger issues like, okay, will killing 15,000 more of them make any difference? Then you have to leave under even worse circumstances. Could you not interpret that sacrifice as getting you to a negotiating position where you can now work out what the real problem is – which is practically nothing in the case of Vietnam. They didn't even have oil.

But this is a kind of logic that fastens itself on the minds of people when they're in conflict and they have not committed themselves to, or been exposed to, become aware of, nonviolence.

No Fresh Issue

All right, and now having wretched on his agreement, Smuts then struck out into a new area, which is, as I had mentioned earlier, was kind of sensitive. And that was the immigration thing. And you may feel that this is not the first or the last time that the immigration issue is going to be sensitive. But he starts to limit immigration into the Transvaal.

And this posed an interesting dilemma for the Satyagrahis. In the film you remember Smuts sitting on the side of the desk, Gandhi standing there. He just said, "I've dined at

the prison, thank you.” Doesn’t need any tea. Decides not to sit down – which struck me as uncharacteristic of Gandhi, actually. But then Smuts said, “We’ve decided to disallow that act that you took such exception to.” Gandhi says, “That’s wonderful news.” And then Smuts says, “But…” And Gandhi says, “Uh huh.” “But we have to do something else. There’s a problem.” And Gandhi says, “Somehow I thought there would be.” And Smuts says, “We’re not going to allow any further immigration into the Transvaal.”

And Gandhi says – you have to watch this very carefully. You have to actually – pardon my expression here – you have to read his lips, okay? Gandhi says, “This was not an issue on which we have fought. But now that we have – he’s about to say, “Won.” And Smuts looks up at him and says, “Don’t you dare use that word.” He doesn’t say that in word, of course, but he shoots him this look. And Gandhi’s lips freezes in the middle of saying, “We have won. Now that we are in a position of advantage,” he says, “we cannot dispute with you about this other thing. That’s another issue.

So, this too is a topic – something that we have learned. It’s called, “No fresh issue.” And it’s going to come up again and again – not only in the Indian Struggle, but in the struggles that we’re going to be studying next semester, those of you who are going to continue. And the idea is this, you enter Satyagraha of some kind, more often than not you find that it’s starting to gain you some traction. Okay? But you are an oppressed community. You’ve been held down for a long time. You haven’t had respect. You haven’t had livelihood. Imagine how you feel at that moment. This is your first breakthrough. You’ve got a little bit of power. You’ve got a little bit of leverage. What are you going to be tempted to do?

Student: Go for more.

Michael: Go for more. Exactly. I’ve been in this situation many, many times. Finally, you get an ability to have your voice heard, to get somewhere. The temptation is going to be to go for everything you can possibly get. Now the difficulty with that is it’s best seen in the logic of a conversation. If your negotiation with the government or whatever it is, is in the nature of a conversation, then no fresh issue would be equivalent to changing the subject, right?

I hope none of you ever has this experience, but I’ve been interviewed twice by what I’d call these, “hate radio people.” And it’s actually going to happen again next week, believe it or not, in Dallas. I’m going to be interviewed by FOX News. I’m sure they’re trembling in their boots already. But if you’ve ever had that experience – and I hope you never do – but maybe you’ll be traveling in a van and someone is playing their radio and you’ll hear one of these interviews, what you’ll hear is that the host, the radio host, will constantly change the subject. The minute you start getting to where you might be making a point, they’ll change the subject.

So, this is the characteristic of someone who is not serious about the truth. Conversely, if you are serious about the truth, you’ve got to stick to the subject until you get to the end of the sentence. And the sentence in this case is the issues on which you are

struggling with your opponent. So, it's considered a matter of principle not to introduce a fresh issue. We're going to see him wrestling with this several times in the Indian campaign. But because they had not included that in the Satyagraha oath – which incidentally Gandhi had re-administered a few months later just to make sure that everybody meant it and they were still on board – because they hadn't included that, they decided not to fight on that particular issue.

Hind Swaraj

So, the end of 1908 things are kind of at a stalemate. He takes a trip to England to see if he can get some support there. And it's in the course of this trip – on his way back in 11 days of working right straight through, without a computer, he wrote “Hind Swaraj” which was probably his most classic text. And at some point – let me take a look at our syllabus and see where it might fit it – it might actually be pretty soon. We'll stop and look at that text and see what it says. It's a classic statement of Gandhi's principle, but at a rather brash stage. Later on, he will mellow out and he'll reconsider things like maybe railroads are okay. Maybe you can occasionally go to a doctor for certain purposes. He'll loosen up a little bit on some things. But in “Hind Swaraj” it's just loaded for bear or whatever is the nonviolent equivalent to that.

Now this whole South Africa struggle seems to be in two phases that really leads up to 1908 – 1909. and then from 1909 to 1913 when it's all over. And people who have looked at his spiritual development and looked at him personally have come to feel that it's in this latter phase that Gandhi really became a Mahatma. You know, he hadn't been exactly killing time. Up until then he had been learning a lot on many different levels. He'd been developing spiritually. He had already taken these two hair raising oaths.

But it's in the later period that he really seems to become the kind of person, the kind of actor in the world that he will be. And there's really no essential change in his style and his way of dealing with people and the kind of power that he uses from this later phase until the end of his mortal career.

Let me just mention a couple or three things quickly, and I'd actually like to leave a little bit early because I'm supposed to be speaking at that event on Sproul Plaza. Three things. In 1910 Tolstoy dies and Gandhi starts his second community, which is Tolstoy Farm, named after him in his honor. In 1912 Gopal Krishna Gokhale, whom he had visited in the 1896 trip for a few months, comes to South Africa, and that's going to give him a huge boost. It's also going to lead up to the second dirty trick.

Finally, on March 14th of 1913, the government will play its last bonehead stupid maneuver which will lead to the paradox of oppression and the final stage of the struggle. And that act is carried out by a Justice, Justice Searle, who decrees in a particular court case that only Christian marriages are valid. This means at a stroke, all Hindus and Muslims, not to mention the African population, all Hindus and Muslims are living in sin. And this – I mean I suppose if we took a lot of time we could think about

something more stupid that he could possibly have done – but I’m not sure it would be easy. Because a mistake always is to try to fool around – to try to tamper with – Indians on the religious level that always backfires on them.

So okay, what we’ll do next week is either Tuesday or Thursday, we’ll look at “Hind Swaraj,” and I’ll go over some of these last three events that I mentioned in a little greater detail.

9. Success in South Africa 1: Return to India and the Year of Silence

Michael: I have announcements. There's an institution known as the "Peace Boat." It was launched in Japan about 23 years ago. Which despite the name, is actually this enormous cruise ship that holds a thousand people, and it goes around the world giving seminars on peace, and it'll be docking in San Francisco at Pier 35 early in October. So, I'll get you the exact dates, but there's going to be an evening – a day and an evening in October when they're going to have people over there. Pier 35 is not too far from Pier 39 so you could get yourself some sort of vegetarian sandwich. Check this thing out.

The opportunities there are that they could – when, you know, you graduate and if you have time in the summer – they have cruises that you can go on for various lengths of time, and they're very expensive unless you're acting as a TA or something like that. I think when you graduate with a degree in PACS they might be interested in using you for some of their seminars. So, you get an ocean cruise and a certain amount of salary. So, let's watch for that when it comes around early in October.

Also, I sent you a CourseWeb notice about a film called, [Encounter Point](#), which looks like it's a very, very moving documentary of Israelis and Palestinians who are crossing over and trying to make these person to person contacts between the two communities – something that is necessary, has limited usefulness, but if you play it right it can be parlayed into something.

Let's see. And I don't remember if I've mentioned this, but several of you went to see that film, "Munna Bhai Lage Raho – Keep Going Munna Bhai." And apparently it's very funny and was very acceptable to the students from the class who went there in terms of its presentation of Gandhi. I haven't seen it yet. I'm usually very hard to please when it comes to Gandhi movies. That's why I made my own. But for everything I've heard, it's at least extremely funny. So, we'll try and get a hold of it when it comes out on DVD. And if you have friends in Fremont and you want to go down there and give it a once over, just go ahead and try that.

Martyrdom and Nonviolence

Okay, there was a question right at the end of last time from Dan, I think, who doesn't seem to be here yet, but I'm going to answer his question anyway very briefly. He challenged me because I had quoted Gandhi's correspondence with Tolstoy – it was very brief, but very important. And in it the two of them had agreed that what Gandhi was doing in South Africa was at least in some sense, unique. Gandhi said that – both of them said that – of course, nonviolent interactions happen all the time. You even

know a case of dog Satyagraha, so you know that this goes way, way back in our pre-human evolution.

But this was the first time that someone had deliberately taken – and we’re answering your question – somebody had deliberately taken it and turned it into a social movement or political struggle. And so, the question was what about the whole era of martyrdom in the first centuries of Christianity. And I said rather quickly, “That wasn’t nonviolence.” But I want to back away from that a little bit and say that it was partly nonviolence.

The church fathers themselves, like Augustine and others who were constantly repeating after the persecutions had run their course – and by the way, we will be talking about this in some detail in a few weeks. But Augustine and others were constantly repeating that what made the church thrive was [*a moriente bus et non repugnanti bus Christianis* 00:04:09] that the Christians did not fight back. It was in their death that the cause was advanced. And that was – I think that is partly – or at least as far as we’ve said so far – that was a nonviolent effect.

But we’re going to be talking about scapegoating, and we’re going to be talking about the scapegoating system. We’re going to be talking about a group of Christians – at least they considered themselves Christians – some of the early gnostic movements who felt that scapegoating was so violent that you shouldn’t participate in it even as a victim if you didn’t want to perpetuate the system in that way.

So, I think for the salvation of my soul, I’m going to back off a little bit on my, you know, flat out rejection of martyrdom as nonviolence and say that it wasn’t always coordinated, and it was always entered into deliberately. Sometimes it was. You’ll have people like Polycarp saying, you know, “Don’t interfere when they come to take me. This is what the church needs.” I’m going to say that it was sort of a borderline thing that had some nonviolent energy in it, but it wasn’t deliberately and specifically organized into a long-term movement.

So, if Gandhi’s movement did anything that was new in history – as far as they knew at that time. Here I am, fudging again – good academic covering my tracks. We’ll be talking about episodes in early Jewish history which were rather well coordinated, apparently deeply embedded in the culture. (Jeff, there’s one here if you can stand it.) But as far as they knew, what he was doing was unique in history in that he was capturing this kind of energy and strategically organizing it and deliberately using it over the long term for a political goal. And that’s what Gandhi and Tolstoy agreed on.

Struggle and 'Personal Fruits'

Gandhi also said in a letter that he wrote to Tolstoy in 1909 on his way back from Britain where he wrote this letter and also “Hind Swaraj,” which we’re going to talk about a bit on Thursday. Gandhi said, “In my opinion this struggle of the Indians in the Transvaal is the greatest of modern times.” Actually, he was the only one who saw it that way.

Everybody else thought it was a very minor struggle compared to the unionization of South Africa, and it wasn't going to be British. And if so, in what sense? What were the four entities going to be in relation to one another? They were very exercised about that. And the Indian struggle seemed very minor to most people. But for Gandhi, it was the biggest struggle in world history.

Okay, "It's the greatest of modern times inasmuch as it has been idealized both as to the goal as also the methods adopted to reach the goal." In other words, it's a good goal that we're striving for. And we're going to use moral good means to get there. And that is what Gandhi felt was unique about it. He goes on, "I am not aware of a struggle in which participators are not to derive any personal advantage at the end of it." Right? We're all familiar with this from the Bhagavad Gita. No personal fruits. "And in which 90% have undergone great suffering and trial for the sake of a principle." So, it was the idealism of the movement and the way it was thoroughly incorporated in both the mechanisms and the outcome that for Gandhi really made it unique. And also – whew. Yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:08:23]

Michael: I can't. No. It's that kind of speaker you'll have to get me off the Web. That's funny. When I was growing up in New York nobody ever told me it was hard to hear me. They said the opposite. I'll speak louder. So, there were two questions that Dan raised. What was new about the movement, and is martyrdom nonviolence? I've fudged on the second question, and I think I've given you an answer on the first one.

Paradox of Oppression

Okay, so let's continue. I've thought of a word for what we're doing here. You've heard of punctuated evolution and punctuated equilibrium. This is punctuated history; in that I am going through the events roughly in chronological order with a certain amount of rabbit tracking and running back. And I'm picking out the things that seem to me to be important for all time. So that's why it'd be very, very helpful for you to be reading it also in Nanda or Fischer or some other historically oriented biography so you get a sense of what exactly the events were in sequence from a political, historical point of view.

I can guarantee you on the midterm and probably also on the final as well, you will have an essay question which will say, "Describe either the South African phase or the Indian phase of Gandhi's career and pull out of it some main principles of nonviolence." So, this will be both in the short-term and the long-term in the sense that you'll be a brilliant performer in cocktail parties from now on. Short-term and long-term this will be very useful for you to have the history solidly as a background for what I'm commenting on. And today we're going to have a mix, I think, of strategic and principled items that I want to pull out of history.

So, we had stopped in about 1909, I think. And then I raced very quickly through the remaining episodes, and I'm going to go back over them and talk about them in some detail. But I wanted to read a part of Nanda's comment on the first Satyagraha movement which was in 1907, before he even goes on that trip to England. Let's see. Gandhi received two months simple imprisonment. This was for not taking out a registration card – or burning them – no, burning was going to come a year later. "If the government had hoped to break the spirit of the rank and file by locking up their leader, they had made a serious miscalculation."

Now we have our own special term for those kinds of miscalculation. We call that – what do we call that? Anyone remember? We're going to meet it again and again and again, fortunately – even in real life. I'll give you a hint. It starts with paradox. Thanks, yes. It's a paradox of oppression. It means that you can get the regime against which you're struggling in such a fix that they have to use [such] methods to hold you down – or they think they do – which will backfire.

And I think I pointed out that this doesn't always work. Sometimes they use oppressive measures, and you get oppressed. But I think there are two phases in a nonviolent struggle when the paradox of oppression is usually going to work to your advantage. And that is in the very beginning which we're seeing now when people's enthusiasm is high and they're looking around for a way to get tangled. And after things have dragged on for a long time and people are starting to lose enthusiasm, very often there'll be what we call in the Free Speech Movement many years ago, "An atrocity." We would go home for Thanksgiving break and come back and find that the administration had thrown everybody in jail or had done something like that. And immediately the movement would be revived.

So, there was a regular series of atrocities that kept the Free Speech Movement going. Of course, it was an exaggeration to call them atrocities. There were some real atrocities to students that happened in the 80's, and they didn't happen in this country. And Gandhi would be against exaggeration, but I think he would agree that there is this dynamic and there's nothing wrong with actually playing on it if you know how to do that.

And we'll see in the Civil Rights Movement, King himself made the decision to use children in the ranks so that when they got arrested and hauled away in police wagons, everybody would be shocked and horrified. And I'm still not entirely sure how I feel about that. But that was an example of using the paradox of oppression in your favor. Yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:13:41]

Michael: I'm sure there are times when it would not be a good idea to try to rouse the oppressor. And I'm not sure how I would know how to characterize them though. That's a very good question. I know that just before the 2004 "election" the person who is now president was campaigning in Jackson, Oregon. There was a crowd on one side of the

road with signs saying, “Four more years.” And there was a crowd on the other side of the road with signs saying, “Three more weeks.” It was three weeks until the election.

And he must have given some order on his cell phone or something. And there were two van loads full of riot police behind him. The vans stopped. They poured in full riot gear and literally attacked this mob of American citizens. All they were doing was standing on the sidewalk holding up these signs. And they beat those people. They drove them off the street. There was some video footage of them beating a 70-year-old man and still beating him when he was down on the sidewalk.

And if there ever was going to be a paradox of repression, it should have happened then. So, it was repression without the paradox. And that is a very interesting question, to know when it’s going to go down and when it’s going to backfire. It’s one of the many, I think, still to be explored avenues in nonviolent strategy. As I said, this is a new science. So don’t count on it, but it is there. Sid?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:15:25]

Michael: That’s why we were nervous about that episode. It “worked” most of the time. But that’s not the point. The point is not whether it worked or didn’t work. The point is whether it fed good energy into the whole system, or it did not. And I’m still entirely sure. There were a lot of things – this was several weeks down the road for us. But there were a lot of things about the Civil Rights Movement which had to be done quickly because there were these very narrow windows of opportunity.

Person Power - Clinging to Principles

And I think in both of Gandhi’s campaigns, there was almost never – or he chose not to regard there as ever being that kind of urgency. Always clung to principle and expected it. In the long run you’d look back at it and you’d see that was the quickest way to get there. He said, “I do not believe in short violent cuts to success.”

But this is not to say that he did it right and King did it wrong. It’s really, you know, there are so many imponderables that we’ve had to factor in. But as a principle, that certainly should, I think, give us pause – using children. I can see using almost anybody else, but children don’t know what they’re in for, and they don’t know what they’re doing. So, because they don’t know exactly what they’re doing, it violates Person Power, you know?

In fact, let me read you a quote about Person Power. This comes from a woman who became an activist in what was then called Ceylon, now Sri Lanka, after a visit to that island by Gandhi. And she said – it was a long, beautiful speech, I’m going to somehow get the rest of it in your hands – but at the end she said, “For God’s sake remember that you can imitate more or less successfully most things. But you can never be an imitation Satyagrahi.” Satyagraha is not a matter of behavior so you can’t just, you know, wear an orange ribbon or something and say, “Hey ma, look, I’m a Satyagrahi.” “You can never

be an imitation Satyagrahi. You must, each of you,” each of you. Not all of you, each of you, “light the lamp within you. You are not a Satyagrahi when you follow the light of the lamp that burns within another.” So, the whole question of leadership in nonviolence is very interesting. What kind of leadership is it? It seems to be on a somewhat different modality than leadership in ordinary movements.

Okay, so I guess there were two points I wanted to make with that little quote from Nanda, that A – this is a paradox of repression. It’s a paradox of repression working in our favor. B – it’s a special type which Gandhi seemed to have caught onto quite early.

Organizing a Movement

And that is you have to so organize your movement – and this fits in perfectly with what we were just saying about Person Power – you have to so organize your movement that it can get on without you. And this will be done brilliantly in 1930 in the Salt March when the Raj arrested all the leaders, all the leadership, anybody who had ever any pretension towards leading anything. They picked them up and put them in prison. And every single participant, every single Satyagrahi knew what to do and was able to carry it out. That was really the climax of the Freedom Struggle.

So, on his return to South Africa in 1909 things had shifted to the Transvaal from Pretoria and things had been going on now for three years, and unfortunately, time was on the government’s side because they could take away your livelihood and put you in jail. It was like having a long, long-drawn-out strike. And eventually you run out of resources. And so, because things were now in the Transvaal and because they needed some way to keep going financially, Gandhi shifted from Phoenix Settlement to Tolstoy Farm – I think about 20 miles outside of Johannesburg – which still exists. It was raided and burned, and some things were destroyed in the 70’s – I think the late 70’s – but it’s still there. And when you go back to India he will leave his nephew Maganlal in charge.

But each of the communities that he starts has a specific purpose, and it ends up serving other purposes as well. And the purpose as well, which is going to be served by the Tolstoy Farm, is it’s going to be a sort of general headquarters for the Satyagraha. It’s going to give training. It’s going to be housing for people who have to leave their domiciles for the struggle – this is going to happen in a few years – as well as being what Phoenix Farm always was, an experiment in simple living. So, these are the models for the village economies that Gandhi is going to set up in India.

Gandhian Education

I have been thinking of applying to this new Blum Center to teach a course, actually, in Gandhian economics – which is sort of a joke. I would have probably failed the only economics course I ever took if I hadn’t quit instead. It might have been a nonviolent

solution or not. But as you'll see at the end of the semester when we get around to it, Gandhi just has a totally different approach to economics and economic life. One of the main components of it, one of the main elements was decentralization and that meant village economies. And he was experimenting with that in South Africa.

And also at Tolstoy Farm, since they were in it for the long-term and since they had children, they started what was to become later on back in India, *Nai Talim*. Now you're familiar with the word "Talim." I think it's an Urdu word. And if you put Pashtun plural on it, it becomes [Taliban], which literally means "students." But here, it just means students. It doesn't mean anything else. And *Nai Talim* means "new education." And this will be one of the planks in Constructive Programme when it's fully developed.

So, he often said if he had it to do over again he'd like to be a nurse, but also his vocation clearly was that of teacher. If he wasn't out being arrested all the time, he would have made a very good teacher. And Gandhian education still flourishes in India. If we had time I would show a video called, "Gandhi's India," which is about the economic policies, how Nehru departed from them and what the result of that was. And they interview several people who were still doing Gandhian teaching in Gandhian schools in various parts of India.

Basically, the philosophy behind *Nai Talim* is that education has to be connected with realities. So, they could be spiritual realities. You start the day with a prayer session, but they also – like if you're learning math, you learn your math in conjunction with selling the wool or the cotton that you were also involved in growing in the village school. So, it's not like this really abstract approach that we specialize in here.

I remember when there was a severe employment shortage. I was walking onto campus one morning. Somebody was holding an enormous thesis that they were trying to sell. What else are you going to do with a PhD thesis? You don't need it for a doorstep because you've already got your old computer for that. So, he was trying to sell this thesis called, "Theory of Unemployment." Here's everybody starving to death and he's explaining the theory of why they're starving to death.

Gandhi, Gokhale, and Smuts

Gandhi wanted to get the education very much grounded in pragmatic realities – and there were other parts to it too. And this becomes a kind of dismal period where they're just being ground down, and they haven't been able to find an issue around which to really struggle. But two things went on. They're going to turn this around. King George V was coming up for coronation. There's that name again – King George V.

He was coming up for coronation and on these occasions Brits like to have things tidy. So, they didn't want to have this nasty struggle going on in South Africa. They became conciliatory, put some pressure on Smuts to back off a little bit. So between about May

of 1911 and on into 1912 there's kind of a truce. The Indians aren't doing anything, and the government isn't thinking of any new atrocities.

And then the big event of 1912 was, of course, the visit by Gopal Krishna Gokhale. Now he had real position in India. He was a member of the Royal Council which meant that he was actually going to South Africa with plenipotentiary powers. He could negotiate with Smuts. He wasn't just there to pluck up people's spirits. And the Boer government which could, at times, be really, really nasty, decided to give him a royal treatment. They put a train at his disposal. Sort of the equivalent of a limousine today or an airplane.

And he went everywhere with Gandhi, saw everything. Gandhi and he struck up one those incredible friendships that Gandhi was sort of famous for. Between him and Gokhale they practically – you could hardly draw the line and say here's where Gokhale leaves off and Gandhi begins. They were so tight. Now if you saw the movie, the Attenborough movie, he's the guy sitting on the bench when Gandhi comes back at that cocktail party. He sees Gandhi dressed in Indian clothing and he says, "Now I can die in peace." And Ben Kingsley is slightly startled. He's a better actor than I am – little subtler. But he's stunned when Gokhale says it. But that was, in fact, their relationship. And Gokhale, in fact, was to die months after Gandhi got back to India in the beginning of 1915.

But it's a funny thing, for all his astuteness and all of his authority that he was carrying with him from the secretary – from the viceroy back in India – Gokhale did not know the Boers as well as Gandhi did. There was something – it's funny, you know, here's Gandhi who's so incredibly idealistic on the one hand. The only thing that's keeping this whole movement going is his enthusiasm. If he had flagged, the whole thing would have collapsed. Gandhi is seeing this thing as a titanic struggle between two civilizations, must never be given up. He's practically the only one who sees it that way, and he's carrying it through.

At the same time, he's also incredibly clever politically. And he is – in that film that I just mentioned, "Gandhi's India," there's a delightful interview with a man named Paddy Quinn who was Gandhi's jailor. So, he got to know Gandhi well. He saw him quite a bit back in India. And one of the things that Paddy Quinn says about Gandhi was, "You know, you couldn't sell him a pup." Which I gather is an Irish expression for, you know, you could not pull a fast one on him. He did his best negotiating from behind bars.

Anyway, Gokhale and Smuts had a meeting and Smuts said, "Well, you're right." There were then, I think, three issues on the table. Of course, the old pass issue, do people have to take out registration cards if they're Indians, the immigration question that the Indians had refused to consider at one point because it was a "fresh issue." And the old issue of the impost that you had to pay when you left indenture. Now that had been whittled down from 25£, which was astronomical, to 3£, which was still unaffordable. If you were an indentured laborer in the mines you didn't have 3£ in assets to come up with at the end of your indenture. So, although it looked more humane, it was having

exactly the same effect. Because, obviously, the mine owners didn't care about the 22£ they wouldn't be getting from you, they cared about the 5 more years of labor that you would owe them. So those were three issues.

And Gokhale was promised by Smuts that all three issues would be resolved. Tax would be abolished, the racial bar on immigration would be abolished, the Black Act would be repealed. He went to Gandhi, and he said, "Well, I've done it. Mission accomplished." Oh, no – sorry, I shouldn't use that expression. "You can come back to India soon." And Gandhi said, "Somehow, Krishna G., I don't think so." Do you have a question?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:29:56]

Michael: Well, the Transvaal was still a part of the British Empire and therefore Lord Hardinge, who was the Viceroy in India is a very important member of the British Cabinet. And, in fact, on two occasions Hardinge had come out on Gandhi's side when they were struggling over various things. And Smuts was furious with him. But nonetheless he could wield various kinds of influence. Maybe not quite directly, but he could talk to the Crown. Okay? Any other questions so far?

Imprisonment of Gandhi and India

Another thing that had happened along the way, incidentally, was the imprisonment had gotten really quite brutal. Like Gandhi had several months of hard labor. They were breaking rocks, you know, in the sun all day. He regarded it as a very important part of his Sadhana, you know, his spiritual development. But it was hard on people and people did die. There were several people whom he memorializes as having died under the harsh terms of the imprisonment. And that meant that the public was starting to get agitated about it. Okay?

Student: You said that the viceroy was the representative for India?

Michael: He was the representative for Britain and India.

Student: For Britain and India, okay. And did Indians have like the representatives?

Michael: This a good question. Did India have any political representation that mattered anywhere? You know, basically not. And this will be a big issue because the British will be trying to set up councils which will ultimately be talk shops. And so, it created a question that's going to lead to a serious division which we'll get to. It's around 1926 and it's called, "The Patna Surrender." It means should you take these partial things that they're offering us or should we hold out for a complete victory. And it's very much like the question you were asking before. When is the time to push? When is the time to chill? This becomes a strategic calculation. But it almost split the movement in India.

Now there was the Indian Congress Party – the Congress Party of India, but of course it had no political power directly. If the entire congress passed a resolution, the viceroy

would have to look at it. But they were very good at looking at it and saying – the thing – the reason the British Empire lasted so long was that they were not heavy-handed. They were only heavy handed where they felt they absolutely had to be. And one place was Kenya, and the other was in the Northwest Frontier where they really got that they were scared for their life, and they felt they really had to crack down violently.

They always had that option at their back. They're the ultimate sanction, as it's called in Roman War theory, "*Ultima Ratio Regum* - the last recourse of kings," was the massive violence that had to be visited on people brutally. But they tried not to use it. We'll be revisiting- yeah?

Student: I was just wondering about Tolstoy, about Gokhale and [unintelligible 00:33:27]

Michael: Well, there's two problems here. The first is, his role was a little fuzzy. And the second is I'm a little fuzzy. I'm [not] sure I entirely understand it. But he had been sent to South Africa by the viceroy. He was part of the viceroy's commission which was advisory, to be sure. But it has some importance. You know, it's not nothing. Theoretically, the entire council could say, "Your Lordship, we think this is a dumb idea." And his Lordship could go and do it anyway. But you wouldn't want to play that too often if you're an astute politician. For one thing, you then bear total responsibility if it is, in fact, a dumb idea.

Student: So just to get it straight. So, the British [unintelligible 00:34:20] pretty much? Like what happened to the political structure of India?

The Maharajas and the Pancayat

Michael: When the British came to India it was not a nation state in the modern sense of the word. There were probably two types of political organization in India. Though, I bet there were others that I'm not aware of. But they were the Maharajas and there were princely states that, I think, about a third of the country was in control of these very petty kinds. Because they were petty, they called themselves, "Maharajas," which means, "terrific kings." And that was called British India. The Maharajas were mostly left on the throne unless they got uppity. It will lead to some very complicated negotiations toward the end.

But then the other institution was known as, "The *Pancayat*." As you can see the word, "*pance*" in there, it means, "Five." When you drink punch, it's supposed to have five ingredients. *Panca* was a drink that was developed. One of the great cultural innovations that the British took back from – punch. Anyway, to get serious, *Pancayat* was a council of five elders that would rule or – rule may be to be harsh a word. They would be the governing center of a village.

You have to realize there were 700,000 villages in India. It was very decentralized. If you read the first sentence of Rabindranath Tagore's book called, "*Sadhana*." *Sadhana*

means, “Spiritual practice.” The first sentence is, “India was a forest civilization.” It was organized in these small units. These extended families, clans, *gotras*, villages, *panchayat*, so forth – with a lot of differences in one region to the next.

Now when the British came in they either didn’t understand this and thought it was no form of order at all and they were walking into a vacuum, or they did understand it, but they realized that they could replace native authority with centralized authority. So, they liked Gokhale. Remember, when Gandhi gets back to India – and we haven’t gotten there yet, but in a few years he’s going to return to India to a hero’s welcome. The Viceroy Lord Hardinge will send him a congratulatory telegram.

The idea is, “You have helped us to reform the empire. You’re a great servant of your people.” It’s like taking a street in Berkeley and calling it, “Martin Luther King Way,” after you’ve had the FBI hounding the guy practically to death, you know. So, I’m sure that the Raj was a little bit nervous about Gandhi, but they didn’t really regard him as a troublemaker until Champaran, which we will be getting into the course of time.

Okay, so Gokhale comes and goes, and no sooner does he go than everything that he has negotiated with Smuts is revoked, which goes to show you how much power he actually did have – Gokhale. And the Indians really did not know what to do when this marvelous boneheaded decision came down on March 14th of 1913 where Justice Searle decreed that only Christian marriages are valid.

East India Mutiny - Paradox of Repression

Now again, this is a subset of the general principle, paradox of oppression. It usually works well. Okay, here’s something. Paradox of oppression works well when you violate a deeply held norm of feeling on the part of your victim population that you are insensitive to. Y’all remember the East India Mutiny? I’m practicing my y’all’s because I’m going to Dallas in a couple days. Do you happen to remember, or have you ever encountered what started the East India Mutiny?

It was that they kind of breached – they had just brought in these breech loading rifles – I mean I’m very bad on military hardware, but apparently what you had to, you had to put this cartridge in your mouth and yank something out and stick it in the gun. Well, okay, except that it was wrapped – they didn’t have that stuff that they use for rifles today – a special lubricant and cover they use. I can’t remember. They didn’t have it, so they used lard. And the Muslim soldiers were outraged. And that actually sparked the mutiny that almost swept the British Raj out of India.

The fact that it didn’t is why we still call it a mutiny and a not freedom struggle. Indian historians do not call it a mutiny. But anyway, it was repeatedly the case that the Europeans in India did not appreciate the depth of passion that Indians of any community had about their religion. And so, this is one of the first clear examples of that. Oh, you know, how much will they care? Well, they were in a state of utter outrage

and that the immediate effect – this is quite significant politically, of bringing the women into the struggle.

Patient Bearing of Suffering

Kasturba did not like the idea of living in sin with her husband. She probably had problems even living with him legally. I guess I've sung that little song for you. It goes, "To live with a saint in heaven is a matter of bliss in glory, but to live with one on earth is quite another story." Sometimes Gandhi was no picnic. Anyway, up until this point the struggle had been mainly the role of educated Indians, tradesmen. "Free Indians," as they were called as opposed to indentured Indians. So, it was a small part of the population, and it was only the men.

So, this is qualitatively as well as quantitatively different. Suddenly the women came into it. I would say that it isn't just a question of doubling the population. If you carefully read Gandhi's thoughts on women you will see that he felt that they had a special aptitude for Satyagraha.

Incidentally, there is a little book called, [All Men are Brothers](#), which of there are probably six or seven different collections of Gandhi's general writings. For a short one, that's well chosen. I've always liked this one the best. It's "All Men are Brothers." It was – UNESCO brought it out. Everybody wanted to jump on board and publish that. It has a nice section on women.

So, his feeling seems to have been that in order to be a Satyagrahi the first requirement was to bear suffering patiently. And whether you regard this is an essentialist fact or a cultural fact, it is a fact that women seem better able to do this than men. Conceivably it has nothing to do with genetics. We could conceivably turn it around in a week of really bad television advertising. But our point is not how it got that way, but that it was that way. So that the bringing of women into the movement was not just a doubling of the resource pool but a bringing in of a qualitatively new dimension in Satyagraha.

And Gandhi later on will boast of how the women faced lathi charges in Gujarat and so forth. And in fact, there's a principle in nonviolence – turning vulnerability into strength. And they seem to be able to play that card more naturally and more successfully. Not only that – poor Justice Searle, I mean this was clearly the most bonehead maneuver in the history of the British empire. Not only that, but what the women decided to do, with Gandhi's cooperation, was to challenge the past laws, the immigration laws by going illegally into the Transvaal from Pretoria, the Orange State, or wherever they were, in small groups.

And now here's an interesting little wrinkle. The first group that went in contained women from the ashram whose names were very well known to the British – to the colonial authorities. And they decided that when they were stopped at the border between Charlestown and Volksrust they wouldn't give their names because if they

gave their names, they wouldn't be arrested. So, here's a very interesting gray area that I'm sure you could write a whole thesis on - here you are clinging to truth and yet you're telling a lie. So, is that okay? I don't propose to stop and solve that issue right now. I just want to flag it as something interesting that we can come back to.

But anyway, they knew perfectly well that the minute police heard who they were they would not be arrested because it would cause too much of a flap. So not in order to protect themselves, but in order to endanger themselves they refuse to give their names. They were arrested. There was a flap. Another group said, "Okay, this is working well. We're going to go in too." So, the second group goes in, and the second group goes to Newcastle or [Nooksel] as I'm sure it's called in the U.K.

Miners Strike at Newcastle

Now what is Newcastle famous for? Anyone? I'll give you a hint. It's a fossil fuel that we should not be using anymore. You're heard the expression? No one's heard the expression? I guess the vocabulary is just kind of shriveling away here. Ever heard the expression, "Carrying coals to Newcastle?" Well, Newcastle was an actual city, and they did coal mining there and that's why, you know, it's an absurd thing to do, carry coals to Newcastle.

So, the dramatic point that I'm leading up to is that women decided to talk the coal miners into striking. That was a big deal. This was really striking a blow at the economic heart of the system and the system's economic heart is a lot bigger than its compassionate heart, its medical heart, its any other kind of heart – as King also would discover. If you can get your hands on their finances, they will sit up and take notice. So, at this point things really got brutal. This is the reason Attenborough chooses to portray this as kind of the emblem of the movement in South Africa.

Total of 5000 men – or 5000 men, women, and children would eventually find themselves not only off work, but with no place to live because they were living at the sufferance of the mine owners. You lived in cabins which were none too luxurious you can believe. And what the mine owners did was they quickly cut off their water, cut off their electricity if they had any, and then basically when the men left, they did not have anything. So – yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:46:45]

Swadeshi and Self-Reliance

Michael: Okay, your question is why would Gandhi have not wanted the cooperation of white miners? Yeah, here's another example of the same thing. In the first part – the first Satyagraha prior to '09, the other Asiatics who were also affected by the legislation wanted to join him. He reluctantly let them come on board, but they didn't stay very

long. Then, more dramatically, many people have raised the question, “What about the Zulus? What about the other native Africans who were there?” And he said, “My heart bled for them, but it would have taken years and years and years to get on their cultural wavelength so that they could understand what I was doing.”

So, this is our introduction, thank you, to an issue which I’ve mentioned before, but we haven’t talked about at length – and that is “*svadeśi*.” I think we have time to do this. If we don’t have time to do this, what are we going to do? So once again you see our “*sva*” word which means, “One’s own.” And then this is based on *deśa* which means, “region,” sort of. It actually comes from Indo-European root meaning to indicate, to point out. So, in other words, the part of the world that you can point – this here’s, “Mah spread [My spread].” You know, that’s your *deśi*. And “*i*” is – it’s sort of an adjective meaning, “having to do with,” so that it becomes *svadeśi*.

So, some people have felt that this was the most important principle after Satyagraha itself. If you could grok *svadeśi* you would really have a key to the whole thing. I’m not contesting that. This might well be true. What it ultimately means is that we find ourselves born into a particular situation. And remember what we were saying about the Gita’s Theory of Action. We have certain strengths and weaknesses as an individual. Well, if you try to go beyond the circle of your competence without dealing with those strengths and weaknesses, everything is going to collapse. You’re building a house of cards.

The right way to proceed is to deal with your capacities and incapacities and let them expand slowly and naturally so when your circle gets wider, it’s also more solidly based. Okay? So, this is kind of the inner dimension of *svadeśi*. But all of Gandhi’s vocabulary – and there’s a book on this, if you’re interested – had layers. And the outer layer of *svadeśi*, skipping a couple three layers, was that it just meant geographically the region. So, in India, for example, when they decide to boycott British goods and buy only Indian cloth – *khadi* – that’s an example of *svadeśi*. Self-reliance, I’m saying.

A young man came to Gandhi at one point and said, “I want to join your movement.” Now anyone else in the whole peace movement that you’ve ever known, you can predict what they would say. “Oh, thank you. Now let me give you a lot of work and pay you nothing.” But Gandhi said to this young man, “Where are you from?” And the guy named a village and Gandhi said, “I’ve been in your village. It’s a cesspool. You go back and clean up your village. For you to come here and join a national struggle and leave your village in that condition is a sin.” Strong language from the Mahatma.

So, on various levels, cultural, economic, political, and ultimately, personal, spiritual, you were supposed to build up from within and not overreach your capacities. So, this then is the explanation why Gandhi did not try to do anything for the African populations in South Africa. It is the explanation why he decided not to come to the United States and do something for originally African populations who were in bondage here. They asked him and he said, “If I come to America, I will lose everything here and gain

nothing there. Whereas if I stay here, I may be able to create an ocular demonstration which other people then can use over there.”

So, it's a question of whether it would have taken decades for him to get them to understand him. Where, see, in India they knew what kind of category to put him into. He was a Mahatma. He was a karma yogi. And they may not have used the word, but they recognized that intuitively. So, when he said, “When we do without something we're going to get more power,” they immediately understood it.”

So that's the answer. Only I forget the original question. Oh yes, the original question was there were sympathetic Europeans at various levels. And if the European born mineworkers had joined him, it would turn into a labor struggle and it would mix up the whole formula. It would change the equation. He wanted everything to be kept very, very clean. Once you won on the ground that you were fighting on – of course, you don't use that vocabulary. I know that – but once you succeed in the circle that you find yourself in, then it can expand. Okay, so that's part of the reason.

The Great March of Newcastle

Okay, so here we have a unique, once again, you'll see over and over again that an extended nonviolent campaign is a mix of planning and serendipity. You have to be, “Adventitious scroungers,” as they call them in anthropology. You have to grab what you can grab, what comes your way. You have to be opportunistic, but at the same time, you have to have a long-range plan. So, this was an incredible opportunity if it were not an incredible problem that suddenly he was faced with. 5000 people had no work, no resources, no food, no nothing, what was he to do with them?

So, on November 6th, 1913, they began the Newcastle March, or sometimes called, “The Great March,” where Gandhi's purpose was to march them into the Transvaal, which was illegal, and to house them at Tolstoy Farm. Now I've often made the point that people think they're imitating this when they march on Washington, or they march on Kezar or something like that. But there's an essential fact that we're forgetting which is that we don't have any concrete reason to do that in neither of those two places has anything to do with the issue whereas here, they had to go somewhere. They really physically had to go somewhere just to live, and they decided that they had the right to go somewhere where the government decided they didn't. So, they were doing something illegal.

And so, on at least those two levels it was quite concrete and not just symbolic that they were marching. I find this is one of the most important things that the Peace Movement today has to kind of grasp. And on this march there were real episodes of brutality.

Salt Satyagraha

In fact, we all know about the description of the attacks of the marchers at the salt pans in 1930 – May of 1930, which was reported by an American journalist and was widely regarded – is widely regarded today as the climax within the climax.

In the Salt Satyagraha was the climax of the Freedom Struggle and the attack on the Dharasana Salt Pans or the raid or whatever you want to call it, was the climax of that climax. And when the colonial police – it was actually mostly Indians who did it, beating people mercilessly all day long and people not resisting. As this American journalist said, “This was the end for Western imperialism.” And he didn’t put quite that way, but they’ve done their worst, they’ve done their worst. They’ve [smacks knuckles together] head-to-head and we can now see that the West is bankrupt.

Well, actually there was a very similar attack, at least one, on the marchers – not as well known to history. But there was a European there who writes about it in his journal. People were sitting by the side of the road and there was a mounted charge, and they were just ruthlessly beaten, and they did not even attempt to ward off the blows. So, this is heavy. This is what we call a nonviolent moment when violence and nonviolence clash.

In a very open and obvious way we like it not to be so heavy and hurtful, but sometimes it is. Okay? So now the demographics of the struggle takes on yet another dimension because we have the women and the laborers who had not played an active part before. And this – probably from a Marxian point of view – this was a very important little development. And a lot of arrests are going on.

Gandhi's Multiple Arrests

On one occasion Gandhi was arrested four times in three days. In order to stay arrested, at one point they had him arraigned and they wanted to book him and the constable behind the desks said, “Okay, what’s the charge?” And nobody knew.

So, Gandhi says, “Oh, I can tell you what the charges are,” and he gave all this evidence against himself so that he could be arrested. And all the leaders were taken off and put in different places. Gandhi was at Bloemfontein Jail in the Orange Free State or *Orangia*, Kallenbach was taken to Pretoria. Kallenbach was really a close lieutenant of his in these days. And Polak was taken to Germiston Jail. And again, the hope was that they would not have the comfort and the ability to strategize among the three of them. And, of course, the laborers wouldn’t know what to do without them. But once, again, that did not work.

Purity of Person Power and Outside Assistance

And finally, the attention of the outside world began to break through. Now this again is an issue that purists like me feel a little bit uncomfortable with. The issue is this – that

theoretically the force of Satyagraha should be so clean and self-acting that it should not rely upon an outside party. It should just do it. I mean Gandhi will make these marvelous statements. All it takes is one Satyagrahi and if he or she is completely pure, however he understands that term, the outcome can only be victory.

But the fact of the matter is that you need both. There are times when you need numbers because nobody can relate to anything else. And very importantly, now in the modern world, there are times when you need outside support. There's a technical term for this in sociology. This is called, "The reference public,"-you and your opponent are on a stage putting on a show of the two kinds of power that you represent for the public to wake up and understand what you're doing.

So, I would like to say that the movement just swept through to victory. Smuts was completely won over and so was everybody else on his side, but it didn't work out that way. In real life, you need to awaken your opponent's conscience and sometimes you cannot awaken his conscience in time without bringing in pressure from outsiders. However, what makes it okay is that they didn't do it for that purpose. They didn't deliberately plan it. It happened in a natural course of events. People were learning about this all over the empire which was about 2/3 of the globe at this point, and they were beginning to feel a lot of sympathy for the Indian struggle even if they didn't have before.

Student: Isn't that always the case though? Isn't there probably two groups in the situation like the Satyagrahis and everyone else? And it just seems like the Satyagrahis – like it's not that it just kind of takes over. It's almost [unintelligible 01:01:12]. I mean doesn't there have to be those two sides?

Persuasion vs Coercion

Michael: Well, we're actually talking about three sides. We're talking about the Satyagrahis, the government, and the world. And you could say, you know, the world in South Africa, the European public, the entire empire that's looking on at this thing. And I guess we're saying the same thing at both levels. We're saying that you want to persuade rather than coerce. But also in the real world, there are times when you can't wait to persuade. The example that I always like to think of in this connection is the voting out of power of Augusto Pinochet in Chile. I give you my rock-bottom guarantee that Pinochet did not go out saying, "I was such a bad boy. *Que malo hombre estaba.*" He did not say, "I'm sorry I tortured all of those people." I bet that he didn't turn a hair.

But they had an opportunity to get him out of office. And I'm not saying that they should have stopped and sat him down and talked it over with him until he left voluntarily. The only occasion that I know of where a whole regime more or less walked out voluntarily was in India – was the Freedom Struggle. And even there, if they hadn't been exhausted by the two world wars, there's a good chance that another Churchill would have come and said, "We intend keeping what we've got."

And so, let's put it this way. In a small enough encounter, when you have enough time, go for complete persuasion. But in a larger encounter, you're dealing with a lot of people, the issue starts to get fudged. You have to move a mass of people that's already not pure Satyagraha. In fact, when we're looking at "Hind Swaraj" for Thursday, you will see to your surprise, and perhaps shock, that Gandhi felt that there were some problems with democracy as we currently understand it. Not "we" currently here. We don't understand it at all. But even as it was understood then there were problems with it in that if you had to operate in political parties you were already abrogating the will of the individual.

So, to do what the party said meant you have to sacrifice your individual judgment. And to not do what the party said would be to render yourself irrelevant politically. So, when you get up to big numbers there was to be rough compromises. But I think what he was aiming for was to get the picture clear enough that people could see that there was a new kind of force there operating. Okay, so let's see – where were we?

Noncooperation

There were two events now in rapid succession that are going to bring things to a successful conclusion. The first one is the British are putting pressure on Smuts' government, the whole world public is getting aroused. You remember that little scene from the movie, the Champaran episode where the governor says, "Back home they're writing essays about him." So, kids in school writing essays about somebody can be a powerful mechanism.

And all this is going on and what does the politician do under these circumstances. They always do the same thing. They decide that there's going to be a commission. They'll inquire into the subject. And this commission was set up. Back in India everybody was thrilled. They thought was a great breakthrough. You took one look at that commission and you – look, there's not a single Indian on it, of the whites who are on the commission, three of them were notoriously anti-Indian. One of them was the guy who organized the mob scene at the S.S. Corland when Gandhi was coming back in January of '08 and almost killed him.

And this is the commission that's going to decide how to resolve the issue. So, Gandhi made a decision that they would not cooperate. They would not give testimony. They would boycott the commission. What's interesting here is not only did he risk alienating Lord Hardinge who said, "Gandhi, we're never going to be able to get you anything better than this." This is the best you've got. Use it, man." And he said, "No, that would violate principle. I actually cannot do it." It would keep the Indians in the same position that they started out of being passive victims with no voice, no ability to speak, no ability to negotiate, as though they were constitutionally incapable of reason.

So, it's on that very deep level that he decided, "No, we can't participate in this." So not only having spent years and years winning the good graces of the viceroy did he risk it,

but he also went against Gokhale. Gokhale did not understand the situation as well as Gandhi. Gandhi had to tell him, “You know, if you were here, you would see it my way. But since you’re not, all I can do is ask you to trust me. We are not going to join this commission.”

So, it looked like it’s déjà vu all over again. We’ve got another stalemate when an interesting turn of events comes up. As another historian, Constance DeJong put it – the movement would not give up its principles just to get on with a ripe moment. So, they’re hanging there in that position when all of a sudden the British railway workers decide to go on strike. They announce that they’re going to strike. This is almost as bad as a coal strike. Of course, trains are not really all that useful without coal. But nothing is going to work without a rail system.

Non-embarrassment

When they threatened to go on strike, that really embarrassed Smuts’ government. And immediately Gandhi sent Smuts a message saying, “Okay, we are going to call off Satyagraha for the time being.” This is – he’ll do this two or three times later in India, especially WWI, WWII.

I have a feeling we’ve kind of discussed what the principle is here that he’s working on, but I don’t remember whether we actually did it here or not. Anybody remember? Why this is called – okay, I’ll give you the technical term for this, and I’ll see what we did or did not say about it. It’s called, “Non-embarrassment.” Is that spelled correctly? It’s very hard to tell on a blackboard? Embarrassment has two R’s? Is that right? Okay, good.

Okay, why is it so important not to embarrass your adversary? And actually, this is one of the things that differentiates principled nonviolence from strategic nonviolence. Yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:09:04]

Michael: Good way to approach it. Your goal is not to win purely and simply, it’s to readjust the relationship between the person, the opponent who feels alienated. If you don’t end up converting your enemy into a friend, you really have not succeeded in Satyagraha. And there’s nothing that will keep a person from being a friend more effectively than disrespect. Mm-hmm, Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:09:42]

Michael: It is sometimes impossible to win a person over. The point is that I’m not saying – if I did say it, I didn’t mean it. I misspoke. I’m not saying that unless the other person feels that you’re his friend, you have failed. I’m not quite saying that. I’m saying that you have to keep that as your primary goal. It’s even more important than whatever the issue is. You know, 3£ tax for the immigration or whatever it is. The person must not be – you must act in such a way that the person will no longer be alienated. What they’re going to do with that, you cannot control. Zoe?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:10:42]

Michael: That is very well put. The bad part of any conflict, the part you've got to resolve is the duality part where there's an element of dehumanization, disregard between one party and the other. That has to be the main thing that you're trying to fix. But you're quite right, Joy, that in the end sometimes the other person will not come around. There is this famous story in the Mahabharata – this huge epic in which the Bhagavad Gita is embedded.

At the end of this epic, the hero of the – I don't want to use the term, "good guys" because it's been very badly misapplied of late. But the Pandavas, the side that Krishna has joined, their hero goes to heaven. They have heaven also, and they also ask you who you are. When you arrive at the gate you have to show your photo I.D., swipe your card quickly through the slot. And they ask his person what his name is. He says – he decides to give his epithet which is a Ajatashatru which means, "he whose enemy has never been born." In other words, he who has no enemies.

And the gatekeeper, Chitragupta, he looks down and he looks at this – they have been – there's like thousands of corpses of people who have been trying to kill you for the last 18 days and you're saying you had no enemy? And Ajatashatru says, "They have hated me, but I did not hate them." So, it's in that sense that you have no enemy. It does not mean that you can ultimately control the other person in terms of their attitude. But I will say this in addition, that what you do will have an effect on that person. What we're really arguing about is not whether it'll have an effect or not, but rather will they own it or not. You will have caused their mirror neurons to fire off. Whether they decide to smile or not, that's up to them.

Student: [Unintelligible 01:13:12]

Michael: Well, you may not be too surprised, Joy, to hear that this is not the first time I've heard that argument. In fact, I just heard it yesterday when I was doing a radio interview. Lots of people think that there are some people who can never be won over. Now, personally, I don't think so. However, we don't have to argue about that. Whew! In fact, we don't have to argue about anything.

I think I can say without fear of contradiction that the number of such people is so small that if you had a sane culture you could isolate them to such a degree that they would be powerless for political purposes. That, at least, you can certainly do. Personally, I believe that as long as you're breathing you have an *atman*. You have a self, and that self can be reached in some way. The practical question is can it be reached in the 21st century, you know, while we're still alive. Maybe not.

But that doesn't matter politically because that cannot be used as an argument – "Nonviolence won't work. Let's abandon it." Okay, my favorite example of this now is that at the end of the Montgomery Bus Boycott they had things almost organized. The White Citizens' Council was ready to concede. They're going to – they did, in fact,

decree that the buses would not be segregated. Somebody got angry and threw a bomb.

However, on this occasion, nobody paid any attention. “Oh, another bomb? Rats.” And they went back to work. And the result of that terrorist attempt was it completely failed. It did not affect anybody. So, the British have known for some time that when there’s a terrorist attack you play it down and you get on with the problem. Play it down and solve the problem. That’s the technique that’s worked for decades in Britain.

Now, of course, we did exactly the opposite. Play it up for all you’re worth, and don’t say diddly about the problem. So, on and on it goes. I hope you read that intelligence report or the unintelligent report about the intelligence report that was in the local newspapers. Sixteen intelligence agencies have said that the result of the Iraq War is that we’re in much greater danger and there’s more terrorism and Al Qaeda is bigger than ever. So obviously they didn’t watch the webcast of Day 1 of PACS 164A, or they would not have made that mistake.

Okay. Well, we’re almost to the very end. So let me just wrap it up quickly and share this famous quote with you from one of Smuts’ secretaries – when Gandhi said we will suspend Satyagraha – I don’t think they had the term non-embarrassment yet. That’s what we call it today. What it did was it gave Smuts’ the opportunity to give Gandhi what he wanted without losing face. “Look at the handsome concession that they’ve made. They’ve been carrying this on for eight years. It’s a terrific pain. It’s a drain on our exchequer. We can’t go on with it forever. And they have decided to step back, so let’s meet them halfway.”

And sure enough, by the time Gandhi returned on July 18th, 1914, he departed from South Africa – 21 years since that night in Maritzburg – he has gotten assurances that the tax will be repealed, the “color bar” will be repealed and the pass laws will be repealed. Now the long term, the aftermath is that after a period of time – the situation is not going to be all that sweet for the Indians in South Africa – but by this time Gandhi will be distracted by India, and he can’t go back. He leaves Maganlal to try to keep things on an even keel.

Even though there’s some backsliding, I don’t think we should say that the movement was a failure because it did so many things that were absolutely impossible before they started. Indians could petition. Indians could litigate. Indians could struggle. It never had been possible in the colonial era. They could force concessions out of a brutal entrenched government. And the big thing I think is – and unfortunately we have no direct way to measure this – but I’m positive that the reason that you have a democratic regime in South Africa today, and that it was reached without the kind of violence that attended similar revolutions in other parts of the world, was because of that model.

They knew that people of color had done it in that country before. Tolstoy Farm was sitting there reminding them every day. And so, I think that the future of South Africa was much, much brighter for what Gandhi did there. Of course, the main significance is

that he's now perfected this mechanism. He's going to take it back to India. But I just wanted to close with the words of one of Smuts' secretaries. "I do not like your people and do not care to assist them at all. But what am I to do? You help us in our days of need. How can we lay hands upon you? I often wish you took to violence like the English strikers and then we would know at once how to dispose of you. But you will not injure even the enemy. You desire victory by suffering alone and that reduces us to sheer helplessness."

Okay, well, I know that you have copies of "Hind Swaraj" or should be able to get them. So, give that a read. We'll look at it and start the India Struggle on Thursday.

10. Success in South Africa 2: Return to India and the Year of Silence

Michael: Well, this morning it's not just a good morning, but I'd like to extend to Camilla and Rami and other Muslim students in the class, *Ramadan Mubarak*. Be careful with these guys. They're going to be a little bit low on blood sugar around this time of the day for the next few weeks. And a belated *Shanah Tovah* to Jordan and other Jewish members of the class.

I said that I think if you got my CourseWeb announcement, you'll know that I will be able to be at most of my office hours today from 2:00 to 2:45 or something like that. Also, I wanted to share with you the good news that that little booklet that I was talking about on the first day, "[Hope or Terror](#);" it's been given to 100 diplomats at an international meeting in Berlin. It's been spread all over the world through the Peace Movement. I think every continent I've heard that there's somebody who's gotten a copy. And Representative Lynn Woolsey is going to be giving it to all the members of Congress in the next session. So just watch this country turn around. So that shows you carry – just become a Peace major and win fame and fortune. I've often said that the big money is really in peace research. We all ought to follow it.

So, we're going to sort of resume – I don't mean resume – sum up the South Africa phase. And I think we'll be falling a little bit behind. I want to do that, then take a pause and look at this classic document that came out of it in 1909, namely "Hind Swaraj." Have a discussion on that. It's got so many basic topics about nonviolence in it that we can take as much time as we want to on that and then get into the first part of the India Struggle. Say, if we can, I'd like to try and sketch over about 1915 when he arrives there until 1924.

1924 to 1928 was a little bit of a down time after some explosive experiments in the earlier years. And I think you'll notice that there's a sort of ten-year rhythm. That there's something that climaxes in the early 20's, climaxes in the early 30's, and then climaxes again and finally with "Quit India" in 1942. And in-between it's mostly constructive programme and laying the groundwork and positioning yourself and then you have these oppositional confrontational nonviolent moment-type episodes at this ten-year rhythm. It's just sort of an interesting observation.

But to go back to South Africa for just a second, there's a book called, [Gandhi Through Western Eyes](#). And there's an essay in it on his youth and his life in South Africa. And here is kind of a summary paragraph I thought we might find useful. "It has regretfully to be recorded that this victory for Satyagraha," climax in 1913, "did not endure. The South African government had been shamed into reform. It had not resolved to reform as a result of change of heart."

Three Grades of Nonviolent Conversion

This is interesting. I think we can discern three kinds of grades of conversion in nonviolence. One is just pure coercion where people have no choice and have to knuckle under and do what you want. Then there's something that they're calling shame. You get shamed into it. You get awakened to the fact that what you're doing is wrong, but it's more – if you're familiar with these terms from anthropology – it's more shame than guilt.

Anthropologists talk about a shame culture versus a guilt culture. And the difference is in a shame culture you're mostly – your behavior is influenced or controlled by *other* members of your community. In a guilt culture, you change your *own* behavior according to your own sensitivities, your own feelings about it. So, I think we could set this up as an interesting possibility that when you get to change an opponent who's doing something that you will not tolerate through nonviolence, the least enduring way to do it is through coercion. In fact, you wouldn't really want to call that principled nonviolence at all. But there are times when you have to do it. I cited the example of Pinochet in Chile where, you know, he had to be removed from office because thousands of people were being tortured and killed and you had an opportunity to get him out of there. Of course, you take it. But I would say there's like zero change of heart in the cases of Pinochet.

Then the South Africans were more or less forced to grant the Indians some rights and some concessions because of public opinion, where the whole world is watching and they're starting to get very ugly and very brutal and so they find themselves exposed. It's not working well for them. But that's also – that's okay. It's still not the best and it is going to – they are going to swing back in the other direction when nobody is looking. That's the problem.

But the best way – though it isn't a particularly comfortable emotion – the best way is to really acknowledge yourself that what you've been doing is very wrong. And, of course, the flip side of that is you overcome your alienation with the victim. So, you've been dehumanizing them. So, there's really two things going on here. Guilt and re-humanization which are permanent – which are real spiritual gains. Everybody benefits from this and it's pretty – it's more or less permanent.

So, the success – our man is telling us here, the success of South African Satyagraha was in this middle category. Let's try these ideas out, see if they work. I've never really thought of it in quite this way so next week I may come in and say, "That was stupid. Let's go back to something else." But right now, that seems sensible.

So, the government had been shamed into reform. It had not resolved to reform as a result of a change of heart, which we're calling re-humanization. "The great majority of white South Africans have remained hostile to the claims of their Indian fellow nationals, the claims to receive legal or social equality. Full citizenship has never been conceded."

So, it's a limited success in terms of what it does to the regime. But we have to remember in nonviolence always, when you're assessing how something succeeded or didn't succeed, that you're looking at the whole environment, the whole situation and not just what it does to the opponent.

Take an extreme case. There's an American universalist minister from the early 19th century named, Adin Ballou who started a community in Massachusetts called, "Hopedale," in about 1815. And he wrote a book called, [Christian Non-resistance in All its Major Principles Explained and Defended](#). They did not like snappy titles in the 19th century. You could not sell Marlboro cigarettes very easily in that era.

Anyway, in this book, Christian Non-resistance which is very right on in terms of nonviolence – and I used to even assign it in this class – he says, "Let's say that you're faced suddenly with an overwhelming opponent, and you face that person with," what he calls, "Christian Non-resistance," which we're calling nonviolence. And it does go to "work." The person – okay, let's take the worst-case scenario – they've come to kill you and they kill you. Still, if you shed your body, if you leave this life without succumbing to hatred, that's a big thing. That's a big gain.

You have accomplished something which is going to help you internally. And that is going to – as we were talking in the early weeks of the semester – we can't rule out that that affects other people positively and helpfully. Of course, we would like to have a little bit more. We'd like to, say, stay alive, little things like that. I don't know if you've seen, "Brothers-in-Law," with Peter Falk and Alan Arkin. Where Peter Falk is recruiting Alan Arkin into the CIA and he tells him about all these wonderful benefits. He says, "But you have to stay alive. That's the key to the benefits program." It's not, you know, it's a key to some benefits in the nonviolence program, but in the last analysis it may not be the only thing we have to hold out for.

Courage and Self-Discipline

So, let's look now at what it did for the resisters. It was this limited success – provisional success for the opponents – "But at least the eight-year campaign had shown what amazing self-discipline and courage can be displayed by simple unlettered men and women under inspired leadership." And that was a very big thing. So, Gandhi knew that he could take that back to India. He had done it on the fringes of the empire. Now he could go right into the heart, the belly of the beast.

"Moreover, it had led to a curiously close relationship of mutual regard between two of the outstanding men of their time, Gandhi and Smuts." And of course, that's the other dimension that it always leads to – the cementing of personal relationships. But at least he had put to the test his idea that people did not have to be educated. They did not have to be enfranchised. They did not have to have social leverage in order to be aroused and turned into an effective tool for social change even aimed against an overwhelming force.

And if you read, there's a kind of imaginative conversation in Easwaran's "Gandhi, the Man" where it says – though Gandhi and Smuts, when they're having that famous meeting in prison in 1908 and Gandhi tells Smuts about his demands and Smuts says, "Is there anything else?" And Gandhi says, "Yes, I've come here to fight your government." And Smuts says, "Oh, really? Anything you'd like to add?" And Gandhi says, "Yes. I'm going to win." And Smuts is kind of stunned and says, "Oh really? How do you expect to do that?" And Gandhi says, "With your help." Now that's not historical recorded conversation, but it's like they could easily have said that. That is, more or less, what happened. You get at your opponent in such a way that you start to convert him or her into a friend and then there's no fight anymore. And then everybody wins.

Three Principles of Satyagraha

But to sum up then a little bit, what was it exactly that he had discovered? There's a neat way to contrast the Satyagraha that he was working on there with passive resistance which is what it was usually compared to. Because there was a movement going on in Britain at the time, especially in 1902, by a group of people called, "The Nonconformists." They wanted basically to have the right to educate their children in their own way and the government was making rules for the education – the whole British system – which they didn't want to go along with. And they didn't have much representation in parliament or money.

It was sort of like the homeschooling movement that goes on in the States today. But we've given the homeschooling movement a lot of leeway and the British government was not doing that. So they went into this campaign that became known as Passive Resistance and that's what a lot of people thought Gandhi was doing. But there really are five – there are five platforms, five strategic principles that the Nonconformists espoused and basically every single of them was not what Gandhi was doing.

The first is they had negative aims. There were specific grievances, but like the denial of facilities to the untouchables later on in India, so like the salt monopoly. But Gandhi put most of his emphasis on constructive programme. And just if you let him alone he would rebuild the whole country and it would never have to be any faceoff between him and the British, but of course, they did not leave him alone.

The second cardinal principle for the Nonconformists was the demand for an immediate response. They said, "This is intolerable. We want this law repealed and we want it repealed now." You know, "Lord give me patience and give it to me right away," as the old saying goes. Whereas Gandhi knew that this thing was going to take a long, long time. As long as they were making progress in the right direction he was content. He actually felt that they were doing it as quickly as possible if you were aiming at a permanent change. And this is one of the many reasons that his own coworkers got seriously impatient with him from time to time.

Thirdly, Gandhi used the term “evil and good,” but he didn’t use it in quite the hard-edged way that the Nonconformists did. One of their principles was no compromise with evil. And the next step is you brand your opponent as evil and then you say, “No compromise with my opponent no matter what.” And as we’ve already emphasized, Gandhi was very careful to use his insight and see what was absolutely essential. Cling to that for all its worth and give [away] everything else.

Now sometimes the things that he thought were essential seemed peripheral to other people. Let’s see if I can think of an example. Yes, he was ready, willing, and able to give up his life to stop the division into two electorates in India for the caste Hindus and the untouchables because he saw that to write this into law would cast it in concrete in people’s minds in a way that it could never really be undone. Other people were saying, “Oh, you know, it’s just – so what? They get to vote. We get to vote. What’s the difference?” But he was very uncompromising on that point. But other than that, you’ll see that the things that he was willing to compromise on were really amazing.

Gandhi also – now another principle was invoking divine sanctions. Now Gandhi did do that. In 1934 there was a terrible earthquake in Bihar, and he claimed, “Well, this is a sign of God’s displeasure with us for untouchability.” Moreover, a year earlier when he had gone on his fast unto death and people asked him, “What possessed you to do that?” He said, “Well, I was sitting there in my jail cell feeling helpless and wondering what to do and I heard a voice and it said, ‘Though must go on a fast.’” And so forth. So, it’s not that Gandhi did not use that kind of vocabulary and did not make any claims to divine sanction. He did. And he would go on doing that.

But he didn’t do it in the way the Nonconformists did which was to say, “We, our group, our project, have divine sanction and anyone who opposes us does not.” In other words, Gandhi wasn’t saying that you got divine sanction just by being on the right side. You got divine sanction by getting in contact with God. And as he said, there was a way that human beings could learn how to do that. Julia, did you? Okay. Yeah?

Gandhi and the Caste System

Student: What caste was Gandhi born into?

Michael: Gandhi was a Bania which means that that’s a sub-caste within the Vaisya, or the third caste down – or the second caste up or however you want to –

Student: And he was for the caste system, but he wasn’t against the untouchability part?

Michael: Yes. We’ll probably have to get back to this at some point. The part that will surprise you is that he was not out to destroy the caste system. And when that struggle became quite intense in the late 30’s and early 40’s, he was working with this Doctor Ambedkar who had been born out of the caste system, beneath the caste system. At one point Ambedkar will write him a letter saying, “Well, Bapu, one thing we agree on is

we have to get rid of the caste system, right?” And to his surprise Gandhi would write back and say, “Wrong.”

Student: Yeah, because it goes the whole dharma thing.

Michael: It goes with the sva-dharma thing. And as long as the caste system was a sort of natural division of labor, not only wasn't he against it, but he felt that it was inevitable. If you try to ignore it, it would only creep back in another way. And when we do things like that, we usually find that when the wheel is reinvented, it's reinvented bigger and uglier than it was before. So, the other part of that statement to Ambedkar was, “We don't have to get rid of caste, but we have to get rid of high and low.” In other words, these things have to be leveled out in terms of human dignity, you know, access to divine sanction and all those things. Yeah.

Fourth Principle of Satyagraha

So that was four principles that we've now smashed that the passive resisters have. There's one left. And that is that they had what they called, “Indignation meetings.” They had mass meetings which were not unlike the noon rallies of certain groups on this campus. No names, please. But the point of them was to stir up people's indignation against atrocities and evil and so forth. Now Gandhi was much more circumspect about doing that.

He would say things like, “Now the lion,” which is the symbol of the British Empire, “Now the lion is shaking it's bloody claws in our face,” but he was exquisitely careful not to act under anger. And to the greatest extent possible, to rouse people without rousing them to anger. There's a very fine line there, and you can see that in “Hind Swaraj.” He's absolutely uncompromising about the regime and what it does to India. He calls it, “The four-fold curse.” India is being destroyed economically, politically, culturally, and spiritually. But he adds over and over again, “The British didn't come here and take this country by the sword. They came here, and we gave it to them. And they will not be able to stay one day past the day that we decide to take it back.”

In fact, in the 40's one of the things he did was declare, “Okay, from now on we're independent. Just start acting like you're independent. Don't go to British law courts. Don't send your kids to British school. Of course, don't wear British cloth. And just walk around ignoring them.” It was very effective. In fact, if you wanted to look backwards in history, back in 1795 there was an episode where the French were taking control of the Sandwich Islands, and they invaded the island because the Sandwich Islanders were not paying a liquor tax. They weren't paying a liquor tax because they didn't drink liquor. But the French didn't think that this was enough of a reason not to give them money. So, they landed a shipload of Marines. They even had Marines in those days. And the islanders didn't know what to do. They didn't have weapons.

They had a meeting with the king, and he decided the most effective thing to do would be to ignore them. So, they totally ignored them. The Marines came up on shore. And said, “Hi.” They attacked the fort. There was an old fort that hadn’t been used for a long, long time. So, the French Marines attacked this fort and burned it to the ground, declared victory, and marched off the island. And it could be a very effective strategy to simply not respond when aggressive moves like that are being made.

The other thing about indignation is critical in my view is he was very emphatic that it was not to be anger against people. It was anger against what people were doing. It was against systems that they had established. He has this famous comment, I think in connection with his imprisonment – the six years imprisonment of harsh labor that came in 1931 where he said, “I refuse to hate the domineering Englishman just as I refuse to hate domineering Hindus. But” he said, “I hate from the bottom of my heart the system of government which the British have set up in India.”

So that was a critical distinction. He never lost focus on that distinction, and he tried to have everyone who worked with him to be like that also. And that’s why Gandhi and Smuts end up being friends and so forth. So, he was not doing these kinds of crude indignation meetings. So that’s kind of a neat way of looking at what was different and what he did create there.

Gandhi vs Tolstoy

And I had one other quote. Let me find it. Yeah, from Tolstoy. Gandhi’s secretary, Pyarelal, was able to cite two qualitative differences that Gandhi had added to the concept of passive resistance or the idea of nonviolence as it had been espoused by Tolstoy. And here they are. One, what Gandhi was adding – and this is close to what we started out with, that he made it into a mass movement, something that Martin Luther King will also observe. “Gandhi added techniques to discipline and organize the masses,” which Tolstoy had not come up with. Tolstoy, you remember, was a member of the sort of lower nobility. He was a count. Graf Lev Nikolayevich Tolstoy. And he resigned all of that. He emancipated his serfs. But that was about all – that was about as close as he could get to them in terms of really having a relationship with them. Whereas Gandhi said, “I’m not going to wear anything that you can’t wear. I’m not going to eat anything that you can’t eat. I’m going to live like you and be your spokesperson.”

So, all the things that we’ve been looking at in South Africa – [Takes off jacket] I’m warming up to the subject here – the ways that he brought in the laboring class and all of that, that was beyond what Tolstoy had hit upon. And the other thing was a technique for pursuing perfect goals with imperfect means. For this, Gandhi felt it was enough if his Satyagrahis – followed the principle of Satyagraha without prior conviction. As long as they’re willing to follow it in their behavior and keep on learning as they’re going.

In other words, he didn’t sit people down and say, “Do you swear never to have any resentment against anyone. Sit here, we’re going to let a cobra crawl over your lap and

see if you have any fear.” There wasn’t anything like that. You could grow into it. He did that once. He was at a prayer meeting and a cobra crawled over his lap. It didn’t freak him out, which maybe is not as impressive to an American because we don’t have poisonous serpents. Where I live we go around looking for gopher snakes and pick them up and take them out to the garden so nature can do its thing. But in India if you see a snake, there’s just a primordial instinctive fear that comes up because those things are very, very terrifying, very fatal.

Gandhi's Nonviolent Leadership

So anyway, to get back to my story, you didn’t have to be like Gandhi before you joined the movement. There was this kind of pyramid where you had – you know, Gandhi said, “I am your general.” His style of leadership was a little bit different from what we’re accustomed to, but it was still a style of leadership. He said, “Look, if you don’t want me to be your general, just tell me and I’m out of here in a heartbeat. But” he said, “while I am your general you will kindly do everything that I say.”

Then were these 70 or 80 people packed around him very tightly who lived with him in the ashram. They didn’t really eat everything that he ate. He thought they were eating everything that he ate. But they went outside and had a little different fare from just the neem chutney and things like that. But mostly they were very close to him. They took some very severe vows. They’re a lot heavier than just, you know, not having a latte every now and then. And they shared everything in common. They cleaned the latrines, classless society and so forth.

They went through this training for years. And then when the time came when there was a confrontation, that would show itself. It was a very moving description that Nehru will give of being at a demonstration against the Prince of Wales. When the police came in there was a lathi charge and charging down on them with horseback and beating them with these bamboo staves. And Nehru was an expert polo player. He had been to Eton and Oxford, I think? Or was it [Caro 00:28:56] and Cambridge, I don’t remember. But he found himself thinking how easy it would be to yank that British cavalryman down off his horse. He said, “I know how to do this. I can.” But he said, “Long training and discipline held.” And he stuck to his no guns and didn’t even try to resist the blows.

So, there was that core group. There’s Gandhi himself. There’s the core group. And then it’s potentially completely open-ended and you could, in the right circumstances, you could organize 100 million people. And they wouldn’t be trained and committed to the principle of nonviolence when they came in, but they would be committed to following it while they were in the action. That was how it worked. And while you were in it, you would see how it worked. You could get a taste for it, and you could grow into it. So that was an experience that a lot of people had.

Nonviolence in the Northwest Frontier

You know, they went in there saying, “Okay, I don’t believe in this stuff, but I believe in Gandhiji. If he wants me to be nonviolent.” Oh, the really good example would be the Pathans in the northwest frontier because they had a culture of revenge and violence. I mean by the time you were 12 years-old, if you were a Pathan, you knew not only how to use a rifle, you knew how to make a rifle. Like we used to do zip guns in my school in Brooklyn, but it wasn’t – we didn’t quite have the same revenge code that the Pathan’s had. It was only the smaller boys that made the zip guns, I seem to remember.

But with the Pathans it was rather different. And yet these people got these horrific beatings and did not hit back, and something happened to them. They understood a power that they had never understood before. In fact, just recently, a woman named Mukulika Banerjee went out and tried to find all these Khudai Khidmatgars. You’ll be more familiar with this whole story in a couple of weeks, I hope. But she found all of these people. There were originally 80,000 of them who had followed Abdul Ghaffar Khan. She rounded them up and took them out to a big party and interviewed them and said, “What enabled you to do that?” And they said, “It was the spirituality of Khan. We saw that. We understand it. And for one brief moment we were able to do superhuman things.”

So, you pull people into this incredible mindset where they can behave in a way that they never thought they were capable of. And then you let them make their choice. So that was something that he added to Tolstoy’s view. Tolstoy thought you had to completely renounce violence under any form of circumstance and then you could be a real Christian. You could be a real part of his social movement that was happening.

Hind Swaraj

Okay, so that was what I wanted to say by way of wrapping up and looking back at what was discovered in South Africa. And now we’re going to rewind just a little bit – about five years – and pause. And look at this classic [Hind Swaraj](#). I can tell you a little bit about it in terms of background. I want to read you one paragraph from it that hits on a number of points. And then I’ll open it up, and we can have a discussion.

He wrote this thing onboard ship, November 13th to November 22nd, 1909. And this is something that makes writers like me just turn green with envy because he just wrote it in one go without even going back and crossing any T’s. Well, for one thing, because he was writing it in Gujarati, and they don’t have Ts in Gujarati. But he never went back and changed anything. And it rapidly became a classic. Thirty-eight years later they re-published it and they showed it to him and said, “What do you want to change?” He read through and he said, “Not a word. *Kuch nahi*. Nothing. Nothing has to be changed.”

And, you know, I write something – like I wrote my dissertation in Dwinelle Hall between the hours of 10:00 PM and 1:00 in the morning over a period of three months. My fellow graduate students were blown away. “Whoa, you wrote your dissertation in three months.” Then I read it. Oh my God. So, I just tore it apart and started all over again

from Page 1. So, this kind of suggests the kind of divine inspiration, the way he wrote this thing.

As soon as it came out, it was a 50-page booklet. As soon as it came out the government banned it. This is going to be a good example of how when repressive regimes do things like that, it backfires on them. They banned it, and he responded by translating it into English. Where, of course, it reached many, many more people. But he had originally written in Gujarati because he was aiming it really not at the British, but at the Indians who were about to pick up the gun and take to violent revolution. That scared him more than anything. He really felt that he had only a limited amount of time to snatch this thing out of the fire.

So, from this time forward he's playing this kind of act where he has to rouse Indians from their torpor and especially he has to break through their almost hypnotic fascination with the West. And he has to do that for both sides. For the Indians who are just not doing anything and for the Indians who are about to take to violence, he's showing in Hind Swaraj that they're both fascinated by the West, either as victims or as participants. And he has to crank them back to discover their own civilization. It's one of the most important statements that he'll make in the book, "Don't be swept off your feet by this glittery civilization." He's already seen in the beginning of the 20th century that it was shallow.

What's that saying, "If you look underneath the false tinsel of Hollywood, you'll find real tinsel." He had seen that. So that's why he wrote it in Gujarati, but he got it to Tolstoy in some language or other. I guess it was probably the English translation that reached Tolstoy. And in April of 1910 Tolstoy wrote in his diary, "Read Gandhi about civilization. Period. Wonderful. Period." That's his testimonial.

So that's the background. The reader of the book could be anyone, but he's thinking primarily of that person whose picture I showed you when we had that little slideshow, a doctor who was a resident in London named Pranjivan Mehta who, you know, was quite a considerable person with a lot of influence and prestige and he was beginning to say that we've got to take to violence to do this.

Now just to look down the road a little bit, this is going to be a struggle that Gandhi has to wage throughout to the very end of his career, against the oppressor and against people who want to use violence against the oppressor. And for him, these are just going to be two sides of one coin. He's really against violence, however you're using it in whatever direction. And that's the point that has to be grasped. He said, on one occasion, "I have three enemies. And they are in descending order of importance. There's the British – they're really pretty easy. Then there's my fellow Indians – that's much more difficult. And finally, and most difficult of all, M.K. Gandhi."

And he would find himself pitted against people like Subhas Chandra Bose. When WWII broke out, Bose actually joined the Japanese and actually went to Berlin and met Hitler. What a privilege. He appeared in public with Hitler. Because if you're against the British,

I'm on your side. So that goes to show you how much violence and anger Gandhi was fighting to control from the Indian side while he was fighting to repel it from the opponent side.

Peace - Negative vs Positive

Okay, at the end of Chapter 8, if you have this book, this is page 38. There's an argument that struck me as – actually, a lot of arguments in this book struck me that way. But it seems to me that if you get at what Gandhi's getting at here, this is directly applicable to our own situation. The reader who's objecting – the reader is saying that after all the British have brought Pax Britannica, which was modeled on Pax Romana, which is in turn going to be a model for Pax Americana. That after all they brought Pax Britannica to India meaning there's a certain kind of social unrest.

And there were hereditary – now this is one kind of unfortunate aspect of the caste system – there were hereditary bandits. And it was caste. There were these groups that said, you know, that's what I do. I rob people, cut off their fingers and wear them around my neck as a necklace. Angulimala, one of the characters that the Buddha had to confront. And they really could make life pretty difficult and awkward. And as a matter of fact, this still goes on.

The Bhils, in particular, still do a certain kind of hereditary banditry which is just as bad as un-hereditary banditry if you're the one who's getting your car jacked or whatever it is that's happening. So, there's reference to three of these groups. Gandhi says, "I do not call the situation in India, "Peace." You may see peace if you like. I see none." What he's getting at here is what we call, "Positive peace," which I've defined as a situation – yeah, let's just say a regime, a situation in which all parties desire one another's welfare. That's peace. But a situation in which the parties who don't desire your welfare are held down by force is not peace from a Gandhian point of view.

So, Gandhi says, "You can call it peace if you like. I don't." And the reader says, "You make light of the terror that the thugs, the Pindaris and the Bhils were to the country." So, these are three other groups who did this kind of thing. And of course, this is where we get our word, "Thug." Tyagis. Wasn't it Richard Nixon who said, "I am not a thug?" "I am not a crook." That's right. That's a different word. Yeah. Whatever it was he thought he was not.

And then Gandhi says, "If you give the matter some thought you will see that the terror was by no means such a mighty thing. If it had been, other people would have died way before the British advent." They would have overwhelmed the country if it was a really serious menace. [unintelligible 00:41:32]. "Before the British got here."

Vinoba Bhave and the Dacoits

And as a matter of fact, there will be a famous episode after Gandhi is assassinated, when one of his disciples, probably the person who was considered closest to him spiritually, a man named Vinoba Bhave, will be going through an area in Maharashtra where there were Dacoits, another type of hereditary bandit and Bhave will issue a call to the Dacoits saying, “You come in. Surrender your guns to me and you will be punished according to law, but no more than that. We won’t pursue your families,” and anything like that.

And there’s even a photograph of Bhave sitting there with – did I show you a slide of that? Did we have a slideshow? Anyway, it’s worth repeating. Bhave sitting at the foot of a tree, sort of a yogic position and these very expensive weapons in front of him which these people are unslinging – high-powered rifles and binoculars and stuff like that, turning themselves in to him. So that’s an important little event because it shows that you can use nonviolence against terrorists.

But then he goes on to make a second point, “Moreover, the present peace is only nominal for by it we have become emasculated and cowardly.” That was an image that Gandhi used a lot. Emasculated. “We are not to assume that the English have changed the nature of the Pindaris and the Bhils. It is therefore better to suffer the Pindari peril than that someone else should protect us from it and thus render us effeminate.”

Norman Cousins - Bacteria in the Fog

I hope you don’t take offense at his use of effeminate in this context, but the point is that for him it was primary that you handled your own defense. Now just look at our own situation for a minute. Recently passed away, a friend of mine, Norman Cousins, discovered that in the 50s – well, it wasn’t he that discovered it. That’s right. The Freedom of Information Act discovered that in the late 50s the U.S. Navy was testing bacteriological weapons. And one of the ways that they tested it was they sailed around the bay – our bay, the East Bay out here – and they sprayed bacteria into the fog to “see” what would happen.

Well, guess what? Some people got sick from this bacteria which was very virulent. And in fact, one person who was an elderly man – this was in the days before the flu shot – anyway, this is bacteria so that wouldn’t count. This person died and his grandchildren discovered it when the Freedom of Information Act came out with this fact, and they sued the Navy. And Norman Cousins made a very interesting point. Now this is a person who was totally against war. He was one of the first Americans to go into Hiroshima after the war, He rounded up what are called “The Hiroshima Maidens,” and brought them to America for reconstructive surgery and all the rest of it. Just a complete pacifist.

However, he said, “Look, if you want to sue them go ahead and sue them because that was a horrible thing to do. They’re supposed to be protecting us, and they killed us. But” he said, “there’s no point in getting indignant about it. We should be learning the lesson.

The lesson is that the minute you hire somebody else to protect you, you have given away your essential freedoms. And they're going to protect you in the way that they see fit, and not in the way that you see fit."

Nonviolent Protection and Defense

So, this is a very important principle, and I'd say it's very relevant to us when the president, after 9/11 says, you know, take the kids to Disneyland. "My job is to protect the American people." And American people's job is to go to Disneyland and not get involved. He is encouraging us to give up our own protection. And this will, of course, be a big issue in the mid-40's when there's a threat of a Japanese invasion.

And Gandhi is being pretty much held under by the British – through that whole period he's in prison most of the time. But he actually argues that the British should leave India and let them defend themselves. The British said, "No way. You guys don't have an army and we do. The minute we pull out of here, the Japanese are going to swarm in and take over the country. We are the only thing that's protecting you."

After the war a couple of little documents came to light and one of them was the defense plan for India – the British defense plan for India. And guess what that plan said? The first Japanese that puts his toe over that line from Burma into India, we're getting the hell out of there. That was how they planned to "defend" the country, which was to scam. And the document said, "Oh, we'll leave a garrison in some strategic places." Some strategic places in the country the size of India.

So, on the one hand they were lying because they really had no intention of "defending" India. But on the other hand, it's also been shown – this is a little bit more theoretical, that to the extent that the Japanese were planning to invade India, they were planning to do so because of the British army. They wanted to fight the British in India. It's not that they mainly wanted to occupy India. Though if you handed it to them, they probably would have taken it at that time.

So, the logic that you have to have other people to defend you is, if you pardon my French, a completely screwed up logic. And the minute you buy into that you really have given up your – well, to use Gandhi's terminology – you've given up your manhood or your womanhood. So, one of the characteristics of nonviolent defense is that it can be done by everybody and not by military elite. We'll get back to that when we talk about civilian based defense later on, but this is a very important point.

And he goes on to say, "It is better to suffer the Pindari peril than that someone else should protect us from it." I guess I've already said that. "I should prefer to be killed by the arrow of a Bhil than to seek unmanly protection." Then he goes on to give various arguments that buttress these major points. Okay, so I thought that might serve as an introduction. Now "Hind Swaraj" was written at a time when Gandhi was very outspoken. So, he's going to say some things in this book which are more hard-edged

than he would say later on. Like, “Railroads are bad,” things like that, so take that into account. But you will find a lot of extremely interesting arguments here on the subject of, for example, history, democracy, and so forth. I want to make sure we hit those two. Okay? So, who has any comments? Anything [unintelligible 00:49:32].

I’m happy to drone on and on. It’s not nearly as much fun, but I could drone on and on, but I’d much rather talk with you guys. Yeah, Camilla?

Student: I found it interesting that [unintelligible 00:49:56] using history as way to like – I guess an example, using it as an example and he said [unintelligible 00:50:06] “Because our country is so much different from anyone else’s that it can’t possibly turn out the same.” [Unintelligible 00:50:17].

Michael: So, Camilla is talking about a place where I think we absolutely have to start which is the question of history because you’ve probably noticed this already, you go back to Unit 3 or wherever you are and you start telling people that you’re taking this nonviolence course and they’ll say, “Are you crazy? Have you never read history?” And they go and read “history” and there’s no nonviolence in that history. But as we’ve mentioned already, there’s an obvious reason for that and that is that people are not looking for it. And when nonviolence happens, they don’t notice it. It’s like nothing happened at all.

And when violence breaks out they say, “Aha, an event.” And they record that event. And they patch together those – what Gandhi calls, “Actually what they’re doing is looking at the breakdowns in the course of nature.” When the system breaks down they rush in and record it. It’s not unlike this famous person in Vienna some about 18 years later who was trying to explain the human personality by studying neurotics. You wait until somebody breaks down and goes wrong. They have this disturbance. You study that – which you can do, you know. There’s nothing wrong with studying the pathology, but there’s something very wrong about taking pathology for the healthy.

So, similarly, historians as a profession had no concept of what the overall sweep of human destiny was and what human beings are striving to achieve consciously or mostly unconsciously. There were a few people like Eric Voegelin at Stanford and a few others who were called “historicists.” That is, they had an overview. They didn’t just study a period.

But I venture to say, if you go into the history department today at our university or even at universities that are not quite as good as, of course, none of the others is, and you say, “Well, I want to take kind of a grand overview. Where have we gotten since the days of cannibalism? I want to look at the rising trend of nonviolence.” I think they’ll tell you to get an independent study somewhere in Stephens Hall. So that’s one point.

Culture of Decentralization in India

Now the other point that you were talking about, Camilla, is if you want to understand the history of India you have to understand certain things about India which Western writers did not understand. One of them is the decentralization. The British came in and said, "Oh my God, this place is a mess. There's no central ruler. You don't even have a name for yourself." The name India is actually a distortion of a Persian mispronunciation of the river Sindhu. The Indians never called themselves India. They called themselves, "The Place where Bharata's rain falls." Bharatavarsha. Bharata being a mythological king.

So, they did not understand that there could be the kind of unity and diversity which pertained. And there were a lot of things they got wrong. One of the ones that they constantly got wrong was the depth of passion that people had around their religion. And that's why it always blew up in their face. But this is kind of – I think of *sine qua non*. If we don't get this point, if someone doesn't get this point, they won't be able to get anywhere with nonviolence. If you want to study the history of nonviolence, you have to go back and do it basically on your own.

Right now, there are a few people who are trying to write histories of nonviolence. Mostly looked upon as revisionists because they're revising the history of the American Revolution where we go out and say if you didn't have the war, we would still be part of the British Empire. And these historians have been showing since the early 60's that we probably would have gotten independence earlier without the war. So that's just one aspect of it.

Another is looking at popular movements which were not formal. And sometimes they didn't even have a name. And yet, accomplished big political changes. It's very difficult to study those. We don't know how to do it. There was a third and particularly brilliant point I was going to make, but it slipped away from me. So that's a good place to start the history.

Evaluating Success of Nonviolence

Even in terms of – this isn't the brilliant point, but it's a nice point. Even as we were saying earlier, in terms of evaluating the success of a nonviolent episode, even there we have to train ourselves to look for certain connections. For example, the Czechs have this non-violence civil based resistance in the spring of 1968 – spring and the summer. And if you look at it and say, "Oh, well, after eight months the Soviets occupied Czechoslovakia, therefore it was a failure.

But you could also say that the Czechs tested themselves and showed themselves that they could resist even if they didn't have the military advantage. In a way, they could resist better. It was a lot more fun. And so sure enough, when the Soviet Union collapses 20 or so years down the line, of all the East European countries, they were the one that came out of it with least damage, the least residue of hatred. Very, very few people were even injured in their liberation.

They had learned from that lesson what they could do, and they did it 20 years later. Again, this is something that would be difficult for a historian to come along and prove. Okay. Other main points about “Hind Swaraj?” Sid?

Student: I have a question. I don’t know, this might be insanely broad right now, but –

Michael: It would be hard to be more insanely broad than I’ve been already. Go ahead.

Hind Swaraj and the West

Student: Well, just like reading all this stuff, reading “Hind Swaraj,” reading “Bhagavad Gita,” it seems to me that Gandhi’s basing so much of his work on this like underlying spirituality and moral codes of India. And he sees a lot of the West is just not having that, not being based on these certain things. So, what do you think that says about any possibility of nonviolence in America where [unintelligible 00:57:21] having this Western frontier pushing forward. There was never this like agrarian village culture?

Michael: Let’s see if I can paraphrase what you’re saying. So especially in “Hind Swaraj” he does not hold out a lot of hope for Western civilization?

Student: Basically. Or just where we would even start?

Michael: Yeah, where would we start? Yeah. I mean no one could disagree with you. He calls it satanic which is not a nice word. And he is fully conscious that it is a clash of civilizations that’s going on. But he’s also very clear that it is not the British that he’s against, but their system. Really anybody, if you get down deep enough, they have the same values and the same capacities. What he’s saying is, that this thing called, “Western Civilization,” remember where he talks about the Gujarati word for civilization being something like politeness or something like that.

The Western system has not encouraged the best values in people. Whereas despite its problems, whatever you want to say about India being backward and the poverty which, you know, basically was caused by external exploitation, whatever you want to say about it, they had a civilization which attempted to foster the spiritual values. It was really – I suppose you could say – it was unique. It’s a matter of degree maybe, but it was sort of unique. Like just as we have documents and institutions, they had what they call their Parampara or their tradition of illumined people. And there was never a period of time when there wasn’t somebody who had made this incredible breakthrough.

Now Gandhi, however, was perfectly well aware that India was the laboratory where he could most easily demonstrate that a spiritual civilization could be made to work. But once he had demonstrated it there, it could be picked up anywhere. Now when he’s writing “Hind Swaraj” he wasn’t saying that last piece very loudly because he’s talking to people who were absolutely dazzled by Western civilization. They think if you can get in a train and go 60 miles an hour you’re 30 times better than somebody who’s going just a few miles per hour in a bullock cart.

So, he has to break that spell. But okay, your practical question is where would you even begin? Well, after all is said and done, if he's right about human nature, then we are going to reach a point – and he predicts it where people will say, "What have we done? We've gone too far down this road and now we need to go back." And we need to discover a spirituality of our own and that's why we'll be talking about what the Judeo-Christian heritage really is in a few weeks.

But if there was that underlying cultural advantage in India, there were also certain disadvantages. People in India were, by this time, pretty darn passive. So, he had to light a fire under them to get them from *tamas* to *rajas* so that he could get them from *rajas* to *satva*. In America, up until recently I would say, you don't have that problem. You know, a Canadian friend of mine was telling me a joke about getting oysters out of Lake Ontario or something and they noticed that the oysters on the Canadian side are very docile. The oysters on the American side are [grabbing gestures]. So that's actually an advantage and there's no question that every – I think we're starting to discover this now in nonviolence. Every culture has advantages and disadvantages.

So, it's a question of finding the advantages and working with them, working against the disadvantages. And, you know, that might be a good thing for us to do toward the end of the semester, sit down and take a good look at ourselves, qua Americans, and say, "What have we got going for us if we wanted to build this kind of thing? And what is going against us?" Uh huh? Julia?

Spirituality and Nonviolent Leadership

Student: I was thinking of – I had a similar question along similar lines as far as [unintelligible 01:02:11]. I was thinking a lot about the Civil Rights Movement and how they really had so many inspired leaders which is something that we're really lacking right now. But they were inspired by Christianity and their own ministers, and they had that whole kind of flare to it. And so, I was thinking about possibilities or [unintelligible 01:02:29].

Michael: Right. Well, now I have to admit we have gotten far from "Hind Swaraj," but that's okay. So, Julia is asking what are the possibilities for a secular movement given the fact that the Civil Rights Movement was not one? There's no question about that. I've noticed a pattern and I've even published it so I, you know, stuck my neck out on this one, that there seems to be three waves of nonviolence. And in the modern era. And the first is the period from Gandhi to King where you have inspired leadership, Gandhi, King, Chavez, you might say, inspired leadership and a spiritual energy that you can tap into.

And the second wave would be – insurrectionary struggles that happened all over Europe where you didn't have that kind of individual leadership. But if you take the – we'll do this next semester, of course. You take the Philippine Insurrection in 86. Christianity played into that in a very helpful and very useful way. So, you have some

leaders like Corazon Aquino and some spirituality, but it's more broad based. And the third wave, which I think we're into now. Is characterized by the WTO demonstrations in – when was that? 99? Something like that – where whole new kinds of organization had to be developed because people are actually anti-leadership. So, it's come a long way since Gandhi says, "I am your general. You either fire me or do everything that I say."

Anyone who stood up and said that in Seattle would find himself a one-way hitchhiker back down to Los Angeles or wherever he or she had come from. It's a completely different style which I thought, myself, was impossible. I thought you could not do this without some kind of leadership. Furthermore, there's a new kind of spirituality that seems to be available to people that isn't limited to a particular religious framework. There are a lot of these, like in the context of – take a look at the time here – in the context of third-party nonviolent intervention, a lot of the teams – some of the teams are just completely secular like Peace Brigades International. Some of them are connected with a special religion like Christian peacemaker teams. And some of them are interfaith, and they have interfaith services.

So, it's both a disadvantage that you don't have a particular religious focus, but after all, that's what we've got in the modern age. And you can learn to live with that and use that also. I've often said that nonviolence is the link between spiritual development and social change. And that's why it's going to play a very, very prominent role as we go on. Okay. I did want to say a few things about the India period, but let's take some more time here. There are a couple of really major points I want to make sure we touch on in "Hind Swaraj," but isn't there a part of the text where you read it and said, "This is crazy. Why is he saying this?" Or even, "This is politically incorrect." Or "That was something that was fascinating. Yeah?"

Gandhi's Medicine and Spirituality

Student: In one of his letters, [unintelligible 01:06:22]. Medical science is the concentrated essence of black magic.

Michael: Yeah. Okay, particularly I thought you pre-med students would pick up on this. That medical science is black magic. Okay, who would like to try and get at what was his objection, Joy?

Student: Well, I mean the term black magic has a negative connotation or maybe it shouldn't.

Michael: Okay, but let's take him on his own terms for the time being. It does have a negative.

Student: I think that's here like an underlying spiritual thing that's going on in medicine that maybe he's mentioning that it is spiritual, but it's disguised as strictly science-based practice.

Michael: That is conceivable that there's something spiritual about medicine that he wasn't seeing. But what was his objection to it?

Student: Maybe the lack of the spiritual element.

Michael: Well, but more particularly. How would that show up? What's wrong with going to a doctor if you're sick? Alex?

Student: He was saying that it made it possible for people to overindulge themselves and they could just get a cure for whatever they did to their own body.

Michael: Right. Let's say overeating, for example, which is very popular in the U.S. You go into it, and then you expect medical science to patch you up. Like they'll sew up your stomach or they do these horrendous things to you to make it physically impossible to go on doing that. And the result of that is that you don't croak. Now isn't this exactly parallel to what we were saying before about defense. It's like relying on somebody else to defend you. And therefore, preventing you from learning how to defend yourself which will require you to grow spiritually. So that was his main objection.

And, of course, it also was being used as an instrument of domination. It hasn't been clear until recently that there's a Sri Lankan writer who wrote a book called, "Prevented Development." I'm not getting it exactly right, but this person showed that up until the middle or the third quarter of the 18th century most sciences in India, for example, and in other Asian countries were exactly at a par with Western sciences. They were ahead in astronomy. Maybe a little behind in some other things. Medicine was much better. And it's this technological revolution that enabled Western science to shoot ahead in a particular way, which is fine.

But then the idea comes about that that's the only way that science is, and other countries didn't have science at all because they didn't have a Western type and then it becomes an instrument of domination. Yeah?

Student: Well, also like with drug companies now, like the idea of a for-profit medicine is terrible.

Michael: He hadn't even gotten there yet. I mean if he were alive today, but you know, for example, I mentioned poisonous reptiles in India. There's an institution at the village level in India called, "*Visavaidyas*" which means, "Poison-doctors." And again, this is a hereditary caste. Your father was a *visavaidya*. You become one. You inherit his garden; you know where all these plants are. And if anyone is bitten by a snake, they bring that person to you, you take a look at the bite, you can tell what bit that person and you can tell what plant to treat it. And now here's the thing. For hundreds of years these people have been practicing this and they are not allowed to charge money. And you can see why.

You know, you've been bitten by a cobra, you've got about an hour to live, and the doctor says, "Oh, I can cure you. What kind of health insurance do you have?" You'll

give up everything in a situation like that. So, they're not allowed to gain money for practicing that type of medicine. And that is one way of preserving what the ideology of the profession originally was. So, before we get to any of those corrupting influences, what Gandhi is saying is, "To expect somebody else to cure you instead of taking care of yourself, you are," again to use his terms, "you're emasculating yourself." Camilla?

Student: What I was thinking was kind of [unintelligible 01:11:18]. Even if you don't agree with that statement, it's against your religion to kill – the doctor. The doctor usually said [unintelligible 01:11:28]. He said that in order to make these medicines they kill a bunch of animals in the process. And, you know, a lot of the medicines actually have animal fat. And that's what he's saying. That even if you're not there with me, you shouldn't do it.

Michael: Yeah, you shouldn't do it because of the cost to animals, but he will say later on that this idea of animal protection in India has a spiritual purpose and that is to make us aware of the unity of life. So, if you don't grasp the unity of life – it's like what we were saying about nonviolence. You don't grok it, you don't have that kind of feeling for animals, you do it because it's your religion, you could grow into it from that perspective. Fact is, that Gandhi went very, very far with this ideology.

And one occasion Kasturba was quite ill, and a Western doctor said to him, "She has to have beef injections." And to him, the idea of injecting beef into the veins of a Hindu woman who hadn't had meat for centuries was absolutely an anathema. Kasturba was not conscious at that time. He had to make the decision, and he decided not to do it. And she did recover on that occasion.

But a lot of people said, you know, this is like some quackery, some Christian science stuff. But he had consulted with Pyarelal's sister, Sushila Nayyar. She had had Western education – Western medical education. He said, "Sushila, do you think that Kasturba needs a beef injection, and can you guarantee me that it will save her?" And Sushila said, "I'm not sure whether she needs it or not, and I absolutely cannot guarantee that it will save her. It's just, you know, something we're hoping for."

And that was – I'm seeing a very close parallel to the pending invasion by Japan in the 40's where they would not allow him to practice his native medicine techniques, which I have to say is like the wackiest side of Gandhi. I follow Gandhi in a lot of things, but I do not take mud packs when I'm having an allergy attack, stuff like that. I don't know, who knows, maybe I'm wrong, but this is one place where I have not followed him.

But they wouldn't let him practice what he knew how to practice, and then they said, "Look, Kasturba's helpless. She needs a Western-type intervention." Similarly, they would not let him organize nonviolent resistance against the Japanese. And then they said, "Look, your country is helpless. You need a Western-style army to defend it." It's the same kind of logic, and you can't blame him for not accepting it.

Gandhi's Objections to Democracy

Whoa, well we'll talk about the first few years in India next time. Let me just mention one topic that I'd like you to go back and look at – we do have a few minutes – in “Hind Swaraj.” This seems to me could really give us some trouble and that is where he talks about the limitations of democracy because personally, for me, democracy is a sacred word and I don't think that there's any problems with democracy, per se. There're problems with the way people use it. And I don't want to necessarily get into exactly what they are, but his problems with it are three-fold. The way democratic systems are being set up; they are methods of representation which do not allow the individual any expression – any meaningful political weight in the system.

You know, even Dennis Kucinich who is – I'm thinking of him because one of the things I most regret about my bicycle being stolen this week was it had a Kucinich sticker on it. It was probably worth more than the bicycle. But anyway, I'm sorry. I shouldn't drag my personal problems in here. Even Dennis Kucinich, who has a party apparatus behind him, is very limited in what he can do, and it really seems like the closer you are to your own values, the less effective you are in the political system.

Okay, so then you take this flawed political system, and you say, “Because we have this ‘Mother of parliaments’ we have to bring democracy to the world. And look at you, you have these Maharajas ruling over you. You need to be liberated.” Now does that sound familiar? Okay. So, if you don't have democracy, we're going to bomb you until you get it. So that is his third objection, that once – sorry, that's the second objection. Once you have a flawed system like that you can still use the name of that system and in its sacred name you can go and exploit other people.

But we get to talk about religions later on. I'm going to be talking about how you start off with a revelation. That revelation gets watered down, and pretty soon you have nothing left but the authority. And you attach that authority to the opposite of what that religion stood for. The third thing was that without nonviolence, democracy was invalid. “Because” he said, “democracy, so long as it is sustained by violence cannot provide for or protect the weak. My notion of democracy is that under it, the weakest should have the same opportunity as the strongest.”

I would even go a little bit deeper and say something that I think he probably believed in. That is if you look at the underlying principle of democracy, what it really is rooted in is the worth of the individual, the value of the individual. And all the safeguards that we have built into our constitutional system are to provide for the individual or the small group not being exploited or put upon by the majority. I mean remember being told when I was a kid in school, it's the decisions of the majority and the rights of the minority. Those two things are necessary.

Now the only way to protect the rights of the minority or the weakest is by including nonviolence in the system. And in fact, if you're looking at principled nonviolence that is,

after all, what it's based on. It is the sanctity, the inviolability and the infinite creativity of the individual. So, all these things start to converge at the center. So, what he was most angry about, as angry as a Mahatma can get, was the use of this flawed system, which is really a disguised way of exploiting others and turning it into something violent.

Now you will read sometimes among political scientists that democracies have less of a tendency to go to war against one another than non-democracies. Statistically, that's correct. But there's also a fascinating argument in Immanuel Kant that really, for war fighting, democracies are worse than monarchies because everybody is doing it. The whole culture has to get behind it. Whereas in a monarchy, you know, it's just the king and his or her minions.

Okay, so those are major points that come up with "Hind Swaraj." I hope you enjoyed it and we'll finally get back to India next week.

11. Tragedy at Amritsar 1: Rebellion Heats Up

Michael: Happy day after everyone. Yesterday was *Charkha Jayanti*. *Charkha* is the Hindi word for “wheel,” and especially for the spinning wheel. And of course, Gandhi was born in 1869 and the country wanted to name that day, “Gandhi *Jayanti*, Gandhi’s birthday.” And he said, “No. Name it after the spinning wheel.” So that actually stuck. I don’t think all India grinds to a halt on October 2nd, but that’s how we remember the day.

I hope you read that we have a Nobel Prize Winner in physics here at Berkeley – Professor Smoot. We’re eagerly awaiting the Nobel Prize in Nonviolence to be announced. We are just a tiny bit behind our original schedule, but that’s fine.

Early Freedom Struggles of India

And we’re going to talk about the early years in India. I’ve kind of suggested that we divide that into two phases, a little bit like the South Africa career – where we go down to 1924-1925 when Gandhi was in prison and things slow down a little bit, but really not that much.

And then the final crisis of the Freedom Struggle with the climaxes in 1931, and then the Quit India Movement. And we’ll talk a little bit about the demoralizing aftermath of the partition and so forth, but not a lot because it would be slightly – it would be slightly a bummer. I had a French professor at NYU who went on for hours and hours about this elaborate theory about [unintelligible 00:01:59]. And then she said, [French accent] “But we will ignore this theory because it is dull.” So similarly, we won’t dwell on that too much.

But I’m going to sort of run through things twice. And I hope that it’s not too confusing. I’m going to start off after saying – making a few announcements actually – and saying a bit about the background in India. I’m going to run through his description of the Five Satyagrahas that are in his introduction to “Satyagraha in South Africa.” And that’s on the Pages 185, following your reader.

And then I’m going to go back and do it chronologically and fill in some of the other events. So, I hope that isn’t too confusing. A couple of announcements. The Prime Minister of India Monmohan Singh has just been to South Africa where he talked to President Mbeki. And he was talking to him about the fact that their nation’s destinies are joined by Gandhi’s career in South Africa and its influence on the eventual resolution of apartheid and suggested that the two nations cooperate around the Gandhian legacy. Fantastic idea. It’s a wonderful thing. So that happened in Durban yesterday. And that’ll be actually a good segue into one of our things because Monmohan Singh, as you can tell from his name, is not Hindu exactly. He’s a Sikh. And one of the early movements in the whole Freedom Struggle, two of the really early

movements did not come directly from the Hindu community. One was the Khilafat struggle. It involved Indian Muslims as well as other Muslims. And then there was a small, but very dramatic affair known as the Affair of the Keys in 1920 which was a Sikh community in Amritsar.

At Stanford, if you'll permit me to mention it, on the day of our midterm, October 19th, that evening at 7:30 and the following day there's a big, big symposium on humanity after Abu Ghraib. Somebody said, "Poetry after Auschwitz would be obscene and this about – is there humanity after Abu Ghraib? They tend – this is the Stanford education extension under the care of Mark Gonnerman. They tend to do very, very good conferences down there. So that'll be the 19th and 20th.

Okay, just a little observation and then we can get started. The little observation is, as you know, I never – almost never go to see movies unless there's a specific reason to do so and then I usually regret it. But this weekend I went to Dallas and back. I like trips to be successful and short – and this was both. But this means four hours out, four hours back, and I can't be writing on my laptop all the time. So, I do glance up at the screen and I see these two movies and – this is really the good way to see them – without the sound. So, you can really tell the subtext, the imagery that's being imprinted in people's minds.

On one level it was interesting because the outbound movie was a Latino movie, and the inbound movie was a gringo movie. They were like exactly the same movie, except the gringo movie was high tech and they had Star Wars and things like that and all kinds of fantastical equipment. And the Latino movie was very – it involved more like burros and people harvesting mesquite with machetes and things like that. But that aside, it was exactly the same movie and both of them were appallingly violent and appallingly childish.

And I think if you were listening to the sound and got caught up, you might not notice that. But I never do that. I'm so smart. [Laughs]. So, this is partly as a result – where is Sid? I know you're here. There you are. Partly as a result of your question last week about how do we get this into American culture, which doesn't have the advantages that Gandhi had? And I insisted that it is possible to do it, but I'm still trying to work out how. And I have to say after seeing these films I have an even more grim sense of how difficult it is going to be – because we've got 300 million people in the country. I'd say probably 295 million of them are living in an extremely dangerous fantasy – the emotional age of about 9.

The last time I saw a study on this, the emotional age of the average television program was – emotional and cognitive – was about 12. And that was some years ago. We've been going downhill ever since. So, there is a sense in which when things get worse it's easier for them to get better because nobody wants to stay in this box. They want to break out.

Two Mandates of Nonviolence

And it's at this point I think I'll introduce, if I haven't already done so – if I have, I apologize – introduce a famous testimonial about Gandhi by Arnold Toynbee, the British historian who said, “He,” Gandhi, “made it impossible for us to go on ruling India, but he made it possible for us to leave without rancor and without humiliation.”

So, I think these are – this is our job. This is operative – these are our marching orders. You got to figure out what nonviolence is and then figure out how to pitch it to people who are half-asleep, and I'm going to read a Gandhian comment on that also. Without rancor and without humiliation. Not that it wouldn't be satisfying to be rancorous and disrespectful. On one level it would be emotionally satisfying for us, but we're not into this for emotional satisfaction. We're into this to get it done. And in that regard, making them feel bad, even angrier than they are, even more embarrassed than they already are – and they are embarrassed with realizing it – would only make it more difficult to get them to change. So, I really think of this as kind of our – it's the banner in which we're operating. That's why we're learning this stuff. We have to think about it on two levels, and that's why we're looking so closely into Gandhi's career.

All right, so we had barely gotten Gandhi back to India. And he did not want to embarrass the British – embarrass with two “Rs” by the way – because WWI was going on. And that put him at odds with some of the more hot-tempered Indian Nationalists. This is a period in which the concept of Indian nationalism is taking root. And it's a tricky thing – nationalism is. Actually, there are two tricky things that Gandhi has to do. He has to awaken the people from their torpor, and then get them quickly moving in a nonviolent direction so that they don't get violent.

Arousal of Courage and Confidence

So, he has to – in a way, he has to get them a little bit angry. But the minute they're angry, he has to give them a nonviolent thing to do with that anger. Now similarly, one of the reasons that in the great scheme of things Gandhi appears on the scene at this period is that India is beginning to lose its confidence – confidence in itself. This can be a very, very serious thing. It's not just emotionally demoralizing.

Remember, I took an anthropology course many years ago, and I was taught about a phenomenon called, “Ritual death.” Ritual death was taking place in certain communities in Africa where people were suddenly – had suddenly come in contact with Western civilization – an advanced technological civilization. And their whole culture suddenly didn't make sense. And some of these people went and sat down and stopped taking food and they died. This can be a matter of life and death. Whether you believe that the culture in which you grew up, the ancestors whom you worship, the ground on which you tread makes sense and has value in the universe. And Indians were

beginning to feel that their entire civilization was a mistake. And that would be a disaster for them and for the world because we need that civilization very badly.

So, Gandhi had to arouse pride in what India had been and what it still could be. And as a person, he succeeded in the later because a lot of people felt, you know, they had come to feel that there couldn't be a God-conscious person anymore. And oh my gosh, there was one. So, he had to give them a sense of national pride, that they were proud to be Indian, but at the same time this was not about nationalism as opposed – let's say I'm, you know, you see all of these SUV's and pickup trucks. I live out in a little more remote area where I see all of these pickup trucks with these big signs on the back that have an American flag and say, "Proud to be an American." People say that because they're ashamed to be an American, otherwise you don't have to put a bumper sticker saying, you know, the opposite.

So, it's this tricky thing where he had to assist in the rise of a nationalistic feeling, but then have it go beyond that to the sense of pride in human accomplishment and not like India as opposed to Pakistan or India as opposed to Sri Lanka or Burma. And there was an unusual character on the scene in these days who's going to figure into our story. Her name was Annie Besant. She was an Irish woman and theosophist. So, she had this interest in India's spirituality, but not a terribly discriminating interest in it. It was more like – she thought it was more like Star Wars – a cult phenomena, things like that.

But she had more to do with Indian Nationalism than any Indian at this early WWI period. And she started something called, "The Home Rule League." Home rule is basically "Hind Swaraj." And she invited Gandhi to join, and he declined. And he will end up saying that there is no ready-made organization with its agenda already fixed that he can join. He doesn't fit in. He's going to take over the Indian National Congress which had no agenda at all. It had basically become a talk-shop. I almost said, "Like the academic senate." But actually, it was probably a little bit worse than the academic senate at that point.

And he took it over – and this is very well done in the film. You see people just, you know, talking and chatting and they listen to him, and they get all turned on. He turned that into a very powerful political vehicle for himself which lasted until he was so far out that we wanted to use nonviolence to defend the country against the Japanese and they couldn't go along with him. So, for 20-some – maybe 25 years – he's going to be the Indian National Congress. He'll put his mold on it completely.

Just to touch briefly on some of the remote background. We know that 1868, I believe, had been the mutiny when there was an uprising that I had mentioned before. It was very, very violent and the British still were nervous about the possibility of that kind of revolt. And then in 1906 Lord Curzon when he was the viceroy, had decided to partition Bengal without asking the Bengali's how they felt about that. I was trying to think of an analogy, and it wouldn't really quite work because I was talking about creating Northern

California and Southern California as two states, but I don't think it would involve the same passions.

The Bengali's were very proud of their culture and their language, and they had worked hard to get Hindu's and Muslim's in the same community. And for a foreigner to come and just chop and say, "No, you're now two states, two districts," was extremely offensive to them and there was almost an uprising on his hands. That had been back in 1906.

So, Gandhi arrives on the scene, and he is advised by Gokhale to, famously, "Keep your big ears open and your big mouth shut for one year." And he went along with that advice. And this is also pretty well done in the film. You see him going around on the train and you see him seeing the results of poverty, seeing the results of the attempt to overcome this poverty by violence. And he's really building up a head of steam.

Pattern of Swadeshi

I gather there's even a scene in the Attenborough movie, which as Americans, we have been protected from because we are so prudish. But there's a scene, I understand, in which he is at the Hooghly [also Hugli] Bridge in Bengal and he goes to wash his cloth in the river. It's narrow at that point. There was a woman at the other side of the river who's washing her sari and it's her only sari, which was the case for many village women at that time. And so, she's naked from the waist up. That's why, you know, absolutely not in America. Can't see that. And Gandhi is looking at her, and she's looking at him. And he takes his cloth, and he floats it across the river to her. It was a very eloquent gesture. So, he is spending this year getting very angry.

I guess let me run through the Satyagrahas that come up as he describes them because he has a very good feel for the development in the preface to Satyagraha in South Africa. So, this is in your Reader, if you want to kind of follow along. The first thing he got involved in was actually – that year of probation wasn't even out yet, but somebody came up to him. And this is how a lot of these things started. He was going to Saurashtra, which is the state – the region, really – district in which he was born.

A man named Motilal – Motilal comes up to him with a small party at a railroad station and complains to him about the hardships of this town or district, Viramgam, and tries to enlist his help. It's a nice conversation. There was an expression of both compassion and firmness in his eyes. "Are you ready to go to jail?" He asked. This is probably a pretty typical question that Gandhi would ask you if you met him. Not like, you know, where you from? What are you majoring in? How much do you make? His interest was, "Are you ready to go to jail?"

"We are ready to march to the gallows." Was the quick reply. "Jail will do for me," Gandhi said. "But see that you do not leave me in the lurch."

Well, there are two things that are typical about how this begins. And that is that within India Gandhi's operations tended to follow the pattern of Swadeshi very closely, as closely as time and events would allow – meaning that he started in Gujarat state. He even started in Saurashtra, the district that he was born in, and he let things grow outward from there. He will never try to operate outside of India in his whole life. That should really give us pause. The other thing that's typical about this is as far as I can remember there are only one or two episodes in the whole Freedom Struggle which were Gandhi's idea – or just by himself.

The most famous one being the Salt Satyagraha. And this was dramatized by Attenborough. You see him sitting there at the sea and suddenly go, "Ah, salt!" He gets the idea; the little light bulb goes off in his head. You know, corny, but accurate enough. That idea came to him as the way to focus, to find the climatic Satyagraha in the spring of 1930. But most of the other events were kind of handed to him on a platter. People came to him with problems. So, this means that the miner's strike that led to the Great March in January of 1913, that that was more typical actually of the way things went. Things got started, and he had to grab the opportunity rather than planning them. And we'll see the same pattern repeated in the career of Martin Luther King where there'll be a couple of events which he'll sit down and plan with his people. But most of them, uh-oh, they're suddenly happening. The most famous of which was the Greensboro lunch counter sit-ins.

Okay, so the issue here was that the local legislation had set up a travel barrier and they weren't issuing fast passes to these bullock carts. So, it actually was a pain in the neck and a huge expense and in all ways, extremely galling. I mean these are people who are not well trained the way we are. Once you've been through an airport security line, the Viramgam customs barrier would be nothing. But they're used to just moving freely about their own country. In fact, they're used to thinking of it as their own country. And that's the problem.

So, this was really a hated barrier, and he went to Rajkot, which is a provincial capital, gets information and commences correspondence with the government. So, we're starting the same pattern that you saw in South Africa. Petitioning, litigation, and Satyagraha with an undercurrent of constructive programme the whole time.

And you saw this sentence here, "The loyal CID brought these speeches to the notice of the government." The CID is basically the same as the FBI. So Criminal Investigation Department. And whenever there were CID men in the audience, Gandhi would always invite them to sit in the front row and translate for them and make sure they could understand everything and help them do their reports. And a lot of the time, in some funny way, this actually would come down to his benefit as with the banning of the Gujarati, the original, of "Hind Swaraj." He said, "Okay, so then I have to produce an English translation." And of course, that had a much wider audience.

“So here also the loyal CID,” he’s being partly sarcastic, but partly not. They are loyal to what they think they’re supposed to be doing. “The loyal CID brought these speeches to the notice of the government. In this, they serve government and unintentionally serve the people also,” by raising consciousness about the event. And finally, he had a talk with Lord Chelmsford who was the viceroy – I’m pretty sure. And he promised abolition of the customs line, and actually did it.

Satyagraha and Person Power

So, he was – unlike Smuts, he had enough power and enough honesty to follow through.

“And I know others also tried for this, but I am strongly of opinion,” Gandhi adds, “that the imminent possibility of Satyagraha was the chief factor in obtaining the desired redress.” So, this is as close as you ever get to threat power in nonviolence. I’ve often said that even though it has the rhetoric of a threat, of an ultimatum, “If you don’t do this, I will have to do that.” I still say it’s not exactly what Boulding meant by threat power. Because with threat power you’re forcing people to do something whether they want to or not, and you’re threatening to hurt them if they don’t.

Whereas in Satyagraha, although you may be, you know, maybe a little bit inconvenient for them, you’re not hurting anyone. You’re actually – your motivation is to liberate them from an oppressive situation in which they happen to be the oppressors. So, it’s not exactly a threat. I hope you’ll see the fine distinction. I think it’s very important.

But we’re going to see this pattern also again and again. Gandhi will go in and say – he will give them an opportunity to get it. If they get it by themselves and they do the right thing, no one would be happier than Gandhi himself. But if they don’t, you’re going to have to face Satyagraha. That’s what we just did with the Peace Pledge, you know? Told them beginning of September, you’ve got 21 days to get out of Iraq. Strangely enough, they didn’t. We had our Satyagraha. And I don’t know where things were at before I left for Texas, but you may not have heard there were 500 organizations, 375 events around the country, and about 250 people arrested. That’s 1 in a million – about 250 million people in the country. But it was a start, and it followed the same pattern.

MLK Jr. and the Law of Progression

Likewise – a really famous example of this – Martin Luther King will go to President Johnson and say, “We need a Voter’s Rights Act.” President will say, “Well, you know, I’d like to myself, but I can’t do that. We will lose the democrats. We’ll lose the south.” And so, King said, “Okay.” He went out and organized civil disobedience for six months and then came in and not only got the Voter’s Rights Act, but Johnson signed it, handed Martin Luther King Jr. the pen, and proceeded to sing, “We shall overcome.” That’s the only time that Martin Luther King’s people saw him crying in the entire Civil Rights

Movement. I mean Johnson was probably not that good of a singer, but I don't think that was the reason. [Laughter]

So then skipping down to 1917. I'm going to go back to a year-by-year thing in a bit after we run through this, as Satyagraha has – what does he call it? The Law of Progression. The next thing that came up was the Indian Immigration Act. He wanted to repeal the entire indenture system that he had struggled with directly in India. There's a lot of agitation. "A deputation of ladies went to the viceroy and hereto success came merely through preparedness for Satyagraha." Same pattern. The viceroy knows perfectly well that people are going to launch Satyagraha if he doesn't comply. He decides to comply.

Incidentally – sorry, got to interrupt myself just a second here. A few people, I think, were confused by my mentioning – and will be mentioning it again – that on one or two occasions Gandhi suspended Satyagraha. And of course, what I meant by suspending Satyagraha was suspending active nonviolent resistance. This is, shall we say, Satyagraha with a small "s." He never suspended Satyagraha, the principle. Not for one moment. I mean every breath was a clinging to Truth. But there were times when you actively resisted, when you pushed forward with what I call, "Obstructive program," and there were times when you did not. So that's what I meant. So here he's holding that in abeyance.

Rowlatt Act - Paradox of Repression

And this will bring us down to the Rowlatt Acts which are starting to be passed now. And that will climax in 1919, but there's a comment here I wanted to share with you – a couple of them actually. "Lord Chelmsford committed a series of blunders beginning with the passing of the Rowlatt Act." This is what I earlier called an atrocity, and it's an example of a paradox of repression. In order to keep these people down we got to put the screws on harder. There comes a point past which when you tighten the screws people are going to fight back.

"Also," he says, "since he thought that Chelmsford was a wise ruler, but what viceroy can escape for long the influence of the permanent officials of the Civil Service." In other words, in a system, which is basically a lie. It's basically, structurally flawed. Namely, we need to come here from Western Europe and rule your country because you're not capable of doing it yourself. And while we're at it, we're also going to loot you, but that's not really the reason. When you have that kind of system, even good individuals cannot function well.

And if you remember the film, "A Passage to India," I did see that film in a movie theatre – years ago – the whole thing. The doctor – Indian doctor in that film, Dr. Aziz, says, "These Englishmen come here. They're very idealistic. I give them two years." You know, two years in this system and they'll turn into brutes. And I've read very similar comments about the criminal justice system. There are people who go into the prison

system with very high ideals. I want to help people. And within a few years they've degenerated into jailors.

So again, for Gandhi, he can always separate in his mind the individual from the system. So, after Viramgam, after the Indian Immigration Act which is passed in 1917 and basically abolishes the indentured labor system, comes the famous Champaran Struggle. And again, this started by a nag. This nag was a young man whose name is escaping me at the moment – Raj Kumar Shukla, Raj Kumar Shukla. For some reason, Richard Attenborough, in his artistic genius, decided to make him an old man. I don't know why. You remember the scene where he's wading across the river to the ashram. He says, "Hello? Hello?" And he comes in and gives him this long story about how terrible it is. And they go, and they interview the man with the flies crawling over his face. It made very good cinema.

But anyway, in reality, Raj Kumar Shukla was a young guy who stuck to Gandhi like glue and basically followed him the length and breadth of India saying, "Champaran, Champaran, Champaran. You got to come here." And so, Gandhi had actually heard about this as early as 1916 in the Indian National Congress meeting of that year where Shukla first went to him. And finally, he does agree to go there. This was really a climatic event because Satyagraha had to be offered here. The threat was not enough – and I'm going to read you just one sentence about that.

Well, as he says here, "Powerful vested interests were arrayed in opposition." Okay, so the basic rule of thumb that we're following is there is no situation to which nonviolence cannot be applied. However, in some cases, it's going to "work" the way we want it to work in a relatively straight up manner. And that happened at Viramgam and about the Indian Immigration Act. But if there were powerful vested interests in the later case, they were in South Africa. And remember, the Indian Colonial Government is actually using South Africa to demonstrate their humanity.

It's like my friend Daniel Ellsberg. He went down to Nicaragua right after the Sandinista Revolution was in power, and they took him around to the prisons and every prison that he went to, they released some of these former militarists who had been oppressing the country under that military – it was mostly a dictatorship. And it was obviously to impress Dan. I mean he didn't mind the guys getting out. You know, they weren't going to be rearrested. It was good that they got out, but it's this funny thing where India is kind of pointing, saying, "See, we're not South Africa. They oppress people down there."

But here he was actually confronting the Raj for the first time where the shoe really pinches and that was with the land ownership and financial exploitation of the country. It's for this reason certain professors of yours, no names please, insisted that during the Declaration of Peace on the platform of that program was not just the removal of troops from Iraq, but the removal of vested interests, corporate interests that have basically sold off – stolen the country and sold it to themselves. Unless that's gotten rid of, we're

not really confronting what the system is all about. But when you confront that, that's when you're really going to meet the resistance.

Champan Trial

So, in April – April 18th of 1917 he was on trial in Champan. You remember the scene with the rain pouring down outside. “I refuse to pay a 100 rupees,” he says. If things ever really get boring here, which is unthinkable, but imagine if they did, just feed me a line from that movie, and we'll see. I can probably go about 25 minutes in dialog. Anyway, he is arrested. He has been told to leave the district. And incidentally, that scene where he's sitting on an elephant and the policeman comes along on a bicycle going, “Ring-ding, ring-ding.” That actually happened. He was handed, “You have to leave the district.” And he signed on the back, “I refuse.” And gave it back to him.

And he told the magistrate, “As a law-abiding citizen my first instinct would be,” as it was, “to obey the order served on me.” But then he explains he couldn't do that without doing violence to the people he had come there to serve.

Higher Law of Conscience

And he states an important principle. “I have disregarded the order served upon me not for want of respect for lawful authority, but in obedience to the higher law of our being, the voice of conscience.”

Don't try this if you graduate and go to Boalt Hall and – getting a law degree in your first moot court case – don't say, “I'm doing this in obedience to the higher law of my being, the law of conscience.” But in 1917 in the British court, you could say things like this and get away with it. And the point I'm getting at here is partly that I can't remember how much we've said about civil disobedience. Anybody remember? I'm sure we touched on it, but I'm not sure how deeply. What do you remember about civil disobedience? Carrie, do you have any recollection?

Student: In this class?

Michael: In this class, yeah.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:37:41]

Rules of Civil Disobedience

Michael: Okay, maybe we didn't and that's fine. Civil disobedience or CD as it's popularly called in the field today. Of course, the language comes from a famous essay by Thoreau which you have all read in high school or heard on your iPods or however you access information these days. And this has led to one big misunderstanding that I can clear up very simply, very straightforwardly. Everybody thinks that he got the idea

from Thoreau. He did not. He explicitly said, “We had been doing civil disobedience for years before I read Thoreau’s essay.”

So, this is incidentally why I recommend that you get the Nanda biography because every biography that I’ve seen by a gringo writer has said that he gets this from Thoreau, okay? Which is just irksome, but we’re trying to cling to truth here – even facts can be helpful. But that’s where the idea comes from. Now the way the idea works is that you have passed the stage of petitioning, and you have to resist a regulation that seems to you to be unjust.

Notice that he’s saying that what he disobeyed was an order, not a law. And you’re disobeying it because you believe it to be unjust. You might be wrong. But that’s okay because you’re not disobeying it violently. So, there are two things that follow from that. You are going to do the disobedience openly because what’s the point of doing it in secret? It’s not going to get the job done which is raising awareness that the law or regulation or what-have-you is not just.

And secondly, this is where the sandal pinches a little bit, you’re going to be willing to undertake the punishment. So those are the two absolutely critical elements of real civil disobedience. There’s one other factor that Gandhi will mention that in order for disobedience to be nonviolent, it has to be civil. And here he means civil in the sense of polite, as in civilized as opposed to civil meaning the city government as opposed to the state government.

So, one day I was driving home late at night. This is in the days when I still was listening to the radio in my car. As some of you know, I don’t do that anymore, but there’s a news brief from Sacramento. State government passed a regulation that people had to register assault weapons because somebody had just tried to kill a whole bunch of school children with them. Somehow people felt that wasn’t okay. So, you had to register your assault rifles. They knew that there were about 6000-gun owners in California who had these weapons. Not a single one had come forward to register them and the commentator said – he was probably an NRA person who was being interviewed and, “What you’re seeing is massive civil disobedience.” Totally wrong in every respect.

It is not civil to keep an assault rifle in your garage. They were not doing it openly. And they were not willing to suffer the penalties, which is totally not civil disobedience in every possible respect. So those are the rules for civil disobedience. It’s a fairly serious thing and you don’t undertake it lightly. And it’s not a good idea to do it before you have tried to reason with your opponent.

Even if you think your opponent will not listen to reason – and there’s quite a few of them we’ve got there today who have already indicated as much. Even if you think they won’t listen to reason, it’s good to give them the opportunity before you go and commit civil disobedience. So that struggle was also successful, and his final comment on it is, in the preface, “Hence it was, that this age-long abuse that had been going on probably

for 200 years came to an end in 6 months.” Very interesting insight into the power of nonviolence. And it’s not that people had not tried to get rid of this abuse before. Like – yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:42:35]

Michael: It’s right before the ultimate self-sacrifice of being willing to risk life, limb, and property. But you are suffering in civil disobedience because as you saw in South Africa, he was arrested. I mean he was arrested four times in three days. One of those arrests they forgot what they were arresting him for. They didn’t have the charge, so he gave evidence against himself. That’s real civil disobedience. You want the process to go through because that will force the authorities to recognize what they’re doing.

Apology of Socrates and Civil Disobedience

One of the books that Gandhi read when he was in prison in South Africa was the Apology of Socrates, and he came out of that saying, “Socrates was a real Satyagrahi.” It thrilled me; you can imagine. I was a classics professor at the time. I already loved Socrates. But here’s my number one man saying that he was a real Satyagrahi. Now the reason – there probably were many – but one reason he would have instantly said that is, in a dialog called, “The Phaedo,” Socrates is in prison. He has been condemned to commit suicide by drinking probably some bioengineered product called hemlock. There was a soldier in WWI, incidentally, who committed suicide by eating a tube of toothpaste. That shows you how toxic that stuff was.

But sorry, that’s a sidetrack. That was a sidetrack on a sidetrack. Let’s get back the first sidetrack which is about Socrates. His friends come to him in The Phaedo, and they say, “We’ve arranged to get you out of here. We’ve got a false mustache for you. Nobody will notice. We’ll get you out of prison. There’s a little cruise ship waiting for you in Piraeus. We’re going to take you out to a Greek island and set you up there. Xanthippe won’t go with you.” That’s his wife.

And Socrates says, “I’m sorry, I cannot do that.” In fact, he doesn’t say, “I’m sorry.” He says, “What’s the matter with you guys? You know perfectly well I cannot do that.” If I do that I will be – it would be like hurting people in my own family. The city is my family. They have got to understand what they have done. If they condemn me, and I wriggle out of it, they won’t ever learn their lesson.”

So, he stays in Athenian prison and dies in order to show the Athenians what they’ve done to him. It didn’t seem to have helped the Athenians a whole lot. They tried to do it to Aristotle about 20 years later. But anyway, he tried. So that was a case of civil disobedience moving all the way up the scale to the final sacrifice.

Means and Ends of Nonviolence

So just the important things are you cannot use civil disobedience for a violent purpose like keeping your assault rifle. In fact, you can put that more generally. You cannot use nonviolence in a violent cause. The cause – the means and the ends are all in the picture. All the means, all the ends are in the picture. So, you can't use a nonviolent technique for a basically coercive or violent end and expect it to work. As Gandhi says, "A thief cannot use his mantrum while he's robbing you. Because if he uses his mantrum, he'll lose heart and stop robbing you." So that's the very general principle.

And in civil disobedience that means that it's got to be civil in manner and in purpose. And then the other two very important things are that it has to be done openly and you have to be willing to take the consequences. If you don't take the consequences, it misses the whole point. Okay, so this comes out in 1918 in the Champaran Struggle. No sooner was that over then he gets a call from Ahmedabad. Imagine Gandhi getting – let's see, what would it be? The cow signal. It's like Batman is always getting the bat signal. Gandhi would always be getting the cow signal on a cloud above Gujarat somewhere. There's a suffering cow, and he has to go to some area and set it right. So, this is Ahmedabad.

I'm not pausing too long here to tell you what the issues were, what it was about. You may want to get back to that later. But I just wanted to give you a sense of how the Satyagrahas develop, the law of progression.

Mill Strike in Ahmedabad and Gandhi Fasting

In Ahmedabad – it's an industrial city and there are a lot of textile mills. And later on, Gandhi will be against this whole system because he doesn't – he wants people leading a simple – materially simple life in their villages. But for right now, the issue is that the mill hands feel that they're being exploited. They're not getting enough pay.

He goes to – here, as usually, his first move is always to go and collect information. He collects information. He arrives at the decision that their cause is just. So, he decides to help them in their strike. The strike goes on for quite a while. One of the neat side features of this, is the mill owner, the main mill owner against whom they are striking, his sister is one of Gandhi's Satyagrahis. So, Gandhi actually goes and stays in the home of this mill owner. And then in the morning he goes out and organizes a strike against them, and then he comes home, shares dinner with them, and goes to bed. That's kind of an extreme example of how he's always able to make contact on a human level and separate what you're doing from who you are.

So, he will go on a strike, which I'm sure we have mentioned briefly before. The strike was aimed at, offered to – however you want to put it – it was offered to the mill workers, not the mill owners. That's the important thing. Why is this important? What's the law or the guiding principle that comes into play here? The laws for fasting. Amy?

Student: You have to appeal to the people who really care about your well being [unintelligible 00:49:33].

Michael: That's right. If in the case of a tyrant, you'll only be making him feel – you remember that scene in the Gandhi movie where Nehru is reading the paper and says, "Gandhi is on a hunger strike," and he throws it down and says, "Why do I have to read headlines like this?" If you're against somebody who's not actually on your wavelength in some very important human way, it will be coercive. They'll only do it because they feel the public exposure will force them to.

And besides, it just plain doesn't make sense, you know, to say – if you walk up a perfect stranger and say, "I'm not going to take food with you." It will not have – they'll think you're crazy. If you say this to your mother or something like that, it has a very different effect because you are threatening to withdraw from the bond between you. Okay, so he offers this to rally the spirits of the mill workers who were starting to drift away, go back to work, they're hiring blacklegs, they're even thinking of using violence.

And so, to get them back on track he goes on a three day fast. The end of three days, the mill owners capitulate, and he feels very awkward about that. This wasn't how the fast was supposed to work. It had a coercive element. But as we've already seen, Gandhi doesn't really expect things to go absolutely perfectly well in the real world.

Gita Theory of Action

One of the little comments that Bhagavad Gita makes about action which I kind of regretted we didn't have time to talk about when we were looking at that theory. So let me gratify myself by bringing it on stage now.

The Gita says, "You must never refrain from an appointed action because it is imperfect." You're just not going to get perfect work in this world. I mean, unless you volunteer for my non-profit or something like that. But by and large that will not happen. So, you have to use your judgement. How imperfect is it going to be? To share with you an example. I got an email from a lady. She happens to have been in Dallas, asking me questions. She said, "I'm so angry about this whole situation. What can I do about it?"

I said, "Look, I'm going to be in Dallas in three weeks. Why don't we meet and talk there?" But what would I say in general is find some constructive creative work. So, she comes up to me at the end of one of my talks and says, "Oh, I found the perfect thing to do. I'm going to go to Iraq and help the GI's." I said, "No, Catherine. No. This is not what I had in mind." So, we have to use our judgement. It has to take the shape – is this a minor imperfection which is sullyng the surface of a basically good work or is it fundamentally flawed?

So, if you remember, he starts off saying, "If they don't let me wear my turban in court, I'm not going to speak there." But in a couple of years, he comes back and says, "You

know, I got more important things to worry about than a turban. If they don't want me to wear it, I won't wear it, but I've got to come in to speak."

So, this was his first hunger strike or his first fast in India, and it leads to this kind of indifferent, slightly flawed success. Then there was a struggle in an area called Kheda – K-H-E-D-A. I'm not putting this on the board because they are in your Reader. Sorry about the people watching the webcast who aren't here. We'll probably get back to most of these anyway. In this case he felt that the people didn't follow him very closely, and they came out of their struggle just barely with their honor. Kheda had not fully grasped the lesson of nonviolence. The mill hands in Ahmedabad had not understood the true meaning of peace. The people had therefore to suffer. And this going to lead up to a big – what he's famously going to call his, "Himalayan miscalculation."

Propaganda and Clinging to Truth

Other people just make like Mount Tamalpais miscalculations, but he makes Himalayan miscalculations around the Rowlatt Acts. So, then the Rowlatt Acts are actually passed in 1919, and it's basically the same as the Black Act. And the situation is similar. They've just come out of four years of a horrendous world war in which Indians had served faithfully. And there was an expectation on their part that that service would be recognized. And instead, at the end, something about that military victory had only made the British mentality worse. And they clamped down on civil rights and so forth.

I've incidentally just been reading a book about propaganda, and it's interesting. It probably won't be too startling for us, but if you ask people about propaganda they will basically start – the knee jerk reaction will be to think Goebbels in WWII, Nazi propaganda. Really, the only thing about Nazi propaganda was it was so obvious, and they had an actual office called, "The Propaganda Office." "I'm the Minister of Propaganda. Let me lie to you." Actually, this whole practice that the Germans carried out with such horrendous efficacy in the Second World War, was started in the First World War, not by the Germans, but by the British.

So, you practice untruth. It's going to spread and it's going to end up coming back to you. Cling to truth, it's going to spread, and it's going to end up coming back to you.

Amritsar Massacre

So, in the course of the Rowlatt Act Satyagraha there occurs the Amritsar Massacre. I'm going to get back to that but let me just go onto his seventh struggle.

The seventh was the struggle to right the Khilafat and Punjab wrongs. The, as we say, the Caliph of Islam who was in Turkey at that time was deposed by the British. Deposed by the British at the conclusion of WWI. And we're familiar with this pattern. It's one thing to conquer another people militarily. It's another thing to start messing with their

religion. And the British are going to make this mistake and again and again. They simply cannot get it that for Hindus or Muslims you do not go in and say, “Okay, let us reorganize your religion for you. Clean it up a little bit.” That is always a horrible mistake.

So, the entire Islamic world is up in arms about this. Gandhi threw in his lot, and he was quite influential at that time, had the Hindus throw their lot in with this Khilafat Struggle. It marked the final sweet moment between Hindus and Muslims in India. After about 1920 Hindus and Muslims would occasionally cooperate because they knew they were both struggling for their freedom. But the relationships are going to be souring progressively. And as we now know, because there’s a kind of Freedom of Information Act for British documents also, as we now know, the British will be explicitly, deliberately playing off Hindus against Muslims. So, they have to bear a big portion of the blame for the eventual disaster that takes place with partition.

And the Punjab wrongs was the Amritsar Massacre. The Punjab is a state where the culture was always a good bit more violent than it was in other parts of India. Other parts of India, people might be – they might be erring on the side of passivity. Not in the Punjab – and so repression was always worse, and the violence was always more aggravating in the Punjab. And then this leads to the struggle to win Swaraj. “It is still going on and my confidence is unshaken that if a single Satyagrahi holds out to the end, victory is absolutely certain.”

So those are the seven steps of Satyagraha in the course of the Indian Freedom Struggle. I’m going to go back and start doing the first phase year by year and saying a little bit more about what these things were. But this might be a good place to pause and see if we have any questions.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:59:38]

Summary of Freedom Struggles in India

Michael: Okay, so let’s go through them again. The first is – this is the name of a district. Viramgam. The second is the Immigration Act – or actually they’re calling it the Emigration Act. The third and most famous one is Champaran. This is all on those pages, 185 following, but you know, no problem. The fourth is Ahmedabad. The fifth is Kheda – again, a district. And again, it’s mostly agricultural. It’s about people who had a bad crop, wanted some tax relief. Government wouldn’t give it to them. The sixth is the Rowlatt Act Satyagraha. And the seventh was Khilafat. And along with it, the Punjab problems, especially the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh. And finally, Swaraj – because after the massacre the relationship with the regime, with the Raj, was forever changed. It had more of an impact on the situation even than the mutiny had had in the 19th century.

Okay? So those are the steps. And you can see the first two, the mere threat of Satyagraha, the Champaran civil disobedience. Ahmedabad was a more localized struggle, but it involved the fasting episode. Kheda really was structurally pretty important because Kheda is going to lead in 1928 to a somewhat similar struggle at Bardoli. And that is going to be a real precursor of the climactic struggle, the Salt Satyagraha. What's happening is in Kheda, as he says, the peasants – they didn't quite get it. At Bardoli, they did. And that told Gandhi that he now could mobilize the whole country for tremendous self-sacrifice. So, it's really kind of important. And the Rowlatt Acts led to massive civil disobedience and Satyagrahas of every kind. And that feeds with the Khilafat Struggle and especially with Amritsar, which is a direct result of this, to the demand for Swaraj.

Up to now they had been just demanding some reforms. But now they're saying, as you saw in the movie he said – you remember, there's a British official, "You don't expect us to just leave old man?" And he says, "That is exactly what I expect you to do. I expect you to leave as friends." And they say, "But then you'll have all these problems." And he says, "Then they will be our problems. Not your problems." I'm not saying that that conversation actually took place, but that definitely was the lay of the land.

Okay, so if there's no other questions I'll go back and step through it again with a slightly different perspective because here we're looking at the buildup of Satyagraha, per se. And here we want to look at the whole situation a little more broadly. Okay.

Spiritual Communities

In 1915, which is the famous, "Big ears open, big mouth shut," year. He does get involved in Viramgam, but not very deeply. He's mostly just trying to relearn. He hasn't been in his native country for 21 years. So, he wants to get acquainted with it. And, of course, he hasn't traveled around India very much.

But he also does another important thing which is to found the Satyagraha Ashram at Kochrab. So Viramgam is one episode. And the Satyagraha Ashram. [Writing on chalkboard] Sat-ya-graha. I do know how to spell that word. And as I briefly mentioned when we were talking about the four communities, it's significant that he's calling them, "Ashrams," because this is no longer a settlement, no longer a farm. He's basically coming out and signaling to the rest of India that this is a spiritual struggle, and he is taking responsibility for it. So, it wouldn't have made much difference to, let's say, the European Editor of the Times of India, but it was probably electrifying for Indians for him to call that an ashram.

And you remember the scene, because it's in your Reader, and I know you've read every word of the Reader up to the point that we're supposed to have read by now. But you remember that very stirring little anecdote that Pyarelal tells us how he met Gandhi. He was a graduate student, renting upstairs rooms in an apartment. And Gandhi comes in with these Punjabi businessmen. This is right after Amritsar. And they have decided

that they are going to buy Jallianwala Bagh. It's kind of a meadow area where it happened and turn it into a memorial.

So, these guys are the big funders. They're supposed to come in and pay for the purchase of the land. And they start hemming and hawing and saying, "It's a tough year. I didn't get the tax rebate I was expecting. I have to arrange a wedding for my daughter or my son." And so on and so forth. And so, all of these Indian figures who were part of this, the struggle at that time, come in, and they make a pitch. "You've got to do this. Our honor is at stake." All falls completely flat. At which point Gandhi very quietly says, "This has to be done. The honor of the nation is at stake. If we do not raise the money here, I will sell my ashram." At which point they all say, "Whoa. No, wait, stop. I didn't mean it. Here's all the money." And he gets the entire sum right on the spot. The steel will of determination and the ability to sacrifice rather than grab, that's the Gandhian combination.

So, the great coming out, his debut is at the end of 1916 when he gives a talk at the Banaras Hindu University. It's a ceremonial occasion and Annie Besant invites Gandhi to speak because he was still considered one of the jewels in the crown as far as the Raj was concerned. But Gandhi has been traveling around keeping his mouth shut for one year. And he is – I'm not sure what the nonviolent equivalent of this expression should be, but he was loaded for bear. How would you say that nonviolently? He was full of carrot juice or something like that.

Anyway, he gets up there to speak. And you see all of these native princes with their jewel encrusted turbans. And every jewel he looks at, he says, "That's the whole village suffering destitution because of you." And he sees the British, you know, with their fancy uniforms, costumes. And there's nobody like the British for official garb. If you've ever read that famous essay of Virginia Woolf's, "Three Guineas," There's some photographs in there of these British officialdom and how they dress up to the nines and then they put down women for being clothes conscious.

Anyway, Gandhi gets up there, and he sees this, and he loses it, basically. He starts cussing these people out, saying, "You're wearing the starvation of these villages on your costumes and stuff." And Annie Besant is – well, already has had problems with him over the Home Rule League. She's totally shocked, and she says, "Please, stop it." [Laughter] And nobody can get him to stop. And so, he – this is really a shock. This is Gandhi's emergence onto the scene in 1916.

Gandhi's Early Victories in India

He's no longer – well, I know what we should call this. He has outed himself. He's no longer a closet revolutionary. He says, "I'm waging war against all this." And sure enough, in 1917 brings him these three quick victories. He is really on a roll. He's emerged onto the scene, and he gets the Indentured Decree, the Viramgam thing at

[Katuyar 01:09:52] and Champaran all take place almost – just slightly more than a space of one year. So that leads to – well, let me get some of this down.

This is the event to remember. The Banaras Hindu U. The inauguration speech. And here we have Emigration, Champaran. And let's see, what was the other one? The Viramgam thing. Wait. He was introduced to it there, but it was concluded here two years later. So, three huge victories. I mean any of which would probably satisfy a person for a lifetime, any one of which would get you the Nobel Prize for Nonviolence. And he's got three of them in one year, in his early 40's. He probably feels pretty invincible at this point.

1918 is the Ahmedabad Mill Strike. That's the important event. His first fast back in India. And in 1920 two things happened that I would like to take note of. One is – it's kind of off the main track, and it's not often even noted in biographies.

The Keys Affair

But in 1920 there was something that was called, "The Keys Affair." The issue is this, the Sikh temple at Amritsar, the Golden Temple, which you're familiar with from more recent events because there was an armed holdout in that temple which eventually led to the assassination of Indira Gandhi.

Anyway, the temple treasury was a very important repository of resources. And somehow the British governor of the Punjab decided that the Sikhs should not, could not be trusted with their own money. So, he took away the keys to the temple. And the population is a Sikh population, not Hindu. It's still considered a part of Hinduism, but they're Sikh. They illegally occupied the temple and sat there. They did not use violence. Violence was used against them. Actually, a pretty large number of people were killed. And because of that, in the end, the British lost control of the situation. They had to give in and give the Gurdwara back the keys to his own temple. At which point Gandhi sent him a telegram saying, "Congratulations. First battle in Freedom Struggle has been fought and won."

So, this is an important thing for him, again, to build his awareness of what he could and could not accomplish with people in India. It was a grim event. People lost their lives and it's somehow not often taken note of because it's a little bit off to one side of the struggle, but it was the first time that there was a real head-to-head confronting violence – at least at this level since Amritsar.

And the other thing that happens in that year is the Khilafat Struggle and it comes to a climax. And this leads to his proclamation of Swaraj in one year. He openly says to the people of India, "We can get – we can liberate the country in one year if you'll give me your complete cooperation." Yeah?

Student: What was the temple [unintelligible 01:14:30]?

Michael: The Golden Temple at Amritsar. Keys Affair. It's amazing how money leads to violence – you almost might think it's the root of all evils if you aren't careful. Okay, so this is really where he puts his whole capabilities on the line and says, "Let's go for it." Now for later purposes, good to note that what they're struggling for here is a kind of dominion status. So, this is not Purna Swaraj or full independence. That will come really only in the 30's, and then that will be followed by Quit India. We just want you completely out of here.

The way I look at it, the British had a series of opportunities to see the handwriting on the wall and to do the right thing. And every time they did not, it got worse for them. There could be certain large industrial countries that are making the same mistake today, but that would not be part of our course and [I won't] dwell on that too much here.

In December of 1920 the Congress Party of India met in Nagpur, right in the center – geographical center of the country – from the end. And so, they declared themselves in favor of Gandhi's program. So, from this point on for the next 10-15 years, they are his party. And between December of 1921 and January of 1922 – so it's not a whole lot of time – 30,000 people were jailed. So, they did a little better than we've done so far. That's 30,000 out of – how many people? What was the population of India? It was just about what the population of the United States is now.

Chauri Chaura - Suspension of Satyagraha

On February 4th of 1921 is the Chauri Chaura episode which was in the movie. I've got just barely enough time to discuss it. This is in a place called, "Gorakhpur," which means, "Cow protection city," in the United Provinces. There was a march, and the march was – it was a demonstration and marchers being harassed by some of the police. People got very angry, chased the policemen back to the police station. Not satisfied with that, they barricaded them in the police station and set it on fire. There being no sprinkler system – I think something like 24 policeman died in that horrible way, including the son of the police superintendent.

And on this occasion Gandhi was deeply shocked, and he immediately declared a suspension of satyagraha – not the big Satyagraha of course, but small satyagraha. This led to a serious rift between himself and almost all of his famous close coworkers, like Nehru and especially C.R. Bose who's going to, later on, lead violent resistance against the British during WWII. Chittaranjan Das and other people – kind of famous high-profile leaders who had been following him, at this point they are saying, "I cannot believe this man's blundering." So really, he is operating on a level where it's rather difficult for ordinary people to understand him.

But it's of course, his intense conviction that the ends and the means are one, and you cannot use violence to bring about a nonviolent end. And I don't know if it was at this period or later that he formulated his famous dictum that [non]violent revolution will bring [non]violent Swaraj. Whereas if you use violence to get your freedom you're going to

have a violent regime when you're done. Okay, thank you for your patience. That was a lot of material. And we'll take this a step further on Thursday.

12. Tragedy at Amritsar 2: Rebellion Heats Up

Michael: ...Sir Richard Attenborough, except I don't have his money, but you remember at the very beginning of the movie he says, "The life is so long and complicated and just in a 2 ½ hour – 3-hour film it's very hard to capture it all. I'm starting to feel overwhelmed by my own material here. Let me make a couple of announcements. Let's try to resume the story and get at least up to the Quit India era. Then next week we'll talk about the collapse into the partition struggle, and I'd like to talk about the – I'll go back a little bit in time and talk about Abdul Ghaffar Khan because there's a very important story.

And then next Tuesday we'll have a complete review and Thursday we will, of course, have our grand opportunity to use what you know. Thursday evening there will be a talk on campus by a Gandhi professor from India. His name is M.P. Mathai. And I think I didn't send you a CourseWeb announcement about that, but just bear that in mind that 7:30 PM on campus, I think. And I'll get you all the details. I, unfortunately, will not be here because I'll be down in San Diego at the Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace and Justice. And I couldn't resist that for various reasons. But anyway, Professor Mathai is very knowledgeable about what's going on in India today in terms of Gandhian struggles.

And that leads me to a kind of difficulty that I need to share with you. I have been saying that we'll have 164B in the spring and it looks at this point as if we may have to postpone it. I'm very sorry about that. So, we may not be able to have 164B until the fall. It's basically a budget problem. So, if any of you knows Bill and Melinda, ask them if they'd like to support Peace and Conflict Studies. It wouldn't take a whole lot. Actually, from their point of view, nothing – to get us back on track. But at this moment there is no budget for the course. And I realize that's going to be difficult for those of you who are graduating seniors who – most of you, because I got all the lower division – a lot of the lower division people out in your favor on the grounds that you'd have A and B together in one year. And now it looks like that may not happen.

So, I've decided not to go to – I decided not to take a fast unto death over this one, but we're not at the end of our resources yet, but at this point that course is not on the books. Yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:03:08]

Michael: What's the date of the midterm? Sorry? You might be right, which would take a lot of the pressure off. Yeah, sometimes – it's not next week, no. But the week after. Yeah. That's right. Right, the 19th, yeah. Oh, that's right. Today is only the – yeah, that's right. Okay. That takes a little bit of the pressure off. Good. And I did send you an announcement about the Peace Boat which is coming on the 11th. So that should be a

lot of fun. The world's only floating university. Though sometimes I feel that this is place is really not very solidly anchored...

Jallianwalla Bagh Massacre

But I would like to start by raising an issue that is a result of not only the Chauri Chaura violence on the part of the Indians where 24 policemen were killed, but prior to that, in April of 1919, the Jallianwalla Bagh Massacre. This was in the context of the Rowlatt Act Satyagraha which was really the first kind of India against the Raj, head-to-head confrontation. And it was a peaceful – rally was going on. In Bagh. Bagh is a Persian word meaning, "Garden." This area was called Jallianwalla Bagh. Walla means, "Seller of," and I never have found what a Jallian is. But so, it's the Garden of the Jallian Sellers, whatever they are.

The point is, it was enclosed on four sides and General Dyer, commander of the area, using these Gurkha's who are Himalayan troops, who are politically Indian, but didn't feel ethnically very Indian. They made very nasty soldiers and they were just marched in. It was one of the most efficient massacres in world history. They fired about 1700 rounds and about 1500 people were hit. Something like 400 killed and a little bit over 1200 wounded. And the people were just trapped in the Bagh. They just couldn't get out. It was just like fish in a barrel.

And they asked General Dyer what he had been trying to accomplish. He said, "I wanted to make a moral statement that would resonate throughout India." Which morality this was, I'm not sure. But as I mentioned last week – I mean on – yeah, last week. This was really the point at which it became clear that the regime could not be sustained. It could not be tolerated. The struggle was between the Raj, the paramount power, and the Indian people.

Nonviolence vs Structural Violence

Okay, so in one sense this is exactly what nonviolence tries to do. You go into a situation which is one of – and this is a term I don't think we've used before. Structural violence meaning it's, you know, you're not openly slaughtering people, hitting them on the head. But something about the way things are structured brings about a severe compromise of the life of one class of people. You know, the classic – in this country, the classic expression of structural violence is, "Both rich and poor alike are forbidden to sleep under the bridge." Okay? This is not a hardship for the rich, right? They have a mansion on top of the bridge. The poor – I've seen this even in Kyoto where there are very few homeless people, they have to live under bridges.

So, the structure of things is prejudicial against a weak sector of the community. So, Johan Galtung coined this term – of structural violence. And if you're nonviolent what

you want to do about structural violence is force it out into the open so people can see what's going on. Now when you do that, people get hurt.

Sacrifice of the Satyagrahi

So, here's the question that I want to throw out to you, hear you're thinking about it, and I'll tell you what Gandhi's logic was in this situation.

But here's Gandhi, he's trying to be nonviolent. He doesn't even like to hurt little bitty animals. And he sets in motion a chain of events that leads to the death of 400 people. 400 people who otherwise, you know, would not have died – at least not on April 23rd, 1919. And people look at this and they say, "You're trying to be nonviolent and it's leading to people's death." And as a matter of fact, that kind of challenge did not faze Gandhi personally. At one point later on the British sent him a warning saying, "If you carry out this Satyagraha, rivers of blood will flow in this country." And he shot back, "Let them." Then he added to himself, "But it's going to be our blood, not theirs." But he didn't scare easy.

So, he didn't blanch at the death of these people. It's interesting. He called off Satyagraha at Chauri Chaura three years later when it was his own people being violent. But he did not even dream of calling off Satyagraha when violence was visited on them. So, the question I'm raising is, how are we going to understand this? Can we still construe this as nonviolence when people are getting killed? It's a challenge. You know, the British said, "Look, you're getting people killed all the time."

How does this strike you? What is your take on it? Who would you imagine – how would you defend this or are we just going to give up on nonviolence, not even have the midterm, just go home and say, "This was a mistake." Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:09:57]

Gandhi's "Himalayan Miscalculations"

Michael: Okay, so he did make mistakes, clearly. In fact, he called them, "Himalayan miscalculations." And he claimed that the whole period from the launch of Satyagrahas country-wide in 1919 until the suspension in the mid-20's when he gets arrested. He said, "I made a Himalayan miscalculation. I thought the Indian people were ready to carry out nonviolence without being violent. And I was wrong." He made a mistake. Yes, you'll never hear me say this, but it is true, Mahatma Gandhi can make mistakes.

However, there is a concept in law which is called, "Criminal negligence." And it states that if you enter into a situation where people's lives are endangered, you're responsible for the damage that accrues. Like every time we drop a bomb on Iraq, and it ends up killing a noncombatant, we say, "Oh, I'm sorry. We didn't mean it." But we knew perfectly well from every single war leading up to this, that the pattern is that more and

more noncombatants are going to be killed. So, it's not like we took a noncombatant and put that person against a wall and shot them. We tried to do something else, and they got killed. But to my mind, we're legally – in terms of the natural law, we're legally responsible because we knew that it was likely to happen. We endangered those people without their consent.

So, does that logic not apply to nonviolent campaigns also? He knew perfectly well that – he knew better than we do. We have this image of the British are very polite and gentle and they would, you know, never handle you roughly. But he knew perfectly well that was wrong. He had seen that in South Africa. He knew he was endangering people. So... dot dot dot. What are we going to say about this? Amy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:12:13]

Michael: Yeah, that's a second very good point, that dying with dignity was better than living without it. Charles Hamilton Houston who starts the early agitations that led to the pulling back of Civil Rights – pulling back of prejudicial legislation regarding travel. He said, "I would rather die on my feet than live on my knees," is a way of putting it. Alex?

Student: I think it was also important, but contrary to your example with the war in Iraq, he was endangering them with their consent. And if they died for their cause, they could [unintelligible 00:13:29].

Michael: This is still a third point, that he did not – when people joined the movement he didn't say, "I guarantee you a free ride." And, you know, as Alan Arkin says in "Brothers-in-law," "You have to stay alive. That's the key to the benefits program in the CIA."

Satyagrahis and Structural Violence

He didn't promise them they were going to stay alive. People had died in India. So, we have three points here. Amy was saying that in structural violence people are dying anyway. And I want to get back to that in a minute.

Sid was saying that death – after all is said and done, it isn't quite everything. It's darn close. It's darn close to being the biggest issue we can possible face – life and death, our own or somebody else's. But there's actually something that trumps it just a little bit. As Martin Luther King says, "If you haven't found a cause for which you are willing to die, you have not found a reason to live." And then Alex was talking the very important question of consent. It's not like the people in Jallianwalla Bagh said, "We're going to die here this afternoon. Is that okay? Sign a release form." But they knew that there was a risk. Yeah. Anything else? Yeah, Kevin?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:14:47]

Michael: It's working in a way because Dyer felt that he had to overreact. And we can take some small comfort from that. And you remember – it would be hard to remember

because I may not have mentioned it before – but there’s a famous formula that Gandhi comes up with. In any movement he says, “First they ignore you. Then they laugh at you. Then they fight you. And then you win.” So at least you’re getting them from the stage of laughing at you to fighting you and it’s a necessary stage to pass through in order to win. Other comments? Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:15:46]

Michael: Yes, you have – that is the point of the awakening issue that I started out with. You have to awaken your own people to see what kind of regime they’re living under. They have to feel their own oppression. We talked a little bit about that on Tuesday in the connection with nationalism. But even more important, you have to awaken the opponent. And sometimes the only way that you can do that is to – how shall I put it? Not trick them, not lure them, but maneuver them into a situation where if they’re going to keep on being what they’ve been being, they’re going to have to do it openly. And that will lead them to see what they had done.

Now in an extreme case – fast forwarding to 1943 – actually, there’s two things in 1943. One was the – in the face of the impending Japanese invasion, Gandhi, who had not had time to organize nonviolent resistance – he had been in prison most of the time. What he recommended was men, women, and children go to the border – the border between India and Burma and stand there. And he said, “I am not telling you that you would not be massacred. But I am telling you that any army that mows down men, women, and children, will find that it cannot repeat the experiment.”

Of course, in modern warfare it’s, you know, it’s a little bit difficult. But I did share with you the tragic rate at which our soldiers in Iraq are being psychologically traumatized by what they’re doing, not by what is done to them. So that is there. Let me get back to the other point about 1943. In 1943 there was an event that’s known to history as The Bengal Famine. [Referring to writing on the chalkboard] The yellow stuff is not me. I don’t know what that is. We’re keeping the Kathar’s though because we’re going to talk about them in about three weeks. But I don’t know what this is supposed to mean. Okay.

The Bengal famine, like almost all famines known to history was not a phenomenon of nature. It was a phenomenon of human mishandling of nature. And in the present case – and this goes back, incidentally, even to historic famines in the ancient world. The third century B.C. there’s a famine in Asia Minor. It turns out it was caused because the wealthy people were buying up grain and hoarding it, not because the grain gave out. The Irish Potato Famine came about because – yes, there was a blight on the potato crop, but what people forget is that the British had taken all the wheat.

So, in Bengal the entire rice crop was appropriated by the Raj for it to feed the army. And, of course, if you asked them they would say, “The army is protecting you. Without them, you know, the Japanese would come in here. So, this is for your own benefit.” But

the fact of the matter is that somewhere between something like 1 and 3 million people died of starvation in Bengal in that season.

So, you look at those numbers and you see that, yeah, 400 people died at Jallianwalla Bagh, but in Bengal, if the structure is kept in place many, many more people are going to die. And given the nature of our imperfect world – and it is imperfect, incidentally. I'm sorry to have to share this with you if you hadn't noticed this before, but given the nature of this world, sometimes you are faced with a terrible choice where you have to risk a loss of life in order to protect a much greater – prevent a much greater loss of life.

Obviously, this logic can be misused. People can say, you know, "Down the ages that's the way violence has been justified." But the fact is that here, A – it's the consent thing that Alex is talking about – the willingness. And B – you are doing the suffering, not them. So, 3 million people dying in Bengal accomplished nothing in terms of political change because they didn't – they didn't do it voluntarily. But at Jallianwalla Bagh this is a risk we're willing to take and so it has that redemptive effect.

So, this is very difficult. I mean it would be really nice if we could do nonviolence without hurting anybody, but at least we're not deliberately hurting someone, but we're creating a situation in which the suffering, which is inherent in the situation, the structural violence, comes out into the open and you can do something about it. It's sort of like, you know, if you have a boil and it's got an infection in there. A good doctor will lance that thing and get the stuff out of there so it can be treated.

So, whenever he was faced with this kind of question, "Look, you know, we've had a nice peaceful country here and now there's all these riots and people are burning cloth and stuff." He said, "It little matters to me whether you shoot a person or starve a person to death by inches." It's going to be death one way or the other. The difference is that here we are taking the advantage. We're taking the initiative. Okay. Any other – I mean this is a very important point so if anyone has any other questions about it, I'd be happy to tarry with it a bit. Sid?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:22:12]

Michael: Well, then we would have to ask ourselves about your question, you know, how meaningful is it to live without being in control of your own destiny, without having dignity, without being fully humanized in the eyes of the other. There was an episode in the Punjab where a British woman was assaulted – at least it was claimed that she was assaulted. And of course, this is the absolutely unforgivable sin, that a non-white person should sexually offend a white woman. This threatens the whole order of the universe. And so, they had to undertake very severe measures, they felt.

And they started issuing what they call, "Crawling orders," meaning that any man who walked by that corner where this alleged event took place had to get down on his belly and crawl. It was like utter abasement, humiliation. And in a sense, you could say that there's only – you know, there's a point at which this becomes worse than death –

provided, of course, the person gets to decide themselves. You don't say, "You are worse than death so I'm going to shoot you." It's not that kind of thing. But there's a time when people have to stand up and say, "It's not worth living like this." Yeah? John, did you have your hand up?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:23:43]

Michael: Yeah, I believe that Gandhi knew that Socrates had willingly accepted the death that was inflicted on him by his countrymen. He probably knew that. It's in two or three of the really major dialogs. There was another event in Socrates life, by the way – now we're really getting off track – where when Athens was ruled by the 30 Tyrants he was told to go out and arrest somebody and he just went home. And he said, "If the 30 Tyrants had not been overthrown, I would certainly have been killed on that occasion." So, Gandhi might have been thinking about that too.

But we're coming to a point when Gandhi is going to spend a year in jail, and he read 150 books that year. So, you guys should not feel bad when I give you a long reading list.

Gandhi's Fallback of Sacrifice and Constructive Programme

Okay, so I guess we were up to the Chauri Chaura episode in the beginning of February 1922. And I've been asked to write some of these down on the board. [Writes, "Chauri Chaura 2/1/22"] And this is where he really starts to lose his credence with the young Turk, sort of the political revolutionaries like Nehru and Chittaranjan Das and some of the others.

At one point some people came from Nehru and said, "We don't want all of this reform business that you're talking about, Gandhi. We want a revolution." And Gandhi said to them, "You people are talking revolution. I am making one." And they were very much persuaded by that, and it was very appealing to them. But when he withdrew non-cooperation Satyagraha in 1922 they thought it was a tremendous blunder. He was bungling one thing after another. We're going to come to an even bigger one in 1926 – in their eyes, anyway.

So, he suspended "Aggressive Programme," as he was calling it then. But that didn't mean that he suspended constructive programme. And you will see that in general when Gandhi is thwarted, when he can't carry out a resistance, he can fall back on two recourses. Now this is very good for us to know about because in my experience we get thwarted a lot. You know, you have 12 million people come out and say, "We don't want this war." And the President says, "I don't have to listen to you. You're just a focus group." That's very frustrating.

So, whenever he was faced with these frustrations for one reason or another he would do two things. Personally, he would give up something. There's this sort of strange reaction that we've talked about before which does not come naturally to our way of thinking. "We need more power. We want to get something." But whenever he needed more power he got rid of something. And in extremis, if this is carried to the ultimate ultimate conclusion, he would give up everything. He would lay down his life. That was his final recourse. But the other thing that he had to fall back on was this constant constructive programme, which the British did not understand the importance of, which was not illegal – for the most part – and which enabled you to keep the community together and keep them working.

Now psychologically we know today because, as you know, there's a lot more scientific evidence that backs up nonviolence today. We know that when people are actively working, they feel empowered. It's not the other way around. I feel empowered so I'm going to go out and do something. It's like get up off your butt and do something, you're going to feel empowered.

Incidentally, I told you about that episode where I took a train into Germany, and I was met by my host. And he was so excited that no sooner had he said, "Hello," then he started telling me about mirror neurons. That was Professor Spiegel, who is with us here today. So, I'm going to share some more scientific results with you pretty soon, Egon, after this class. Okay, so now I will try to stay on the track for just a little bit so we can get through this.

In March – March 18th, 1922 – and, of course, on the midterm I'm [not] going to expect you to remember the exact day and dates, but I will be impressed if you do. It's worth impressing me. It's helpful in that context. That's when he had his famous sedition trial by – he was tried by Justice Broomfield who – it was pretty well portrayed in the Attenborough movie, but they neglected one thing because Gandhi actually said to him, "If you feel that what I have done is wrong, please punish me with the greatest penalty that you have at your disposal. But if you feel, as I do, that this was the first duty of a citizen, then get down off your bench and join me." Imagine saying that to a British judge? I mean I couldn't even imagine saying that to the Dean.

So, he really had, what in Hindi is called, "Hutzpah." Needless to say, Justice Broomfield did not join – didn't step down off his bench and join him. It so reminds me of this comment that was made about these generals who have come out now saying, "The Iraq War is a terrible mistake." And someone pointed out that these are people who are willing to risk their life, but they are not willing to risk their careers." So, it was unreasonable to expect that Justice Broomfield would actually step down off the bench. But he did say, "In my whole life I have never tried anybody that has your character." And though he sentenced him to six years of harsh imprisonment he said, "If you get out early, no one will be happier than I." And that part was in the movie. And it's that year that he's put in prison, and he reads 150 books.

Chauri Chaura Episode

The next event I want to talk – Chauri Chaura is 1922. 1924 is the Vykom Satyagraha. Vykom is a city in the south. And so now Gandhi is no longer operating in Saurashtra only, no longer operating in Gujarat only. He's moving into the south. So, swadeshi has grown for him, right? He's established his control with his people. Jordan, are you okay? Do you want a ride home? You sure? I'm sorry. So, she – she? Duh. Back to PACS164A.

He had really worked with his own people and started this way in South Africa also, but he now was beginning to feel that his reach was pan-Indian. And that's one significance of this. The other significance of this is that the south is known as the land of orthodoxy in India. You're really orthodox Brahmin communities are in the south. And that's because the south never got invaded, you see. North you had all these Muslims and all these other – other types. Greeks had a little territory that they ruled in Bactria and other places. But the south had always been pretty well enclaved.

Addressing the British, Hindu Castes, and Hindu-Muslim Unity

And so, this is the first time in a major public way that Gandhi is turning his attention and his efforts to problems that are within Hinduism itself. So, it's one thing to go into the villages and say, "You know, we have poverty here and we want to start village uplift," and stuff like that. But it's another to say that there are some moral problems within Hinduism. And in the end you're going to see that Gandhi's efforts are kind of going in three directions, if you like this kind of model.

They're going against the British Raj, so that's from an under-class to an upper-class. They're going horizontally to the caste problems in India itself. And eventually, he's going to be offering Satyagraha of various kinds to the Muslim community. As you know, things are rapidly falling apart between Muslims and Hindus in India in the early 1920's. So, against their rulers, against elements that he considers to be doing the wrong thing within his own fold, but socially his equals – and for towards social inferiors.

And so now you're tampering with – remember I said several times that the British kept making the mistake of thinking that religion didn't matter all that much? And they would get in there. They would just, "We'll fix Islam, and we'll fix Hinduism," and stuff like that. And that always blew up on them. But here, at least Gandhi is, himself, a Hindu. But he's starting to tamper with things that were felt to be deeply, deeply embedded in the very nature of Hinduism. And he's going to argue – and this is going to be the biggest issue.

Dignity and Untouchability

Probably the most consistent issue concerning him to the very end of his career – and that is the elimination of untouchability.

You have these four castes – Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya, Shudra. And he's a Vaishya, by the way. And then you have these people whom the British refer to as, "Unscheduled classes," and whom they had been called by a terrible term, "*asparśa*," which literally means, "untouchable." And as you know this was carried out in fairly extreme ways. You could not accept water from an untouchable. You know, you're dying of thirst. Somebody ladles some water up out of the well. They can't give it to you.

Yet, there had always been an awareness among the sages, those who kind of rise above all kinds of social hierarchies, there had always been an awareness among them that this caste business was nonsense, and that God lives in every human being in exactly the same way. There's a story, it goes back to the 8th century AD about a mystic by the name of Shankaracharya who – he was a great reformer of Hinduism. Incredible philosopher, poet, all the rest of it. He was going down to a bathing ghat in the Ganges. And when he came up, a butcher, which is like the lowest of the low. I mean they're not only unscheduled, they're de-scheduled. Horrible. A butcher carrying a load of meat – which could not be more polluting – bumped into him.

And Shankara said, "You have touched me." And the butcher said, "I have not touched you, neither have you touched me." And then he disappeared. And Shankara realized that that was Brahmin – God – appearing to him as an untouchable to kind of break through the last fetter of illusion that was holding him to the world. I'm telling you this story to illustrate two things, I guess, that the caste system and especially untouchability – because there's a difference. Caste is one thing, untouchability is another.

Untouchability was deeply, deeply ingrained in everyone. And the other thing I want to illustrate is that when you got down to the living spirit of India's spirituality it had no business there. And this is where Gandhi is coming from. So Vykom was a town where there was a temple which had been closed to the untouchables for 400 or 500 years – which, of course, is not much time by Indian standards. But, you know, there's a sense of tradition that for 400 or 500 years this temple has not been polluted by the presence of an untouchable. And though Gandhi was not personally there he authorized people to walk into that temple.

As a matter of fact, not only was the temple forbidden to the untouchables. The road leading to the temple was forbidden. And you can imagine it would go on and on from there. But they weren't even allowed to walk on the road. So, the Satyagraha was very easy. You just got up and walked down the road. It was very intense. I know a person who had a relative in his family who lost an eye in this Satyagraha. So, people were really attacked. It was brutal because the feelings were very, very deep.

But in the end it was successful. There was a fast against the Brahmins who were running the temple and they eventually were won over by that fast. And the opened up the road and the temple. Yes, Julia?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:38:44]

Michael: Yeah, well the caste system consisted of basically four functional differences. The Brahmins were responsible for learning and preserving the religion and carrying out the rituals. The Kshatriyas were responsible for governing and defense. The Vaishyas are responsible for trade. And the Shudras, for service. But underneath that with no designation are people who are – they're just basically not part of the system and the only thing they can do for a living is scavenging. In other words, they're – what we call today, "Sanitation engineers." They come along and empty the garbage and the human waste and so forth.

Now, you know, the fact is, that human waste has germs. And the fact is that people handling this stuff will get sick and they will make you sick. So there as element of reality that underlies this. But what Gandhi couldn't tolerate was the dehumanization. Now there's still another group in India which are the *adivasis* who are the indigenous people who were not part of the Indo-Aryan social order. And he did some work with them. And their struggle has really come to the fore recently.

So, I guess technically – well, from our point of view, anyone in any one of the four castes is a human being. You might consider the fourth caste lower than the third and so forth. But they're people and they have a role in society. But the *asparshas* are there just to, you know, collect the waste and they should be not only not heard, but not seen. Yeah, Camilla?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:40:48]

Importance of Sanitation in Self-reliance

Michael: Yeah, well he – we'll talk about this some more when we get down to constructive programme. But he fixed it in two ways, basically. Which is the first way was he had everybody take care of the toilet sanitation starting with himself. And you saw that in the film. He said to Kasturba, "You should empty the latrines." And she said, "You know I'm not – we don't do that. That's not me." And he's getting ready to fling her out of the ashram over that. That was real, that episode really happened – until he came to his senses. So that was one thing. He would identify himself with them by doing their work. He would carry a basket of night soil on his head and dump it into latrines.

And famous episode in 1931. He came to Oxford during his – during the Round Table Conference. And the Indian students at Oxford wanted to sponsor him and he was their hero. He was going to give a big talk and they rented the hall. Everything was in readiness. And he arrived and he said, "Let's see the latrines." So, the – "What?" "Let's see the latrines." So, he marches them off to visit the latrines. He said, "This is disgusting. You got paper all over the place. Look, you have graffiti." Probably not, but that's what our latrines look like.

Teaching Without Words

And so, he basically said, “Okay, guys, you know, roll up your sleeves. Let’s get to work here.” They spent the whole day cleaning latrines. They never went and heard his talk. But he felt that that was his message. Not that he would get up there and say some inspiring words and act like a professor, that he would actually – he showed them more with his behavior than he could have done with words. So that was one thing.

And then another thing was to try to bring them into society in various ways. Now this was – it was kind of – he was never entirely sure how to do this. On one period, you know, people always came and said, “We want to get married in your ashram,” because that’s the holiest place in India. So, for several years he only allowed marriages that were in-between castes. If you’re marrying someone in your caste you couldn’t do it in the ashram. But if you were marrying an untouchable, come on in.

And then in other years he said, “No, that won’t work.” So, he didn’t do it. But he tried various mechanisms to get that to work. But it was the biggest issue that he consistently worked on. Just one second. He did not – at a certain point, and it’s coming pretty soon – actually, a little bit after Bardoli in 1928. There were a lot of serious Hindu/Muslim riots. And he said, “This problem is bigger than I am. I can’t deal with it.” But in terms of things that he felt he could deal with, this was probably the most explosive, emotional issue. Rami?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:43:56]

Michael: Exactly. I mean the way he put it in – and I think I’ve shared with you that famous letter he got from Ambedkar saying, “Well, Gandhiji, we have to get rid of the caste system, right?” And Gandhiji said, “Wrong. We do not need to, and we cannot get rid of the caste. What we have to get rid of is high and low.”

Student: [Unintelligible 00:44:22]

Michael: Untouchables? Well, as I say, it went back and forth. He never was quite certain what he wanted to do with that. I don’t think marriage was his biggest thing anyway. But however, the mechanism was worked out, what was absolutely certain was the high/low distinction has to go. Yeah? John and then Joy.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:44:53]

Michael: Well, at first untouchables were not welcomed into the struggle. Don’t forget the British were, if anything, more caste-conscious than the Indians and, [Accent] “It wouldn’t do, you see?” to have untouchables. But later on, he opened it up to anyone and he just – he gave everyone, you know, particular tasks that they could carry out.

There’s a film that I sometimes show, if we get our budget back and we have 164B, maybe I’ll show the film there where there’s a British Oxfam worker who’s helping a village which has been a village of untouchables. He’s helping them build a well. And

he's standing up there on a rise, you know, looking down at the workers and he turns to his fellow worker, his name is Bajpai, who's one of the untouchables from the village. And he says, "If Gandhi were here today, Bajpai, he'd be happy to see us standing here together wouldn't he?" And the man said, "No, he wouldn't. We should be down there working." So that's just a joke, and not a very good one at that.

But a lot of – actually, one of the – this is one of the areas that is improving in India today. Still needs a lot of work, but you know, they're going into untouchable villages and helping them in lots of different ways. So, Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:46:28]

Michael: Okay, we should actually – we'll wrap this caste discussion up for now because we're going to get back to it when it gets to the surface in the 30's and when we're talking about constructive programme. But I'll just say that Gandhi felt that originally the caste system was not rigid. And as a matter of fact, he is a Vaishya so he should be a businessperson, but his father and his grandfather and at least one of his uncles were government officials in Rajkot. So, it wasn't as rigid as all that.

And I admit that part of it is the hardest for Americans to swallow. We have a different society here. But the fact is, my father was a schoolteacher. My grandparents were scholars – Yeshiva scholars in Europe. It just gets efficient after a while. I could have been an auto mechanic or a rock star that was also suggested – a number of other things, right? That would have been fun for a while. Would not have added to the development of modern music, I think.

Okay, could we move onto the next thing because we're now falling seriously behind? Seriously behind of something. I don't know what that it matters a whole lot. The next years, 1925 to 1928 are somewhat uneventful. But in 1928 you have two important events. Actually, hang on. I'm skipping something. Okay. Let me get the two events up here and then talk about them.

The Beginning of the Bardoli Satyagraha

[Writes "Patna surrender"] And then in 1928 the Bardoli Satyagraha. Okay, what's happened here is, as you know, from 1922 onwards Gandhi was in jail. And in his absence something happened to split the Congress Party. He had been adamant that there should be – there was a Swaraj Party that was going for freedom, whatever they had to do to get it. And there was the No-changers. Let me give you a little bit of the background and then move quickly to what I want to pull out of this. Gandhi had adamantly maintained that the Indians should not cooperate with councils that were being set up by the British because he saw through them. It was very much like the commission thing that we discussed that the climax of the South African Satyagraha.

They make this handsome gesture, "We'll set up a commission. We'll hear your grievances." Only guess what? There won't be anybody on the commission who cares

about your grievances. Well, these councils were sort of the same. They were – again, they were a little bit like the academic senate where you could get up and talk about issues, but whatever decisions you made were advisory to the government. And sure enough, the government started ignoring them. And so, Gandhi felt that it was much better to create an entire parallel government and not play their games.

This is, you know, one of many cases in which he was actually taking a much harder line than the rest of the so-called “revolutionaries.” Sometimes it didn’t look like that, but that was almost always the case. But while he was in prison, people like Jawaharlal Nehru and Chittaranjan Das were coming to prominence. And these were people who had a British education. You know, the Nehru’s were from an extremely wealthy family. Motilal Nehru was a very successful lawyer. I keep encouraging PACS majors to go into law school, but they never end up practicing law when they get out of it, so I’ve stopped.

But it is said, I don’t know if this true, but it’ll give you a kind of a flavor of the thing. They were very wealthy Shaivite Brahmin family from Kashmir. It’s said that they used to send their laundry to Paris because they had really the best laundries – were in Paris. So, you’d put it on a boat and get it back five weeks later, perfectly starched and so forth. They were, in other words, an extremely aristocratic family.

And they felt that if they cooperated with what the British were giving them, they would get somewhere and they were getting tired of not seeing any visible results, which is going to be the issue over and over and over again. They don’t see visible results. They get impatient and over and over again, Gandhi will say to Nehru, “You were too hasty and didn’t believe me.” So there develops this very strong human bond between the two men. Nehru being much more his junior, very close human bond that was never really broken. But at the same time, they pulled apart drastically on the political level.

And at the end when Gandhi is inactive and Nehru gets to really organize what the modern State of India will be, he turns it into something which Gandhi would never have approved of or ever recognized. But at this point in 1924 the issue is that Nehru, Das, and others want to join the councils – be on these councils. And the No-changers say, “You know, Gandhi didn’t authorize this.” And sure enough, when Gandhi gets out of prison he says, “That would not be the right thing to do.” But he’s distressed to see that Congress is really splitting apart over this issue.

And in the end, to make a long story short, Gandhi decided, “Okay, join them. I will be – I’m with you. You want to be part of the councils; you can be part of the councils.” And by this maneuver, what he did was he prevented the split in the Congress Party. He felt it was more important at that point for the party to stay together than for him to hold out with this kind of pure kind of concept of non-cooperation.

On other occasions he’ll make exactly the opposite decision. And, you know, just about ten or so years down the road he’s going to actually leave the Congress Party so that they’re free to do their thing and he’s free to do his. But for now, he needs to keep it together.

The Patna Surrender - Surrender as a Nonviolent Tactic

His own sister felt that this was a terrific mistake, and this event becomes – because it happened at a major city called, “Patna,” it’s known as, “The Patna Surrender.” And everyone thought that Gandhi had caved in. And you’re not supposed to cave in. You’re supposed to “stay the course.” Right? That’s what you do.

And he made a public confession of his mistake and his sister said, “You know, you’re going to lose all your prestige.” And he said to his secretary – probably Mahadev Desai – write to her and tell her, “That my confession itself was my victory.” And he also said on this occasion, “That people see the fighter in me, but they miss my capacity to surrender from which my power springs.” So, it’s like that thing that we said before that when he needs power, he gives up something.

Sometimes I like to think that in a violent confrontation between two parties, party A pushes on Party B to get them to move somewhere. Whereas in a nonviolent confrontation against a violent opponent you create a pull, a vacuum, a kind of a gravitational pull. I know gravity doesn’t actually exist. I’ve read some physics. But you know what I mean. You make it attractive for them to move into a space.

And in the Gandhi felt that if in a just cause, in a good fight, even enemies will end up as friends whereas in a bad fight, even friends will end up as enemies. So, what – this is what he’s doing here. He’s creating a way for the people who did not see his point to join him. That’s what he was basically doing. It looked like he was joining them, but actually he was creating a space where they could be together.

However, he never lied. He said, “You people are as patriotic as I am. You have arrived at this decision by your lights which are perfectly valid, although they’re different from mine. And I’m here to tell you that you’ve made a mistake and your thing is going to fail. However, I’m not standing in your way.” And sure enough, in just a couple of years it became clear that that was a huge mistake. The British were tricking them and they themselves decided to go for much deeper noncooperation.

So, I think we can learn a lot from watching his behavior in this episode. Had he been out of prison the whole time he probably could have been working with these people and they could all have come out on the no-cooperation side, and it would have been more efficient. But he – this was something that he – a deeply held feeling that he had that this was the wrong thing to do. Nonetheless he was strong enough somehow to give in, even though he knew that everyone would look upon it as a surrender, as a cave-in.

Okay, then in the years 1927 and 28 – just to plug this in. There’s the Simon Commission which was appointed by the British government back in London to investigate things. And once again, they saw that this commission was a fraud and they

decided not to play along with it and they even, you know, boycotted the parades and things like that. And in 1928 it was that the Hindu/Muslim problem came apart so badly that Gandhi said, “I’m not going to try to deal with this.” And he basically, himself, withdrew a little bit from politics. He’s going to do this in a much more dramatic way later on. But he withdrew a little bit and he said – I’m reading the last part of 146 of abridged edition of Nanda’s biography.

“In the pages of young India from 1925 onwards Gandhi continued to devote occasional attention the Hindu/Muslim problem. He had almost despaired of a solution.” And here’s another thing, “He saw the urban intelligentsia split into antagonistic groups but felt he could not react on it. He had no influence with them.” He said, “Their method is not my method. I am trying to work from the bottom upward.” That was the signature of constructive programme.

So, whenever he felt that he couldn’t get anywhere with people like Nehru, not to mention not being able to get anywhere with the Raj, he went back to the villages and started to do constructive programme from the ground up. Now here’s the way he’s thinking of it. He’s not thinking, “I am defeated.” He’s thinking, “I have an obstacle and therefore I need to drop back, get more momentum, and come into this from a stronger position.” What do they say in French? [Speaks French 00:59:55]. You know, drop back to get more spring. I think they say that in French.

And so, he knew he had the patience – he’s what I’m trying to say. Finally, I realized what I’m trying to say. The guy was just constitutionally incapable of giving up. Whenever something didn’t work he said, “Okay, what will make it work?” And nine times out of ten he felt that going back to the village level so that you had enormous popular support behind you is what would make it work.

Bardoli Satyagraha

There was a sort of delayed result of the Satyagrahas on the part of the British government. And that was the Gandhi-Irwin Pact. But let me – hold on a second, let me lead up to this. In 1928 there was an area in the south of Gujarat called Bardoli. There was a very intense peasant disturbance. It was one of these situations where crops had failed and the owners, the Taluk owners – Taluka is a district – they had refused to make concessions and so the peasants said, “We cannot pay these taxes and these rents.”

Gandhi couldn’t go there, but he sent his lieutenant, as he sometimes called Vallabhbai Patel. This is the man who always said, “My only culture is agriculture.” And this turned out to be a spectacular success. The peasants had to put up with a lot of abuse. Their property was confiscated and, you know, when all you’ve got is a cow and they come and take your cow away, it’s a very serious wrench. And Gandhi is not there personally, but Patel is able to keep their spirits so high that even though they had suffered beatings, confiscation of property, being locked out of their homes and so forth,

they adamantly refused to pay what they considered was unfair for them to pay. And in the end, the provincial governor had to step in, and they were given redress.

So, you might look at this and say, “Okay, this was just very local. It was a smallish episode.” But two things about it were tremendously important. One was you had – and I mentioned this on Tuesday – this really strikes at the heart of the Raj. If they cannot own the country in a kind of medieval sense that, you know, your land belongs to us. The profits from it are ultimately in our control. And we’re here to skim off the wealth of the country.

And there was a cartoon around this period, incidentally, a map of the world with India over here and Britain over here and earth was represented as an enormous cow with her mouth in India and her udders in Britain. So, you know, she’s like eating India and the British are milking it. If they couldn’t do that, the Raj really could not stand on its own two feet. This is repeatedly what we’re going to see in the structure of exploitation. It’ll be even clearer in the Salt Satyagraha which is coming up.

So, this is one important thing, was this was not a symbolic issue. This was the life’s blood of the Raj. To get at them there would make the whole system collapse. And this is – to give you a modern example, I’m one of those who believe that the attack on Iraq was very much an attempt to prop up an old-fashioned system of colonialism. And if you look at what’s happened in Iraq, sure enough, every source of revenue in that country has basically been taken over. And Paul Bremer where this all belongs to multi-national corporations under the title of “Free Trade.”

So, I have been arguing that while the military confrontation is going on, you know, getting rid of this dictator, Saddam Hussein, is one issue. What really matters is here the access to the wealth of the country and the stiff arming of the people who live there. And if we can get that to stop happening, this whole project called, “The New American Century,” and full-spectrum dominance, will fall apart.

Whether I’m right or wrong about that – and I tend to think I’m right actually, but then I always tend to think I’m right. Bardoli was that kind of issue. If you stop them from exploiting the resources of the land and they have no foothold in this country. So that’s why the British were very, very brutal in trying to suppress this uprising. The other important thing about it was it was testing the system. It proved at least two things. Somebody other than Gandhi could go there and organize things and inspire the people. And it proved that the peasants had whatever it takes to carry out this kind of struggle.

The Salt Satyagraha - Dharasana

So, there’s a scholar, Dennis Dalton, a Gandhian scholar who was brought this really to our attention and I think he’s absolutely correct, that whatever else it may have been –

although it seemed like a local kind of issue, Bardoli was the launching pad for the Salt Satyagraha.

Okay, so let's talk about that. It's early in 1930. Things are kind of winding down. People are losing enthusiasm for constructive programme. There aren't many opportunities for obstructive programme or what he calls, "Aggressive programme." It's not that nothing happened in 1929, but we do have to keep moving on. [Writes "Salt"] And this is one of the events where Gandhi himself got the idea.

Most of the others he was an opportunist. He waited for people to get exercise about something. He had judged that this was a good issue to fight on. We stand a chance of success here and he would go along with them. But this is one where nobody knew what to do. People were getting demoralized. They were sort of going back to the same-old, same-old. And he gets this brainstorm that probably the most powerful, single issue is this British monopoly on salt.

So here – now you'll notice actually that most of the climatic struggles are around very basic things. They're not about symbols. They're like about salt which is absolutely essential to stay alive in a tropical country or that who owns the value added that comes off your own property. And, of course, coming up pretty soon, cloth. So, food, clothing, shelter, very, very basic human needs. That's an important element of the way the Freedom Struggle is working.

And for us, it's a classic example of exactly what we're facing in globalism today because what you do is you take a natural product – and there's nothing more natural than salt. You know, you don't need to add a whole lot of value to salt. In fact, I happen to know something about this because, since you're asking why am I such an expert on salt production. Well, it's because my son is in the Peace Corps in Nicaragua and he's working in a little area called, "Salinas Grande," which, you know, I'm not fluent in Spanish but I know enough to know that Salinas Grande means, "Big Salt."

And what they simply do is they construct these pens. The tide comes in. And when the tide goes out, salt water is left there in this pool. And they just let it evaporate. And they pump it into another pen, so the sediment falls out and it gets to be about four- or five-times higher salinity than it is in the natural state – same as in our blood stream, incidentally. When it gets to that – when the salinity gets that intense they let it dry out and you get this very nice, lovely white salt.

So, it's something you absolutely need. God has provided it in the form of oceans, of which India has a lot of access, and it's easy to manufacture. And an industrialized country comes in and says, "No, this is no good. This won't work. You have to manufacture it in these very special arrangements. And guess what? Only we can do it. And not a problem, don't worry. We'll take the salt water, and we'll turn it into salt and we will let you buy it at a much higher price than it would have cost you before."

So, this is taking a natural product like salt, milk, wheat, what-have-you, and commoditizing it – making it into something that has to be manufactured and sold back to you. So, I really think that the Salt Satyagraha reflects the whole issue of globalism all over the world today. We'll talk more about that in 164B, whenever that happens. So, Gandhi simply decided that this was a huge lie, and the truth actually would be for the Indians to just go and take their own salt. Hey, it's my ocean. It's my hands. I'm going to make the salt.

And in his classic style he announced to the viceroy, he sent him a long letter, saying that on a certain day in March I am going to march down to Dandi which is about 220 miles, on the coast, and we are going to take salt illegally. So, this is classic civil disobedience. You're doing it openly. He even published the names of the 70 Satyagrahis who were going to join him going from the ashram.

Where is that? Yeah. Hold on a second. I maybe will read you – sorry, I don't have this flagged, but there's a very nice statement that he makes about – when he's leaving the ashram he says, "I may never get back here alive." And in fact, he abandons the ashram at that point and says, "We will not come back to his place until Satyagraha is won." So, it was a very powerful motive for all of them.

And I call this a kind of classically concrete because all though salt was, in a sense, symbolic – and it's treated that way in the movie – it was actually real salt. And now, of course he could have hired a train or something and gotten down to Dandi overnight before the British knew what was happening. But he deliberately decided to walk there on foot, and it took them about 12 days which did two things.

It gave the government ample opportunity to arrest him. So, he's sort of taunting them. It flaunted their courage and their determination in the face of the regime. I guess it actually did three things. As I told you, I'm not terribly good at math. The third thing was it enabled hundreds of people – indeed, tens of thousands of people to join him.

I don't know if you've ever seen "Viva Zapata." It's a black and white movie. I know people don't see black and white movies anymore. Marlon Brando is – I'm sure he'll come back, but he's sort of – he's a little bit passé, I gather. But anyway, one of his very, very best films was "Viva Zapata." And in it, Emiliano Zapata, this hero of Mexican uprising is captured, and he's being led on a rope down to the *Distrito Federal*. It takes him a couple days to get there. And every few miles these *compassinos* come out of the jungle and join him. So, by the time they get down there they have to let him go because you look back and there's thousands and thousands of people walking with him.

Well, it was not unlike that. Let's see, I think had I a description of it somewhere. "They got up at 4:30 every morning for prayers and spinning, keeping a diary. It was continued for all of them every day." And then yeah, they had prayers at 6:00 and shortly after that they had a light breakfast and got on the march. And they covered, you know, 10, 12, 15 miles a day. And at every town he stopped and gave a talk. And in every town and

every little village people joined him. So, he gets down to Dandi with something like 70 – not 70, but 70,000 people, walks out onto the beach, bends down, picks up a piece of salt.

Fortunately, there was a photographer who caught him bending over and picking up that salt. We have that photograph. And then Sarojini Naidu, who was the poet laureate of India was waiting there with a garland. She put that garland around him, and the fight was on. So that was the signal and all over India people started making contraband salt. And not only making it, but “hawking it.” Going out on the street and selling it openly. They were arrested. They were beaten. People were thrown in jail, and finally, a couple of years – sorry, a couple of weeks – almost a month later they arrested Gandhi in the middle of the night.

See, he does things openly. They don't. It's kind of interesting. Middle of the night they came into the ashram and said, “Is Gandhi here?” They pointed to this little bundle over in the corner and said, “That's Gandhi.” So, they said, “We know. We'll give you an hour to get ready.” He said, “I'm ready.” I actually have this a little bit of a documentary film, a newsreel from a British newsreel where someone is questioning Gandhi about what's going to happen if he doesn't get good results. This is late in the 30's. And said, “Well, we will be forced to re-resume Satyagraha.” And the journalist says, “Are you prepared? Are you prepared to go to jail?” And he says, “I am always prepared to go to jail.” And so, you know, off he goes.

And what the British didn't realize was that this was very well – people were very well trained. That's why Bardoli was so important. They arrested the entire leadership, starting from Gandhi all the way down. But everybody had orders and they knew exactly what to do. They knew the chain of command. If Gandhi is arrested, you follow Patel. If Patel is arrested, you follow this person. If this person is arrested, you follow your village person. If everyone is arrested, here's what you do.

And so, they knew exactly what to do and they kept on doing it and the jails were packed and the world was watching, and you have this famous event of the raid on the Dharasana Salt Pans where – I hope you can see this. [Writes “Dharasana”] I think it was something like 250 people came to this facility where salt was being evaporated – salt water was being evaporated. And they just walked in and took the salt. So, you know, there's an issue here of property and property destruction which can come up and I don't want to pause to discuss it now, but I don't think this is a problem from that point of view.

Anyway, the police were there to meet them, and they were pretty darned determined not to let those people in and they just beat them to the ground. In many cases they fell into this muddy ditch with bleeding heads. And at the end of the day – no. That's right, I'm sorry. There was something like 2000 people who came. At the end of day 258 people were hospitalized. They just kept it up all day long. They would march up to the gates in groups of 20. Mostly, they were so disciplined that they didn't even raise their

arm to defend themselves. They were brutally beaten and kicked. And bones were broken.

There was a makeshift first aid station that, you know, kind of patched these people up, took them off to a hospital. And there was an American reporter, Webb Miller. Nothing is complete without an American reporter, right? So, Webb Miller trots over to a wall telephone and puts in his dime or whatever it was in those days. And he sends this famous message saying that West and – “Whatever moral ascendancy the West has had died here today in Dharasana because we beat them with bamboo and iron, and they responded with courage, and we could not break their will. And it’s over.”

The Nonviolent Moment

And that was the climax of the climaxes. Within the Salt Satyagraha, the Dharasana campaign is what we call a nonviolent moment. Yay! Some of us have done a film on that subject. That’s why I get so excited every time I mention this. This is where you actually force things out into the open. This is Stage 4. You know, they’ve ignored you, they’ve laughed at you. Now you’re forcing them to fight you on your own terms. And you win. So, it’s going to take some years before the British realize what happened and actually give them their independence. But ultimately it’s just a matter of time from this point onwards.

Very good. So, let’s do the same thing on Tuesday. Let’s, you know, pull out some really key events that we can talk about to go through the rest of the story. And –

13. Legacy of Triumph and Tragedy

Michael: Good morning everyone. I have a pleasant announcement to start us off with, and that is that a friend has stepped forward and offered us a challenge grant to make up the amount of money that the program needs to teach PACS 164B this spring. So... we don't really need to raise all that much and I think I would say at this point that the likelihood is greater that we actually will be offering it in the spring. It's good. I'm glad about that because I wanted to have like the whole year block for the Web site and for other things. So, I feel really good about that.

M.E.T.T.A

I've sent you some CourseWeb announcements with a lot of fun things that are going on. And I wanted to mention one other; we're getting ready to send you and bring you and that is the nonprofit for nonviolence education called, "Metta," is setting up an office near campus very soon, i.e., tomorrow morning. And we're going to have several internships available there. And we're looking for a technical person who – you know what I mean: technical person. Technically, we're all people, but a person who could help us set up our network, for example. We have three technologically challenged staff people – myself and two others. We're looking for somebody who can help us get the network set up if you have a person in your life who knows how to do that.

Course Review

Alright, so here's the plan. We have now discussed the climax of the Freedom Struggle which was the Salt Satyagraha. And in particular within that climax the raid on the Dharasana Salt Pans which we could consider the climax of the climax. And that was the nonviolent moment of the Freedom Struggle. So, in terms of liberating India from foreign domination, and in wider terms, saying no to foreign domination in general, (in other words, to end the colonial era in human history), it all took place on that one day in the spring of 1930. Two people gave up their lives, many others were brutally injured, and it was all over. So, nobody promised us a rose garden, you know. Nobody said that nonviolence wouldn't hurt. But considering what was gained and the amount of pain, it was a bargain – if you have to talk about it in those terms.

And so, the reason that we march around today every now and then, especially in the springtime when we get kind of – we have a lot of energy. We pick up placards and march around and protest things which is, you know, a perfectly reasonable thing to do. And one of the things that we go around saying these days is, "Hey, hey, ho, ho, Western civ has got to go." And the reason that we say that that would have been unthinkable if Gandhi had not risen up and said, "No, yours is not the only civilization.

Other human beings are also human. We also have a culture. We have a way to live, and we can work it out together cooperatively.”

And it’s been said that about 50 countries, at least, were under the yoke of colonial domination and are now “technically” liberated thanks to what happened on that afternoon and the buildup to that event. And it’s not to say that the problem is over. Your human exploitation isn’t over. We’re in at least one, maybe two phases of domination past frank colonialism. But at least at one point the human race stood up and said, “No, this isn’t okay.” Now we have to figure out whom we’re talking to and how to do it again because colonialism is still going on in much subtler ways. But at least we stood up and said it can’t go on in this obvious way anymore.

So, what I’d like to do today is run through – and it really is sort of a run-through, you know, kind of thing where if you drop your pencil you miss 50 years of history – We’re going to run through the conclusion to the end of Gandhi’s mortal life, highlighting some key events in our usual style, and on Thursday go back a little bit to around 1920 so that we can pick up the story of Abdul Ghaffar Khan because it is so critically important for us that we had a Muslim nonviolent advocate who spiritually was almost on a level of Gandhi – at least he was for his own people. He would, of course, deny that.

But he’s a person with whom I have a slight indirect connection. I got a friend of mine to do an interview with Abdul Ghaffar Khan in Delhi and I think it was the last interview ever taken of him. He died shortly after that. And I’m the only one that has the film. So, if someone would like to purchase rights to this film, we need exactly, I think, \$3000 more to teach PACS 164B in the spring. It’s going, going, gone.

Now I sent you last night a review list of terms that you could be looking at for the ID portion of the midterm. And in case you don’t like cyberspace, I have a few copies of it here also. So – hello, oh here they are. Thank you, Jordan. Oh, I didn’t realize they’d be blue. That’s so nice. You’re not staying? Okay. So, this is the description of those internships that I mentioned. The internships are blue. The review terms are white. So, we’ll talk about those, of course – the review terms next Tuesday. I’m giving them to you a week in advance. And also, what I’m going to give you is an example of how to answer an ID. And I think with that, we’ll be ready to go for the midterm. Okay? So, any questions before I take the bit out of my teeth and launch into it? Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:06:54]

Michael: I didn’t discuss the term paper? No, it’s way too soon for that. You need to concern yourself with the midterm. But when I do the diagnostic of the midterm, which is the meeting, I try usually to get the midterms back to you the next class day, that is if you’re going to take on the 19th, that’s the Thursday. I’m going to try and get it back in your hands on Tuesday. Did you know that Eli and Laura? It may be difficult because I actually have to go to a conference that weekend. But by Tuesday or – anyway, by next, by the following Tuesday, we’ll have a sort of diagnostic overview of what I failed to communicate well and get you prepared for with the midterm.

And at that point I'll also hand out a sheet that will kind of guide towards doing the term paper, okay? If you want to think about it already and I know that some of you are, look for an area that we have talked about, but have not satisfied you on. You know, something that interested you, but we couldn't get to the bottom of. That's usually the best place to start. What is heart unity all about? What is Nagler's Law? How does Quantum Theory fit into all of this? Which, incidentally, is not going to play a very big role on your midterm. I see some nods of approval. Yes, derive Heisenberg's Wave Equation in 15 lines. So that's what I would be thinking of, if you want to be thinking about the term paper now and it's not a bad idea. Okay. Yeah?

Student: I was just wondering what the format for the midterm is.

Michael: The format for the midterm is very simple. There will be two questions. One will be a set of ID's and one will be an essay. And in both cases, there'll be choice. One of the choices for that essay will undoubtedly be both – and there'll be a similar one on the final – take the South Africa phase or the India phase of Gandhi's career, run through it, pick out highlights, and tell us what we can learn from each of these events. So, it won't be a very satisfactory answer if you just say, "This happened, this happened, this happened." And it won't be satisfactory if you say, "Nonviolence works in the following way." We want to connect what actually happened to the general principles. Okay? All right? Very good.

Results of the Salt Satyagraha

So... the result of the Salt Satyagraha and the British reacted very badly to it. First, they didn't react enough and then, they reacted too much. First, they underestimated Gandhi's power and thought that the thing would blow over and they decided to ignore it. And then it went out of all proportion, and they had to react. And you had a classic example of paradox of repression. And you had tens of thousands of people in jail. The British were really starting to not look like the image of themselves that they project and did project into the world, as of a civilized nation and people. And it was getting sticky and so they decided to do what regimes always do in these situations which is to convene a meeting and talk about it.

So, they, but they didn't want to have Gandhi at that meeting so they said, "Let's have a big round table and everybody can come, except people who are in prison." And, of course, Gandhi had been in prison quite some time. So, they had Round Table Conference 1 which was a total farce. I mean without Gandhi nobody knew what to say and it didn't matter what they said anyway. So, then they realized they had to have Gandhi. And they said, "Please come to London." And he said, "I can't. I'm in prison." So, they said, "We'll let you out." He said, "I don't want to come. I like it here. I'm reading a good book. We have our prayer meeting every day and I get 12 almonds and I day and I'm just pigging out here."

So, they had to actually sort of beg him to come out of prison. I've been looking recently at ways in which the nonviolence paradigm turns our expectations upside down and reverses the normal expectation. This would be a good example of that. When jail going becomes a positive pleasure and jail leaving becomes something that you have to be cajoled into doing, it became a bargain chip for him.

In fact, he once said that "I drove my hardest bargains from behind bars." That turns our expectations inside out. Next semester – knock wood – or if not, in the fall, we'll be talking about the power of vulnerability. It came up particularly in the People's Power Revolution in the Philippines in 1987. But they begged him to come out and it took him so long that by the time he was ready to come out of prison, they had to get a special train to take him from Yerwada to the dock, put him on the boat. And this becomes a very well advertised and well-known and iconic period in his life. Great adventure. He needed to – drinking goat's milk at the time so the only way to get fresh goat's milk onboard ship was to have two goats with him.

So, it's like a classic example of Gandhi doing something concrete that had a huge symbolic resonance. There was no better way that he could advertise that it matters how you live and what you eat, and you should live lightly on the earth. And if people are being unkind to cows, which had become the case, I'm going to boycott their products. I'm going to drink goat's milk. And so, he goes all over Europe with these two goats in tow. And that attracted a lot of media attention. He was very famous by this time.

When he landed in Marseille a journalist came to him and said, "Mr. Gandhi, what do you think of Western civilization?" And he said, "I think it would be a very nice idea." Now you see this written on walls everywhere. There's a famous repost, famous rejoinder of his. The conference itself was a complete farce – again, of a different kind. What the British did was they stacked the meeting against him, and they did everything possible to play what they thought was their strongest card, which was "if we leave India, there's going to be communal riots and it'll erupt in a civil war." It'll be Sunni's versus Shia's all over again. Sorry, I'm being a little anachronistic.

But that was what they were claiming was their main reason for staying in India at that point, which is interesting, because prior to that they had said, "You are a lesser breed without the law. If we go, you won't have any civilization. You won't even know how to make tea. You didn't even grow it before we got there." But now they have to put it on a different basis and that was interesting.

And it provides us with a very good example of a topic that I call "*work*" versus *work* which I admit is not a terribly skillful way to express it. Sometimes I call it, "work versus success." And it's a very important tool that we need to evaluate how nonviolent events work. And that is they can or – they may or may not "work" in the sense that they may or may not do exactly what we want them to do. But they will always "work" in the sense that they will change things for the better. They will set up new relationships. They will

advertise that there's a new kind of power that people can have recourse to. In some way they will change things for the better.

And very often the *work* that they do is much more impressive than the “*work*” that they fail to do. And we've discussed a good example of this right in connection with the Salt Satyagraha – I think we discussed it. I discussed it with somebody in the last five days; I can't remember who. The fact is, there are two funny things about the Salt Satyagraha. One is here's Gandhi turning the world upside down to get the right to manufacture their own salt. He wasn't even taking salt at that time. It meant absolutely nothing to him personally.

The second is that as an attempt reverse the Salt Laws, it just about completely failed. The concession that the regime actually made at the end of that campaign was just symbolic. It really – they kept control of the salt monopoly. So, we would have to say, “This event did not work.” On the other hand – and this we did talk about last week – that was the nonviolent moment that showed that the British could no control India. And you remember Toynbee's famous formulation, “He made it impossible for us to go on ruling India, but he made it possible for us to leave without rancor and without humiliation.” Yes, Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:16:44]

Commoditization of Natural Resources

Michael: They kept control of that monopoly. I mean as far as I know, the Dharasana Salt Pans were still operating in British hands after that and it just kind of petered out. And at the end of it, on paper not much had changed.

Student: So, did the Indians make their own salt?

Michael: They made their own salt during the campaign and I'm sure some people went on making it, but the point was to get it legalized. The atrocity was that you could come in and make a law saying, “You can't breathe your air, you can't drink your water, you can't grow your cloth. You're depending on us to do it.” I have been recently noticing how far this has gone, this commodification – I guess we call it, “Commoditization,” taking this provided by nature, taking control of them and turning them into saleable commodities.

We have billboards around the town where I live – or near which I live – in which real estate agents are advertising their services. You know, so far, so good. I have nothing against real estate agents advertising on billboards. But a formula, a slogan has become very popular with them recently. And say if you're a realtor and you're seeing property in Petaluma, you have a picture of yourself smiling, cheerful, looking sort of like the Marlboro Man without a cigarette. And it'll say, “I sell Petaluma.”

This is really bad. Petaluma is not a thing, you know? It's a city. People live there. My son lived there for a while. This is getting serious, you know? It's getting real. And you don't own it and you can't sell it. Now of course they don't "mean it" literally, but it's not only what we mean literally that affects our consciousness. This is one of the things that progressives and the left have not caught onto, and they don't understand it as well as regressive and conservative individuals do. And that's one of the reasons that conservatives are so much more effective right now.

So okay, as you know, every day you have to be subjected to one of my rants. That was it for today – I hope. But it's this idea of taking something that is natural and that's available in the world and making a commodity out of it, where what then becomes important is the buying and the selling and not the commodity, not the relationship with the people, not the networks of relationships that spring up around providing this commodity.

Yet one more example, if you can stand it. This is exactly what we've done to the Tigris and the Euphrates. People have been living in Iraq – what is now Iraq – for 7000 years and they've worked out ways of dealing with a scarce commodity called, "Water," that comes from those two rivers. And it's been fine. They have not had a war over water in that Mesopotamian region in all this time.

But when we occupied the country, the first thing we did was privatize the water and make a commodity out of it and teach some Iraqis how to sell it to one another. So that was the real outrage. And that was not redressed.

Gandhi's Response to Commoditization

They did not succeed in changing the law that said, "Indians are not allowed to make salt. It has to be made by British monopolies." So, it was a complete failure on that technical level.

On the other hand, it accomplished much more than that goal it had set out for. It liberated India, basically. It's just a matter of time. The Round Table Conference was not dissimilar. Apparently, Gandhi gave one of the best speeches of his life. He spoke for about two hours at the actual conference – when his turn came. We don't have that speech, unfortunately, because the British refused to allow anybody to record it or take notes. But William Shirer, Gandhi's favorite Western journalist – he was there. And we have some idea what he said. But there was no way that you could come out of that conference with a different arrangement.

So, Gandhi goes in saying, "Let's be partners. You're a great country. We're a great country. Just imagine what we could do together in the world." But the British were intransigent, and they just trotted out one stool pigeon after another, one – what's the word I'm looking for? One puppet. One puppet after another who said, "Oh, no, please

don't leave us. If you do, those Hindus will kill us or those Muslims will kill us and we need you."

So in terms of doing it's "work," really renegotiating the colonial domination, it failed. On the other hand, Gandhi made very good use of the time. He met a lot of people. He had the opportunity to meet Charlie Chaplin, but he had no idea who Charlie Chaplin was, so that was called off. He gave a radio broadcast to this country – which is a very important message. It's the context of that talk where he gave his famous definition of God.

It goes, "I do dimly perceive that whilst all around me is ever changing, ever dying. There is, underlying all that change, a living power that changes not, which holds all together, which creates, dissolves, and recreates. And since this power – this eternal force or power – this eternal law or power is God. And since all else that I see merely with my senses will not and cannot persist. God alone is." And I didn't realize I was going to do this, but here we are. "Is this power benevolent or malevolent? I see it as purely benevolent, for I do see in the midst of death, life persists. In the midst of untruth, truth persists. In the midst of darkness, light persists. Hence, I conclude that God is Truth, Love, Light. He is Love, he is the Supreme Good."

So that was – that won't be on the midterm, but that was a really famous statement that he made in his radio broadcast to America. Another very telling event was his meeting with Lancashire mill workers that I think we mentioned last week, he had put like about 4000 or 5000 people out of work by boycotting British cloth. They were very angry with him. The minute he heard they were very angry he said, "I want to go and talk to them." And he gave them this very, very astute analysis. He says, "Look, you know, the system that your country set up in India is," well, he didn't use the term, but he said, "...is not sustainable. Don't even think of going back to that system. It will not work anymore. Think of who is really exploiting both of us. You as an underpaid mill worker, me as the leader of the Indian masses." He said, "You have – okay, I'm sorry you have 5000 unemployed. I'm really sorry. I have 200,000 unemployed. You know where your next meal is coming from. My people do not." And at the end they were just overjoyed. It was a great example of how on the person-to-person level you could overcome really deeply felt hostilities.

But so there you have it. He made terrific use of the time in London on the human level, but as a political event, the conference was a complete flop. And when he goes back to India and gets off the ship, he is met at the dock and arrested. He said, "I went from His Majesty's hotel to His Majesty's prison.

One other neat little anecdote I guess we shouldn't pass over here, he was invited to have tea with His Majesty, the king emperor. And they asked him to please wear Western clothes when he came in. And he said, "I'm going to wear what I'm wearing. And if his majesty doesn't want to see me, that's okay with me." So, they decided to have him in, and he was wearing what he called his, "Minus fours." You know, because

British in the Caribbean wore these long cut-offs that were called, “Plus fours.” So, he said, “I’m wearing my minus fours.”

And when he came out they surround him and said, “Mr. Gandhi, don’t you think you are a bit underdressed for the occasion?” And he said, “His Majesty had on quite enough for both of us.” And, you know, it really shows you what a sense of tact that he had. The king actually tried to get him involved in a political discussion. They’re sitting there and having tea and he said, “Why did you demonstrate against the Prince of Wales?” And he said, “We will not discuss politics on this occasion.” So actually, he was more polite than His Majesty, the king emperor. He had a finer sense of social protocol. Though to look at him, you would not have guessed it.

So, he comes back, and he’s thrown into prison. He comes back to find that all of his coworkers are in prison, and he’s also thrown in prison.

The Epic Fast of 1932

And the next event of interest for us, which I’ve started, is popularly known as, “The epic fast.” You’ll actually – there are other – he’s going to be fasting quite a bit now for the next 10 or 15 years. Sometimes people say the Kolkata Fast, which was so well dramatized in the movie, they called that, “The epic fast.” It doesn’t matter.

But there was *an* epic fast in 1932. He was in prison in Yervada Jail and the government announced that they were going to deal with untouchability was to set up separate electorates. And as we’ve mentioned, Gandhi felt that this would formulize the division between the caste and the non-caste Hindus. And what you wanted to do was the exact opposite. You want to breach that barrier.

And he felt this very deeply in his heart that this was unacceptable. Totally unacceptable. And he had only one mechanism open to him because he was in prison. He was not allowed to do political work. And that was to announce a stunned India on September – September is an important month in his life – September 20th, 1932, “I have gone on a perpetual fast unto death against this arrangement.” And immediately everyone in the country was galvanized. What are we going to do about this? It wasn’t too difficult to rally many of his coworkers.

But it’s interesting; there were two parties whom he completely failed to reach with this device – and one was the Raj. They did not appreciate the depth of feeling that he had. They did not appreciate that this was a religious issue for him. They didn’t quite believe him when he said, “The still voice within had told [him] to do this.” And they regarded it as a political ploy because that’s what it would have been for them. They did not understand that this was Stage 3 on the famous escalation curve of conflict – dehumanization – and that he was laying down his life for this.

Now the other party that he was unable to reach was Dr. Ambedkar who is really going to be his biggest adversary in the whole Harijan Movement which takes off the rest of

his life. Ambedkar was of Harijan – the term hadn't been brought in quite yet – he was an untouchable by birth. But he got a law degree and rose up through the ranks, married a Brahmin woman, interestingly enough. They would say, "It's all for us untouchables," but he wouldn't marry one. And he never got reconciled to what Gandhi was doing and never totally appreciated him.

In the end, just to skip down a little bit, he will eventually bring many, many untouchables out of the Hindu fold altogether. And that's one of the main reasons that you still have Buddhists in India today. Because he got about 15 – 20,000 untouchables to convert to Buddhism as a way of saying, "We will not put up with this." But anyway, Ambedkar couldn't be reached.

Now the technical details of what's going on here are a little complicated and I'm not going to hold you responsible for all of them, but they worked out. Gandhi and his fellow workers in the prison, while he was fasting, and they knew they didn't have a lot of time. He was not young anymore. The *fast* was telling on his health rather more quickly than other *fasts* had done. So, they had to work quickly. And they hammered out an agreement whereby the caste Hindus would – it's really complicated, but the upshot of it was this...

...that they were going to put something in place for ten years and what it symbolized was distrust on the part of the Harijans, on the part of the untouchables, or whatever – of the caste Hindus. And Gandhi said, "No, the five years maximum." And at the end when they had it almost signed, Gandhi was so weak that all he could say was, five years or my life." And Ambedkar says, "Well, I guess we lose you then." Everybody else was deeply shocked. Gandhi prepared to die. And they went off and stayed up all night long and worked on that guy and hammered away at him and hammered out an agreement which they hoped against hope that Gandhi would accept.

It's now the 6th day – September 26th. They went back to him in the morning. They put the papers in front of him and they stood there praying that it would be okay. And he looked at them and said, "Excellent." His last sort of gasp. And that was the Yeravda Pact. And so, they did sign onto it, and I think the important things to note here are that Gandhi had much more trouble in his own party than he had with the British – on this issue and on many others. The *fast* was not aimed at the British who totally didn't get it. The point of it was to prick the conscious of the Indian people.

So, in a sense – well, I wanted to point out one thing before I conclude with this – taking some of Nanda's observations. "The British Premiere and his advisors were unable to appreciate Gandhi's deeply emotional and religious approach to the problem." This is something that we've noticed again and again and again. They're operating at a political level, and they just don't get it, that there's a deeper level on which Gandhi is operating. "Gandhi, however, did not have to justify his fast to anybody except to his own conscious. Or," as he put it, "to his maker."

I mean there was a part of him which was absolutely, as he put it, between himself and God. And he would make these decisions and there just plain wasn't anything you could do about it. So, there was always that dimension to his life. I've been thinking of a couple of essay questions that are a little bit different from ones that I've used before. I haven't run this by the staff yet, but one of them would be, "What is the relationship between Gandhi's spirituality and his political behavior?" And another one might be, "Pick out four or five really salient characteristics of Gandhi as a revolutionist. What makes him special or different as a leader of a revolutionary movement?"

But if you do get one of those questions, this would definitely be one of those characteristics. That ultimately there were some issues which were between him and – as we would like to put it perhaps – between him and his conscience and nobody could intervene.

Ambedkar's Mistrust

And I remember the governor – previous governor of the State of New York decided to get rid of the death penalty and people came to him. Lawyers can't defend it and criminologists can't defend it. He said, "I don't any defense." He said, "I will not be – I will not preside over execution as long as I'm governor of New York. You want to execute people, vote me out of office." So it was that kind of thing. Gandhi had a number of issues that were like that for him.

The government even offered to let him out of jail to give him a comfortable place to fast in. But he said, "No, I prefer to fast in jail." The Leaders Conference included names that we're going to meet with again and again, like Rajagopalachari and Rajendra Prasad and others. But Ambedkar was a stubborn advocate of separate electorates. That's the odd thing. So, you have this odd configuration where the British is saying, "Harijans need separate electorates. Ambedkar, who has set himself as their representative said, "Oh yes, that's exactly what we need." They're both thinking of it politically. Gandhi is thinking, "What is the repercussion of this? We are saying that in our polity, in our political structure, these are two different communities. And that's fatal. There's enough tension between us already."

Okay, Joy, you had a question?

Student: I was just wondering, you mentioned that... [Unintelligible 00:36:47].

Michael: It's complicated. I can't even quite remember how it goes, but Ambedkar, basically his position was he did not trust the caste Hindus. And Gandhi was saying, "Part of the deal is, you have to trust us. If you don't trust us, we're not members of the same community." That's what Gandhi was holding out for. And again, Ambedkar wants a guarantee on paper, written into the Constitution, it has to be solved on a political level. John?

Differences in Dedication Between Gandhi and Ambedkar

Student: How did Ambedkar get so much power?

Michael: Um...I'm not entirely sure about that. I think he was a charismatic person. He had a law degree, which was rare in that community. And he was totally dedicated to the cause of his people. But here's the thing – here's the thing. Okay, I'm really glad you asked me that question. He was dedicated to the cause of his people as a *separate* item. Gandhi was dedicated to the cause of the Harijans as a member of the human race. For Gandhi there was no such thing as win/lose interaction. There was no such thing as a zero-sum conclusion. There was no such thing.

We've discussed this early on in terms of the underlying faith that an advocate of principled nonviolence has, is that there is no irreducible conflict. In order for you to thrive, I do not have to suffer. That's his whole worldview. In order for the Indians to be free, the British do not have to be hurt. That's what Toynbee said, "No rancor, no humiliation, we just stop dominating you." So that was really the difference and thank you for prodding me into clarifying this.

Ambedkar wants everything for the Harijans, period – separately. So, if it means taken them out of the Hindu fold where they have been, albeit uncomfortably for thousands of years. Okay, so be it. But Gandhi says, "No, we can work this out to everybody's benefit." And so, they thought – Ambedkar at least thought that he was anti-Harijan. It's so frustrating because they could not see that their benefit lay with the benefit of everybody. They thought he was against them by wanting it to be in that larger framework. Yeah?

Student: Wasn't Ambedkar who said that we need to get rid of the caste system?

Michael: Yes. There was also him and on another occasion he's writing to Gandhi, and he said, "We have to get rid of the caste system." And Gandhi said, "No, we have to get rid of high and low." Yeah, that's another thing that made Ambedkar look very good because he's advocating getting rid of the caste system and everybody can relate to that. Now what Gandhi's advocating would require a growth in consciousness of the human race. Okay, we keep the caste system, but we don't exploit it. That's very hard.

The Grand Illusion

One of my mentors at this university was Alain Renoir. And as you know, I love dropping names. And his father was Jean Renoir who wrote – did the film "*Grande Illusion* – Grand Illusions." And Alain Renoir, when he was a boy, he had a minor role in that movie, so he was hanging around on the set. And he noticed that, you know, there were cast of thousands. You were either German – you had a German uniform or a

French Uniform. It's all the same people. You got a German uniform or a French uniform. Every tenth uniform was an officer.

So provided you were the right size, you come by and if you're Number 10, you were wearing a lieutenant's uniform and not a private uniform, okay? Within one week Alain, who was very shrewd in these matters, within one week, Alain noticed that at lunch time, when they took a break, all the "officers," that is the ordinary stiffs who happened to be wearing officers' uniforms, they would congregate on one side of the set and all of the "enlisted" men didn't go there.

And if you made the mistake of walking past the "officers" they would say, "*Garçon, demi carafe*. Get me a half of red, will you?" Throw, took him a franc. Getting exactly the same salary, exactly the same people. Wearing that stupid uniform for one week and consciously you turn into an officer. So what Gandhi is holding out for is very, very difficult. That we're going to keep distinctions, but we're not going to regard them as differences in human value. No matter what you do, you're playing a necessary role in society and the upshot of it all is that you're a human being along with all the rest of us.

You're not better for being a professor. You're not worse for being a garbage collector. The question is just be a good professor and a good garbage collector. Raymond?

Student: Through Ambedkar's eyes, how did this policy work to empower the untouchables?

Michael: You would get more privileges. You get a separate electorate, you vote for your own people, get them into Congress and they would fight for you as opposed to fighting for the wellbeing of the whole in which you were included. And, you know, it's a sad thing, but today this is an issue around which Gandhi is not understood. And the Harijans have voluntarily rejected the title of Harijan and they now call themselves, "Dalits," or oppressed ones. So, he's calling them, "The children of God." And they're calling themselves, "Underclass, the oppressed people."

I've come across this many times with people who actually would rather be labeled as a victim than not because you think you're going to get more privileges that way. It's a very deep problem. And I know I've been talking with a lot of friends recently about how – for example, yesterday I was talking to a psychologist who was saying, "We are trying desperately to bring spirituality into our profession." And we've been doing the same thing with political activism. And I think it's because we're beginning to feel that these political criteria and these political categories are not enough. We're missing something somehow. We just keep recycling the same problems with all of this stuff.

Okay, so it's all very good. I don't want us to get too far afield though. Sometimes, I admit, it's hard to tell what the field was really – originally.

Effects of the Epic Fast - Yeravda Pact

But so, the eventual arrangements actually, in this case also were, again, a case of not a whole lot of “work,” but some work. To quote Nanda, “Just a crack in national life was closed for a while, but more important than these constitutional,” this is Page 191 if you want to go back and look this up. “More important than these constitutional arrangements, which incidentally did not come into force for nearly four and a half years, was the emotional catharsis through which the Hindu community had passed. The fast had been intended to,” this is quoting Gandhi, “To sting the conscious of the community into right religious action.”

So, the scrapping of separate electorates was only the beginning of the end of untouchability. They would have to do a lot. And the point was to wake them up and to realize that they had to do this. So even if they had failed completely to do away with separate electorates, which they did not, the thing worked in the sense that millions – this is not an exaggeration – millions of people said, “Oh my God, if he’s going to die on us, there must be something horribly wrong with this that I did not understand.” And his act served to awaken people. So that was the important point.

Now he was quite weak by now, so he was let out of prison shortly thereafter. Let’s get some of this stuff down here. Yeah. So that’s the Epic Pact. Yeravda is the name of the prison. And incidentally, once again, Gandhi called this place, “Yeravda Mandir.” Mandir means, “Temple.” And so, he actually had stationary made up where it said, “Yeravda Temple.”

After that the Satyagraha had kind of fallen apart. It wasn’t at all clear where to strike next. And Gandhi came to feel that this untouchability was the stumbling block to freedom. If they could get the Hindus to rid themselves of this temptation to despise another person because of birth, they would have so purified and strengthened their own position that then they could go to the British and say, “You have no right to do the same thing to us.” Okay? The logic is pretty clear.

As long as we’re doing it to people over whom we have that kind of power, how do we turn around and say to somebody else, “Don’t do that to us.” So, this is the one thing that those who advocate violence never understand. They always think that you don’t have to clean up your own act first, you have to dirty up somebody else’s act.

Formalization of Constructive Program

And so, from 1933 onwards he launches on a grassroots campaign against untouchability. He tours the country, covers, you know, about 25,000 miles of touring. India is a very decentralized country with 700,000 villages. He tried to visit almost all of them. And he – this is also the year when he gives up the next to last ashram – Sabarmati ashram – and he turns it over to the Harijan Sevak Sangh. That means, “The Harijan Service Organization.” Turns it over to them and proceeds to tour the country going from village to village talking about getting rid of untouchability. That last for about three years.

In 1936 he settled – he picked a small village called Saigoung which was like really – like the Milpitas of India. There’s no there there. And he purposely picked out this godforsaken little place that nobody ever went and decided to live there. Because in addition to untouchability, he’s now working on village uplift. And I guess this is a good time to talk about Constructive Programme which is becoming formalized. He puts and more and more of his effort until the final Satyagraha in the early 1940’s – he puts most of his effort into Constructive Programme.

So, I think you’ve got that little book, “Constructive Programme,” it’s meaning in place. And we’ve touched upon it in various ways. And I think I’d sort of open it up at this point and ask you why was constructive program so important for him – strategically, philosophically, whatever. You’ll remember that in the very beginning of the story, he said in 1894, when he was starting things out in South Africa, one of the first things he said was, “In addition to protesting, against our being downtrodden we have to work within our own community for uplift of various kinds.”

So, you’ve either read the chapter in my book or you’ve read “Constructive Programme,” his booklet, or you’re just smart and you think about stuff – and that’s okay also. What do you think about it? Why is it so important? John?

Student: I have a question. [Unintelligible 00:50:02]

Constructive Program and No Fresh Issue

Michael: You could do those two at the same time. See, No Fresh Issue is between you and an opponent. It doesn’t I just thought of another problem we’ve got that we’ve got to fix. The reason for No Fresh Issue, you remember, is that you’re negotiating with somebody and you’re negotiating on various levels. And if you change your demand, just because you have your power, you’re changing it from a conversation to a power struggle. So that’s a rather restrictive thing. It doesn’t mean you could never think of anything else to work on. Yeah. Okay, so maybe let’s just start strategically. Why was it so important to have Constructive Programme going on?

Even if you haven’t thought about this before, it might be fairly obvious what was so great about it. Amy?

Student: I think Constructive Programme, as it stood, because it showed that like Indians could rule themselves and they could be... [Unintelligible 00:51:06].

Michael: Yes. What Amy is pointing out is very important, that in a – anyway, in this kind of problem, a problem of domination, the dominator is always saying that you need us to take charge of your thing because you’re not up to it. And so, you say, you know, we’re going to show you that we can do it. That that takes away their main legitimate excuse for exploiting you. Now let’s be careful here folks. We’re not saying, “They will immediately stop exploiting you,” because that wasn’t the reason. The reason they’re

exploiting you is they like it. Their ego feels good when they do it. They get some money. All of those good things.

But never yet has someone marched into a country and planted the flag and say, “We’re here because it makes our ego feel good to dominate other people.” They always give you a reason. And at least you have to deal with that reason, even if isn’t their underlying mode of cause. Yeah?

Student: Maybe he felt like if you were to demand respect from others, you need to gain respect for ourselves and be self-sufficient.

Michael: Super important. Yes. Self-sufficiency and self-respect. If you’re asking others to respect you, you don’t go to them hat in hand and say, “We’re helpless. We can’t govern ourselves. We can’t feed ourselves. Please respect us.” You wouldn’t even feel much respect. We’re going to revisit this in an interesting way as soon as we do the Civil Rights Movement, incidentally, because Martin Luther King faced very similar things. Yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:52:49]

Michael: Well, yeah, this is an important element within Constructive Programme was if you were exploiting other people, stop doing it. Yeah. And of course, that was absolutely essential. You cannot – if you want to get somebody to do something that you yourself are not doing, the only way to accomplish that is through coercion. The only way to accomplish it through persuasion, is to stop doing it yourself – which you’re calling, “The moral high ground.” Not all of the programs within Constructive Programme had that characteristic. Like, you know, spinning would be different and drinking, non-drinking, stuff like that.

Student: It’s the way you’re taking – that even just the rhetoric itself is a way to bring a positive energy into the situation. [Unintelligible 00:54:02] ...something positive, non-cooperation, as seeming more negative?

Michael: This is very important that we go – rewind all the way back to our first lecture, we first began, remember we were struggling to get people off the waiting-list and all those Satyagrahas were going on. The illustration that I started us off with was a case of positive energy versus a case of negative energy. And ultimately, this is almost too simple for us to grok, but we have to grok and it’s very important - and that is Constructive Programme is constructive – now that you’ve said it, it sounds obvious. But it’s not obvious in a way. So, it’s always infinitely better to do something constructive than something destructive or even obstructive, if you have a choice. And once you’ve done everything that you can constructively, then the oppositional program will be much more powerful – coming from a different place.

So let me just add to that that strategically it was – there was a double – a triple advantage really to Constructive Programme. Let’s see if I can remember – one is it gave you something to do when you could not be obstructive. You know you can’t

always call a march and expect a lot of people to come out. Various reasons – sometimes that doesn't work. But you can always do Constructive Programme. And that led to a second advantage which was very important – strategic advantage – was it was a way of keeping the community together.

Even when you're doing a campaign of some kind, a resistance, you're sitting in your village, out on the village [maidan 00:56:00], the village square or meadow in the evening. And there are films. There are like hundreds of people spinning their spinning wheel and producing their cotton. You felt a very deep connection with somebody, you know, 1000 miles away doing the same thing in their little village. And we know that working together bonds people more than any other force – as a generalization.

Symbols don't do it. Entertainment doesn't do it. Slogans don't do it. Costumes don't do it. Working on the same project does it.

There's a book called, [In Common Predicament](#), by Sherif and Sherif which is a very good study in a sociological point of view of this phenomenon. So, you've got a powerful bonding force which keeps the community together and so that means that when the next issue comes up, that you have to be against, you don't have to start from scratch. And as someone who's been a quasi-activist for many, many years, I cannot tell you how advantageous this would be.

Every time they start another war or whatever it is they want to start, we have to say, "Oh, where did I put my rolodex? Who's still around?" And we have to start the thing all over again. And if only we had some Constructive Programme keeping us going from event to event, it would be so much more efficient.

Now the third strategic advantage that I wanted to mention is mostly Constructive Programme is legal. So, you can do a lot of it without getting in the face of the opposition without provoking it. And that could be a great advantage. That means when you do have to face off with them, you've built up all this strength and they didn't know to do anything about it. So constantly provoking your adversary can be very wearing. It can be very exhausting.

In Cologne, where I had the opportunity to give a talk on nonviolence, I remember very vividly one member of the audience saying, "You don't understand what the German police are like. You know, when we go out there they beat us with sticks, man. And they kick us with those boots and that hurts. I don't want to go there." Now you may not have to go there – or you can go there less frequently if you found legal ways of building your strength, up until the next time that a confrontation is necessary.

Constructive Program as a Nonviolent Tactic

And I believe that at the end of his life Gandhi came to feel that if you would do Constructive Programme right early enough, consistently enough, you never needed anything else. You would never need an obstructive program. At some point the British

would look around and say, “Oh my God, what are we doing here? They don’t come to our law courts. They don’t come to our schools. They don’t buy our cloth. We’re not making any money here. There’s no way to advance. They haven’t converted to our religion. I just want to go back home.” That’s really the way things are going to work out in real life. Okay, any other points about Constructive Programme? I think you have a sense now of why I’m so enthusiastic about it. Okay, so good, where are we at?

Quit India and WWII

We’re up to the breakout of WWII and 1942. The Congress Party passes a resolution called, “Quit India,” which was very in your face and provocative. And note that is not the way they started. They started by saying, “Let’s reform this.” And then when certain parts of it couldn’t be reformed they said, “Well, let’s go to dominion status and we’ll part of the empire.” And that was offered in the 20’s. The British refused. In 1930’s they said, “Well, okay. Let’s work out some kind of partnership.” They refused that. And so finally in 1942 they said, “Get the hell out of here. Quit India.”

The final straw was that the nation woke up one morning to discover that it was at war with Germany, and they had never been asked. Nobody consulted them. They just said, “You’re part of our empire. Our empire is at war with Germany. Therefore, you are at war with Germany.” And that degree of insult and that degree of un-freedom was so offensive that for many people this was the final straw. They had tasted their strength and they knew that they could do what they needed to do. And they said, “We just want you out of here.”

Now this was actually the last Satyagraha in which Gandhi played an active part. He is soon going to actually quit the Congress Party which was his own creation – mostly over the issue of the defense of India. He wanted to defend the country through nonviolence. And we’re going to talk about how he expected people to do that. But they could not go along with him. And this was – this has been repeated over and over again in the history of pacifism. You’ll have a very strong pacifist movement building up into outbreak of a war. Comes the war, 9/10 of the pacifists step out and say, “You know, that was a nice idea, but it doesn’t work.

Next semester or next fall, once again, depending on how much we can get this act together, we’re going to see a film called, “The Good War and Those Who Refuse to Fight It.” There were about 20,000 conscientious objectors in the U.S. during WWII. And that was a very hard war to be a conscientious objector in. But nonetheless, at that point, Gandhi felt, “Okay, now I have grown to the place where, for me, this is an absolute commitment. I will not take part in war.” He liberated the congress to go. “You go do your thing and I wish you the best, but it’s not my thing anymore.”

Another feature of this era was his famous letter to Hitler. He wrote two famous letters which the British authorities would not let him mail so they never were received. But he wrote a letter to Hitler which began, “My dear friend.” And he said, “You are perhaps

surprised that I call you my friend, by I have to tell you, I stopped hating people a long time ago.” So, sort of between the lines he’s saying, “Hey, if I were going to hate anybody, you would be it. But I can’t and I don’t.” But he was extremely courageous, and he said in this letter to Hitler, “You are no friend of the German people.” Can you imagine?

Now it’s interesting, Hitler had – in Mein Kampf there is a reference to what Gandhi was doing in India because Hitler knew what the Freedom struggle was doing and he said, “We Germans have learned to our cost that the British will listen to nothing but force.” So, it’s an interesting historical comparison because it shows, you know, Hitler did not believe that Gandhi could possibly succeed. Gandhi was right. Hitler was wrong, when you get right down to it.

He also made a very – what shall I say? A very harsh judgment about the war. It’s not even an easy to think about, but I think if you look at what’s happening today, you would have to say that he had a point. He was asked, “What is going to be outcome of the war?” And he said, “The allies will prevail, but in order to do so, they will have to be more brutal than Hitler because they have chosen his methods.” At the time that looked like, you know, we don’t do stuff like that. It’s not true. But you look at what’s happening in our government today. We’re trying to say things like Guantanamo are okay. And you realize that in the course of time that horrible prediction has come true.

So, I don’t say this in a spirit of condemnation, but in a spirit of let’s learn the lesson. The lesson is we got ourselves into this fix because we chose to fight Hitler on his own ground with his methods. Anyone who does that is going to eventually be dragged down to the place that Hitler felt himself dragged down to. So that was another event of this period. Also, he wrote a famous letter called, “To every Britain,” which was addressed to the English people during the Blitzkrieg when Britain was being bombed and rocketed from the European mainland. And Gandhi advised the British people not to try to resist Hitler’s invasion, but to non-cooperate with the German forces when they landed in England. And he advised the same thing to his fellow Indians.

Civilian Based Defense and Third-Party Intervention

And this became – today, there are two mechanisms today by which nonviolence can be applied to a large-scale conflict, to war. And one is called, “Civilian Based Defense.” And the other is called, “Third Party Nonviolent Intervention.” Okay? We’ll talk a little bit more about TPNI, or Third-party Nonviolent Intervention, when we talk about Abdul Ghaffar Khan on Thursday. But here’s basically how they work. Civilian Based Defense says that when you’re invaded, you don’t do what is called in military parlance, “You don’t do shallow interdiction. You do deep interdiction.” Meaning you don’t try to prevent the enemy from invading your country, because that’s very costly. You’re fighting over a symbolic barrier and the enemy is still in a strong position. You do deep interdiction

which means you let them come in, if you have no choice, but you don't let them take over your institutions. You don't cooperate with them.

And the classic example of this actually happened in 1968 as known as Prague Spring where there was a reform within the communist regime in Czechoslovakia. And the Russian high command was very nervous about this and tried to get them to stop. The president who came to power in Czechoslovakia at that time, Alexander Dubček, who was very much in favor of the reforms. In the end Moscow ordered an invasion of 500,000 troops from 3 different directions. Czechoslovakia is a small country. Now it's two tiny countries. Then, it was one small country.

The Soviet High Command predicted that Czechoslovakia would fall in four days. Eight months later they still had not gained control of the country. And Gene Sharp who is well known strategic nonviolence theorist was working at Harvard and there was a Russian scholar there – it was in the early 80's. So, Gene Sharp correctly assumed that he was Secret Service and KVD. And he correctly assumed that he liked vodka – pardon my cultural stereotype. But he took him to the Men's Faculty Club at Harvard – which is really nice. I mean, you know, physically, Berkeley is a dump, you realize that. You just have to be kind of proud of that fact.

But the Men's Faculty Club at Harvard is pretty posh. I got there once. And so, he fed this guy up a sufficient quantity of vodka and said, "Well, I understand the Prague Spring didn't go for you – didn't go very well for you." And he said, "My boy, it was a disaster." He said, "Not just Prague, the entire country. They simply could not control it." So, there's a chapter in my book that tells about some of the funny things that they do which can you look into.

But this is what he recommended, "Don't try to prevent the Japanese from coming in or at least don't try to prevent them by force. Stand there at the border, men, women, and children." People said, "But we'll be killed." Gandhi said, "I'm sorry. This is very late stage. There is no better way for us to fix this. I wanted to build nonviolent resistance for the last 20 years, but I spent most of that time in prison. This is an emergency. Things are not going to be sweet. So yeah, they're going to kill us, but they won't be able to kill us twice." He said, "An army which marches over the mangled bodies of men, women, and children," to use his expression, "would not be able to repeat the experiment." And he suggested the same thing in Switzerland and ultimately, in Britain.

At the time, it looked like he was absolutely crazy. Remember his formula? "First they ignore you. Then they laugh at you, then they fight you. And then you win." So, he was in the "laugh at you" stage with this one. Now it doesn't look so ridiculous because it's actually been done in several places. We'll look into that more closely in 164B.

Quit India and Non-embarrassment

The other thing I want you to know about the Quit India Movement is the non-embarrassment issue; because the British were fighting, he did not feel it was appropriate to launch full scale Satyagraha against them. So, he launched symbolic Satyagraha. Now this is not symbolic in the sense that I object to because it was real. There was a person named Vinoba Bhave who was supposed to go and offer Satyagraha. He does this. He gets arrested. So, they send another person out. The point is, we are not accepting your regency in this country. We have not stopped our Freedom Struggle, but at the same time, we're perfectly well aware that your hands are full, you're occupied elsewhere, and we don't want to embarrass you in that technical sense. So that was the way he got out of that.

Okay, another thing – maybe I'll just – let's see, we got about five minutes at this point. I don't know exactly how to use them. You guys all know that the British had been operating behind the scenes to give a lot more prestige to the leaders of the partition idea than they actually had among the people, especially Muhammad Ali Jinnah who becomes Gandhi's real adversary at this point. This is probably one of the bitterest rivalries that he ever had to face.

And there's a clip of a newsreel, which to me is one of the most moving depictions of Gandhi and who he was that I've seen anywhere – and that is a scene of Jinnah and Gandhi going into a building together for a meeting. And Jinnah is much taller than Gandhi. Almost everybody was much taller than Gandhi. And so, you see Gandhi reaching up and putting his hand on that man's shoulder. Now, you know, Jinnah absolutely hated him at that point, and he was ruining everything that Gandhi had worked on for decades. And still that man reached out to him in genuine love. And you see this in that film. And this is something that cannot be faked.

You know, it's like – he really – which is how I would probably do that. He really loved him as a human being – as a prologue to going in and trying everything possible to get him to stop this drive towards partition. But the British were backing him. And as was sometimes quipped in India, Jinnah had a problem for every solution that Gandhi could come up with. So, partition happened; it was the most catastrophic, the most traumatic such political arrangement in history. 15 million people were rendered homeless. And today we're still suffering from the shockwaves of that terrific rupture.

January 30th, 1948

And as you know on January 30th, the last day of 1948, on his way into a prayer meeting he was assassinated by a Hindu fanatic who was part of the RSS or Black Flag Movement, which now actually is the illegal wing of the – of the ruling party in India. And you know from reading Easwaran's book that the very last thing he did in his life – his last words were, "Rama, Rama, Rama." In other words, he was blessing the person who had shot him. Not understanding that Attenborough has him saying, "Oh God." It's like, "Oh now what? Now they're assassinating me. What's next?"

But that's not the way it actually was. He – people who were there, who heard it with his very last breath trailing off said they had never heard anything so moving and so pathetic in their life. The country was plunged into a state of absolutely grief. William Shirer was there talking to a fellow journalist, another American journalist in India who had never seen anything like it, and he was completely unable to understand what was going on. So, he asked this other journalist – asked an Indian colleague of his, "What's happening here?" And the man said, "You know we felt that in the Mahatma there was a mirror of the finest that is in us, of the greatest that we could become, was mirrored in him. And now the people are afraid that that mirror has been shattered." So that really explained that incredible outpouring.

But I would maintain that the mirror has not been shattered; it's just for us now to put the pieces back together. We may not have the gilt frame that we had in Gandhi's day, but the legacy is there for all of us. So, I'll close for today with that and on Thursday we'll look at Abdul Ghaffar Khan and then you'll bring it all back to me.

14. Abdul Ghaffar Khan and the Khudai Khitmatgars

Michael: Well, good morning everyone. We're starting to look a little more like a pre-midterm class here. I think all of my classes are a little thinner this week than they usually are.

Abdul Ghaffar Khan and the Four Myths About Nonviolence

So, what we're going to do today is talk about the career of a particular individual of special importance in Gandhi's entourage, so to speak. Khan –Abdul Ghaffar Khan, 1890-1998 –whose name and dates are up on the board here.

And I don't think it's going to take us our whole time to discuss his history and the significance of it. So, we can get started with some review stuff in a little while. And I'm going to follow the old standby, the formula that they tell you for writing a successful paper: tell them what you're going to tell them. Tell them. And then tell them that you told them. So that's what I'm going to do. I'm going to start right away by telling you what I think is the main kernel that I'd like us to get out of this story.

And that is that this one man, in his lifetime, without planning to, managed to give the light to four myths about nonviolence. There are four very common misbeliefs about nonviolence. If you look in Wikipedia you'll find them right there. And the career of this one person, which we're going to go over in a little bit, shows you that these four things are not true.

Myth 1: Nonviolence Only Works Against the Weak

So, the *first* myth is that nonviolence only works against a weak opponent. And that's a serious problem in the field because what it basically means is that nonviolence is a weak force, and it depends on the other person not putting up much resistance. But, of course, thinking that nonviolence is a weak force so that it's no force at all, is part of the old paradigm. That's exactly what we've been trying to overthrow or at least show an alternative to in this whole time – and of course, in our whole semester together.

Once you understand that nonviolence is a force, you're on your way to understanding that it really is the paramount force. Gandhi said, "It's the greatest force at the disposal of humanity." So obviously, it will not depend on the condition of the opponent at all much less that the opponent is weak and undetermined. Let's see – do we have it in our reader? There is an article that usually I assign for next semester by Ralph Summy called, "Nonviolence and the Case of the Extremely Ruthless Opponent."

If you have a regular fight and both opponents are using the same means, the one that has more of it wins, right? If they have ten guns and you have only eight guns, they're

going to outshoot you. But if they have ten guns and you decide to use nonviolence, it's an entirely different equation. And at that point, the more violent your opponent is, the easier it may be to overcome him. That's why in the very early days when an American scholar named Richard Gregg, who was a pacifist, went to India and visited Gandhi he came back and wrote a book about it.

The term that they were using often in those days – the 30's – was "Moral jiu jitsu." Moral jiu jitsu. Because it's neither moral nor jiu jitsu, but that's okay. The point of jujitsu was that – in all Japanese martial arts, as far as I know– the stronger and the more vehemently someone jumps on you, the easier it is to overcome because what you're doing is you're using their energy against them. So, in that respect it resembled what nonviolence was like. And we're going to see a very pointed example of that in a bit when we're looking at the Civil Rights Movement because Martin Luther King was brilliantly successful against stupid, pigheaded authorities who were dumb enough to beat him in public – especially beating children. That was very effective and useful.

On one occasion, at least, in Albany, Georgia he comes up against somebody who's smart enough to know that this doesn't work. And he only arrests you very politely. And in fact, this is what happens in Washington D.C. in our country today, if you are protesting or you try to enter the Whitehouse lawn or something like that, they're very polite to you in that city because they know there's a lot of press coverage and this will give the wrong image. So, the assumption that we would usually have that the more brutal your opponent is, the more impossible it will be to overcome them by nonviolence is the reverse of the truth.

Of course, it may mean that if they're really brutal, that you're going to have a lot of suffering in your path before you can overcome them. Gandhi – I think I told you on Tuesday – was asked, "Could you use nonviolence to overcome the Nazi's?" And he said, "Not without a lot of pain." So yeah, it may hurt, but that may make your victory all the more assured. So, what the story of the Pathan's, the old spelling was, "Pathan." This is sort of an Anglicization. There are actually – today we mostly call them Pakhtun, or Pashtun, or Pashto or something like that.

But this is a, more or less, clearly demarcated ethnic and cultural community which is pretty much coterminous with Afghanistan. So, these are the people whom the Soviets were not able to conquer. But that's actually the second myth. So let me stick with the first one. If you read the story, which we'll be looking at in a little while, of the British behavior in the Northwest Frontier Province – [Writes N.W.F.P] Northwest Frontier Province – you will see that the gloves were off. The British were extremely violent in the Northwest Frontier. And that's tragic, but it does show us that because nonviolence was as successful there as it was anywhere else, that shows us that nonviolence is not limited to working against a weak opponent. On the contrary. Julia, I think there's one right there.

Myth 2: Nonviolence is Gentle

So, the second myth – and again, we’ll be getting back to these in a bit – that the person offering nonviolence has to be in some sense or another, gentle. And that’s not entirely wrong, but it can be exaggerated, and people can think that in order to be nonviolent you pretty much have to be a wimp. You know, you pretty much have to eat quiche and drink decaf and all this slightly less than fully human attributes. Or maybe you’re even from California, and you’re an avocado eater. That’s what they call us in the rest of the country.

And again, this is an inference that grows out of this idea that nonviolence is not a real power. All you’re doing is saying, “I will not be violent.” But if there was anyone that gave a lie to this, it was the Pathans. They had, as you’ve known from looking through the book – this is the book that you just finished, by the way – very good. There is – no one was less wimpy than the Pathans. They’re still not at all wimpy.

They, you know, revenge ethic, this book tells the whole story. Climatically, in the late 30’s and early 40’s when a lot of Hindus were saying, “This isn’t going to work.” And you have Subhas Chandra Bose, this famous – he was called, “Netaji, the Leader.” He was actually advocating open warfare against the British to the extent that he even went to Germany and met Hitler. He, and people like him were starting to collect impatient Hindus who hadn’t seen enough progress from all of their struggle and suffering in the 30’s – early 30’s.

And the Pathans were still completely nonviolent. And Abdul Ghaffar Khan actually said to Gandhi, “How is this? You know, you Hindus are supposed to be the nonviolent people. We Muslims are violent. Now look, it’s the reverse.” And Gandhi said, “Yes. We Hindus have always espoused nonviolence, but we have not always been brave. You Pathans have always been brave, and so therefore when you took to nonviolence, you took it much more definitively than Hindus did.”

Myth 3: Islam is No Place for Nonviolence

So thirdly – and this is probably the reason that I’m spending a special time on Abdul Ghaffar Khan for us right now – it’s the idea that nonviolence has no place in Islam. Just do it this way. Off on Northside here, there used to be a nice little shop that sold Afghan articles. And if you felt like walking around in one of those beaded hats, you thought you’d look good in something like that, people were often in there – or they’re buying exotic presents for their partner or something like that. It was a fun place to hang out.

And I was in there one time. It must have been about 1987, I guess, because Abdul Ghaffar Khan was still alive. And, you know, the shop owner looked like he was Afghan, so I started to talk to him about Abdul Ghaffar Khan. And he said, “Is the old man still alive?” Just practically weeping. It was very embarrassing – right there on Northside. But he had such an emotional hold on the people. And then we talked about what we were just talking about, how Islam actually is as adoptable toward nonviolence as almost any other faith. And we will be talking about this again in a little bit when we shift

our attention and look at nonviolence in the West – and we’re talking Judaism, Islam, and Christianity as nonviolent – potentially nonviolent religions.

And the guy said something to me which I’ve never forgotten. He said, “You know, there’s no one as more Musalman than your Pathan.” In other words, Pathans are like mega Muslims. They’re hyper-super Muslim. So, if anyone – if Pathans could take to nonviolence, then that is proof positive that it definitely fits in an Islamic context.

Myth 4: Nonviolence Cannot Be a Substitute for Warfare

And the fourth myth, again, is very important for us today in a slightly different way, and that is that nonviolence can only be used – let’s see, how should we put this – within a society. That it cannot be organized against or as a substitute for warfare. And I’ve already mentioned that there are two modalities in which nonviolence is, in fact, applicable to the large-scale interstate armed conflict situation – otherwise known as “War.”

One is called, “Civilian based defense,” where you do it yourself. And another is called, “Third party nonviolent intervention.” And those are both very important, particularly the latter, because this is a growing edge of nonviolence in the world today. And we’ll be talking a lot about that in PACS 164B – which will probably happen next semester.

The Khudai Khidmatgar

But the fact is that Khan Sahib was the first person to raise virtually an army of nonviolent resisters. This organization was called the Khudai Khidmatgars which means, “The servants of God.” That’s the last item in the left-hand column of your ID review sheet on the bottom is Khudai Khidmatgars. “Khud” means “God,” I guess, in Arabic. Camille? “Khud?”

Student: [Unintelligible 00:13:42]

Michael: Allah will always work. But I think it’s a general term of God, I think. Khudai is like Persian or Arabic. I’m not sure. Probably Persian and Urdu. So, this is the genitive. So, these are the servants of God. So, the fact is that people numbered 80,000 thanks to British repression. Classic example of Paradox of Repression. They were absolutely obedient to their officers, including their top man, the general, Abdul Ghaffar. They were wearing uniforms. You’ve seen the picture in the book. And in every respect they were an army except they didn’t wear weapons. They didn’t carry weapons, and they were completely dedicated to nonviolent resistance and humanitarian and civilian service. Okay? So that’s the point that I hope you take away from this if nothing else, that just studying this man’s career completely busts open four of the most damaging myths about nonviolence.

The Early Life of Abdul Ghaffar Khan

So, he was born in 1890 in the village of Utmanzai which is near Peshawar in, of course, what is now Pakistan. That's a grim part of the story that we'll be getting to. This province, the Northwest Frontier Province, had always been sort of a special border area in many ways. For one thing, it was mostly Islamic. But for another, there was a tribal culture there. And it's like the opposite extreme from South India where it was protected from external influences. Because you had the Greeks, the Persians, the Arabs, and there's a heavy Buddhist influence at one point. There's really – these cultures are washing back and forth.

And there was a tribal – it's a tribal society. And it was very much caught in the violence of what became known to history as, "The Great Game." The Great Game is not the Cal-Stanford game in this case. It was the struggle between the British and the Soviets, but not yet the Soviets – the Russians. The British and the Russians over who was going to control India. India was a big fat prize, and the British got there first. And, you know, colonial powers tend to feel very possessive about possessions. I hope that doesn't sound too stupid.

I remember reading an account of a mystic that I kind of liked. She's not exactly my style, but I kind of like her. Her name is Saint Rose of Lima. And how they defended Peru against the Dutch. The Spanish defended Peru against the Dutch with a sense of tremendous righteousness. Like, "We conquered this country first. How dare you come in and try to conquer it? I stole it fair and square." That kind of thing.

So, the British were very uptight about losing India to Russian influence. And the locus of that, geographically, was the Khyber Pass. In those days that was the only kind of pass you had. You didn't have a Eurail Pass. You didn't have a Continental One Pass. So, the only way to get into India was from that direction on land, was through the Khyber Pass because the mountains were really, really impassable to the prevailing technologies. The story of Italy is not dissimilar. You have a few passes where Hannibal actually managed to get some elephants through there, and that led him to, you know, devastate parts of northern Italy. So, it's a little bit like that. Khyber Pass was the gateway to India. Yeah?

Student: Can you spell that?

Michael: Khyber? Yeah. [Writes "Khyber"]. Very romantic associations, the Khyber Pass. And because in prior centuries, I mean prior to the Great Game in the 19th century, the Pathans had actually served as a kind of protective barrier for the rest of India. But now they're really going to be squeezed in this vice between the two Superpowers. And this is something that we've encountered before. And the result was a very – a very destructive clash between the British determination, that they had to hold onto the Khyber Pass, or they would lose India. And if they lost India, they would become modern England. They didn't want that to happen.

In fact, in the early 20th century there were 390 million people who were British subjects, and 305 million of them were Indian. So, it's not just the jewel in the crown, this was

also the rim and the little adjusting clasp in the back. It was basically the whole thing. So, in order to hold onto it, it was essential that they hold onto the Khyber Pass. And a political career could be made or broken in India on the basis of whether or not you were tough enough to overcome the Pathans.

So, on the one hand you have this intense determination to hold onto that place at all costs. And on the other hand, you have this incredible spirit of freedom among the Afghans or the Pathans who absolutely insist on killing one another and not having anyone else kill them. That's what they like to do. So, they will, you know, the Russians were unable to do it, and I have a funny feeling that in a couple of years, we're going to see our own military expedition there coming to grief as the Taliban slowly retakes the country. And they're doing it partly on that old Pathan spirit which nobody has succeeded in crushing.

So, these are people who would rather die than lose their freedom. And on the other hand, you have the British who for nothing would they give up the capacity to dominate these people. So, it was an extremely intense confrontation that kept flaring up. Okay, and Abdul Ghaffar's family was, you know, very Pathan, but his father, Bahram Khan was apparently something of – he was a bit unusual. He was much more dedicated to conversation and solving problems diplomatically and by speech. Yeah, he was okay with revenge, but it wasn't his favorite thing. He was just not absolutely completely dedicated to it.

And I guess you would say that in a sense, he was rather – his strength came out more in gentleness than in ferocity. Let me put it that way. He had a kind of gentle strength which really is the mark of Abdul Ghaffar Khan. I guess at some point if we have time and we can get the equipment together, I will show you this interview that I have of Badrah Khan when he was almost 90. And you can just see that in his personality. He's this huge, towering figure, not uncommon in that part of India. And, you know, you totally would not want to mess with him. But on the other hand, he totally – he was totally not threatening. And you can see, it's a great deal of gentleness.

And his start as – well, his father, Bahram Khan – “Khan” means “village ruler or chieftain.” It's a term which I think they had taken over from the Mongols in the 14th century. And he was – so he had some political authority. He was a ruler. And Khan himself was being groomed for this.

Abdul Ghaffar Khan's Village Uplift

But his first experience of political life is doing what Gandhi would later call, “Village uplift.” He decides to go from village to village and ask himself, “What do my people need?” And what he came up with first and foremost was schools. And that led him immediately into a clash – this is going to kind of be the story of his life now – clash between the mullahs on the one hand who did not want anybody teaching anything outside of the Quran.

And so, they sort of remind me of my barber when I was a kid growing up in Brooklyn. I needed a barber at that time of my life. And I had this Italian barber, and he would always ask me, you know, “What are you studying in school?” And I would say, “Well, I’m learning German and reading all this.” [Italian accent] “Why you bother with all of that? Everything is in Dante. Just read Dante.” The mullahs were sort of like that. Just read the Quran, don’t mess with anything else.

So, he’s clashing with the mullahs on the one hand and, you know, he’s got to work that out. And on the other hand, he’s clashing with the Raj because they don’t want him doing anything. They are in charge, and they’re very nervous about anybody standing up and saying, “I have some role to play in my society here.” So, in the end he’s going to live for 90 years. He’s going to spend 52 of those 90 years in prison. Mostly not at the hands of the British.

In fact, when I got caught up in his story was when he was brought into house arrest, I think. Again, he was already a very old man in the early 1980’s. And we decided to put together a group to nominate him for the Nobel Prize. He had already won a very coveted award in 1962. He was Amnesty International’s Prisoner of the Year. So maybe if I don’t ever get the Nobel, at least I’ll be Prisoner of the Year at some point.

But we nominated him twice for the Nobel Peace Prize, which he didn’t get – which I think means that he was a very important figure in the world of peace development because if you’re really very important, no one will give you a prize. They didn’t give it to Gandhi, and so they didn’t give it to him.

But he gets involved in village uplift, and it primarily takes the form of education. He wants to start schools. And another very important thing to him was the uplift of women. And that would be for the rest of his life, one of his main preoccupations. In 1925, when he had heard of Gandhi, but he had not yet met him, he founded a newspaper called, “The Pashtun,” which is the name of the people and the language. And that ran, I think, until it was snuffed out by the Pakistani regime in 1947.

And so, you see, he’s running on a parallel track to Gandhi. He gets very interested in Constructive Programme. In fact, in 1948 he took the Oath of Allegiance to Pakistan. We’re going to get around to the circumstances that led up to that in a little bit. He said, “There is no advantage in destruction. There is advantage only in construction. I want to tell you categorically; I will not support anybody in destruction. If any constructive program is before you, if you want to do something constructive for our people,” he’s talking to the government of Pakistan. “If you want to do something constructive for our people, not in theory, but in practice,” that’s another very Gandhian element there, “I declare before this house,” the new Pakistan House of Parliament, “that I and my people are at your service.”

So, he had very – though he is a born fighter, like most Pathans, he knew how to make his own rifle at age 12, but he was like Gandhi by this time in his life, completely dedicated to constructive action. And that’s how it all started.

The Muslim League and Indian National Congress

Now in Calcutta in 1928, there was a Congress meeting – Indian National Congress – and a parallel meeting of the Muslim League. See, by this time the two peoples are not cooperating very much. And the Muslim League meeting was sort of like a disaster. Sort of like a typical peace movement meeting. Everybody was squabbling. Only in this case they were pulling knives and things like that. And Khan got – yeah, Camilla?

Student: What year was this?

Michael: 28 – 1928. Am I going too fast? Okay. So, Badrah Khan got kind of fed up with that meeting, and he wandered on over to the Indian National Congress, you know, by this, it was the only show in town if you weren't going to be in the Muslim League. And he saw a remarkable thing. Gandhi was up on the podium and somebody in the audience was heckling him, and Gandhi was having the time of his life. He was chuckling. He was loving it. At no point did he stop saying what he wanted to say, but at no point did he get annoyed by the person heckling him. That little vignette of just seeing him under pressure, not be rattled, immediately attracted Khan's admiration.

He went back – let's see if I – I think this would be Page – yeah – this would Page 106 and 107 in the book that you just finished. "He went back to his own conference and told the president privately that he thought the movement would be stronger if its leadership embodied a little more tolerance and self-restraint." Of course, coming from a Pathan, this is not the expected message. So, the president thundered at him, "So, the wild Pathans have come to teach us about tolerance." And Khan left the conference and went home.

But this idea of Gandhi being able to face that kind of pressure and not even have a feeling of unkindness in him, that really stayed with him. In a very short time, the two became extremely close. So much so that in a few years his own people would call him, "The Frontier Gandhi," and he would be constantly saying, "Don't. There's only one Gandhi. Don't call me anything Gandhi. Gandhi is Gandhi. I'm Abdul Ghaffar Khan, okay?"

And he visited – stayed in Gandhi's ashram quite a bit. You've seen these beautiful photos of the two of them. And on one occasion he wanted to go and give a speech which would have content that the British would regard as seditious. And Gandhi asked him not to do it. But then Gandhi himself was arrested and with him off the scene for a while and not having fresh input, he decided to go and give the speech, and he was arrested in Delhi. It was in 1929.

But he had been involved in the Khilafat Struggle and he had been involved in the Rowlatt Act Satyagraha from the Northwest Frontier earlier on. And now the two of them really joined forces. And during the Salt Satyagraha where the Northwest Frontier – you couldn't make salt. It's just all these mountains and stuff. But they were involved in the uprising.

Qissa Khwani Bazaar Episode

And this is when that episode in the Qissa Khwani Bazaar takes place. Page 122 following. I just want to read you part of it. I know you've just finished reading it, but I just want to read you part of it because you will never again entertain Myth Number 1 once you've read this description.

And we owe this to Gene Sharp – by the way, he's the one who found the documents that had the description of this episode. And this is going to be just about as destructive and probably in the end more brutal, more dehumanized than the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre had been. We don't have the numbers on exactly how many people got killed and wounded, but you're talking about charging into a crowd of people with an armored car and just, you know, crushing people.

So, there was a standoff between the crowd of protestors in this bazaar and the British police who are ordering them to leave. "At about half past 11:00 people tried to persuade the crowd to disperse and persuade the authorities to remove the troops and the armored cars. The crowds were willing to disperse if they were allowed to remove the dead and the injured and if the armored cars and the troops were removed. But the authorities refused. The result was that people did not disperse and were prepared to receive the bullets and lay down their lives. A second firing began and lasted on and off for more than three hours."

Can you imagine? Here's this crowd of people, not resisting. In fact, there's a case of a young Sikh boy who came and stood in front of a soldier, opened his shirt and said, "Go ahead, shoot me." And he did. He killed him instantly. "And the state of things continued from 11:00 until 5 o'clock in the evening, when the number of corpses became too many, the ambulance cars of the government took them away and burned them."

So, you know, once again, this inability to respect people's religious sensibilities. And the result of this was that up until that point, the Khudai Khidmatgars had been, I think, something like 2000 or 3000. They immediately became 80,000. Now unfortunately before partition and independence, the Khudai Khidmatgars were more or less just systematically rounded up and crushed and their offices were burned. And it was really basically, as a movement, it was basically stamped out by the British.

Partition of India and Pakistan

And then when partition came the question was, here are these people who had died and bled for independence. Would they go with India or with Pakistan? And Lord Irwin's plan had always been – and the later Viceroy Mountbatten, definitely stood by that – that every region would have – first of all, if there was a majority Muslim population, the region would be part of Pakistan. If the majority was Hindu, it would be part of India.

That's what led to this horrendous wrenching apart of peoples who had lived together forever.

But in the case of the Northwest Frontier, although there were more than 90% Muslim because they had – they were a part of the Congress Party. And there was a referendum. And the first referendum – there were two. The first referendum, the people voted almost unanimously to go with India. But Jinnah would not hear of it. And one thing led to another. In the second referendum Abdul Ghaffar Khan, who was not in prison, strangely enough at that moment, made a decision that they should boycott it. So, the Khudai Khidmatgars and their followers basically didn't vote. And then it went 9 to 1 in favor of joining Pakistan. It was a very bitter moment for Khan who had been totally against the partition with every breath. That's why the Pakistanis didn't trust him – why Jinnah didn't trust him. And so, he wired to Gandhi and Nehru and all the others and said, "You have thrown us to the wolves." In fact, one of the biographies of his life is just that, "Thrown to the Wolves."

Peace Armies

It's kind of hard to know exactly what else to pick out from his life. Let me say a little bit more about the significance of the Khudai Khidmatgars. What they used to do is when there wasn't a conflict going on, they would devote themselves to service. So, they were doing, in this case now, quite deliberately, they were building what Gandhi had called, "Shanti Sena." "Sena" means, "army," and shanti, of course, as you know from being in Berkeley, "shanti" means "peace." So, this is a peace army.

Gandhi's plan was that in every district there be an army of volunteers – army only in the sense that, you know, a big group of volunteers – preferably from the district, but not necessarily. And that they would be there for service. That was their main role. Whatever you needed, they would do. And incidentally, this would be also carried out in a different way in Sri Lanka where there was a very important movement still going on called, "Sarvodaya," a Gandhian term meaning, "Uplift of everybody." "Sarva" is "everybody." "Od" means "up" and "aya" means "going." So, let's all get up is Sarvodaya – or uplift of all.

And that's been one of the few things that's been holding Sri Lanka together. It's a huge movement started by a man named Dr. A.T. Ariyaratne who was very close to Gandhi in principle but turned this thing into a – just gave it sort of a non-Hindu format in Sri Lanka. So, the Shanti Sena was supposed to be there providing services and especially in cases of incipient conflict and especially in cases of communal conflict which could flare up very, very quickly and it'd get hideously destructive. They were supposed to provide good offices between the two parties.

So, the way this often would work is a rumor would get started. And where there's anxiety, rumors can get started very quickly – get out of proportion. Someone came running in, "Oh my God, did you hear what's happening in the next village. They're

slaughtering all the Hindus.” So, you go out there to investigate and you find that a cow got run over or something like that. And as a trusted third party, you see, you can come back and say, “Hey, no. Cool it. Don’t worry. It’s not what you think.” So, they can keep a damper on conflict – keep these communal hatreds from flaring up.

So, it’s like there are three stages. When nothing is going on, you do service, and you build trust and confidence. When something is starting to go on you do what’s called, “Good offices,” kind of being a go-between. And when something is happening, when it has flared up, in the last analysis, what you’re supposed to do, if you’re a good Shanti Senac, is to get in-between the parties and say, “Okay, if you’re going to shoot, you’ll hit us.” And that sounds like a dangerous vocation, and probably it is.

But as a matter of fact, the psychology of conflict is such that when you get into that polarization, where it’s me against you, you see nothing but against and you can’t even see anybody else. Now when a third party comes in and says, “I’m neither ‘me’ nor ‘you,’” there’s a whole other world that’s opened up, and that can be enough, sometimes, to diffuse the polarization and the tensions that are leading up to the violence.

Now we actually witnessed something like that on a somewhat smaller scale, believe it or not, on the UC Berkeley campus. We didn’t have military affairs in those days. We had something called, “ROTC,” Reserve Officers Training Corp. If something is doing harmful destructive work, the solution is, change its name. Now we have the School of Americas got changed to the Western Hemisphere Security Cooperation blah, blah. They’re doing exactly the same thing.

But in those days, anyway, they called it the ROTC, and they had a little building called, “Callahan Hall,” which is now a huge generator, I think. But in those days it was this wooden building with lots of rifles inside. People would come out in brown uniforms every now and then and march around and go back. But the 70’s was very anti-militarist on this campus – also some other parts of the world, I think, dotted around here and there. But definitely on the Berkeley campus it was not fun to be in the ROTC in the early 70’s.

And a big group of very angry students was coming down to Callahan Hall, picking up rocks and getting ready to trash the building, which you could do – it was basically glass and wood. They could have done it. And inside the building are the ROTC cadets with their M1 rifles thinking, you know, we’re supposed to defend the building. We get to do it now for real, not just training anymore. And it could have been very ugly. In fact, it was already sort of ugly in a way.

But there was a little organization that existed for about a month, I think. It was called, “Berkeley Students for Peace.” And they trotted on down there when they heard about this, and they stood in between and they said to the students, “If you throw stones, you’ll hit us.” Inherently they said to the ROTC students, “If you shoot, you’ll kill us.” I don’t think they were seriously intending to shoot at them.

But anyway, the thing is, that they completely stopped that conflict. They were very small in number, armed with nothing, but they did what's called, "Interposition." Sometimes we call it, "Interpositioning," and make it sound a little bit more formal. And this is sort of the last-ditch service that a Shanti Sena is supposed to provide. So first it's, you know, humanitarian and other services, second is conflict reduction, and heading off of conflict. And finally, if it's too late and a conflict is going on, you make yourself into a willing victim and that completely changes the psycho-dynamics of the situation.

Now it has been put to test, historically, in a few cases. There was a riot at the University of Beijing in the 70's where this worked. And on the largest scale, it was probably the case of the Western Sahara where they actually headed off a civil war between the government and the Polisario Front. These two forces were marching on one another. It was going to be a bloody confrontation. And ladies with baby carriages and just ordinary people just got out and stood in between and basically stopped it.

So, it's a very powerful mechanism. Of course, by itself, this is only – okay, to use the technical terms here that the field has developed – this is a form of Peacekeeping which is an emergency operation. In order for it to endure though, you have to go onto Peacemaking, which can be one word. And ultimately to Peace Building which means – Peacemaking is – hold on, let me get this written down. Peacemaking is where you sit the two sides down at the table to talk and they try to resolve their conflict. Peace Building is where you look at the underlying conditions that caused the conflict in the first place – socioeconomics, social, political, whatever they were.

So, these three mechanisms have grown out of Gandhi's concept of Shanti Sena which really developed pretty early in his mind, which he tried to build in India. But he finally said, "Look, I'm spread too thin already. I don't have the time or the heart to do this." And actually, the story of the "formal organization" called, "The Shanti Sena," in India is not a brilliant dramatic success. There were two conflicts which they tried to intervene in and really weren't able to get anywhere. And so, like a number of other things, it failed in India, but it was picked up somewhere else. And the fact that – yeah, John?

Student: Is that like "work" in a way?

Michael: Yeah, I suppose you could call the fact that it failed in India and was picked up elsewhere, you could call that work versus "work." Because it looks, you know, if you look at the history of the Shanti Sena, so called, it's a history of failure. But in the meantime, the idea is percolating out through the world, and the U.N. tries to pick it up in a way. And it goes on and on. I think today, you probably have guessed this already, but I think this is the cutting edge of anti-war work – peace development in the world.

And that's why I work with an organization which was at the Peace Boat yesterday called, "The Nonviolent Peaceforce." And they have 90 member organizations. We will talk about it in some detail next semester. They're trying to take this idea of interposition and make it global. Of course, it would cost a lot. It would probably cost as much as one

F-16 fighter to turn this into a worldwide organization. So, you can't afford that kind of money.

Okay, so I got a little carried away. But a part of – I think that's okay though.

Organization of the Khudai Khidmatgars

A part of the significance of Abdul Ghaffar Khan is that he was the first to actually outfit a whole army and have it operate with uniforms, obedience, everything that an army had – music, you know, songs, everything. Probably much better music than most of the armies that I've ever – oompa, oompa. Everything but violence. And it became extremely stirring, the degree to which they were able to carry out nonviolent resistance.

There's a story of one Pathan coming into the Khudai Khidmatgar office and very dramatically taking off his shirt and turning around and showing – he has these big welts on his back. He's been severely beaten by the police. And he says, "This has never happened in the history of the Pathans. The Pathans give blows, they do not receive them. I'm doing it only for you," speaking to Abdul Ghaffar Khan.

And Gandhi knew that part of their commitment was their loyalty to him. Now just recently after decades of neglect, the story is being rediscovered. And a Bengali woman named Mukulika Banerjee, who was an anthropologist, went to the Pathan territories. I still say, "Pathan." I'm a little bit – because I've worked on this book. A lot of it kind of got into my head. But when I say, "Pathan," you should hear, "Pakhtun." Okay?

And she went into those territories and tried to collect the people who had been Khudai Khidmatgars. In some cases, they were, you know, into Alzheimer's already. But she got them together and interviewed them. And she asked them questions like, "What made you follow Abdul Ghaffar Khan? It was completely – in a way, it was completely against your culture. Though in a way, it was just a slight refocusing of what that culture had been about.

And most often they said it was because of his spirituality. "We could sense his stature and we knew that he was a real leader, and we would follow him anywhere." At the same time, however – while this is very stirring and very inspiring, there's a weakness there – a potential weakness. And Gandhi knew that these people were not dedicated to principled nonviolence at a depth which would really carry on. So, in 1930 he cheerfully accepted an invitation from Abdul Ghaffar Khan to tour the Northwest Provinces and speak to those people.

And basically, what he told them is, "You guys, it's just brilliant, it's great what you're doing. But this is just the beginning. What I'm seeing from you now is like nonviolence of the weak." I want you to take this into your heart and make it nonviolence of the strong or else go back to your house and pick up your rifle and do what you feel is the right thing to do." So, he had no objection, of course, to their following Abdul Ghaffar Khan. They played a key role in the Freedom Struggle because while the British were losing it

in one way at the Dharasana Salt Pans during the Salt March, they were losing it in another way, but a more costly way for India in the Northwest Frontier. Because they did the worst that they were capable of, and it was not holding these people down. Yeah?

Student: Was that they were just soldiers and doing as they were told and was not really like their inner feelings. They were [unintelligible 00:49:22].

Michael: Well, the question is, “To what extent they really assimilated and believed this and to what extent were they just so dedicated to Khan Sahib that they were following him and doing what he suggested. You know, I think it’s sort of in-between. It’s sort of in-between in the following two respects. They were intrigued by that new definition of courage. I think there was something about that that really appealed to them. And so, they felt really – that guy who went in and showed his back and said, “You know, we Pathans have never done this before.” I think there was a part of him that felt really good about it.

And when you survey different peoples in the world today who have tried nonviolence in one way or another, they will say – like the Filipinos will say, “This is Filipino style.” And the Poles in Solidarnosc, they said, “We did it because we were Polish.” In other words, it’s part of people’s self-image – deeply buried in them sometimes – that they are a courageous nonviolent people. And that must have appealed to the Pathans very deeply. But they didn’t quite grok it, you know? They didn’t quite understand. You don’t get it overnight what nonviolence really is. And so, what carried them the rest of the way was just the tremendous appeal of Abdul Ghaffar Khan himself and their loyalty. What would have – I think if they had had the time to connect up with his Constructive Programme, then it really could have built out and become something permanent and very deep inside of them.

But alas, that was not to be the case because Khan spends most of his time in prison. And when he’s in prison things tend to fall apart. And so, it was a limited success, but it’s like a model success for the rest of the world because it shows you – and here, say, “Okay, I told you what I was going to tell you. I told you. And now I’m going to tell you that I told you.” Okay? And then we’ll be finished.

Four Myths of Nonviolence - Summary

It shows you that the British were not a weak opponent. They drag people by the heels. They threw them in wells, they ordered a Pathan to strip in public, and he said, “I am a Muslim. This will never happen.” And they just beat him senseless.

As you know, they shot people down in cold blood. They were terrified of serving in the Northwest Frontier for very good reasons. And that terror turned into an extreme violence, an inhibited violence. And this violence was the final sanction that lay behind the whole imperial domination. Even when you could so cleverly disguise it and

organize it, that it didn't come out that was the final recourse. It's what we call in Political Science, "The Ultima Ratio Regum." The final recourse of rulers is the exertion of violence. And it came out. So, the British were – nonviolence did not work in India because the British were polite. That's the point. That's Myth Number 1.

Secondly, that you don't have to be polite yourself to be nonviolent. You really just have to be courageous and have some sense of principle and some other things that we've discussed. It works perfectly well in Islam. Gandhi – I'm sorry. Even I'm getting them confused now. Abdul Ghaffar Khan said, "I'm going to give you such a weapon," he's now talking to his own people in the early stage of building up the Khudai Khidmatgars. "I'm going to give you such a weapon that the police and the army will not be able to stand against it. It was the weapon of the Prophet," capital P – Prophet Mohammed, peace be upon him. "But you are not aware of it. That weapon is patience and righteousness. No power on earth can stand against it."

So, he felt that he was operating in strictly Islamic context, and he was being, as my friend said on Euclid Avenue, "The most Musalman, the most Muslim of Muslims." Yeah. And finally, as I've been stressing that it is wrong to say – and even Kenneth Boulding said that nonviolence is very good for offense, but it's not very good for defense. He was given to sort of a wry humor at times – Kenneth Boulding was.

But there are many political scientists who will be aware of the fact that there have been class uprisings, like the uprising against British rule in India or against racism in America. But they have no idea and don't believe that it can be used in international conflict. Well, given what we've actually experienced, there's no reason to disbelieve that that can be done. Okay, well, as predicted, I think I'm going to stop now in terms of adding any new material. And let's just open it up and see if you want to maybe list off the basic concepts that we've covered or just work from the review sheet.

Or anyway, Rami, I knew you had a question a while back that we didn't get around to. Let's start there.

Persuasion vs Coercion

Student: It's a question concerning some of the older material. When we were talking about nonviolent coercion and how do you know when to enter this stage? How do you know that the only way to get your opponent to understand what your position is by nonviolent coercion or action?

Michael: I think nonviolent coercion – the way I'm going to interpret the word anyway. It's used slightly differently by different people. I think I'm going to put this in the category of more or less forcing someone to do something by social pressure, by some kind of external pressure rather than persuasion. And I think what I would say is that it's a matter of timing. If you have time to persuade, try to persuade. But in the real world – I see you Joy. I'll get to you in a second – in the "real" world – and I'm putting "real" in

quotes because, you know, the world is not real. Quantum scientists have proven that over and over again.

For the time being, in the “real” world windows of opportunity come up, and you have to use them. The Civil Rights Movement was a window of opportunity. Black soldiers had just come back from WWII, racism had been given a very, very bad reputation by Hitler. And they had a window of opportunity. They’ve been waiting for hundreds of years. And they had to do what they could do then and not wait anymore. This is – I’m kind of paraphrasing Martin Luther King’s famous letter from Birmingham jail.

And I guess the example I used before was the overthrow of Pinochet in Chile. They had just one window there where they could get their forces together. He made two big mistakes – Pinochet did. He let them use television for 15 minutes a day. And that was all that it took. They got their message out. He had the other 23 hours and 45 minutes, but apparently lots of lying is not as powerful as a little bit of truth. And they built up that whole movement. And the second mistake was he had allowed them to do a plebiscite, and they voted him out.

I seriously doubt that to this day he was for one minute ever persuaded that he did wrong to torture all those people. And there are plenty of people around him who would shake his hand and say, “You know, Pinochet, Pinochet.” We’ll see this in the film in 164B. So, the choice, realistically, was either force him out or get nowhere – just have him continue being the dictator. So, it’s at that point where nonviolent coercion comes into the picture. It’s nonviolent because you’re not forcing him out at gunpoint. You’re forcing him out by constitutional means. But it’s definitely not the same as persuasion.

If he had his chance, if he wasn’t so old and is now being indicted by a Spanish court thanks to international law, I assure you, he would come back with the same charisma and subjugate Chile all over again. He’s just the same.

So, what are we saying? Yes, persuasion is ideal because it’s going to be permanent, but when you’re talking about large groups of people and the opportunism that has to come in in social movements. Sometimes you cannot persuade your opponent. The next best thing is to compel their behavior through external force of some kind or another. And the worst thing to do is to just pick up their weapons and fight against them on their own terms. Okay, Joy?

Student: I just wanted to ask you a question, [unintelligible 00:59:03].

Michael: Yes. Well, I apologize for the fact that there’s a lot of material. I wanted there to be five courses on nonviolence, but they didn’t give them to me. So, it has to get kind of crammed down. And not just UC Berkeley problem, but as you know, it’s way, way out of – it’s asymmetrical. Destructive energy is studied until the cows come home; you know. We’ve been going at this for centuries. But constructive energy, which we need, which is infinitely more important, we’re just – the human race is just starting to catch

on. So, this is kind of a big philosophical apology for having so much material in the course and so many books. It can't be helped. We just need to do it.

I think I'm sort of at a loss to tell you how to determine what's important and what isn't. I think you should try to psych me out. If worse comes to worse, you know, go on a hunger strike, whatever it takes. I'm only kidding at that part. I don't want anyone to lose any calories over this. But I think – I hope and expect that it's something that you can build up just by listening to the way we've been going through the material. I've been constantly pulling out what I think is important – like I just did here.

So, I'm not going to expect you to remember the name of Abdul Ghaffar Khan's father. You don't have to remember anything about his two wives, though it's a very sad, very romantic story if that happens to amuse you. But the important thing about his life is that it gives the lie to these four myths. And you should know in some detail how he did it. So, you're not just going to say, "He proved that nonviolence works against a ruthless opponent." But then you go on to say, "Look at what the British police did at the Qissa Khawani Bazaar in 1930 in Peshawar where they," and, you know, list off as many of the gruesome details as you can stomach.

In other words, know the principles and have some concrete detail to put to those principles. That's how I would study. Now there are going to be – did you guys announce it already? Okay, there are going to be review sessions with our intrepid readers who are very, very good at this stuff. And also, I think people have often found it helpful to get together in groups. So, it's a little bit like studying for your law degree, which some of you will eventually be doing, I suspect. I don't know why it works so well that way, but it's always been the case that people get together in Milano's or Nefeli's or one of the – how many coffee shops are there in Berkeley? There must be at least 190 of them.

Just get together in one of those, together in groups and just talk about this stuff. Beyond that, I really don't know what to suggest. However, I can say this by way of mitigation. I think I've mentioned this before, but if you do not do so great on the midterm and *inshallah* you do very, very well on the final, the midterm grade does not count – does not really count. It doesn't count is what I'm trying to say. It doesn't count. So, if you get a C on the midterm and an A on the final – just to simplify – we're not going to give you a B for your exam grade and then make that half the grade and weigh that against the paper grade. It'll be more like a B+ or an A-.

So, I understand that partly you have to figure out how I think, if that's the term that I should be using, and what I'm really asking for. And that's why after – the Tuesday after the midterm we'll have a detailed diagnostic and I'll tell you. I'm also going to – will take some time either Tuesday, which will be completely dedicated to review, or today, if we run out of questions. And I will tell you in detail point for point how to answer an ID, because that's important. Because if you go on and on and on you won't have time for your essay questions. If you don't give enough, of course, it also won't work. Okay? Any

other questions either about the mechanics or somewhat preferably the content of the course? Julia?

Student: In that part of the Reader that was mostly about science and [unintelligible 01:03:48] and it was really long. A lot of it – I mean how much?

More Myths about Nonviolence

Michael: Okay. What do I want you to know about science? Well, what I want you to know about it is everything. What I'm going to really want you to know for the exam is only to know that the fifth big myth – and the sixth, namely that science shows that nonviolence is impossible, and history shows that nonviolence is impossible. Both of those are totally wrong. That in fact, when you do science intelligently, as some scientists do, you can actually get a tremendous amount of support for the basic principles that we need to have to understand how nonviolence would work.

And the three that I picked out were, first of all, that we're built to empathize with one another. And that when we – however we behave – not just behave, but however we – whatever our mental state is, influences the mental states of others. And thirdly and finally, that this can be changed through culture, through education. Those – I think those three big facts.

Now, you know, you're going to have people come up to you and say, "No, but the world consists of the material objects with tables and chairs. What's this living power all about?" You sit them down and say, "Hey, I hate to be the one to break it to you, buddy, but the world does not consist of physical objects, tables and chairs. It consists of probability waves in an energy field or something like that. Just don't look at me. I was a comparative literature person. So, I think it's extremely helpful to know, but I'm not going to insist that you know in much detail for the midterm or the final exam. That's the answer. Yeah?"

Work vs "Work"

Student: You mentioned work versus "work." Can you explain it?

Michael: Yes, I can explain work versus "work," but I would rather some other people explain it. What is that concept there? And why is it important? John? Since you brought it up earlier.

Student: [Unintelligible 01:06:08]

Michael: Oh, I always will correct you. That's my job description, yeah.

Student: [Unintelligible 01:06:14]

Michael: Right. And the reason that's so important for us to know about – I mean aside from its obvious interest, think of going back to your co-op or wherever you live and people saying, "But look, you know, nonviolence doesn't work. Look at what happened to the students in Beijing. Look at what happened at the Salt March. It doesn't work. Yeah?"

Student: [Unintelligible 01:07:12] Violence sometimes works, but never actually works. And nonviolence sometimes works, but always works.

Michael: Yes. I actually think that if I do get the Nobel Prize, it'll be for that one sentence. This is my main contribution to human civilization. There's another wrinkle to that, and that is when violence doesn't "work," you know, there was a guy in San Francisco a few years ago who stepped up to somebody's car and pointed a gun at him, opened the door and said, "Get out. Leave the keys in the ignition and get out." And the driver got out of the car and said, "Hi, my name is Bill. I don't think we've met." The next thing you knew, the poor carjacker was flummoxed, and he couldn't carry out his plan. So, the violence didn't "work."

Or to take a rather more painful example, you know, we went into Iraq to bring them democracy. We've now killed about 650,000 people, and they still don't have democracy. It didn't work. But nobody, I promise you, nobody is going to go back to Congress unless it be Lynn Woolsey, my representative from Marin and Sonoma. She's fantastic. It's not just because she's my representative, but you know, I love her. She may well go in there and say, "Gentlemen," and most of the house is gentlemen – men anyway. [Laughter] She will say, "Gentlemen, this proves that violence doesn't work." Nobody says that. You have one episode of nonviolence not "working," and they say, "Aha. I told you. Nonviolence doesn't work." So that's why it's critically important to be a little bit more astute about that.

We're not going to say that nonviolence always "works" because sometimes as John was just telling us, it does not. But it always does work. It does some good work on the situation. Now the last thing that you pointed out, John, which I really think is neat, is that very often it accomplishes something that you didn't even have in mind. And very often, what it accomplishes is much better than what you had in mind. Most of those people at the Dharasana Raid, they were not saying, "This is going to get the British out of India. This is going to show what Western civilization is doing here in our country." But that's exactly what it accomplished.

And you know my famous example of the grain bag story? Do you want to tell us what happened because you read it in my book, right? Yeah.

Student: I think it has something to do with how the – I think it was during Korea.

Michael: Yeah. Well, it was during the Korean Conflict.

Student: Yeah, during the Korean Conflict a bunch of people sent in grain bags to the U.S. Congress –

Michael: To the president, actually.

Student: To the president [unintelligible 01:10:33]. And to show that we wanted to give the people of Korea food, not bombs.

Michael: Yeah, it was actually the Chinese. There was a critical horrendous famine going on in China. And at that point in time, we had a huge food surplus in the U.S. This went over very big in PACS10 yesterday. So, I thought I'd trot it out again for you guys. There used to be something called, "Newsreels." It was before there were iPods and things like that – cell phones. I got my first text message last week. I was really thrilled.

But there used to be newsreels. You'd go in the theatre, and you'd sit there and before the film came that you had paid to watch, you'd hear, "Da-da-da da don da dum. Yada-da da." And there's Pathé News. And they would give you like ten minutes maybe of newsreel footage. And one of things that they were showing over and over and over again was destroying food in America because there was such a surplus that it was driving the prices too low. So, they were like mountains of potatoes were being burned and millions of gallons of milk were being dumped into the rivers.

Some genius who really should get the Nobel Prize was thinking, "We have too much food. The Chinese don't have enough. Aha!" He had what's called in German, "*Ein Aha-erlebnis*" And he said, "We give some of our food to the Chinese which will have – first of all, will keep them from dying of starvation. That's nice. But also, you know, they were our biggest enemy at that time outside of Russia." So, 35,000 Americans including your humble servant, sent these little miniature grain bags to the Whitehouse.

And we sat listening by our radios. They had something called radios. And it was a big wooden box – you listened to them. And nothing. The war rages on. No change, nothing. So, you could easily conclude that it did not "work." But then there came the Freedom of Information Act – you remember the Freedom of Information Act? I'm sure it's dead by now, but they proved – they discovered that Eisenhower was having a meeting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Chiefs were arguing that we should go across the Yellow River and start bombing mainland China. But he did not want to.

And he asked his aide how many of those grain bags had come in? And the aid said, "It was 35,000." And he got up and he said, "35,000 Americans are asking me to start feeding the Chinese. This is hardly the time to be bombing them." End of conversation. So basically, I and 34,999 other people basically prevented WWII. I mean that's the reason we're all here today. [Laughter and Applause] Thank you. Some appreciation. It's about time. Yes, thank you very much. [Laughter]

Now, you know, it's perhaps a slight exaggeration about the WWII part, but the fact is we were not aiming – we had no idea that the Joint Chiefs were prodding the president to bomb China at that time. So, what it accomplished was far greater than even what we had set out to do, which we failed to accomplish. That's my favorite example. Partly, of course, because of my signal role in this example. But remember back, the very first

meeting that we had together, starting to think about positive energy, negative energy. When you decide to use positive energy, it does positive work. And vice versa. Eli?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:14:25]

Michael: Yes, please do that.

Student: [Unintelligible 01:14:30]

Michael: yeah. Thanks to global warming we can mostly meet outdoors.

Student: And then I usually have Mondays from 2:00 to 4:00, but [unintelligible 01:15:05]. What about Wednesday?

Michael: It looks like you better have two of them, Laura? Can you do that?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:15:26] How about Wednesday 1:00 to 2:00.

Michael: Nothing is going to get everybody, I can tell you.

Student: Wednesday 4:00 to 5:00?

Michael: We'll try and get you some help if you want to have two sections. We'll try to find somebody who can help you.

Student: What about Monday at 6:00? Who can come Monday at 6:00? Okay, let's do that then. Monday at 6:00, let's just meet right after class in this classroom. I don't know if we'll be able to do that.

Michael: Probably will. Okay. We have a few more minutes. Anything else? What has particularly intrigued you or puzzled you about the concept of nonviolence? Kevin?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:16:30]

Shanti Sena and Civilian Based Defense

Michael: Well, let's put it this way, Shanti Sena could be used for civilian based defense or for a kind of third-party nonviolent intervention. The way Gandhi originally conceived of it – see, he was not – except for the potential Japanese invasion through Burma, he was really not directly working on the question of war. So, he thought of his Shanti Senas as mostly local phenomena.

But actually, given today's world where national boundaries are becoming more porous and less significant, it really – the concept has become any third party intervening at any scale. So, there's – one of the books that describes this is called, "Nonviolent Intervention Across Borders." But it doesn't really matter all that much whether you're going across the border into a foreign territory of some kind, or you're just interposing yourself between two groups.

So, it really – so the way he was thinking of a Shanti Sena is sort of in between civilian based defense and a third party nonviolent intervention and it could break either way. Good. Okay, Camilla?

Student: Sorry. So, the part that interested me – like a lot with the Hinduism aspect of it, like [unintelligible 01:18:01].

Michael: It's underlying it, and that means that you can bring it in whenever you want to. And it means that there probably will be – like as you see on your list – there may be one or two questions directly aimed at that. Like what is the Gita Theory of Action? Who was Arjuna? Even Arjuna couldn't figure that one out. And I guess, you know, terms like karma. We may have that in the ID's, but I think the best way to think about it is you can really understand where Gandhi is coming from only if you know that background. And then you can bring it in as you find use for it. Okay, everybody, have a good weekend. Not too much fun though. Lots of studying.

15. Review

Michael: Thoughts I'd like to share with you, as you know. We have to start off every week by relieving my frustrations for never being interviewed by CNN. And then I'm going to go over with you a system for doing well on ID's and that's what Amy's putting on the board. And then we'll open it up for general review questions.

Forgiveness and Nonviolent Response

So, here's the philosophical stuff. We have recently been presented with very clear cases in things that have happened in the U.S. of the nonviolent response and the violent response to similar events. In fact, it was the same event. What I'm thinking of is the very arresting response that the Amish community has made in Pennsylvania to the attack – the terrible attack on their school. And I've sent you by CourseWeb an article about that because next week we're going to be talking about the three major religious traditions of the West – Christianity, Judaism, and Islam – and how each of those has dealt with the issue of violence and nonviolence, which would be very similar.

So, it's partly topical from that point of view, but partly – I'm impressed very much by the response of this community, that their knee jerk reaction was, "Don't hate this person." They have actually started a trust fund for his children – got some chairs over there. And they are practicing forgiveness and prayer. And that's a part of it – is their reaction. And part of it is the world's response to their reaction – or reaction to their response.

And it's always very striking to me that when something nonviolent and counter-cultural in that sense comes along, something that we're not supposed to believe in or approve of, people are woken up by it. So, you have people all over the world writing about their response to the event. And it reminded me of when Pope John Paul was shot in an assassination attempt by a Turk. He went into the prison where that guy was imprisoned, and he actually sat in the cell with him, shook hands with him. That was photographed and that became the cover of "Time Magazine."

So here are people going around telling you that violence alone prevails and it's the only way to go and that's the way it's always been and it's going to be. But you present them with counter-instance to that and they're awakened in a way. They're always overwhelmed by it. Now in contrast to the response of the Amish community you may also have read that there's a person in Texas who's going around to classrooms teaching children how to react with violence when an attacker comes into the classroom. Jump on him, swarm him, hit him with pencils, you know, bounce erasers off his head, things like that.

The tragedy of it, you know, this is going to increase the level of terror and anxiety permanently for all those children. So, this is actually helping terrorists to do their work

because he's coming into these classrooms and getting them to expect to be terrorized by somebody who loses it because of the pressures of our civilization. So, think about those two examples. That kind of demarcates the two ways that we can go towards security – the way of nonviolence and the way of violence. And you might think of that almost as maybe something you might want to use for a paper or get yourself started – something that you could use, have in the back of your mind for an essay question on Thursday. Okay?

Eugene Anarchists

The other thing I wanted to mention is that, yes, a couple of – three years ago I had a debate with the Eugene Anarchists, and I had more or less forgotten about that, but it came up again in a special class I had to do last week. The Eugene Anarchists are like other anarchists except they live in Eugene. And they have created a lot of trouble. They created a lot of trouble for the Seattle Protests in 1999 because they believe in violence because they feel that you should not have any restrictions on your behavior or anything.

So, their argument was that this nonviolence business, Nagler, it's not radical enough. It's not going to get anything done. You need violence to get things done. My argument to them was, "You guys claim that you're really, really radical, but I think I'm much more radical than you. So there." "No, I'm more radical." "No, I'm more radical," slug, bang. "So, here's my point, if you really get down to what is the final recourse that our civilization maintains, for maintaining order, for operating the economy, for everything, you will see that it would be not too much of an exaggeration to say that our civilization really rests upon violence. Our civilization as we know it now was built upon the power, built upon threat power, built upon the power of violence. And if you don't get rid of that, you guys," I said, "are not going deep enough."

They were very impressed because no one had ever told them that they weren't radical enough before. But here's this little Berkeley professor saying, "No. In fact, you have not gone deep enough in reconstructing our civilization. If you want a new paradigm the first thing you have to do – not the last thing – the first thing you have to do is say, 'The new paradigm must be based on nonviolence. And wherever the present paradigm is based on violence we have to reorganize it and get it over on this other basis.'"

And so, I think I actually won that debate. And that's hard. To win a debate with anarchists is not so easy. I also told them that Emma Goldman – famous anarchist from the early 20th century was slightly related to me by marriage. That helped – it softened them up a little bit. But the real blow was telling them that they're not radical enough. Unfortunately, they were taping that debate and they have the tape and won't give it to us. So, the world will never know about my brilliant success with them. But you know about it, and that's a start.

The Great Turning

However, I just wanted to encourage you here, you're about to go into this incredible study and grind and you've already begun it and you have to have this midterm on Thursday. So, I wanted to give you some encouragement about the importance of what you're studying. I think there are many people trying to do a change of paradigm from many angles. It's sometimes called, "The great turning." Nowadays that's our term for it. It has to happen, or you won't have a world to grow up in.

But I honestly believe – and that's why I spend so much time on this – that unless the change process incorporates nonviolence at a very early level and builds it into the new paradigm, it will not go deeply enough, and we'll just be offered the same-old same-old. Okay, thank you for listening. I feel much better. And now we can get started on your immediate issues which is the midterm.

DACE System

What I want to present you with here today is called in commercial language, "The DACE System." The DACE System for getting through a PACS164 ID. When you're going into the exam and you haven't slept much and you're a little nervous, just remember, "Ace it with DACE." I think that's stupid enough and corny enough that it could even fly in the commercial world. But this is the DACE System. It's partly in order. Here they are, the four – a big acronym.

"D" stands for Define. And what I mean by that is very often people get started with an ID and they tell things about the term that they're responding to, but they don't actually define it. So, they say, "Oh, this thing is tremendously important. I'm glad I learned about it, and you can read about it in such and such a book. Nonviolence would be nowhere without it and yadata, yadata." And then either I, or Laura, or Eli, be screaming and tearing our hair out – which is more dangerous in my case – and saying in the margin, "What is it?" Tell us what you're defining. Define the darn thing. So, here's – okay, let me give you the other three and then we'll go to the example.

"A" is for attribute. That means if your term was invented by someone, tell us who that someone is – even if it's me. The point being that we're still at a very early stage. I just came from a PACS faculty meeting, and we were talking about the same thing there, that we have to – it's difficult to work out a vocabulary for this field because it's so new that people are using the same terms in different ways, different terms in the same way, so there's not using any terms at all.

So, if you wanted to talk about a particular – a concept that was the property or the invention, the discovery of a particular person, it's very helpful if you tell us who that person is. So, for example, if you talk about – well, here's a kind of obvious example, okay? If you talk about "Nagler's Law," don't say, this was developed by Johan Galtung.

That's why it's called, "Nagler's Law." It's important for you to know, especially if it's something that I've come up with because you might get the impression that it's universally known in the field and used – and it isn't.

So, then you get to have a semester abroad at Meiji Gakuin or something outside of Tokyo and you say, "Well, you know, as Nagler's Law states," and they say, "Nagler's Law?" They'll say, "*Kore wa nande ka?* What the hell is that?" So, attribute when appropriate. So, this is always appropriate and should always be the first thing you do. The attribution may or may not be necessary.

"C" stands for contextualize. And again, that may or may not be necessary. But to give you an example, I might give you a term which is part of a set of terms, and it's very helpful for you to give the rest of the set. So, if I were to say, "Person power." You would define what it is. You could, in fact, attribute it to me because no one else uses the term. It might be handy for you to know that. I hope by the end of the 21st century it'll be common parlance and, you know, whatever we have for the way of newspapers in those days, that they'll be, "The last person power event was in Milwaukee." But that hasn't happened yet.

So, attribute it to me. And then you contextualize it by saying, "Person power is part of a set of three domains in which nonviolent power can operate – or violent power for that matter." There is the classical distribution of the state versus people power which is commonly understood – well, relatively speaking, it's commonly understood. But there's also person power and that's very important from the point of view of principled nonviolence which actually starts from within the human being. Okay, so that's contextualization. If your item is part of a set, tell us at one point what the rest of the set is, and define the rest of the set too if you have a chance.

And then finally, evaluate. That's because some of the things that you might be given to identify will not come from the world of nonviolence, and they will not be obvious. So, if you're defining principled nonviolence, you don't have to evaluate its importance from the point of view of nonviolence. But suppose you were defining something from – let's take a really far out example. Suppose I were to give an ID – I won't – but suppose I'm really feeling unkind and were to give you an ID which was, let's say, "quantum inseparability." You would define it, and you wouldn't have to contextualize it because it doesn't matter for our purposes whether it was Richard Feynman or whoever it was.

But in the end you'd want to say, "This is important to nonviolence because it breaks up the paradigm of classical science within which it was very difficult to understand how nonviolence could operate." You might go on to say, "There is a suggestive parallel between quantum inseparability and the mysterious unity on the spiritual level among human beings which nonviolence proposes. But no one knows how to bridge that gap. It's just at this point it's just intriguing." Okay, so I'm not saying you need to know that about quantum inseparability, but I'm saying, "If the thing that I ask you is not

immediately obvious, how it relates to nonviolence, then it's very important for you to say how."

So that's the DACE system, folks. It's on sale this week. And if you remember that, it will really help you to get through an ID successfully. John?

Student: Should we use an example [unintelligible 00:15:18] principled nonviolence?

Michael: Always – that's going to be part of the instructions that you'll see on your exam paper, but that is very, very useful. Always give a concrete example for something that isn't concrete. And that, in fact, is true on the ID and on the midterms. Yeah, the more you can back up what you're saying by concrete examples, the better off you are. For one simple reason, you may be defining something a little bit wrong or a little bit differently from how we define it, and we may not know what you're talking about, but if you give us an example, then we say, "Oh, okay. All they did was they're using the term differently at this point." Okay?

So, what I've done here is – and thank you Amy for getting it on the board. I sent it out to you on CourseWeb – I wrote an answer to a punitive question on, let's say if you got an ID called, "Integrative power." I wrote this answer, walked into the next room, put on my other hat, came back and gave myself an A for this answer. So, this is an excellent example, if I must say so myself, of how to do an ID. It follows the DACE system very accurately and it's quite succinct.

You just, you know, you think – think before you write, write something like this. It could be this short. Your ID could be this short. You wouldn't want it to be much shorter. You definitely wouldn't want it to be much longer because then you wouldn't have time left over for the essay questions and taking a break, things like that. Okay, first thing that we want to – identify with approval is that you have to give the number and the item that you're identifying. Okay, that's very, very helpful for us because you can get very enthusiastic, tear into it, and we don't really know what it is you are defining. So that's very helpful for us.

The list – you're going to have, let's say, probably – oh, probably 12 out of which you'll be asked to choose 10. So, you give us these numbers and the thing right away. Okay, that's just [unintelligible 00:17:43]. Then notice that Amy and I started right off with the definition. So, let's say this part, "The power that arises from an act of authenticity or clinging to truth." That part of it is the core definition of this concept. Okay, so that's our "D."

Everybody can read this well, by the way? Okay. "Coined by peace researcher," actually I think I said peace –

Student: Yeah, [unintelligible 00:18:25].

Michael: Oh, okay. I actually said, "Peace research giant Kenneth Boulding," just for a little extra credit. I gave myself a little extra credit in that. But this will certainly do.

“Peace researcher coined by Kenneth Boulding.” This is our attribution. Right. And, of course, it goes on to say where he coined it in his book “Three Faces of Power,” the last book that he wrote. And then what’s this all about? The other two are etc, etc. What are we talking about there?

Student: Contextualization.

Michael: That’s right. That’s the contextualization. Wait, yeah. That’s right. So, D-A-C. “Integrative power, by far the least studied in our culture,” that’s just a little bit of irony which adds to the enjoyment of the whole thing. But the important part is that it is essentially satyagraha. Now you could say a little bit more about that if you wanted to. But that’s probably enough. Integrative power is a way of looking at how Satyagraha works.

It draws upon the fact, which is part of the belief system of the principled nonviolence person, that as it was stated by Saint Augustine, “All human beings desire integration as far as in them lies.” In other words, there’s no limit to how close we want to be to one another. And that constitutes an ongoing desire in the consciousness of every person. And when you use integrative power the result is that you come out of an interaction closer to the person or persons that you are opposed to when you went in, at least. In your mind they’re a lot closer and probably in their mind, also – because of mirrored neurons.

And that satisfies this desire for integration which human beings are usually unaware of in our present culture. But that they are unaware of it does not mean they don’t possess it. And so that really explains how integrative power works. So, you’re now in a good position to explain to your roommate or your parents who are challenging you about why it’s costing so much money to send you to Berkeley. What are you getting out of this? It’s an opportunity to explain rationally how nonviolence can actually operate. Okay?

So, are those four things now pretty clear? We’ve got our little advertising slogan so it should be easy to remember it when you go into the midterm. Good. Okay, let me make one brief announcement and then we can start reviewing from wherever you feel like you would like to do that, whatever you feel is most useful. We have an important guest speaker coming to the campus on Thursday. His name is M.P. Mathai. And he’s speaking at 7:00 – I think it’s actually two T’s but that’s how I saw it in writing recently. 7:00 PM in 166 Barrows.

Now the point is that Mathai is a Gandhian scholar. He teaches at the Gandhi University in India. Can you imagine a country that has a Gandhi University in it? And he’s an expert on current Gandhian practices and events in India. So, he’s absolutely perfect for PACS164B. I’m going to try to interview him, depending on whether Jordan knows how to use a video camera or not – and get what he has to say because we have to have our midterm while he’s here. But at 7:00 PM he’ll be talking about Gandhi and Gandhian studies in India.

And also, in general, there's a lot of lectures and events that are on the IAS website. In fact, the IASTP – International and Area Studies Teaching Programs website and underneath the university's website. The last item on the left-hand column is events. So, if I forget to send you something by CourseWeb and you're really bored and you want to go to another lecture, always be checking that IASTP. But for right now I'd strongly recommend that you go to hear Mathai. Normally, he would have actually been here in the classroom with us.

Okay, people, so where do you want to begin? I think we've sort of said enough about the mechanics of the exam, how to study for it. Yeah, Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:23:40]

Michael: Well, it's okay. The India phase of Gandhi's career which is, of course, the actual kernel of the whole thing, we did go over it and we took about two weeks on it, I think. And I pulled out the events and what I thought each event was important for – it would be kind of hard for me standing up here to do that whole thing right now. Your other sources, of course, are you have a chronology in the reader. And you have either Nanda or Fisher. And it should not amount to more than 40 or 50 pages in each of those books. Particularly, if you have the abridged B.R. Nanda biography which, as I said, should be available down in Bazaar of India on University Avenue.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:24:49]

Michael: Well, there was overlapping information on a couple of run-throughs because there's a particular point I wanted to make with one or with the other. So, I'm leaving it up to you to fold them back in. And I mean you know best how you learn historical material. Some people, you know, do it by writing it out, very chronologically. Others have other systems. But, you know, get together and sketch out – when you get the question, the question is going to say, "Take either the South Africa phase or the India phase. Give us a quick sketch of what the highlights were from the historical point of view and tell us what we can learn from each one or what Gandhi learned from each one. What was significant about each one from the point of view of nonviolence?"

Now what that means is, except for the ID part, we're not going to ask you for particular events. So, it's up to you to make your own syncretism, your own synopsis of what you think the important events were in Gandhi's career.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:26:22]

Michael: Five would be a little sketchy. I mean five would be very convenient for that particular essay. But I bet having six or seven in your mind would – I mean we all have to know about the Epic Fast. We have to know about the Salt Satyagraha. We have to know about Quit India – the really, really major events. The fast that I didn't talk about, you know, the Calcutta Fast and Gandhi's response to the partition and the rioting and so forth.

I suppose every – it would be – it would look weird to do a sketch of the Indian phase without mentioning those events, but others that you want to mention, just as long as you know why you’re mentioning them. You know, it could be something that maybe – like the Patna Surrender in historical terms is not a big deal. But it did illustrate what? What does it illustrate? Alex?

Student: His family’s willingness to make concessions. Sometimes it’s necessary to keep the [unintelligible 00:27:45].

Counterintuitive Concessions

Michael: I would go a little bit further than that. Not only that he was willing to make concessions, but the darn thing worked. And that’s counterintuitive for us. You know, we tend to approach a conflict with the idea of, “The harder you fight, the more you win.” And as I’ve mentioned, when he was really stuck and he really needed more power, his first reaction – well, maybe not his first reaction, but darn close to it – his nearly first reaction was, “What can I give up?”

And in this case we’re talking about him making a political concession, but there were also personal renunciations that he made to get more power. You know, right after – while you’re thinking of your next question I’ll just share this image with you. Right after WWII when the allies wanted to experiment with breaking the sound barrier, the only way they could get an airplane moving that fast was to take a jet fighter, which was the fastest thing that they had, and put it into a power dive. In other words, you know, point it at the earth and keep the engine running and soon it would break the sound barrier. But there was one slight problem. They all crashed.

And hitting the earth at, you know, 900 miles an hour made it very hard to collect insurance for those pilots. You know, I don’t mean to be sarcastic about it, but it was terribly costly. And they would have these pilots reporting constantly on what they’re experiencing in the plane while they’re doing this. You know, buffeting, very tail heavy. One pilot figured out that the way to get it out of the dive was actually to reverse the controls and push the stick forward instead of pulling it backward. And it worked.

And you can imagine, here you are, hurtling toward the earth at 900 miles an hour. You’ve got like eight seconds left to save your life and you’ve got to push this stick instead of pulling it. Everything in you is screaming, “Pull up! Pull up!” But when you pull up, the plane dives faster. For some weird reason – I don’t know if it’s still true, but in those aircraft, when you broke the sound barrier, the direction of the controls reversed.

Now the reason I’m mentioning this – as you are wondering, “Why is he talking about that?” The reason I’m mentioning it is there are frequently areas in nonviolence where you have to be so counterintuitive, you have to go so in the face of your training that it’s not unlike what those poor pilots had to do to save those planes.

So, here's Gandhi, he's faced with a rebellion. And you might think, "I'm going to collect as much force as I can and isolate these people and get them over on my side." And his response is, "I know. I'll give up." And sure enough, two years later he's fine. He comes out on top of it anyway. Yeah?

Rights of Fasting

Student: Could you just briefly list again the rules of fasting?

Michael: Right, okay. That's a good idea. I'm not sure that came up here. But yeah, let's list then. Let's see, there's room over here. And by this time, I think it would be nice for us to explain why these are the rules. [Writes "Fasting"] First of all, just to contextualize this a little bit, lots of people who are trying to discipline themselves spiritually, work with themselves, they go on fasts. And that's not the kind that we're talking about. What we're talking about is the interface between the person fasting, the satyagrahi who has felt that the time has come to use that method, and the people to whom he is directing this gesture.

Okay, so we're talking about fasting as a political gesture, just to clarify that. Okay, and there are five rules, no particular order. John?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:32:07]

Michael: You want to say all of them? Okay, sure. And we're listening very carefully. Go ahead.

Student: Be the right person.

Michael: You have to be the right person. Now you're not reading this off a sheet?

Student: No, I just wrote them down. I remember them.

Michael: Okay, good. Okay, let's get them down first and then talk about the –

Student: The right audience.

Michael: Okay. Right audience. This is starting to sound Buddhist at this point. Right occupation. Right audience.

Student: Doable demand.

Michael: Okay. Doable demand.

Student: Consistent with the rest of your campaign.

Michael: Yeah. Hang on here. Just a second. I'll just put, "Consistent." And finally –

Student: Your last resort.

Michael: Last resort. Okay. That is the list. And that's really good work. It took me years to actually come up with all five, every time I announced that I was about to do this. Let's talk about them. What it is actually – what does each one actually mean and why is it important? What does it tell us about the mechanism that's involved here? Maybe we should let other people talk about it. What does it mean to be the right person? I mean here you have Gandhi, he goes on a fast in 1942. He gets a telegram from Nehru saying, "I'm going to join you." And Nehru gets an immediate telegram back saying, "Don't. Continue to be the Jewel of India," Gandhi said. "This is my job." Julia?

Student: Well, in regard to being the right person [unintelligible 00:33:54].

Michael: Take one at a time.

Student: Oh, I was just going to – I thought it went from – it's just what Gandhi said, that he fasted to inform the ones who love him. So [unintelligible 00:34:07] to be the right person, that implies that you're somebody that lots of people know about, whom they respect. You're not just somebody that nobody knows about, that [unintelligible 00:34:18].

Michael: Okay. I would put that under two, "The right audience." And what Julia is saying is that this is not going to have any meaning if the people whom you're trying to persuade do not care about you. Because you go to somebody and say, "Ha ha. I won't play with you." And you've never played with them before and they don't like you in the first place, you know, it's just not – your gesture will be sort of wasted. Yes, Camilla?

Student: Well, I don't know if this is [unintelligible 00:34:47] story that you told us about like the prisoners. Yeah, and so they fasted, you know, to try to [unintelligible 00:34:56] being imprisoned and they died.

Michael: They died, yeah. This is a frequent outcome of doing nonviolence wrongly. Actually, I quoted those prisoners because they got all five rules wrong. Totally wrong. They could not have been worse off. But what do I mean by the right person? Yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:35:21]

Michael: Very good. Gena was saying, "You have to know why you're doing this and know that you can do it." Actually, what we're talking about here is a serious fast, like an open-ended fast unto death is our classic case here. There are others where you say, "I'm just going to not – I'm not going to partake in food for five days just to show you that something is wrong here." But this is a fast in which the other party actually has to respond or else you're going to die. And that's the difference between an open-ended fast unto death and immolation. We didn't mention that before.

This is just in the context of it, this is an interesting thing to note. If you go and set yourself on fire, the other person has nothing to do with it. They cannot interfere. They didn't even know you were doing it until it's over. So, you are actually taking your life. Here, you're not taking your life, you are offering it. You are putting your life in the hands

of another person. Now part of being the right person means – and incidentally – it may not be necessary for me to say this, but I sincerely hope that this never comes up for any of us, right? I hope we have long, healthy, active nonviolent careers and never have to do anything so drastic. But if we don't get involved in the deteriorating spirals of violence soon enough, it's just good to know that this has a dynamic that works.

So being the right person means that you actually have your – you have control over your life force in some way and you are actually – you know what you're doing and you're willing to lay down your life. Now people can get swept up by enthusiasm.

Effervescence of the Crowd

Next semester we're going to call this, "the effervescence of the crowd." You can get swept up by enthusiasm and do drastic things which really are not in your willpower. It's the crowd volatility that makes you do that.

In the ancient world – I'm giving you – actually, this is going to be a pretty drastic example if you're of a sensitive nature or a vegetarian, hold onto your seats here – but I remember when I was the Chairman of Religious Studies attending a lecture by someone who talked about the Cult of Cybele in ancient Roman Empire. And priests of Cybele used to get themselves intoxicated and work themselves up into a frenzy and castrate themselves and give the thing over to the goddess. And his final comment was, "Now that's commitment."

And my comment, which I didn't actually utter because I was the Chairman – I was supposed to be polite to our guests was, "No, it's not. That's not commitment. That's hysteria." So, people can get tricked into by external forces, get tricked into risking their life. And at the very last second as it's being pulled away from them they say, "Oh my God, what have I done? You know, plug me back in. I didn't – I really didn't want to die," at a very, very deep level. So, you really have to have deep control of yourself to do this in a way that will make it work. That's the – yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:38:55]

Michael: That's a very interesting proposal. How would this be related to sva-dharma? That's a very interesting proposal. I guess I just said that, didn't I? I'm obviously stalling for time here. Yeah, I think it would – your sva-dharma would have to be in the area of service. You'd have to be really pretty advanced in that area to where you feel that the purpose of your life is defined by your value to others or else it would not make sense for you to offer your life in the service of others.

Now the reason I'm hesitating a little bit is that in one sense this is human dharma. I like to think of Martin Luther King saying, "Unless you have found a cause for which you are willing to die, you have not found a reason to live." So, in a sense, this pertains to everybody, but very few people actually work themselves around to a position of being in that kind of control. That's a really good proposition. Okay.

Doable Demand

Doable demand – comment on that. First of all, what is it? Second of all, why is it important? What does it mean that what you’re demanding that the person respond to in order to get you to go back into the food chain is doable? What do we mean by that? Give us a counterexample? I thought this was going to be the easiest one of all. Yes, Camilla?

Student: Well, I mean, obviously, an exaggeration if you’re asking somebody to like go sit on the sun [unintelligible 00:41:03].

Michael: Yeah, the people in the Irish Republican Army prisoners in Long Kesh Prison – I don’t know. This may be one of the rules that they came close to being okay with because after all was said and done, they were aiming this at Margaret Thatcher. She definitely was the wrong audience for them. She didn’t care whether they lived or died. But she could have commuted their sentence in some other way.

Let me give you a better example that happened and that was during the Cold War. I think it was five Americans who decided that they were going to go on a hunger strike to get President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev to end the Cold War. And it was just hopelessly unrealistic. You know, there’s billions of dollars, decades of propaganda, and enormous machinery geared up to do nothing but have a Cold War. And you can’t say, “You know, stop or I’m not going to have my three squares a day for however long.” So that was unrealistic.

However, what is unrealistic and what isn’t depends on who you are, how much power you have and what the audience is. Remember, in the – during the partition, Gandhi goes to Calcutta, people are slaughtering each other in very large numbers every day. It’s horrible. It’s utterly gruesome. And he goes in there and he just announces that he’s staying with Mr. Suhrawardy who was one of the people who actually started the rioting and now regretted it. And he said, “You guys keep rioting, I die.”

And I forget how long that took. I think it was six days. And the whole city came to a standstill. It was incredible. So, his doable demands were much higher than the doable demands of some other people. Incidentally, a little anecdote that I did not share with you, and it’s not very well known, it’s not publicly known, really. I happen to know about it. During that period, even Gandhi was stretched very thin. You know, the Viceroy Mountbatten said, “Whenever our city breaks out into a riot, erupts in rioting, I have two options. I can send a brigade of 50,000 highly trained troops or I can send one little man who weighs about 102 pounds and doesn’t even have any teeth. And they both have the same effect.”

But that just goes to show you how much more costly it is to use threat power than to use integrative power. It’s a very, very good example. But at one point even Gandhi couldn’t be everywhere and so he called – he’s sitting at this meeting. Things were very tense, and he called over – I think it was an 18 year-old girl. And he said, “I can’t go to

such and such a village. I need you to go there.” Madeleine Slade was there, you know, Mirabehn. And she said, “No. No, you can’t send her. You’re crazy. They’re killing people. They’re raping people. You can send a young girl into that town.”

And so, he called her over and he said – he looked her right in the face and said, “I don’t believe in death. Do you?” She said, “No, Bapu.” He said, “Very good. Then you go.” So that just shows you how intense and how reaching deep into the psyche these things were at that time. Okay, so the doable demand has to be, you know, within reason. Something that you – what you’re calling upon a person to do, they can do. Yeah?

Student: Does that have anything to do with non-embarrassment? Like with the prisoners and Margaret Thatcher, like it was kind of like what they were doing was putting pressure on her to release them, which I guess you could say is selfish. Or like if she did that, like maybe publicly she would have lost face or something like that.

Michael: Good point. Yeah. I had never brought these two things together onto the same page, but I don’t see why that would not be an example.

Gandhian Context of Non-Embarrassment

Usually, when we talk about non-embarrassment in the Gandhian context it usually means the party that you’re trying to have a conversation with, a nonviolent interaction with, is preoccupied. And it’s embarrassment in the sense of encumbrance.

But I don’t see why we couldn’t extend it and say, “You know, he’s actually shaming her.” They were trying to put her in a position where she would be shamed one way or the other. That’s an interesting juncture there. Yeah. And, you know, embarrassing your opponent is something that, in the best of all cases, you never want to do. There are times when you have to use that device, but it’s never ideal and you want to avoid it under all circumstances in principled nonviolence.

Classically, in strategic nonviolence it doesn’t seem to bother them as much. They talk about, “Here’s how you can get people to do this by shame and things like that.” We don’t want to do that. Above all, never do anything that degrades human dignity. This is like if in medicine the first rule, the first Hippocratic regulation is, “*Primum non nocere.*” First of all, don’t make things worse, okay? Don’t hurt anybody. Then we can talk about maybe curing them.

So, I would say for nonviolence, similarly, it would be – the first rule would be, “Don’t do anything that’s going to reduce human dignity.” Everybody loses in that regard. So, we would never do that. That’s why non-embarrassment comes in. Okay? Consistent with the rest of the campaign. That should be pretty easy to identify, and we can talk about that also. We can take somebody who’s not fasting today, I think we’ve exhausted Camilla already.

So, this may be self-evident, but what does it mean to say that the fast should be consistent? Yeah?

Student: Well, I heard those prisoners, they had always been using violence to accomplish their goals. So, when they were in prison they just kind of [lost] – the option to use violence so they tried nonviolence.

Michael: Excellent. Yeah, the Long Kesh prisoners had been out there kneecapping people and blowing them up and things like that. And now they're nonviolent. So, you're bringing up two things here. One is – and you may not even realize that you're bringing up two things at once. One of them is, this would only be strategic nonviolence because it's clear that they would use nonviolence if they could. So, this is the nonviolence of the weak and we're not thrilled by that kind of nonviolence, though it's better than the violence of the weak.

The other thing you're bringing up is the person audience kind of thing. They wouldn't believe you if you've been killing them and killing them and killing them and now you say, "Well, I'm not going to play with you anymore." It just simply would not have the desired meaning for them. Good. Yeah?

Student: I just have a quick question. In the example of [unintelligible 00:48:47]

Michael: The Pathans?

Student: Yeah, the Pathans became peaceful quite suddenly. And he said that courage is courage. Like the people who practice violence have courage and they can move that type of courage to [unintelligible 00:49:07]. How would that be different from the –

Nonviolent Courage of the Pashtuns

Michael: Okay. This is a very good question. Why is the courage, the nonviolent courage of the Pathans which is something that we like, and we say, "This fits the mold perfectly." You have people who are capable of violence and then they renounced it. How does that differ from the consistency issue where you have these IRA people? They were basically terrorists, if that term has any meaning. And then they renounced violence. Why is that inconsistent? Another way of looking at it is, "What's the consistency on the part of the Pathans being nonviolent?" Good questions. Hold on just a second Joy. Yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:49:51]

Michael: Yeah, in fact his attitude was that there was a certain level of inconsistency and that the Pathans had now kind of launched themselves into a nonviolent posture because of their leader and him. And as he was always saying to them, this is not enough. This is a great first step, but it's not enough. As opposed to the episode I think I shared with you where someone wrote to him and said, "The police came into our village. They were offering indignities to our women, and I didn't even try to defend

them. Aren't you proud of us?" And he said, "I hung my head in shame." That was not even the first step. This was a step – that was a step backwards.

Whereas what the Pathans were doing was a step forward, but only one step. You now have to go and live it out as a lifestyle, incorporate it, and so forth. So okay, we're getting a better definition of this, I think. Okay, let me go back to my last question. What is the consistency of the Pathan, the Khudai Khidmatgars being nonviolent? How is that consistent with their previous career? On the surface, it's totally inconsistent, right? They used to hide behind a rock and shoot you at the slightest provocation.

You probably are too young to have heard the expression, "Three on a match." You're too young and you don't smoke anyway. So, I'm very proud to say this would not mean anything to you. But there used to be this military – in military parlance they said, "Never three on a match." It was because if you were in the Northwest Frontier and you're standing up doing guard duty and you decide to smoke. So, the first soldier lights a match and lights his cigarette. The Pathan who's been watching from the hills sees you. Then you hand the match to the second soldier. He takes aim. And the third soldier, he shoots. That was what those people were like. But now why is that consistent with their putting up with incredible beatings and humiliation and – yeah?

Student: [unintelligible 00:52:26]

Michael: Okay, that's part of it. That their goals were consistent. They were fighting to get rid of the British, but through violence and now they're fighting to get rid of them through nonviolence. But even from the point of view of nonviolence, I think you already said it, John, that they – where they were courageous then and they were courageous now. And that's very important. Remember the *tomas*, *rajas*, *satva* progression. Yeah?

Student: Another thing is that the Khudai Khidmatgars didn't try fasting. They did other things first and this is a rule for fasting.

Michael: That's Item 5. Very good. We'll get to that in one second. Yeah, very good. That they didn't try fasting first. In fact, they may never have actually gotten to it in their case. I don't know of any example of them doing that. Joy?

Student: I just wanted to ask about [unintelligible 00:53:29]

Non-Embarrassment and Restorative Justice

Michael: Okay, here's what's happening here. The rule – let's continue to use that vocabulary. The rule in nonviolence about non-embarrassment is not the same thing as don't ever embarrass anyone. It has a very specific application. It means that if you have been carrying on a nonviolent interaction with a party and their attention is distracted by something else, the last thing you want to do is take advantage of them. In fact, you probably want to stop your demands until they're finished with their other conversation and then you come back. And that worked with brilliant success in South

Africa when the British rail workers went on strike that really – that was the end of the satyagraha. That made it – launched it into its final success. In India, the non-embarrassment about WWII didn't work so dramatically, but the principle was still the same. So non-embarrassment does not mean don't ever embarrass anyone – which may not be a good idea. Certainly, be a bad idea to embarrass me before you get your final grade. But it doesn't just mean that. It has that very specific application. Okay? So, were we finished with the consistency piece?

Student: I have one more question [unintelligible 00:55:18]. So non-embarrassment has to do with not taking advantage of the person in the situation. It doesn't – because obviously, if you're standing still and a person comes and attacks you and then comes to the realization that it's wrong, there's obviously an awkward moment. So, they feel embarrassed by the fact that they attacked you.

Michael: In a way, in nonviolence, what you're always trying to do is some good creative embarrassment. You're taking people who are morally obtuse. They do not understand that they're hurting you or rather, they understand that they're hurting you, but they don't understand that it matters. And it's true, in order to get them to have that realization you have to pass through a brief phase of embarrassment – embarrassing them.

But what makes it okay is that you're always giving them something to do about it. You're not leading them from embarrassment into a guilt trip and then walking out on them. I really like this example. I was in Atlanta, Georgia a number of years ago and I think four white people – some number of white people had burned down a black church and they were on trial. And the judge ordered them to rebuild the church. And we haven't talked about it, but there's this whole institution of truth and reconciliation. There's probably eight or nine countries in the world where this is going on, in an intense post-conflict situation ranging from Rwanda to some others that are not that serious.

And the people who have committed these crimes, they have to pass through a phase of awareness that what they did was wrong. And all criminal justice works on this also. In fact, we won't probably get a chance to talk about it very much, but we have this system based on what's called retributive justice. Somebody commits a crime. They've hurt a party within the culture, in the society, you hurt them back, you get retribution, and that's justice.

We don't like that. PNV (Principled Nonviolence) people don't like that. We want to move it over to what's called restorative justice where when they've hurt somebody, they have to be restored. They have to be brought back into the community. They have to heal. Even in restorative justice though, they have to own what they did. And in fact, the remarkable thing is that most prisoners feel good about that. They don't like being told, "Oh, you didn't know what you were doing. You were on a drug trip." Because what you're telling them is, "You're not human. You're not a responsible human being." So,

there is a phase, but it should be transitional where they have to take responsibility. They have to own it. They have to feel bad about what they did, or they'll never get out of it.

So again, that's a good reason not to push the concept of non-embarrassment into wider and wider circles. Okay? Non-humiliation is probably a rule that we would want to follow. You don't want to humiliate. You never want to decrease human dignity. But there is a situation, a critical point in which you want people to wake up and realize what they did was wrong. The way to do that safely is to give them some way of getting out of it, some restoration. So that was a great discussion.

Where are we now with fasting? I think we've pretty much covered consistent, that there's a larger principle, I guess, that I didn't mention which is that this particular rule applies throughout to nonviolence. You cannot use nonviolence provisionally and expect it to be very effective, okay? That's why one of the definitions of principled nonviolence, it's not usually the one that I use – or at least not first – but one of the definitions you'll often encounter, if you would encounter anything often in the world of nonviolence, is that it's a lifestyle, it's not just a technique. Okay?

So now let's move onto the last resort. And I guess it's obvious what that means, that let's say you have a mild conflict with somebody, you don't send them an email saying, "Oh, and by the way, I'm not going to eat until you keep your dog your quiet," or something like that. So, we know what it means to say that – yeah, why should it be the last resort?

Student: Well, I wanted to ask you a different question.

Michael: Oh, okay. Hold onto the different question and let's see if we can get this answered first. Why should fasting be the last resort? Yeah, Julia?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:00:12].

Michael: It's definitely going to be the last resort if you die. That's pretty – that's for sure. But what else?

Student: Well, just that – and it's just a grave responsibility, fasting, and if you've exhausted all other options, then, you know, [unintelligible 01:00:35].

Michael: Right. Yeah. And again, this applicable to every mechanism in nonviolence, that it has a time and a place within the conversation that you're carrying on with your opponent. Yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:00:51]

Awakening vs Coercion

Michael: Yeah. It's a very good point. It's very clear that the reason for all of these rules is to keep us out of the coercive arena and have it be persuasive. You want to awaken the person, not force them. And about 2 – 3 times out of 12 Gandhi felt that his fast had not worked even though the people did exactly what he wanted them to do. And the reason he felt they were failures was that they were coercive, not persuasive. Yeah, obviously this is a drastic move. You're saying to somebody on this very deep symbolic level, I'm not going to live on the same planet with you unless you wake up and realize what you've done.

This is so serious. If my Harijans are not going to be able to be part of the same political community as the rest of us, I don't want to live in that India. I was struck by the number of people – now here's the person that I hope you never heard of. His name was Garrett Harden. He was a biologist down in San Diego. And he was the one who came up with the "Lifeboat Ethics" idea. At the time when it looked like lots of people were going to starve because there wasn't enough food to go around. Now we know that lots of people starve because other people won't let them have any of their food or their resources.

But this is the early 80's and it was thought there's only so much food on the planet. He was still going off this Malthusian Doctrine. And he said, "We need a triage. We need to say, okay, there's some societies which are okay. They have enough food. Let them live. There are some societies which are marginal. We have to help them. We have to get more food to them and there are some societies which are beyond help. There isn't enough food to save them. So, I'm sorry folks, they're going to have to be chucked out of the lifeboat and we're going to have to watch them starve." So that was "Lifeboat Ethics."

And I was very impressed by the number of people who wrote to Garrett Harden or wrote op-eds and said, "By the way, please put me in the third category. I don't want to live on a planet where we say this to our fellow human beings." Trying desperately to remember why I mentioned that right now. Oh yeah, it was the last resort because fasting, especially, an unlimited fast which might take your life, is extremely drastic. You're saying, "I'm breaking community with you because the community you've created is unacceptable to me. I don't even want to live in it."

So, one of the most common mistakes in peace movements today – I would say there are two very, very common mistakes. One of them is to do things that are symbolic instead of real. And the second is to go – to get the timing wrong and go to something drastic before they've even given the opponent a chance to respond. So, the point is that you always want to evoke, to elicit a response willingly from your opponent, not to coerce them and give them a situation where they have no choice. Yeah?

Phalam - Fruits of Action

Student: I was wondering if we could go onto another ID.

Michael: Sure. I think we're ready for another ID. We'll take yours next.

Student: Fruits of action.

Michael: Sorry, which one?

Student: Fruits of action. It's on the second column. [Unintelligible 01:04:40]

Michael: Fruits of action. I'm sorry, I didn't quite – yeah. Right. Okay, good. What was I talking about there and what's it doing here?

Student: Would that be phalam? Is that how you say it?

Michael: Phalam. Phalam. Yeah.

Student: Which comes from the idea about not acting [unintelligible 01:05:06].

Michael: Okay, very good. Now if you were actually answering this on an ID, which may not be so theoretical after all. And you remember our DACE system, define what's meant by that term, "Phalam." What's the fruit of action in the sense that this is what you should avoid being motivated by? Remember, I'm not saying you should avoid getting rewards. You should avoid being motivated by them. How would you define fruits in this sense? You want to try?

Student: I guess personal or material objects that you do not need.

Michael: Well, let's not bring in the whole need thing, the whole Gandhian economics – or you could bring it in, it is interesting, but let's keep it a little bit focused. Sid?

Student: Isn't it about doing action that is right and you're doing it because it's the right thing to do in that situation and so you're not thinking about –

Michael: Again, that's also true. That's also true that the definition of principled nonviolence, this is much more general, the definition of principled nonviolence is you're doing it because you think it's the right thing to do, not because you think it's going to succeed. Though you believe that it will have a good effect. So that links those two things together very nicely. All right.

Student: [Unintelligible 01:06:32]

Michael: Right. And I would want to go a tiny little step further. It's not just personal gain, but it's restricted to you personally. That's where you go off the rails. For example, Gandhi strives for liberation for India. Now does he benefit from living in a free India? Of course. I mean in his case, not for very long, but you know, he has children and grandchildren who grow up in a free India. So that's a personal benefit. And there's nothing wrong with that because it's not only a personal benefit. It benefits everyone. So, it's not like the old idea of altruism which states that no pain, no gain. If you're not suffering, somebody else isn't benefitting. It's not like that.

But it's that you are not driven by a reward which will accrue only to yourself. That's the real poison in the phalam concept. Yeah?

Student: So, in Gandhi's [unintelligible 01:07:41].

Michael: Yeah, as all human beings normally do. Now, of course, it's a little bit broader than that because in an Indian family you're doing it for your whole family. You're not doing it for yourself. The decision probably wasn't even his. They told him to go and do that, to rescue the family. So, it's a little bit broader than the individual. But yeah, like most human beings he wanted a career, family, you know, things that pertain pretty much only to himself.

This can get subtle – hold on, I'll get to you in a second. This can get subtle because even if you are doing something that benefits everyone – liberating India is good for Britain, it's good India, it's good for the whole world. But you come out with this little smirk. You're saying to yourself, "I should get the Nobel Prize for this. This was a biggie." To that extent, you're putting on to it a little personal gain. And to the extent that you let that drive you, you are adulterating the act. Yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:08:53]

Michael: Yeah. That's, in fact, the reason I used the word "fruit" is that's what phalam means. It means – the accent is on the first syllable. Phalam. Yeah?

Student: What about actions? Like in the present, they are of [unintelligible 01:09:11].

Michael: I think it's pretty big to take a nonviolence course. It impresses me.

Student: And so, is that like – well, would that be counted as? [Unintelligible 01:09:28]

Michael: Well, yeah. I mean – remember that the whole problem is one of intention, not of results. So, the issue would be why are you getting this education? Because you want to earn six figure salaries some day? In which case you're in the wrong course. Or because you want to develop your gifts for the benefit of the world? Or you might be a normal human being – in which case, there would be a slight mixture of the two. But I would imagine that in the case of most of you, it's much more the latter than the former. So, it's perfectly okay to be a student.

In fact, on more than one occasion students came to Gandhi and said, "We're not going to go to school. We're going to join you." And he said, "Nope. You're not going to join me. You're going to go back to school." When times really got critical, he enlisted students. But don't forget you are training yourself to make a tremendous contribution to the world. And I think you should feel really good about it and don't worry about the fact that you're not doing anything yet.

In a way, I'm happy in the spring – usually it's in the spring. In a way, I'm kind of happy when some of the students from this class go out and get arrested. But in a way, I don't mind if they don't. We're training ourselves for even bigger things. Yeah?

Meaning of Mahatma

Student: Can you go over quickly what it means to be a Mahatma and when [unintelligible 01:11:12].

Michael: Right. The etymology of the word is easy enough. It comes from Maha – which you probably already know means, “Big.” And Atman which means, “self,” in various senses. Or sometimes in this connection we translate it as soul. So, it just means a huge person spiritually. I think you remember that some journalist came to Mrs. Gandhi, otherwise known as Kasturba, on your list. And said, “How many children do you have?” And she said, “Depends who you ask. I have four. My husband has 400 million.”

He cared for the wellbeing of everybody living in India as deeply and as passionately as she cared for her four natural children. Actually, she was much bigger than that also by that stage, but she was just being modest. But it’s that kind of bigness, that’s the Maha part, that you are just a tremendous person in your ability to identify with your fellow human beings. Julia?

Student: I was wondering if you were going to review [unintelligible 01:12:32].

Michael: Yeah, those are very important. I guess we didn’t quite answer the second part of your question. He started to be called Mahatma shortly after he landed in India. Yeah. And he claimed he did not like the word, but he couldn’t help it. Okay, so the Law of Suffering and the Law of Progression – let’s do A first of our DACE formula. Where do these laws come from? Who coined these terms? Thank you, thank you, but no. I can’t bite the phalam on that one. No, in this case, no. I’m flattered, but no.

Who invented these terms? We may only have mentioned it once, so good that I’m discussing it here. If it wasn’t me, who was it likely to have been? I’ll give you a hint. He was often called Mahatma, although he didn’t really like the term. Yeah.

Suffering and Progression

And actually, these two terms were coined in the course of Satyagraha in South Africa. Although you’ve only read a little snippet from that book, it’d be good for you to know that it was in the course of the South African Struggle that he made these observations.

And what were those two observations? Let’s take progression first, but let’s make sure we get to suffering. Let’s state the Law of Progression. If a body acted upon by a constant force in a frictionless field. What’s the law? Sid, did you have a notion what that means?

Student: No. [Unintelligible 01:14:22]

Michael: Okay, we’ll help you out. You want to try? Yes? Zoe?

Student: Does it have anything to do with the natural acceleration of something? If you remain – you stick to your principles and naturally things will accelerate?

Michael: Very well put. If you stick to your principles, things will accelerate or get bigger – however you want to put it. My colleague, Professor Spiegel, who was here a couple of times, you know, he was visiting us from Germany. He was part of an event that took place in Schlossberg where there were only five or six people involved. He was in prison at the time, and these five or six colleagues of his, they stood outside the prison and said nothing. If you came up to them and said, “What are you doing here?” They would explain, but there was no sign; they weren’t holding placards. They just stood there in front of the prison.

At the same time that they were doing that, there was a huge demonstration in Stuttgart, which was a bigger city – something like 20,000 people were marching in the streets waving flags and stuff. The press swarmed over those six people who weren’t saying anything in Schlossberg and almost ignored the Stuttgart demonstration. Because there was something about it which was more right – it was more right on.

So, because of the law of progression, you don’t worry about numbers. And that’s critical for Person Power, right? Law of Progression states, “No matter how few you are – even one – if you stick to your principles, when you need numbers, they will be there.” Like the Salt March that Gandhi undertakes, you know, he starts out with 70 people – 12 days later he has something like 70,000.

Okay, onto everybody’s favorite now, the Law of Suffering. I attribute it to Gandhi in Satyagraha in South Africa. What does it state? What else of interest can we say about it? Zoe?

Student: There comes a time when dehumanization becomes so large it can improve your willingness to suffer and [unintelligible 01:16:47]. Naturally you restore or you re-humanize that in your opponent.

Michael: Very good. It comes in when dehumanization is so serious, so severe that ordinary communication is not working anymore. And do you remember Gandhi had a pretty easy formula for describing what this is about. There come times when you can no longer appeal to the head, and you have to appeal to the heart. And to wake up the heart dialog and language are not appropriate. They’re not even relevant. You have to act. And the most effective action often is to take on some of the suffering that’s inherent in the situation.

When you do that you awaken the opponent. We’re not standing here and saying it will always work right in that timeframe, but it will have an effect. Of that we’re absolutely certain. Yeah?

Student: I had a question about the vows that Gandhi talked about in the book. And I was wondering if they appear only to India, like the situation in India or – yeah, I asked you that in an email.

Michael: Oh yes. Thanks for that email. It was great. Yeah, especially like the vows of poverty and some other things. Do they apply only to India? I would say partly. They apply – the poverty part of it applied to India in a special way because there was so much poverty in India that in order to identify with the poor he had to live like them. But there's a level on which it would apply anywhere. And that is what I was saying before, when you really need power, you give up something.

If you renounce something in the right spirit it will give you more capacity. And that's true everywhere. But where we would do that in this country, where you have all of this abundance floating around and clogging up the garbage dumps and polluting the rivers, poverty here is rather differently structured than it was in India. We might go about it differently in terms of the social act. But in terms of the personal renunciation, it would always have the same effect. Yeah, good question.

Student: [Unintelligible 01:19:13]

Michael: Yeah, I would say the Law of Suffering doesn't necessarily mean you expose yourself to physical pain. It could be just a risk. It could be just an inconvenience. Okay, [Gesturing to the chalkboard] so if anyone wants to have a copy of this deathless prose here, I have copies of it and I think I have one or two copies left of the ID sheets. There you go.

16. Guest Lecturer - M.P. Mathai

Eli: Hi everyone. Welcome to this evening's special presentation. This event is sponsored by the Peace and Conflict Studies Program as well as the Peace Studies Student Association and Peace Power Magazine.

"Mahatma Gandhi's Worldview" by Dr. M.P Mathai

We are very honored tonight to have a special guest from India. Dr. M. P. Mathai is a Gandhian scholar who teaches at the School of Gandhian Studies. And he's also the author of the book, *Mahatma Gandhi's World-view* which I'm very honored to have in my personal collection thanks to my friend, Chelsea. And author of many other books as well.

And tonight, he's going to be speaking about the current state of the Gandhian movement in India and a little bit about the background of the Gandhian movement. And he will probably also be talking about whatever you would like to hear about. So, thank you very much for coming tonight and please join me in extending a warm UC Berkeley Go Bears welcome to Dr. M.P. Mathai.

[Applause]

Eli: And this is the book in question.

Dr. Mathai: How much time do you think?

Eli: 80 minutes.

Dr. Mathai: 80.

Eli: Yes. An hour 20.

Dr. Mathai: First, I must say I am really honored to be here talking to you in Berkeley. This is not my first visit. I was here in 2001, again, around this time. That was three weeks or so after the 9/11 event. At that time, I was talking about the response in India to the 9/11 event, how the people of India, the press of India responded to the 9/11. At this time, I am called upon to speak on the Gandhian movement in India today, or the status of Gandhian work in India today.

This is a subject on which I can talk very elaborately, which might take a lot of time. So, I would like to know, precisely, as to whether you have some questions in mind, some ideas about how I should go, that I would be able to, you know, kind of reorganize my talk to cater to your specific needs and questions. Yeah?

Student: I hope this doesn't sound trivial, but I'd like to know – I understand that there's a comedy that's very popular in India right now about a criminal who takes on Gandhian methods. It's supposed to be very popular.

Dr. Mathai: You mentioned a movie? Yeah. I also heard about this movie, but I have not seen the movie. But those who have seen the movie told me that it is very, very effective in communicating the message of Gandhi to the people – ordinary people. So, since I have not seen the movie, I will not be able to make any observations.

Lok Sevak Sangh

Student: Could you just start with maybe talking a little bit about what is going on post-Gandhi? What is happening? Where are we now with the Gandhian movement and what the Gandhian movement is doing? And then maybe we can get into some more of the audience questions. I think that would be useful, especially for our viewers on the Internet.

Dr. Mathai: Well, you know, Gandhi wanted the Indian National Congress, which was the organization which started before Indian independence, to be disbanded after we attained independence. And a new organization formed. Which he called, “Lok Sevak Sangh.” Creating an organization for serving the people. The people’s service organization. And this idea was placed before the leaders of the International Congress. And they rejected it outright.

They said that they wanted this organization to continue as a political organization. And that continued. But even during Gandhi’s time there were two streams in the Gandhian movement, in the nationalist movement. One stream really consisted of the people who were interested in power politics. And the other was people who are interested in “rule of service”.

Constructive Program -Sarva Seva Sangh

Gandhi had a program called, “The constructive programme,” which was a package of 18 items intended to rebuild society – total society from the bottom with the participation of the people. So, there were thousands of people, you know, taking up this constructive programme, working in all areas. They would bring a kind of silent lip service. The other stream consisted of people with a political orientation. You know, offering civil disobedience and the other programs of the national movement.

So, when India got independence, you know those people, those politically oriented people, naturally, you know, went into the International Congress and they continued to be active in the political frame. While those who are doing the constructive work activities continued their work.

So, when Gandhi said that there should be a new organization in order to carry out the work of rural reconstruction, what he called building swaraj from below. Swaraj was the word that he used for freedom. It was much more than political independence. It was empowering people and strengthening, you know, the role of the masses and so on. So,

Gandhi was assassinated on the 30th of January 1948, a few months after India became independent.

So, this dream of Gandhi which he really wrote down and which is known as his last will and testament was to be carried out by a group of people who are active in the constructive work program. And there was a very well known Gandhian – we don't say – disciple is not the right word. Gandhi never believed that he had disciples. His co-worker called Vinoba. And so, we know what convened at this meeting in Gandhi's Ashram in Sevagram. And a new organization was formed called, "Sarva Seva Sang," which means an organization forum for serving all people.

Lok Sevak Sangh they used the words Sarva Seva Sangh. And then the Sarva Seva Sangh is an apex organization to coordinate the various activities of the Gandhian movement. Because I said there was the rural reconstruction work carried out by Gandhian organizations in rural areas. Even during the Freedom Struggle Gandhi had formed several organizations. Say for examples for the propagation of hand spinning and hand weaving, what he called khadi. And for promoting village industries he had formed an organization called, "All India Khadi" and "Village industries" Association."

Then for the promotion of the cause of the untouchables, an organization was formed called the "Harijan Sevak Sangh". Harijan was the term that Gandhi used to designate the untouchables.

Kasturba Trust

And for the women's empowerment and similar problems associated with, you know, women, there was a trust formed named, "Kasturba Trust," after the name of his wife.

And so, there were several organizations like this. And you know the Sarva Seva Sangh was coordinating all these organizations. These organizations were autonomous organizations. And while maintaining their autonomy, you know, it was coordinated at the national level by the Sarva Seva Sangh. And at the state, the Sarva Seva Sangh had state units, and they approached several of their mandates.

And this is, in fact, a general structure of the Gandhian movement. Now each organization has its focus and its, you know, activities in rural areas. What happened was that after independence for a certain period of time, the political will which was represented by the International Congress and the constructive will represented by various organizations and coordinated by our best body called, "Sarva Seva Sangh." They worked side by side in unison with each other.

But there came a point of time when power started corrupting people who assumed the positions of power. And they were not actually trying to translate the dream, you know, presented before the country by Gandhian practice. You know, Gandhi had presented a model of development before the country. And this model was rejected by the leaders of

the – many leaders of the International Congress, particularly by Nehru and the others who came to power.

They accepted the western model of development and wanted to rebuild India after the image of the industrially developed West. So, this really led to a conflict between those who believe in the Gandhian model and those who promoted the western model who came to power. So, naturally, a conflict arose between the Gandhian movement and the people in the government, who during the Freedom Movement worked together for the larger goal of the political independence of the country.

This actually alienated the Gandhian movement from the government to a considerable extent. And there was one leader of the Gandhian movement,

Vinoba Bhave and Landgift Movement

Vinoba Bhave, who really tried to bring the movement closer to the government. He did not want the Gandhian movement to launch direct action, nonviolent direct action against the government. He said that the time of nonviolent direct action has come to an end. And it was the time for cooperating with the government for rebuilding the country.

So, he launched the movement in the 50s for land reforms which is known as the Land Gift Movement. I don't have time to go into the details of that. The Land Gift Movement was a very successful movement. If you go to the statistics, you know, they succeeded in getting 4.8 million acres of land as a gift. And more than 1 million acres of land was distributed among families who had no land of their own.

And the government cooperated to some extent with this movement. But in 1969 Vinoba just closed the Land Gift Movement and withdrew into his ashram, in a place called Pavnar in central India. The land problem remained unresolved to a considerable extent. And then people who believed in violence stepped in. And that created a different situation. There was another important follower of Gandhi and a great leader of India called Jayaprakash Narayan.

Jayaprakash Narayan continued the work in the rural areas of India, particularly in the states of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, and other areas. And you know, addressing the problems faced by the people and trying to find out a nonviolent solution to it. And some of the problems really demanded nonviolent direct action against the governments that ruled the states and government that ruled the center.

Total Revolution

So, confrontation could not be avoided. And it reached the crisis point in the 70s, the early 70s, when some of the state governments and the government in the center became highly dictatorial and corrupt. And therefore, a people's movement was launched against these corrupt governments, showing totalitarian tendencies. And that

assumed the dimension of a people's revolution known as, "The Total Revolution. It was a total revolution in all areas of public life that was what Jayaprakash Narayan realized.

This resulted in the correlation of the internal emergency in the country by the then prime minister, Mrs. Gandhi. And civil rights and freedoms were really abridged, cut down. Freedom of the press was taken away. And the country was almost in the grip of a kind of dictatorship. But you know, on the surface – everything was smooth. But people were revolting.

And it reached a point where Mrs. Gandhi was compelled to cancel the emergency and declare elections. And in the elections, the party led by Mrs. Gandhi, the Indian National Congress was routed completely. And a new government [* 00:15:34] which actually Jayaprakash Narayan put together came to power. And then there was a kind of relapse for the Gandhian movement because they thought that a movement that – a political coalition, although it was called Janata Dal party, it was not really a party: it was a kind of coalition. This was actually the creation of the Gandhian movement that had come to power.

And therefore, you know, there might have been a qualitative change in the administration as well as in the developmental model to be pursued by the new government. But, you know, the government was a disaster. It crumbled. There were contradictions and other factors. And then another election was declared.

Kundai Commission

And Mrs. Gandhi again returned to power. And when she returned to power she appointed a commission of inquiry called, "The Kundai Commission," to inquire into the activities of the Gandhian organizations.

And this commission was engaging itself in an active witch hunt. All Gandhian organizations were put to innumerable difficulties. Through continuous statements, you know, they were discredited. There was an attempt at discrediting these organizations in the public estimation.

Although this commission was constituted for a period of six months, it continued. Its date was extended and extended. And it continued for five years. And during this period, the movement actually lost its steam. It crumbled. I would say it crumbled. Many people joined several political parties from the movement. Some people left the movement and formed their own non-government organizations, non-profit organizations. Some people left political – public life and withdrew into their own private activities.

So, there was a kind of collapse of the Gandhian movement following the Kundai Commission. But yet, you know, it didn't really, really got lost. There were several people who really wanted to hold on in the face of these adversities, and the movement continued. The work was only dormant. It failed to make any national impact. Or even at

the regional level, it did not create much impact. But still, the movement continued its work.

And then we enter the next phase of the Gandhian movement that is the beginning of the globalization and marketization of the 1990s which was initiated in 1991. New challenges came to be thrown up. You know, capital was allowed to move freely into the country. Foreign direct investment increased. So, multinational corporations and transnational corporations started coming to the country. Huge projects funded by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund were started in different places.

This created a very difficult situation in the rural areas because this huge development project started displacing people in large numbers. Particularly the tribes of aboriginals in rural India. And in several places, the new factories that came in actually started appropriating the scarce resources of the people. And many of the small-scale factories were closed down because large-scale factories started coming in. And this started entrenchment of employees.

So, there were problems in rural areas which were to be addressed by people's movements. So, again, the Gandhian movement got active. It had to come together and become active. And it was apparent that the movement, because it lost much of its enthusiasm and its steam, may not have been able to address some of the issues effectively.

Grassroots Movements and Struggling Villages

There were several movements coming up in rural areas at the grassroot level addressing these problems which were originating locally. And therefore, we thought that something had to be done about it if there should be an effective kind of resistance to be built up against these forces which were really causing havoc in the rural areas. So, we thought that there should be an effective coordination of the various people's movements working in different areas of the country. So, we thought of forming an alliance, a national alliance.

And the initiative was taken by the people in the Gandhian movement. And also, people engaged in some other major persistent movements like the Narmada Bachao Andolan in the Narmada Valley. I was in the team. We traveled in almost all parts of India and met people in their areas of struggle. They were really struggling. We went to the villages, to the rural areas where there were struggles taking place. Movements organizing resistance against some of the multinationals and other forces which were really taking away their resources. We talked to people.

And there was a consensus that there should be a kind of national alliance of these people's movements. So, we decided to form a national alliance. A meeting was organized in the ashram of Gandhi in 1994. And a formal decision was taken to form a national alliance of people's movements. And now we have what is called, "The NAPM,"

the acronym for National Alliance of People's Movements. The Gandhian movement has taken a leadership role in the formation of this national alliance.

Another important thing that has taken place in recent years are struggles against some of the multinational companies in various parts of India. And particularly, I can mention the instance of a struggle in Kerala against a Coca Cola factory. You know, Coca Cola started this factory in Kerala, the district of Palghar which is the birthplace of Eknath Easwaran who was in Berkeley for many years and who is the founder of the Peace Studies program. It was just seven kilometers – seven miles – from the place of birth of Eknath Easwaran.

And you know, the drinking water which people take from wells. You know, Kerala is a place where every family has a family well. You know, that is one of the first two things that people do before constructing a house – they will dig a well. Water is available in almost all places. And the [unintelligible 00:23:53] also used to take water from their traditional wells. But once the Coca Cola factory started over exploiting groundwater, most of the wells dried up.

And some of the wells where water was available were highly contaminated, highly polluted. So, it became a serious problem. And the local people got worried about it. So poor people from the Gandhian movement got involved. Then they convened a meeting of people interested in this issue, and a struggle was started. First of all, the response from Coca-Cola was that if you don't have potable water to drink we'll supply it in your own house – a little water – potable water. So, they started, you know, supplying water.

But the idea was this. It was not acceptable for them because they had a traditional way of living. And drawing water from the well, etc., was a part of their culture – their way of living. And therefore, they were not satisfied with water coming in trucks or in bottles. So, they did not accept this. And this struggle got intensified. I don't want to go into the details of the struggle, but it intensified.

And a political party which was in power[* 00:25:23] and which gave license to this company to start its operation in this place. Realizing that, more and more people were getting organized, and it was just becoming a massive people's movement. And unless they took a position, they would be alienated from the public. And therefore, they came forward and made a public announcement from the direct-action spot before the satyagraha pundit, a place where satyagraha is organized. The shed of the satyagraha. They said that they made a mistake and therefore it was necessary that the factory should close down. And we were also supporting this movement. And now, they are back in power. And in the last month they ordered the closure of the factory, and the Coca Cola factory has been closed down.

But the factory people have got the tails of the coat. But that is not going to make any change because people will not permit the factory to function. And a similar struggle is going on in the state of Rajasthan in northwestern India. But it has not produced the same results as in Kerala.

So, similar struggles are led in cooperation with the Gandhian movement. I don't say that they are in the forefront of it. That's one thing. So, there are struggles against this. And the Narmada Bachao Andolan, the struggle in Narmada Valley, is mainly a question of the rehabilitation and resettlement of the people who have been displaced by this huge dam.

You know, the Gandhian movement people are still playing an active role and, the struggle has been going on for the last 20 years. And it has been a completely nonviolent struggle. And therefore, it has almost caught international attention, and people from different parts of the world are congregating in that place and expressing their solidarity.

You know, several studies have come out on the level of the Gandhian movement today in India. And some of the major criticism written against it by people like Thomas Weber, [unintelligible 00:27:55], etc., who have studied the Gandhian movement most thoroughly and [unintelligible 00:28:02] very particularly say that Gandhians are not effective.

Student: I'm sorry. I didn't hear. Gandhians are not what?

Dr. Mathai: Not effective.

Student: Ah. Thank you.

Dr. Mathai: Not effective. They are not making an impact either on the policy-making level of the government or at the people's level on public land – either in the government or in public life. And they also say that young people are not to be seen in the movement. These are two major criticisms placed against the Gandhian movement by people who have made a very incisive study of the Gandhian movement by traveling in different parts of the country, interviewing people, etc.

And I admit that Gandhian movement is not as effective as it was during Vinoba's time or during Jayaprakash Narayan's time. One of the reasons these people point out is that there is the absence of a charismatic leader like Jayaprakash Narayan. He was a very charismatic leader. I don't know how to answer that criticism except admitting that yes, there is no charismatic leader now in the Gandhian movement.

You know, most of the people who really worked with Gandhi were very young during Gandhi's time and who continue to work in the Gandhian movement...

[End of recorded material 00:29:56]

17. Nonviolence in the West (yes, there is)

Michael: Good to see you all again. I guess there are three kinds of fasts. There's Satyagraha fasts, there's penitential fasts, and then there's can't hold down any food fasts. I had the third kind. And I thought at first it would be a lot of fun, but it was no fun at all. When Gandhi says, "I'm entering the fiery gates," when he started on a fast, it was no exaggeration. It really is a kind of torment.

So, I'm really sorry that I sent around a CourseWeb message saying there would be no class and then I realized this is a perfect talk for Eli to give. And he agreed. And by that time, I was way too sick to remember to send you another CourseWeb, and it might have been too late anyway. So, some of you missed Eli's presentation of the basic models that I find helpful to look at the development of religious consciousness in the West for signs of where we can see nonviolence growing.

I know some of you missed that, but it is on the Web. It's on the webcast. I sat in my sick bed and watched it yesterday – you all feeling very sorry for me. And what I'd like to do today – and this will leave us right on schedule – is just pick up the conversation where Eli left it with you on Tuesday. I'd like to embellish and focus on a few things a little bit more, bring in a point or two. And I was not able to hear your questions. That was the only problem with the webcast.

So, if you'd like to discuss them further, I'm really happy to do that. And then when the Campanile strikes 3:00 we will seek not to find for whom the bell tolls, but instead take stock. If we have some time at that point I would like to go into this fascinating question of the Jesus of history and what kind of nonviolent light that casts on what the Christian religion was to have been.

And then, if we can do that in about ten minutes, I'm going to go over the midterm for about ten minutes. I don't think I need more than that. Then we'll stop early and spread out the books and you can get them. The midterm was on the whole, very good. I think there was a big range of grades. And my guess is, although this is an untested hypothesis, my guess is that people who studied very hard got higher grades than people who did not. It's just my theory.

So, the first question that came up – oh, let me say one thing about the midterms before I get into this. I wanted to remind you that if you don't do well on the midterm, but you do well on the final, you're in pretty good shape because the final grade kind of phagocytizes the midterm grade. If you did well on the midterm – and some of you did very, very well – we're going to practice non-crowding. That's like non-embarrassment. It means you're not going to kick back and say, "This course is a gut. I don't have to study." Because it's going to be cumulative on the final and there's a psychological

phenomenon that happens where people do very well on the midterm, they lose their moral fiber and then they don't do well on the final and they do badly for the course.

So psychologically, if you did well on the midterm you can be happy about that and be glad that you know how to do these exams but keep on doing it.

Three Stages of Religion

All right, so the first question that I picked up from Tuesday was this theory of mine about three stages of religion incidentally, Nagler's Theory of Religion was sort of a joke. I didn't mean it to be like, you know, up there on the marquee, "Playing this week, Nagler's Theory of Religion." But it is good to know that it was my theory, so you don't confuse it with something that's accepted in general by the academic community, because it is not.

Though Herbert Spencer, the philosopher also came up with a very similar theory, I understand. But this theory suggests that people at first see the source of power that should be worshiped and propitiated and harnessed in the natural environment, and then they proceed to a stage where it's more vivid for them in their community. And then finally – and I do mean this to be a progression, an improvement, a growth, an evolution, if you will – people begin to discover the source of reality within them.

Now in a sense this is cumulative because when you discover the reality within you it doesn't mean you don't see it anymore anywhere else. But the location of reality within the human person, in addition to its tremendous ramifications for nonviolence and violence, is an effective discovery because that's where this reality is most accessible to us. As you can worship trees until the cows come home – that's a nice image – and, you know, you'll probably have a nice, robust, safe environment to grow up in, but you will not make the final realization of where the source of reality is and where happiness is coming from until you realize that that reality that you're worshipping in the tree is also in you.

And you're closer to you than the tree. So hard as it is to discover this reality, it's easier to discover it within you than anywhere else. Gandhi, for example, had three rules for successful prayer – which again, he didn't write up in any one place, but you can put it together from various remarks he made. And this is a very interesting list. First, the prayer has to be selfless. So, for example, you could be praying, "God, get the British off our backs." You know, or like that famous prayer in *Fiddler on the Roof*, "Blessing for the czar, may the Lord bless him and keep him...far away from us." So, if you're praying that because you just want them out of your face, it's not entirely a selfless prayer. If you're aware that it's not doing them any good to be in your country dominating you and exploiting you and that it's actually partly for their welfare that you want them to be relieved of the burden of empire, then it's a selfless prayer.

The second criterion is it has to be done with a great deal of concentration. It's not like, "Oh, Lord, I hope we have world peace. Now what's going on in Venezuela today?" That won't work. She is not listening. And thirdly – and this is why I bring it up here – you have to have some awareness that the entity to whom you're addressing your prayer is within you. Otherwise, it's just like you going and shouting to the wrong room.

So, the first question that came up about these three stages was did I mean this to apply to religious development everywhere? And the answer is, "I guess so, but I haven't really thought about it." I haven't thought about religion in China, which is very special. I haven't thought about most nature religions, of which there are some examples in Africa that are monotheistic and very advanced, even though they are nature-centered. And I haven't really thought about any of that. I've been thinking about mainly our experience in the West.

And I am including India where you meet with an advanced kind of monotheism at the very earliest stage – almost. I mean it's in very early Vedic hymns, probably about like 2000 B.C., which seem to be pure nature religion, polytheistic in nature, but very soon you have a special type of monotheism for which a word was invented. Oh, you're wearing your Oedipus shirt. That's going to be very convenient for us. You're going to have to get up and get you on camera at some point. Okay.

A term was invented by a Sanskrit scholar Max Miller, "Kathenotheism," which is sort of a made-up word from Greek. And it would mean god by god-ism. In other words, whichever god that you're worshipping is the God. So, if you [hin 00:09:21] to Indra, Indra is the supreme deity in the universe – Ahimta Agni, although in the pantheistic worldview, Agni is just the god of fire. In advanced worldview, Agni is the supreme reality as fire, and so forth. So that's my answer to the first question. Basically, I don't know. I haven't really thought about other religious environments than the west.

And then the other question that I picked up was about monotheism. And you quite understandably said, "Am I saying," I am the Nagler of Nagler's Theory of Religion by the way, "Am I saying that where you have monotheism you have nonviolence and where you have polytheism, you have violence?" No, no. Obviously not because look around you. I mean just look at the front page of the newspaper and you know we do not have a nonviolent world. The analogy is this though, and I'm really glad you brought this up because it hasn't quite occurred to me before. The analogy is very much to what we were talking about in connection with quantum theory.

Quantum theory pulls the philosophical underpinnings out from under any plausible worldview which could endorse violence. Okay? If you have a materialistic worldview, it means we're all separate. We can tell we're separate because we have separate bodies. I mean look at my body sitting up here on the desk. Shannon's body is way back there in the audience. So obviously, we're separate. So assumedly I could do something to hurt Shannon, and it wouldn't hurt me. But the mere thought of that is actually something that I shrink from, and I would not do.

So, when one can show, even from a scientific standpoint, that the world is not made of separate material particles, it really, philosophically, takes away the basis for violence. Okay? Now in the same way, but in a more important way, monotheism takes away the religious support for violence. Because if you have a real polytheistic religious belief system, you believe there are different gods. So, you live in Athens and your god is Athena and the Lacedaemonians worship Ares or something. This is a fundamental split in the universe, and these two forces can be opposed to one another, and there can be a zero-sum struggle between them at the deepest level of reality.

But when you say, “No,” as the Jews said some remote time in antiquity, “*Shema Yisrael, Adonai eloheinu, Adonai echad*. Hear people, the Lord our God, the Lord is one,” then you no longer have that structure. You can longer say – though people are going to go on saying it, for sure – it’s the God of the Hebrews against the God of the Canaanites. Because guess what? It’s the same God, really. But does that change everything all at once? Of course not, because people are plagued with a neurotic condition known as cognitive dissonance, and they say one thing, they do another, and they think a third.

But at least it puts a framework out there. It sets a goal, as Eli was stressing on Tuesday. We now see that paradise is in the future, not in the past. And that means we have the responsibility of growing towards it. We have a responsibility to realize this fact – that the supreme reality is one and it unites all of us. So, it’s a very handy thing, and it’s out there. And the question is, at what rate of speed people are going to catch onto it. Yeah?

Student: Where do you place atheism?

Michael: Atheism kind of places itself outside this whole framework. There’s a difference, of course, between atheism and agnosticism. And I think mostly what we’re talking about is agnosticism because atheism, like the [unintelligible 00:13:54], I swear, by god, that there is no God. It is in some way self contradictory. It’s said that an atheist is someone who goes down to the very basement of consciousness and knocks on the door and says, “Is there anybody here?” And hears a voice saying, “No.” He says, “I told you so.”

So, I mean in reality what we’re mostly talking about when we say atheism is agnosticism. And that just means in a modern context, it just means we haven’t found a religious commitment that makes any sense to us. And I still think it’s a matter of intuition as to whether we think that, you know, we’re fundamentally connected with other people or not.

Faith-Based Nonviolence

Let me give you an example – not of exactly this, but something that might help.

There are about 20 institutions, organizations in the world that are doing third party nonviolent intervention. And about half of them are faith-based groups. They're Christian Peacemaker teams, Muslim Peace Fellowship, Jewish Peace Fellowship, Buddhist Peace Fellowship, etc. And the other half are atheistic. They're noncommittal regarding any faith proposition. But the fact is, they're doing exactly the same thing. They're risking their lives to save the lives of people who they're not even related to.

So spiritually they're deeply religious people, but they don't belong to any structured faith commitment because sometimes today, none of these structured faith commitments work for us. And that's partly a result of the fact that we're all mushed together today so we're in contact with one another's religion and that's very confusing. And it's partly because of materialism. And it's partly because of the third stage in that descending hierarchy that Eli was talking about, where we've gone from revelation to accommodation to cooptation very quickly.

Honest people are quite fed up with all the religions that they see around them, but they still have the same feeling for oneness. And it's that feeling that we're talking about. Now in the ancient world it was simpler because – it wasn't less bloody – but it was simpler in that you mostly had a framework for your beliefs. Okay? Yes, Julia?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:16:32]

Michael: I think what Julia is saying, and that nobody heard, is correct, that there are modern nature-based religions which are only apparently polytheistic, but are really pantheistic in the Hindu sense, that they're seeing the same god in all forms of life. I think that's true. Yeah. But mind you, what I was starting to talk about here is our history, and I'll work our way up to our modern condition. Okay?

Now I'm looking around carefully for any questions, and I'm happy to go slowly – especially since I'm still in recovery.

Scapegoating

But I did want to talk a little bit about ritual and especially animal sacrifice in connection with Girard's famous model. What we're going to be concerned about is not so much Stage 1 where it's still with us, in a sense, and there's no documentation for it really anyway. But it's that shift from Stage 2 to Stage 3 where the communities worshipped to the individuals worshiped that really breaks loose a huge new possibility for nonviolence.

And, you know, as I'm sure you're aware, I don't think we've really completely made that shift yet. But I think that this is what Jesus was all about. This is what the Buddha was all about. And it's not a coincidence that in terms of social institutions, both Jesus and the Buddha – this is one of the few things that's known for fairly certain about Jesus – they were both against animal sacrifice. And why is that?

Well, partly for an obvious reason. If you see life everywhere and you feel for the suffering of animals, just pure compassion. Why are you killing these animals? They have absolutely nothing to do with it. I happened to be in a village on Crete once during a *yorty* – a festival. It's not too unusual. About every fourth or fifth day is a *yorty* somewhere in Greece. But this one was a big *yorty* in Crete, and they were going to have some meat, which they don't often have. And so, I was sitting there in the village drinking coffee with the boys – I can't imagine I was actually getting paid for this. Some kind of stupid research grant, but I was actually drinking coffee and singing folk songs with all of these – my friends in the village square.

And they brought this goat down from the mountain to be slaughtered. That animal was aware that something was going on. It was shaking, just trembling in every limb. And as it walked, clattering on by me, my friend Andrea said, “[Povati]. [Povati]. Poor creature is afraid.” So, all human beings have mirror neurons, right? And they're aware when an animal is suffering, and they feel bad when they kill it. But on the other hand, they want to eat. They eat meat. So, they're going to do it anyway, so they invent an enormous fabrication, basically, to make it not only okay, but a religious requirement that they do this.

And one of the powers that you have to deal with then in this process is the guilt. You have to deal with the guilt for killing the animal. So, let's look at a particular ritual. I'm going to look at two Greek rituals. Oh, I completely forgot my announcements. I'll talk about them later.

Buphonia - Ox- Murder

There was a ritual in ancient Greece called Buphonia, which is a very obvious word to understand. “Phonia” means a murder or a slaughter. And “Bu” means, “Ox.” So, this is the ox-murder ritual.

And there's two useful features that it has that we can learn from. One is the way they set up. They would draw a sacred precinct – big circle. And they'd say, “No one is allowed inside this circle.” And they would say that in Greek so that people were okay with it. They understood that. And then they would sprinkle some barley on the altar which was in the middle of the circle. And then they would release an ox outside the circle. Okay, for \$64,000 what do you think the ox is going to do? Obviously, it's going to, “Oh, barley. Ha-ha.” [Laughter].

Poor ox has not had Greek 10, does not what he's just been told. Goes and eats the barley. At which point the priest and all of his administrators, “Sacrilege. Sacrilege.” They run after the poor creature, and they slaughter it. And they barbecue it and distribute the meat as well as all these various very well scripted components. But so, the first feature is that the animal is tricked into innocently violating a regulation and making itself guilty. The second feature is the person who actually takes the *machairi*, the knife, and slaughters it. Then has been infected by the guilt.

So, he has to run out of the community and throw the knife off a cliff into the sea because the sea will purify the [elumata 00:23:01], the pollution from the murder. And then he himself has to be exiled from the community for a period of – in some cases – ten years. This is all crazy. But that’s how people work, you know? And what I’m trying to give us a sense of is the power, the power of this kind of ritual. No contract was considered legally binding in the ancient world, Stage 2 world, the community is sacred. No power – no contract is binding if it’s not sealed with a ritual of some kind. The most potent kind of ritual was an offering ritual. And the most potent kind of offering was where you killed an animal. And then there are further classifications of whether you burn it completely or eat it, but that ceases to become irrelevant for us. Hey, John?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:24:00]

Michael: No. They do all this partly because they want to eat meat. People, you know, some people do want to do that. And in some cases, it’s important for their nutrition, but they also do it because of the Girardian model that Eli was telling you about on Tuesday.

Power Shifting of Sacrifice

Okay, once you’ve got this extreme power shift under your control in the culture you can use it as the single reliable mechanism for keeping disruptive violence limited so that the community does not destroy itself. Because there have been communities where violence has gotten out of hand, and they destroyed themselves. It happened on Easter Island, most probably. Hatfield and the McCoy kind of feuding gets out of hand. It could happen in Afghanistan.

You need something before you have a body of agreed upon law to keep that violence in check. And the only way you can do it is with this stupid ugly – pardon my value loading here – the stupid, ugly, mechanism of scapegoating which enables you to vent that violence in a unanimous way on a victim who cannot react back on the community. So, you often choose, for example, this is pretty horrific, but you know, we’re grown-ups here. You often choose orphans. Now why do you choose orphans? Because they have no relatives, by definition. As George Bush says, “Most of our exports come from outside the country.”

So, most orphans have no relatives. And because they have no relatives, there will be nobody to take revenge for them. That’s why the Koran says, “Protect the orphan because you have been protected when you have no protector.” The Koran, in saying that, is actually making an explicit attempt. The prophet is doing exactly the same thing that Jesus, the earlier prophet, and Buddha did before him, which was to try to cancel out the sacrifice system, the scapegoating system because of its horrific violence which is actually self-repeating. So that’s why the system is perpetuated. You had a question too. Your name is? Elizabeth.

Student: I was just going to ask like [unintelligible 00:26:41]

Michael: The Greeks, in particular, that I know a little bit about, they did eat meat on other occasions other than part of a sacrifice. But they had a little way around that. They had what are called [tropet zomata 00:27:02] which are little depressions in the family table. And you would put aside a portion of everything for the gods. What exactly the gods did with it, I don't know. I suspect it was more the rats that got to it. But you were, in a sense, sacrificing a little bit. But whether you only ate meat on that occasion or not, the sacrifice put the seal of approval, if you will, on all other occasions.

Now in early 1st century Palestine, the temple in Jerusalem had become just basically a huge abattoir, just a slaughterhouse. People were going in there with everything they could get their hands on. You know, pigeons, sheep, goats, what have you. And this meant a living for the priests, it meant it was important for economic circulation of wealth, establishing the hierarchy of the community. You did that in accordance with where people were standing on the ritual. And as I say, it enabled you to vent some of this unanimous violence.

Okay, so there's one other feature of Greek sacrificial practice that I want to mention. And that is that in order for the system to work, you had to convince yourself that the victim was guilty. This is probably the most important feature in Girard's whole system. And you can do this in some pretty wacky ways. Either the victim is guilty, or the victim actually wants to be sacrificed. And that's why you have these myths about how after a sacrifice the victim becomes deified, which you know, is a very nice thing to happen.

Communal Sacrifice of Sheep

Sheep were often sacrificed in the Greek countries, Greek territories. And they often bring the sheep forward to be sacrificed and they would say to it, "We're going to sacrifice you right now. Are you okay with that?" And then they would sprinkle water on the sheep's head. Okay? Anybody ever sprinkled water on a sheep's head? What is a sheep going to do if you sprinkle water on its head? Exactly. Like that. You shake it off. Okay?

What's the gesture for yes in Greek? No is – it's exactly the opposite from us. *Ochi, ochi*. But yes is *nai, nai, nai*. So, I know how stupid this sounds and it's not such a great idea to make fun of somebody else's religion, even though it's been dead for 2000 years. But what I'm trying to emphasize is people are going to go to extreme lengths to construct a guilt or an acquiescence of the victim as a means of proving that the sacrifice was effective and channeling the guilt, so it's taken off from the community.

Now when you start getting into actually practicing this against human beings, you've got another situation. And for the system to work, you have to have a perfect victim. You've heard of the perfect storm, well, we have the perfect victim in Mr. Oedipus, the fellow with the swollen foot – which proves already that there's something wrong with

him. And you go right down the list, and he's violated every single possible prohibition against being victimized. And he's the perfect victim up to and including the fact that he actually punishes himself, so you don't have to take the knife and run 10,000 miles and throw it in the sea, all that stuff.

So as Eli was saying last time, Oedipus is – you know, here people have studied this play for 2000 years and it is extremely beautiful. I still remember [*O tekna kodmu tupolina atraphay* 00:31:36]. It's an extremely powerful play. Freud had some things to say about it, I gather. And there's probably some point to all of that also. And, you know, it's just a gut-wrenching profound piece of literature. But when you get right down to it, folks, in terms of its social effect, it's a text of persecution, and it enables the community to go on persecuting.

The plague afflicting the City of Thebes stands for violence running out of control. The investigator discovers that he, himself, is the victim and he carries out his own punishment and it's just perfect. So, the minute that the victim can actually speak and say, "Hey, what the hell is going on here?" Or as Job says, "Look fellas, you can do whatever you want, but as far as I know, I didn't do any of those things that you're talking about." The system is busted wide open. And that's why Girard was very excited about this text because he thinks here it shows you the Jews were trying to get away from the scapegoating process.

There are other examples of that also in Jewish culture. There is a law in Deuteronomy which states that if someone has been accused of a crime and the entire community condemns that person, he is to be released. Why is that? Why would they have such a law, do you think? See, that shows you how cunning some of these mechanisms are.

The reason is that if it were a real person committing a real crime, probably there'd be someone who would say he was innocent. If everybody is against him, what are we talking about? It's unanimous violence. The community has picked him out as a scapegoat. Now notice how complicated this is. He may be actually guilty.

Retributive Justice

And the fact is, that we're going to see a lot of situations where there may be people who are actually guilty of real crimes, but the community is, nonetheless, treating them as a scapegoat in the sense that they think that if they get rid of the person, they will get rid of the crime, get rid of the process.

And that leads you directly to the modern criminal justice system, which is explicitly in California since 1976, based on retribution, not on rehabilitation. Okay. So, this is, again, an example that the Jews were trying to – they had kind of instinctively recognized that the sacrificial system was causing a lot of violence and somehow were trying to get rid of it. And they recognized that you have these situations where

everybody in the community feels like pointing to one person, blaming him or her, and that's got to be stopped.

So now you come to Jesus, and he is walking along one day, and he sees a woman taken in adultery. And incidentally, sexual dysfunction or abnormality, or I don't know what to call it – abhorrent behavior. These are all constructed terms, partly. Sexual noticeable differences of some kind are almost always associated with the ritual victim that has to be sacrificed for the purification of the community.

That's why they're getting ready to stone this woman because you can't touch her, or you'll get infected by the guilt. So, they're trying to kill her in the worst possible way. And I'm sorry to say, this is actually being carried out for exactly the "same crime" today in Iran, just trying to illustrate that these things have not yet gone away. Right? They've been driven underground, but they're still with us, and it's important for us to be able to recognize them.

So where are we? Jesus is coming along, and he sees this woman and they're getting ready to stone her and they don't know what he's going to do. He goes – he's thinking, I guess. I don't know if avatars think. He seems to be thinking, writes something on the ground. He stands up, and they have tremendous respect for him. What is he going to say? He says, "Okay, whoever has no guilt, can throw the first stone." Very clever because if people had no guilt, they wouldn't care about the woman. Or maybe that's her husband's problem. You know, they have no interest in it, basically.

Plus, the fact, of course, that everybody has erred. And what we're doing is we're trying to offload our feeling of guilt onto a scapegoat. And incidentally, the term, "Scapegoat," is a Jewish term. It goes back to a practice where they would take a goat and everybody in the community would lay hands on the goat and curse the goat, all of their guilt would go into the goat, and they would drive the goat out into the wilderness. Probably works as well as modern medicines, far as I know. I'm rather bitter because they couldn't find any way to cure me this weekend.

So obviously, one of the main missions that Jesus felt that he had was to break open the sacrifice system. And that's undoubtedly why he had trouble with the temple authorities. You know the episode I'm referring to, where he'll go through the temple with a whip, driving out the moneylenders which some people think was not a very nonviolent thing to do, but I'm okay with it.

And he clearly had some of the Jewish – especially the Jewish religious authorities – on his case. And that may have been one of the things that led to his execution at a very early age. But now we come to the chilling mind, just going to be adding to what Matthew was saying – what Eli was saying last time – this line is from Matthew. Soon as I stop this, I'm going to stop and see if you have any questions from Tuesday or subsequently that we should talk about.

This is Matthew 27, verse 25. Pilate has just finished the trial. He's just literally washed his hands. That's his way of throwing the knife in the sea. No guilt on this boy. And then he says to the [lau-us 00:39:24], the people – and I'll have to get back to that, is how this line got into Matthew is a very interesting problem. He says to the [lau-us 00:39:35], the people... I'm sorry, this is in Greek and it's very small, so it's taking me a while. Okay. "I'm guiltless from the blood of this person." And the people said back to him – this is like the most terrible line in the Bible – "His blood be upon us and upon our children." Who said that? Can you, in your wildest imagination, imagine the Jewish people standing around while one of their beloved leaders is being crucified and saying, "We'll take all the guilt, and let it be on our descendants also." Does that sound plausible to you?

And if not, who put that line in there? Well, there's not an immediate answer for this question. But I have a friend who has written a book on the Book of Matthew. The book is called, "Healing the Rift," the Jewish-Christian rift. And she said at one point in that book, "God have mercy on the person who put that line in the book of Matthew because this has brought persecution down on the Jewish race for 2000 years." You can see what this line does. This is making the New Testament narrative into a text of persecution where the victims become the victimizers. The Jewish people have now taken on the guilt for the crucifixion, the sacrifice of one of their teachers and their popular leaders.

So, we have to go back. This is very heavy. I find this kind of chilling. I mean when I read this line nowadays – and really – it chills up my spine. I just think it's horrendous to think about it. How much blood has been spilled and how much violence has been caused by inserting that line into a foundational text for the biggest religion in the world? Question?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:41:42]

Michael: Yes. That also is a very interesting line. I've been thinking about that of late, "Forgive them Father, for they know not what they do." One level, it's an extremely noble thing, and I can easily imagine Jesus saying that. You know, if Gandhi was able to die saying, "Rama Rama Rama," to the face of the person who killed him, I can imagine Jesus forgiving the people who were torturing him.

But on the other hand, I have deep suspicion about that line, and I think there's not a coincidence that it's the climax of Mel Gibson's movie, which Mel Gibson is both one of the most violent and one of the most anti-Semitic people in Hollywood today. I haven't seen the movie, and I'm not recommending it, but I understand that people were very moved when that line came on because what he was saying is that people killing me are not guilty. And who would want to say that? Who's writing this text from the Girardian point of view?

So, on one level, it's not Jesus who's writing that text. It's the people who killed him who are writing that text. It's the victimizers who write the text of the persecution. The minute

the victim can speak, the system is broken open and doesn't work anymore. This is a very, very powerful dynamic. Joy?

Student: So, you're saying that the victimizers of Jesus wrote that line?

Historical Jesus & Nonviolence

Michael: I'm basically saying that. I've got no way to prove it. But let me give you the context for why I say that it was the Romans or the Romanizers who inserted that line in Matthew. Okay, there has been – we're just about right on time here. There has been a very interesting development that Eli started talking to you about, and I want to say a little more about. It's called a "Jesus of History movement." It actually goes back to German theologians in the 19th century who invented this concept of *Entmythologisierung* which means, "demythologization," where they – you know, how the Germans are very systemic and can be literal minded about some things. And they went back to the Bible and said, "What do we think really happened here, and how do we know?"

And they started this movement. Albert Schweitzer was a main proponent of it, but in the last 30 years, it's really shot ahead because they've been able to combine micro-archeological evidence, sociological theory, and astute textual analysis. And textual analysis, I'm happy to say, is actually a product of classics, my old field. We doped out how to figure out what Sophocles actually wrote – the best possible way to do that. And you can apply that to sacred scripture also.

And by careful, careful study of the four Gospels which differ a lot among themselves, and even within themselves, they're able to dope out, you know, it's part of this that is very interesting. But it's not totally relevant for us, and I'm trying to keep it within the bounds of where it's helpful for us, most immediately. But you can tell that they're the earliest text, even if it was a written text, we have not yet found a written copy of, okay?

Now there are 26 gospels extant today. I don't know if you knew that. There are several different genres – sayings, gospels, narrative gospels. But if you look at them with an unbiased eye as a historian, they have the same historical claim to validity as the four that were chosen by the bishops in the 4th century.

Incidentally, we know a lot about that process too. How they threw out some gospels and kept others. This is a time of tremendous religious diversity. There were groups that we call, "Gnostics," today who were so suppressed that we knew nothing about them until a young shepherd boy named Muhammad was looking for his goats somewhere near Nag Hammadi, and he threw a rock into a cave to see if his goats were in there. And it went, "Ping!" instead, "Bleaaap." And he figured that he'd hit a jar of some kind, and he went in and discovered this incredible library of Coptic and other languages text that had been hidden in that cave by the Gnostics during a persecution.

The reason I'm mentioning them is that a lot of these religious experiments that were going on were more nonviolent in some ways than the one that we ended up with. For example, the Gnostics were not patriarchal.

Gnostic Gospels

You can read a book about that by Elaine Pagels called, "The Gnostic Gospels."

Okay, I'm so enthusiastic about all this stuff that I get carried away, and I forget where I was. Okay, so the earliest "document" that we don't have, but we can infer the existence of, is called, "Q" because Q is the first letter of the German word *Quelle* which means, "Force," sorry – "Source." Not may the force be with you, may the source be with you.

So, Q was a set of sayings of Jesus. And it came into existence pretty early, only shortly after the execution. Whether it had written existence or not, we're not sure. Mark is the earliest gospel writer and he used Q extensively. The other two synoptic writers are Matthew and Luke. They come on about 20 years later. They start adding stuff – Luke and then Matthew, right Eli? And then John. And that's how it goes.

Now Eli mentioned this fellow John Dominic Crossan who's been one of the really assiduous scholars bearing down on all this material. And he says, "Look closely at the trial scene and you'll see it migrating." In the earliest phase Pilate has Jesus and Barabbas there. And some of Barabbas's people come and they say, "We want Barabbas back." That's all they say. They never heard of Jesus, maybe. They don't care who he is.

It's like the Weathermen coming and saying, "We want Patty Hearst back," or something. "You've got one of our leaders." And, in fact, Barabbas, as Eli was saying, was probably leading a violent revolution.

But that's all we say. There's nothing in there about, you know, crucify him, crucify him. The next version of it, it's just a few people, it's a crowd. And in the final version in Matthew, it's [Lau-us], the people, the Jews. So, what somebody is doing is turning this step by step into a text of persecution where the Jews are responsible for the death of Jesus.

So, the historical Jesus movement has turned up two things of very grave importance. And this is almost as big as, you know, quantum theory or the 9/11 discrepancies. They're so big that people aren't paying any attention to them. But we are paying attention, in this class.

The two things are, first, that the "Jews" did not kill Jesus. They adored him. They thought he was probably their messiah. Some Jews had trouble with him for that very reason. Undoubtedly, the religious hierarchy. And they may have acted in collusion with the Roman authorities. But he was basically executed by Pontius Pilate who executed

thousands of people, and it didn't seem to cost him a night's sleep at any time in his long and bloody career.

And so that's one thing, that this idea that the Jews killed Jesus was extremely convenient for the Romans, because they actually did it. And anyone who was trying to spread the religion of Jesus among the Romans would want to make it look that way. Okay, who wanted to spread the religion of Jesus among the Romans? I know that religious education is not – yeah, Amy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:51:20]

Michael: Any other religious studies majors here?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:51:26]

Michael: Well, not a gospel writer, actually. But he's a writer in the New Testament, for sure. In fact, I'll give you a hint, his letters are earlier than many of the gospels.

Student: Is it Paul?

Michael: Yeah. There's a big – I'm sorry. I get so excited by this stuff. Let me get back to the second most – the other important thing and then we can come follow up this track. Okay, the first important thing is that the Jews didn't kill Jesus. In fact, what actually happened was the greatest crime, in my opinion, ever committed against the Jewish people. Jesus was taken away from them, from us, and was made to look – he was made into a club to beat us with for 2000 years. I'm very upset about that, as you can imagine. I only discovered it about 15 years ago, and I'm still kind of peeved. So, this was actually – I mean once you've taken my personal little problems aside – it was a horrendous crime against a group of people.

The Kingdom Movement

Secondly, Jesus was pretty obviously starting a nonviolent revolution which he called, "The Kingdom Movement." If he were starting a violent revolution all of his followers would have been killed along with him. That is how Pontius Pilate and all the procurators operated. They didn't do that to him because his group was nonviolent, and they didn't perceive him as a threat. But they knew that Jesus had this enormous following, and they could not predict what he would say. So, it seemed safer on the whole to kill him.

There's another theory, it's not particularly relevant for us, but it's interesting that Jesus was actually, in fact, a descendent of David, and he was messianic, and he thought that he was starting a messianic movement. And that was a big threat to the Roman authorities, obviously.

Okay, I think I've finally got the bit in my teeth. I can slow down a little bit here. So, if Jesus' religion was a religion of nonviolence and that means that he was totally against

the sacrificial system, that had another feature to it and that meant that he was against the ultimate control of the individual by the state. Because that's what the temple hierarchy stood for. Ancient Judaism was a religious state, not unlike modern Judaism, and not unlike Tibet.

He was trying to create some freedom for the individual over the religious hierarchy, and that made the priests nervous because they knew perfectly well they had no other authority. He was trying to get individuals to come into their own relationship with God that was within them. And that's why he said, as the Greek gospel writer said, "[Hay basallayah eton uranon entos humon 00:54:43] The kingdom of God is within you." And that's a very difficult line to deal with.

Teresa of Avila used this line for a homework exercise, gave it to some heavyweights like John of the Cross and people like that, and they couldn't come up with a good essay.

Student: Isn't it also translated as [unintelligible 00:55:05].

Michael: Yes, it is. [Entos humon] is in the plural and it could mean it's already in the world, as a social reality. It could mean that also. But I don't like that idea as well. That actually puts me in mind. I should say that everything that I've just said has to be, in the nature of the case, somewhat personal and tentative because as a colleague of mine here says, "It is very difficult to get any traction on any historical reality in that time and place."

The destruction in 70 AD was so total that there's very little left in the way of documents, monuments, and so forth. Even this ossuary that you may have heard of, where this incredibly exciting discovery. They found this bone coffin and it was labeled, "James, brother of Jesus." They still don't know whether that's actually a fake or not. You may have read in the newspapers that it's a fake, but the actual archeologists are not sure.

So, I just want to pick up one other part of the story. And that is that evidently, again, the evidence for this is as reasonable as you can get, but nothing is certain. Evidently, there was a group of Jews who became followers of Jesus. We don't exactly – some call them Jewish Christians. But there was a word for them. A known word in Hebrew was "*Ebionites*," from the Hebrew word, "[Ebioneem]," which means, "The poor ones."

And they were probably led by Jesus' younger brother, James, who himself was murdered very brutally in '62. And these Ebionites – it's been argued by a guy whose work, I think sounds pretty good to me. His name is Keith Akers. A-K-E-R-S. He wrote a book called, "The Lost Religion of Jesus."

There's a whole shelf full of books called, "Lost Christian," "Lost Scriptures," "Lost Religion and Jesus," coming out now. And these titles are very accurate. This religion went lost. Now the Ebionites survived down to approximately the 6th century when, interestingly enough, they were taken up by the Sufi's. Their teachings were absorbed into the mystical dimension of Islam, according to Akers.

And the reason I'm talking about them is that they were very nonviolent, and they practiced simple living, nonviolence, complete abstention from animal slaughter and all of those good things. So, it really looks as if that's where the heart and soul of Jesus' religion went. While at the same time, a version of it, an export model if you will, was being brought to the West by Paul and company. And I'm not saying that this was necessarily a bad thing because it's a lot better than running around in the woods painting yourself blue and roasting all of your enemies in a big wicker tent, which is what the Germanic tribes were doing at that time.

I'm not saying that Christianity in Europe was not an improvement over the preceding polytheistic religions, sometimes called, "Paganism." But it does not seem to have fulfilled the nonviolent potential of Jesus' religion. So, what we're going to see next week is a series of waves of rediscovery, where people are going to read even the four gospels that they had, with some sensitivity and see that, you know, Mel Gibson got it wrong, Jesus was very gentle and strong and nonviolent.

And you're going to see subsequent rediscoveries of this. And in every stage it's going to lead to a big conflict with the state because it's not a state religion, Jesus' religion. It's a religion of the person. And it's going to lead to conflict with the war system because this is the primary mode in which the state exerts control over the individual – that we can take you and make you lose your life and make you kill another for the purposes of the state. That's the ultimate control that the state will exercise over the individual. And these revelation people coming down the ages every few centuries will be rediscovering both of those two principles, by and large.

Okay, well, I have – yes?

Student: I have a question. Why was James killed?

Michael: Why was he killed? It seems like it was pretty much for the same reason, that he was causing difficulties to the temple authorities. And things were very tense at that time. It was only a few years before the Bar Kokhba Rebellion was going to break out. And the Jews were a very difficult people to keep control of.

Student: [Unintelligible 01:00:39]

Michael: Yeah, he'd be a good example of that because then he goes and dies himself.

Student: Yeah, he kills himself.

Michael: He kills himself, so he takes the problem. Like your man. Yeah.

Student: [Unintelligible 01:00:57]

Michael: Paganism was – okay, that's a prejudicial term. I was hoping nobody would notice I used it. But it's basically the pre-Christian religions of Europe, we're calling Paganism.

Student: [Unintelligible 01:01:14]

Michael: Pre-Christian religions, yeah. Yes, Sid?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:01:21]

Student: Would you say that was just like the Roman interpretation of God and stuff? Like they kind of brought up into the clouds [unintelligible 01:01:47].

Michael: Okay, this is unfortunately one of the things that happened to early Christianity to make it more palatable, was to create accommodation. And one of the ways that accommodation was facilitated was to say, “Okay, people this was all symbolic.” So, when Jesus says that the *pneuma*, the spirit appeared out of the heavens. It was like in the form of a bird that came down from the sky. But I guess it’s the opposite of symbolic. It’s literalizing what was symbolic and making symbolic what was literal.

I mean you have to have some sympathy for people’s problems. I was once driving Norman Cousins to a breakfast somewhere. I love name dropping, but it doesn’t work with most of you because you don’t know who any of my famous friends were. Anyway, I was driving him to breakfast, and he said, “What do you think would happen if people took the gospel seriously?”

And I said, “My God, it would spoil your whole day.” So, the fact is, that most human beings need a certain degree of accommodation. And what the essential thing that Paul did was he – this is going to be a funny kind of word – dehumanized Jesus by deifying him. And that was the removal that you’re talking about, Sid. That made it easier for people to say, “You know, when I first heard about Gandhi, I thought whoa, you know, he’s – I’m glad he existed, but no relevance to my life.” It was the same sort of thing.

Paul did that. I’m not even going to tell you that I think he was wrong. But I am going to say that on one level, at least, it was a pity. And on another much more important level, it’s time for us to get over it. That’s really what’s important now. That’s where I think the value of the Jesus of History Movement is now. Shannon?

Student: I actually was – you had it right after – it’s funny, because [unintelligible 01:04:04].

Michael: Yes, you remember that comment of Attenborough’s where somebody said, “Oh, Gandhi should not appear as a human being. He should just be a disembodied voice.” And he said, “I’m not going to have Tinkerbelle on the screen.” Yeah. It is the same problem. It made it possible to use a monotheistic system with much higher ethical values than people had at the time accessible to them. But it was nowhere near realizing for the ordinary person what Jesus had stood for. And I think Eli put it very well – that ultimate act of love of sacrificing your life because you knew there was no other way that people would understand who you were and what you stood for. That challenge was too much for most people.

But it also has to be said that it was not too much for some people. And there have been these revelatory figures who’ve come up. Probably, Saint Francis of Assisi is the

one who comes to mind most readily, who said, “No, I know exactly what he did, and I’m going to do the same thing.” And I’m glad that Eli mentioned Walter Wink because he’s an important theologian today. Wrote a book – no, that was John Dear who wrote a book called, “Our God is Nonviolent.” But Walter Wink wrote a lot of books about how it is just about impossible to read even the four gospels we’ve got which have already been worked over, considerably. But even to read them with some sensitivity and think that Jesus was in favor of the Crusades, for example, or persecutions, for example. You have to be half-blind in order to do that. It seems that there are a lot of people like that, and they’re not all in Alabama either.

18. Medieval and Modern Nonviolent Christian Sects

1: the Society of Friends (Quakers)

Michael: Okay, hi. Good morning everyone. I hope you like my Halloween costume. I came disguised as a nonviolence professor. I hope it fools you. In the meditation class this morning I started off by saying, “I see you’re all disguised as separate individuals.” That was for the meditators. So, you’re getting a sheet that’s being passed around. There should be enough for everyone. I’ll also send out a copy of it on CourseWeb describing – or at least listing – some tips to how you can approach the question of writing a paper for us.

And several people were asking me about all the books that I referred to about the Jesus of History versus the Christ of Faith movement. And so, these are some of the main books that can get you started. This is the one that actually started it all off. And most of you got this on CourseWeb with some comments from me.

It started the modern version of it anyway, Geza Vermes is a very, very distinguished Jewish scholar, of Hungarian origin who wrote a book called, “Jesus the Jew,” back in the 80’s when it was not common to remember that, in fact, he was Jewish.

There’s a joke about the Pope calling up the Chief Rabbi of Jerusalem and saying, “Rabbi, we’ve got some wonderful for you. We’ve decided to canonize Einstein.” And the Rabbi says, “Well, that’s nice.” And the Pope says, “I’m not sure you quite appreciate, this is the first time in history that the church has so honored a person who was born and died a Jew.” And the Rabbi says, “No, it isn’t.”

So that was back in the days when we had still conveniently forgotten Jesus’ Jewish origins. Geza Vermes has also done a complete translation into English of the Dead Sea Scrolls documents, the ones that are long enough to translate. What I’d like to do is say a few words about the midterm, now that you’ve had a chance to look at your copy of it. And then I’m actually going to talk a little bit about Islam, even though Camilla appears not to be here today, right? Camilla? No, she’s not here. And then we’ll get back to the question of the historical Jesus and what happened to the nonviolence that was at the heart of that original religion.

Three Institutions of Religion

And we’re going to be – when we get around to that – we’re going to be looking basically at three institutions. One, is the state itself because the state becomes the formalization at a very big scale of what was the community in Stage 2 religions. And the minute you have a Stage 3 religion, in my terms, that is you have a person-centered religion, the state loses its absolute control of authority.

Max Weber, among others, has said, the very definition of the state is that collective which has the monopoly on legitimate violence. That's how we define what a state is, consciously or unconsciously. And the second institution, of course, is scapegoating which after ritual animal sacrifice has been more or less abolished. It goes on the ground, and it shows up in remarkable forms. And, of course, war, which is not so subtle, easier to talk about.

Non- Embarrassment

Okay, but I wanted to say a few things about the ID's first. Non-embarrassment was an embarrassment for us because it's a technical term, and we meant it as such and it really – as such – it does not refer to the overriding principle which admittedly is much more important, that the wellbeing of your opponent and of yourself, the wellbeing of everyone, intimately involves the dignity of that person. And so, in principled nonviolence you should never have to invoke any kind of mechanism that would compromise the dignity of the other. And you should never put up with a compromise to your own dignity. But, of course, that can be a little bit different.

You remember the story I told you about somebody who was slapped by a bully and wrote to Gandhi and said, "I felt ashamed, I felt humiliated. What should I have done?" And Gandhi said, "If you felt humiliated, you should have hit him back. I don't care how big he was. But your problem was you should not have felt humiliated." So, it's a little bit subtler when it involves yourself. But nothing in nonviolence should involve the compromise of the dignity of a person – whatever side they're on. That's a big issue, of course, and I'm glad that a lot of you remembered about it.

But non-embarrassment is something much more specific. Who'd like to – someone who got all four points on that one or who has learned their lesson since then who'd like to succinctly tell us what non-embarrassment is as a nonviolent strategy?

Student: If your opponent is distracted by something [unintelligible 00:06:01].

Michael: Yeah. Julia is correct. That it's a question of distraction which would almost be more called non-distraction than non-embarrassment. It's embarrassment in the sense of encumbrance. And it's good if you're answering an ID like that, to describe why that is important. Does anybody want to try that? Why does it matter so much not to take advantage of your opponent when they're distracted? Joy?

Student: Maybe because that's not [unintelligible 00:06:38].

Michael: Yeah. It's not the central issue, that's true. Sid?

Student: Because then they'll give in to their demand, not because they have a change of heart, just because they're forced into this awkward position.

Michael: Yeah. I think Sid's point is the basic one. That you always want, if at all possible, now obviously there are – sometimes there are constraints of time and you

can't achieve this. But you always want the opponent to see the light. You want to talk them around. And what you're doing, if you take advantage of something like the English Railroad Workers strike or WWII or little things like that, you take advantage of the fact that your opponent is distracted by these. You're shifting the whole interaction from a conversation and learning experience to a power struggle. Is that what you were going to say, Rami?

Student: I was going to say if you don't – if your opponent doesn't gain an understanding [unintelligible 00:07:35].

Michael: Right. So, you may force your opponent into a position that's comfortable for you, that you get rid of some oppression in the short-term, but they haven't really changed their mind and their thinking. So, the problem is just going to come back up at some point down the road. So that's why non-embarrassment is closely related to no fresh issue. That's exactly the same point, the same reasoning behind it. You don't want the fresh issue to come up because it will shift things to a power struggle, and you may win in the short term, but you will not have improved the situation in the long haul.

Okay. When you talk about something like the Harijan Struggle or Champaran or even Chauri Chaura, sometimes you get into describing what it was, and you forget to tell us what the outcome was. And I think it's kind of important. Like if we ask you what was the Epic Fast? You want to tell us it's 1932. Describe the issue. Separate electorate thing. Why was it so important to Gandhi? And tell us that he succeeded, that he went head-to-head with Ambedkar. He said to Ambedkar, "Five years or my life." Ambedkar said, "Well, I guess it's your life then because I'm not conceding on the five years." And the other Indians worked on Ambedkar around the clock until they got him around to compromise position. So, the thing worked. I think that's important to mention.

Influence of Hinduism on Gandhi

With regard to Tolstoy, there is a very commonly held misbelief. I don't say myth because I used to teach myths and I like them, but I don't like lies. So, it's a misbelief that Tolstoy, and especially Thoreau, influenced Gandhi significantly. And this is mostly held by people who do not understand that the Brahmanism or the background of Hindu religion was nonviolent from the get-go. And he didn't actually need any of these people. But Gandhi explicitly disavowed that Thoreau had influenced him.

He said, "I was really happy to see that he came up with the term civil disobedience. I borrowed that term from him." Similarly, he was thrilled to find that Tolstoy was a pacifist in the Christian fold, respected intellectual living in the West. It was great to find a kindred spirit over there, but he didn't get pacifism from Tolstoy, and he didn't get civil disobedience from Thoreau. Okay? Just to set the record straight.

If you talk about Tolstoy Farm which was one of the four ashrams. We consider it important to mention that there were others. In other words, this is a set. You know, the

contextualization issue. And then it's awfully nice if you can go on to say that Tolstoy Farm and Phoenix Settlement were not explicitly called ashrams versus the ones in India which were. And that's because it sort of shows Gandhi was signaling to his compatriots that he was coming out as a spiritual leader. He never wanted to be called that and he always disavowed the term Mahatma. He said it caused him a lot of pain. But the fact is, that he was letting people know by calling these communities ashrams, that he was a spiritual teacher of some kind.

The South African government and the struggles that Gandhi has with them – there's a – now we didn't take off points for this, but just to get the record straight again, they were not British. If you called Jan Christian Smuts British, he would probably arrange to have you disappeared at the next possible opportunity. They were Afrikaans and they were Boers. And in fact, the last phase of Gandhi's South African career, if you remember, mostly is around him, and it takes place mostly in the Transvaal. And that was not a British colony at that time.

Non-attachment to Results

Okay, let's see. Yeah, the fruits of action – this phalam thing – it can be a little bit subtle because you want to say – you want to say that you shouldn't be attached to the outcome, but you can't say that you shouldn't be concerned about the outcome. That would be ridiculous, obviously, for Gandhi to do everything that he did and then not be concerned whether India gets its independence or not, that would not make sense. Of course, he wants it to happen.

But the difference is he is not clinging to it personally. He is more interested in his motivation and in the methods that he uses, and relatively less interested in the outcome. But especially the thing to avoid is to be motivated by personal benefit. That's really – if you wanted a single formula that would capture that concept in the Gita Theory of Action, that would be the one. You are not driven to the act by the personal benefit that you can accrue to you from that act. Okay? Any questions about this or the other stuff I've said so far?

In the case of Abdul Ghaffar Khan – yeah?

Tolstoy Farm

Student: I'm still a little confused about the Tolstoy Farm. Did you say he referred it to as an ashram?

Michael: He did not. At least the name was not – it was not Tolstoy Ashram. It was Tolstoy Farm. And that's partly because it wasn't in India. But it's partly because, I think, he was stepping into his position in India. So, you have Sabarmati Ashram and Satyagraha Ashram in India. Most of you got pretty well what the power and the function

of those communities were because there were several such functions. It doesn't really seem that it has been our destiny to see nonviolence played out on a very large scale, yet.

There are two quasi exceptions to this, the Realm of Ashoka in India and the Pennsylvania colony we're going to be talking about probably on Thursday. But by and large nonviolence is something that's been worked out on a small scale and as a model to be used for larger scale developments. So, one of the most important things about those communities, call them ashrams or farms or what you will, is that you could do pure nonviolence there. And incidentally, I guess there's a fourth institution that I haven't mentioned that we could be thinking about in terms of looking at the degree of nonviolence in a Western society, and that is criminal justice. We'll be talking a good bit about it next semester in the B class.

Gandhi's Alternative to Punishment

But you note that in Phoenix Settlement, I think, there was an episode where some of the young people – teenagers – misbehaved. I don't know exactly what the misbehavior was. Probably something absolutely shocking and terrible like smoking a cigarette or something like that. And Gandhi felt that something had to be done about this. But he intuitively felt that punishment was ruled out in his community. In a nonviolent community, punishment is not used. So, what could he do? What he did was, he fasted to take on the harm and purify it in his own person. And in the course of doing so, of course these young people would see what they had done to him, and that would be much more powerful as a way of changing them than if he caused them to suffer physically or some other way on top of that.

So, in that little way also he laid out a model for a way that society might be able to deal with criminal behavior without getting into this horrible endless cycle, this trap that we've fallen into where we know have like 2 million people in the U.S. are part of the criminal justice system in one part of the cycle or another.

Okay, so now about the essay. The only thing I want to add, I guess, is that if you do one of the historical questions, you know, take South Africa or take India, in the ones that I read, nobody really was able to put across that this thing had a rhythm. It built up slowly, it had a climax, and a denouement, if you will. So, think about that, when you go into the final exam. A good example for part of it is that famous little section that I quoted that you have in your reader from Satyagraha in South Africa. Gandhi's description of the five or six or seven Satyagrahas that preceded the outbreak of the real freedom struggle in India.

And he will show you that there was a steady progression. The confrontation was more intense with each one. So that's again, it's like a conversation. It's leading up to a big breakthrough. And I had a little breakthrough of my own over the weekend while I was talking to Jennifer, who you met last week. And I realized that in a – this is apropos of

absolutely nothing, by the way. Put your pens down. This is known as amusing Nagler by letting him share what he feels like sharing. It's not relevant to what we're immediately discussing.

Nonviolent Confrontation to Awaken a Perspective

In our nonviolent confrontation, you reach a climax like that. I suddenly saw that it's – like there are two things that are happening. You are shocking the opponent into a state of befuddlement, where the opponent comes at you with anger, fully expecting that you're going to respond with fear. When you don't respond with fear, he or she is startled. Okay, that's a golden moment. That bit of befuddlement where the person was exactly clear, totally wrong, but exactly clear about what's going on. I'm dominating this person with my anger.

When that's broken up, there's a moment of openness there where you can introduce some other considerations into that person's mind. So, it's like a two-phase thing going on. You're breaking up the person's mindset, and then you get to feed in a new one. Again, this isn't something that's always going to work. In the story – I think it's James Farmer who's being badly beaten in a prison somewhere in the South. We'll be getting to the Civil Rights Movement probably next week.

And throughout the whole time, he just kept talking to the police who were beating him. Finally, they said, "The guy's crazy," and just threw him into a cell by himself. So, it's not like you're going to always see the conversion there, but part of what you're doing is arresting that person in a sense that's startling them out of their mindset so that you can bring in another one. Okay, so are there any questions then about the midterm or anything else we've covered so far?

Okay. If not, let me talk a little bit about Islam and keep careful notes so that you can share them with Camilla when she gets back. She's our token Muslim. To sort of summarize at the beginning what I'm going to end up concluding with, we in the West often tend to think in polarized terms, and we think that our religion is a religion of peace, but Islam is a religion of violence. And there's absolutely no justification for a generalization like that.

Religious Peacebuilding

All of the major monotheistic faiths in the West, Judaism, Christianity, Islam, they all have the same dilemma. They start off wanting absolutely peace, but then they have to confront the world in the situation that they're actually in. And they have to start making compromises. So, what you find is glorious expressions of peace in the scriptural tradition, which in the case of Islam is two-fold – I'll be talking about that in a minute – buffered by various accommodations that happened in the real world.

And if there's a difference at all, it's a matter of degree. And incidentally, the best book that I know of on nonviolence in Islam is by Muhammad Abu Nimer, let me put that on here. That's short for peacebuilding, okay? Nonviolence and peacebuilding in Islam. I've read a lot of books that claim that Islam is a religion of peace and nonviolence and a lot of books that claim the opposite, and they're all wrong. And I think Mohammed Abu Nimer has a very good balanced approach.

So first of all, what is the tradition? As you know, it arose in the 6th century when there was this prophetic figure, Muhammad Al Karaji, Muhammad of the Karaj Clan, who had a set of revelations from God. And the word for God – and it's important to be aware of this – is “Al” is a prefix “the” and “lah” means, “The Lord.” So, their name for God is Allah, the Lord. It's not like there's a person whose name is Allah as opposed to a person named Jehovah or a person named Krishna or something else like that. So, this is not a personal name, Allah.

And he was in a cave on Mount Hira and was seized by this incredible grip. It was like it was almost killing him, and he said he felt like he was going to die. And he heard a voice saying to him, “Idra. Recite.” And he said, “What recite? What are you talking about? What am I supposed to recite?” And these verses came to him. And this happened over several episodes. And I don't remember exactly how long the Quran is, but part of its power is that it's incredibly beautiful poetry. And apparently it's just about untranslatable.

And these verses are called, “Surahs.” This is the main source of the tradition – this collection of surahs that were revealed to Muhammad over the period of his maturity. Yeah? Joy?

Student: Is this Muhammad of the 6th century?

Michael: 7th century, yeah. Born in the late 6th century, but this happened in the –

Student: [Unintelligible 00:23:50]

Michael: Yeah. Not the boxer. Talking about the prophet. And so, you have two major sources for the tradition. One is the Quran or more accurately, Quran, which means, “the thing recited.” And the other is a set of stories recollected about the prophet and his immediate disciples, and those are known as the Hadith. So those are the two fundamental sources of Islamic tradition.

And the fact is, that there is no explicit and total rejection of war in the Quran, but there's a lot of hedging around war to limit it. It's an attempt to limit war so that most Islamic scholars feel that what you really come out with is a justification for defensive limited war. Defensive meaning only when you've been attacked or –and here where it sort of starts to get fuzzy, of course, like they always do –where other Muslims had been attacked, or the innocent have been attacked.

And it's limited in the sense that you always want to leave the opportunity for the defeated to be reconciled. You don't practice a war of annihilation. You don't – and they copied many prescriptions from the Jewish tradition also. You don't destroy fruit trees, oases, things like that. Probably, they would have added libraries and museums. And that would have gotten us in a lot of trouble in Iraq.

So, on the one hand, the one thing that's absolutely forbidden is an aggressive war against the innocent. God hates that. We're told that over and over again. And when you wage war, when you have to wage war for your own protection or the protection of the innocent, it's to be done without transgressing limits because as the Quran says, "God hates the transgressor." Okay, so this is not a god of absolute love any more than the composite picture that you end up with in the Judeo-Christian tradition.

Nonviolent Principles in Islam

But quite apart from the question of war, there are some surahs which establish all the nonviolent principles, whether they're applied to war or not. Probably one of the most famous is – this is 2:256, for those of you who want to rush out consult your Quran. "Therefore, listen not to the unbelievers, but strive against them with the utmost strenuousness with the Quran." In other words, with the book, not with the sword. And there was an expression in Jewish tradition, "[Al satai siphed lo-sofair 00:27:13] If the sword, then not the book. If the book, then not the sword.

And there's a Quranic verse – sorry. That was 25:52. This is 2:256. "Let there be no compulsion in religion." In other words, you should not, according to the Quran itself, you should not convert anybody forcibly because religion does not work that way. And then there's another surah which is apparently modeled on a verse from the Torah which says, "If you save one person, it is as though you've saved the entire people." Now why am I enthusiastic about that surah? Why is that important for us? John, you want to try a stab at it?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:28:14]

Michael: It sounds like person-power. Exactly, yeah. If you remember, this is Stage 3. The sanctity is in the individual. In Stage 3 you never say what Stalin said, apparently, "One death is a tragedy. A million deaths is a statistic." You never say that. Each death is a tragedy, and the numbers are irrelevant. There's really no such thing as more infinities or bigger infinities. So once you – and the story goes on to say, "If you save one person, it's as though you have saved the entire people. If you kill one person, it's as though you have killed the entire people." So, the germ of the person, the sanctity of the person is there.

Another surah that's very helpful for us, it starts, "Oh, Insan, oh man," this is Allah speaking to humanity, "Oh man, I made you into tribes and nations that you might discover your unity with another, not that you might despise one another." In other

words, there is a confirmation of both diversity and unity. And that's exactly what we need for a nonviolent world.

You want to be aware of unity, but not lose individual diversity. You cannot sacrifice svadharma for dharma. Okay? So, I know this is very, very brief, but I just – because we've spoken about Judaism and about Christianity, I didn't want to leave Islam out. And also, because this is critically important for us today. This non-clash of non-civilizations that's going on.

Finally, there is one Hadith that I like very much from this point of view. It seems that the prophet, peace be upon him, was out riding one time with his companions and he said, "Yes, if you are a good Muslim, you must help everyone." And they said, "Surely, you don't mean that, right? You mean we must help a brother. We must help a victim. We must help an orphan. But you don't mean we must help an oppressor, because Islam is very, very against oppression. It's not to say that there are not oppressive states that are Muslim states, but again, this contrast between the ideal and the real, right?"

But no, the Prophet says, "No, I meant what I said. After all, that's how I got to be a prophet, right? And you must help everyone, brother or an oppressor." So, then the befuddled companion says, "How do you expect us to help an oppressor?" And the prophet says, "By preventing him from oppressing you." So that's very sophisticated nonviolent logic. That you dislodge the British Raj in India partly because you need to for your country and your own people and your own culture, but partly because they need it. And, in fact, Kenneth Boulding, whom I've mentioned before, is the author of "Integrative Power," and the other two kinds.

He was an economist, and he did some studies showing that the British were ruining themselves economically by holding onto India. Even economically. Not to mention morally, and all the rest of it. So, you have this robust faith that there is such a thing as a win/win situation for every conflict and your conflict with an oppressor is not against him, but against the oppression. And it's for his benefit as much as for your own. So, with those elements, not that anybody kind of knitted them together and said, "See, we have a complete nonviolence theory here," but all the elements were embedded in the tradition. So, the rest just became a matter of compromising and practice.

The Nonviolent Tradition in Islam

And in the 14th century there was a saint whose name was Lalla Aziza who lived in Morocco. I'm just giving you one isolated episode to illustrate the power of nonviolence being recognized in the tradition. There was a general named Al-Hintati – you don't have to remember these names, but if you want amuse your friends, especially your Muslim ones, I have all the facts here – who was engaged in the struggle to bring the whole of Morocco, southern Morocco under his control, and he was going after region after region and subduing them with his army in the traditional fashion where you force the subdued regions to pay you tribute and it gives you soldiers. And so, you just get

bigger and bigger and bigger and pretty soon you have an ego like – who was it? Frog and Toad? Did you ever Frog and Toad stories?

You remember that Frog and Toad story where Frog is giving a lecture and Toad is the only person in the audience. And Frog keeps saying, “I’m so great.” And every time he says something like that, Toad shoots back about five rows until finally he can hardly see him, and he gets it. And he says, “No, you know, Toad, you’re my friend. I’m just an ordinary person.” Every time, Toad comes ten rows closer. So, it’s really the very simple way to get people – they don’t see any end to the expansion of their egotism and their material conquests.

And he reached this area called Seksawa which is where she lives up in the mountains. And he’s approaching Seksawa with 6000 men to conquer it. And when his forces drew near the mountains, what should he meet, but this lone woman without any weapons. She just came down out of the mountains and stood there. Very much like that guy in Tiananmen square, that old man standing in front of the column of tanks, and started to have a theological dispute with him, and got him completely converted. He said, “She is a wonder. She answered before I could ask her anything. I have never witnessed a more penetrating proof than what she used against me.” And he was completely talked out of his conquest, turned his army around and went back.

Now exactly a parallel story is told about Paris about the invasions of the Huns when Saint Genevieve, when the city had no military power against them, went out with her sisters and created what they called, “A wall of prayer.” And the Huns, whom I don’t even think were Christianized at that time, they were confronted with this. You had this two-fold phenomenon that I was just telling you about. They’re shocked, and they see that there’s some other kind of power operating in the world, and they don’t know what to do about it. They don’t have anything to mobilize against it. And she’s credited with saving Paris. Similarly, Saint Clair against the Saracens and so forth.

So, the history of Islam does contain episodes of nonviolence just as the history of Judaism and the history of Christianity does. And it may be of special interest that in 1948, in Iraq, the British were maneuvering with their puppet sultan in Iraq to take over the oil production. Tell me if this sounds familiar to you. And there was a popular nonviolent uprising. This time it’s not religious. This time it’s not a woman. This time it’s not a single powerless person. It’s more like people-power.

And they were very persistent, and they got the government out of power, and they got the British to have to back down. So just think how the history of our world might be different if somebody had remembered that. If they created a course called, “PACS 164A-B,” and taught people how to do this after shock and awe had subsided, they could have delivered another kind of shock. We could be facing a very, very different world here today.

The First Intifada

Of course, you're already familiar with the story of Abdul Ghaffar Khan, but I wanted to say a hesitant word about the first intifada because this is more about Muslim society than about Islam because in its first phase the Intifada in Palestine were proud to be a secular movement. It was a political struggle against Israeli occupation and various attacks. It was not a question of Islam against Judaism.

I don't want to take the time now to go into the Intifada. Maybe we'll get a chance to talk about it next semester. But it was a very successful series of popular resistance movements coordinated by some people who had studied with Gene Sharp. Okay, so there, I think that to be fair, we've looked at Islam. And I think if you look at it closely you see that really the situation is not qualitatively different from the situation in Judaism or Christianity.

And if you were to ask me why there's always this problem of accommodation? Why you have these texts, and you have these wonderful statements, as we're going to see in a minute, by Christian church fathers. You have these wonderful statements saying, "We don't get involved in war. We're Christians." And that lasts up until the point at which Christianity and the state more or less identified. And then it becomes a practical impossibility.

So, you have the same issue. You have the ideal of non-war confronting the needs of defense and whatever other needs people think they have. And then the accommodations and the breakdowns start to happen. So, I'm sure that the question on all of your minds is, "How do we get out of this dilemma?" Right? Isn't what you're all asking yourselves? Of course, it is.

Dan Ellsberg and the Pentagon Papers

I've come to think that the problem is the negative approach.

In other words, when we go into the issue saying what are we forbidden to do, you will never come up with a practical solution. The practical solution will only be gained if you say what power is available to us? Do you remember the wonderful anecdote that I told you at least twice about my friend Dan Ellsberg, that he had these Pentagon papers, and the Xerox machines were right across the street? And what he should do with them? They were going to reveal the fact that there was all of this lying going on about the Vietnam War.

He was the only person who was capable of revealing this to the American public. And he kept not being able to do it because the thing that came up in his mind was, "What will happen to me if I do this?" And then one day something snapped – I had nothing to do with it. I didn't even know Dan at that time. Something snapped. Instead of saying, "What will happen to me if I do this?" He said, "Suppose I were willing to go to jail? Then what could I do?" And immediately it became clear to him, "As long as I'm willing to go to jail, they can't hold anything over me, and I can do whatever I want with these darn

things.” He said, “Come on Patricia, let’s go.” And they walked across the street and started Xeroxing it and it was made public in the New York Times, the Washington Post, and so forth.

So, in a kind of parallel way, this is what I mean by the positive approach. If theologians and individuals, whoever they be, were to be thinking, “What is nonviolence and what can we do with it?” Eventually you would work out a solution to the criminal justice problem, the defense problem, all the other problems. And the reason it keeps on being a problem is as a kind of moral shorthand, instead of saying, “Let’s work out what nonviolence is and how to use it.”

Up until very recently people have been saying, “The only way we can get people to change their behavior is by telling them what they cannot do.” And telling them what’s going to happen to them if they do it. And that approach, I think, lands you constantly in these problems. So that’s my second big insight that I want to share with you today – the shock thing and now this.

Alright, so let’s get back to the story of the Christian West. I do want to emphasize, again, that I was talking about the ancient world and in the ancient world there was basically no such thing as atheism. I think I can say that without fear of contradiction. Have you ever seen that cartoon of a guy in a radio station and saying, “And I think I can say without fear of contradiction,” as somebody is about to hit him over the head with a chair? But I think I can really say it, without fear of contradiction, there was no such thing as a serious atheistic commitment in the ancient world. There was polytheistic and then there was monotheistic and stages in between.

Negative Lens of Selective Pacifism

For example, let me mention another great scholar here. A good guy, a friend of mine, Peter Brock, teaches at the University of Toronto – or, “Tron-no” as they call it out there. The University of “Tron-no.” He is the foremost scholar of pacifism in the West. Now talking about the war institution in particular. So, pacifism, if you define it as the refusal to engage in war fighting, it’s a negative thing, not like the positive thing I was just talking about. He is a terrific historian, and he knows a lot of European languages and he’s written just text after definitive text about the history of pacifism.

And one of the things that he’s shown is that the kind of pacifism that we’re most familiar with didn’t exist until early in the 20th century. Namely, “Humanistic,” or secular pacifism. When you had pacifism, for example, among socialists – of which there was a lot – their pacifism was that they were against capitalist wars. They felt that capitalism would inevitably lead to war, and they didn’t want to fight in those damn wars because they didn’t care whether the German capitalists succeeded in trouncing French capitalists. A plague on both their houses. It’s the workers that get sent off to get killed in these wars.

But that was the extent, for the most part. Of course, there are always individuals who are different, but that was the extent of their pacifism commitment. So it was like a selective objection, and it really does not do us a whole lot of good in and of itself to develop a nonviolent worldview.

If you remember, in the Bhagavad Gita, Arjuna is a selective pacifist, right? He is about to fight this war, and he sees his kinsmen on the other side – and kin bonds are very, very much stronger in his culture than they are in ours. And he says, “I can’t do this.” And people are always surprised that Krishna tells him, “You wimp.” Whatever the Sanskrit word he uses for that. “Get up off the floor of the chariot. Stop blubbering. Pick up your bow and let’s get back to work here.”

Now how could Krishna, the lord of love, tell this warrior to get back into the fight? Because Arjuna’s objection to the fight was he didn’t like this war. And Gandhi was quick to point that out. That’s not a legitimate position. You can’t say, “I have no objection to wars, but please only give me the ones that I like.” It doesn’t work that way. They are always going to degenerate into ones that you don’t like anyway.

So not to confuse Arjuna’s objection to the Mahabharata War as pacifism, and not to confuse socialist pacifism with nonviolence. It’s a selective kind of objection, okay?

So actual believers that war is wrong because human life is sacred – if you can, I guess, you can still use that term in this context – and yet not being embedded in a religious tradition of some kind is a relatively modern phenomenon. Okay? So, I have no objection to agnostic nonviolence in our century, but I’m talking about the ancient world. Okay.

I also need to retract a very unkind word that I used last time. And I want to do this before the Law of Karma catches up with me. I said that Saint Paul dehumanized Jesus. And I said that to shock you. Apparently it worked, especially in some quarters. But as Eli pointed out to me, what’s characteristic about the theology of Paul is that for him, Jesus is fully human on the one hand, and he’s also infused fully by the divine on the other hand.

And I got carried away and was rather anti-Pauline last time. And I’m sure that was wrong, and I’m sure that Christianity was of tremendous benefit to ancient Europe. And I’m sure that Paul’s Epistle on Love is an incredibly wonderful and powerful document. I use it as a meditation passage myself. The point was not to speak limitingly or deprecatingly about the way that Christianity cobbles together a set of texts and a set of beliefs over a period of four or five centuries in the West.

But to say that today we don’t have to be confined by that. For various features of modern society, what they decided in the Council of Trent in the 4th century doesn’t have to be our Jesus.

Jesus' Kingdom Movement

And we have had an unusual opportunity in the last 20 years, it seems to me, to rediscover Jesus and then do whatever you want about it or with him. Because we believe in history, we don't know anything about history, but that doesn't prevent us from believing it.

And because the scientific historical approach has shown us a Jesus who is much, much more nonviolent than we had realized. And let me quote you something from Crossan about that. Yeah. If John or Jesus had led a violent military uprising, many of their followers would have been crucified along with them. Jesus' Kingdom Movement was instead a programmatically nonviolent resistance. But emphatically, it confronted present economic, social, and political realities."

So apparently, you had, with this movement, the configuration that I was describing in Gandhi's career. That he was against the abuses within his own community, and he was against the oppression of his community from above. So, you have lateral downward pointing and upward pointing nonviolence. And that's how you know that you're really dealing with the real thing. Okay, so what happens to this religion after Jesus is summarily removed from the scene which happened very, very quickly, and which was a catastrophe from which I don't think we've ever completely recovered.

For about 300 years there's this powerful wave of spirituality and it includes nonviolent commitments. So, for example, you have the church fathers like Lactantius. He's now writing in the year 197 of the Common Era. And he says, "We who freeze at the thought of all worldly glory," you know, I don't want tenure, I don't want the Nobel Prize, I don't want a dream job. None of that stuff. "We who freeze at the thought of all worldly glory have no need for political factions. Nothing is more foreign to us than the state. For there is only one state that we recognize and that consists of the entire world."

So, this was fairly typical. Here's another statement of his. "When God forbids killing, He is not only ordering us to avoid armed robbery, but He is forbidding what men regard as ethical. Thus, it is not right for a just man to serve in the army since justice itself is his form of service." Let me read you one other thing here.

Origen - Children of Peace

This is from Origen, who was one of my absolute total favorites. As far ancient philosophy is concerned – putting Plato in a separate category – it's Heraclitus and Origen. They're my main men.

Origen said, "We Christians no longer take up the sword against nations, nor we do learn to make war anymore." He's obviously paraphrasing Micah. "Having become children of peace for the sake of Jesus who is our leader. And no one fights better for the King than we do." This is the important point. So, the first important point to pull out what Lactantius is saying, is that if you're a Christian, you cannot, you do not, you will

not worship the state. And that's where the first round of accommodation and the first round of difficulties is coming.

And the second important point is that it's not strictly a negative commitment. He's not saying, "We're not going to fight for you." He's saying, "We're fighting for you in a better way than you can possibly understand." I feel really good about it. I know when I was working for a Scottish doctor in New York, and I broke the news to him that I was a conscientious objector because I actually wanted him to write a recommendation for me. He was deeply shocked. He said [In Scottish accent], "That means you're taking all of these benefits from society and you're not going to serve it at all."

And I said, "No, Jack, it's not like that." We would have gotten into a long argument. He was paying me, and I had to wash test tubes and that was the end of the argument. But this is extremely important, to get a hold of the positive commitment. That we are a conscientious objector – and don't forget to go to the Combatants for Peace talk tonight. I know Yonatan, at least, personally and he's a great guy, had a terrific revelation. I'm sure his Palestinian counterpart is just as good.

Once you step out of war fighting there has to be some sense of what you're stepping into. Otherwise, the commitment will not be practicable. In fact, I've had this argument several times with friends in Japan because, as you know, the Japanese Constitution – it was not entirely their idea. It was partly our idea. We just finished bombing them, so we got to tell them what to write in their Constitution. But still, it was a good idea. Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution states, "Japan will not wage war outside of its own borders. We will not go outside the border of Japan with military force."

And now they're very unhappy because Japan is taking a tilt to the right. Duh, what else is new? And they are starting to reconsider Article 9. And you know what's going to happen when they're reconsidering it. So, a lot of my Japanese friends are asking me about this, and what I told them was Article 9 was half of a commitment. You can say we're not going to wage war, and it's a very noble thing and I'm entirely in favor of it. But the next clause has to be what you are in favor of, how are you going to defend Japan against something like China, something like North Korea if you're not going to do it with weapons.

Gladiators and Commitment to War

Unless you see that, you will not be able to hold on to the negative.

So, this is what is slowly going to happen with the war commitment. And let's take the other institution that we're so fond of scapegoating, talk about a form that scapegoating took on, institutionalized, ritualized scapegoating in the Roman Empire. And everybody who has seen Conan the Barbarian or voted for the present Governor of California, everybody knows that there was this institution in the Roman world called, "The gladiatorial combat. *Le gladiateur*," it's called in French. And they called them, "Games."

And it seems to have started in the 3rd century BC at the funeral of somebody called Brutus. Not the famous Brutus. That three pairs of gladiators would – “gladiator” means, “sword-wielder.” Gladius is a sword. Gladiators, three pair of gladiators were set to fight one another, sort of like a cockfight with people. And the crowd loved it. You have to remember, they hadn’t invented television yet. So, the only recourse they had was to do it with live people.

And when you got to the time of Julius Caesar, who was assassinated in 44 BC, the thing had grown to this obscene spectacle where you could have 300 pairs of fighters killing each other, 600 men out there in the arena killing each other. Now why does it keep getting so big? Because if you ask me, and do you really have a choice? If you ask me, the reason it got so big was that the thing is inherently dissatisfying. And there’s part of you that’s saying, “Whoa, this is better than Hollywood 5-0 any day. And this is so exciting. I just love to see all that blood flowing all over the place.”

But there’s a part of you which is not being made happy by this. And as Freud pointed out very well, you get into what’s called, “A repetition compulsion.” And you’ve just got to do it over and over again. The thing gets bigger and bigger. I mean if ice cream were capable of making human beings happy, there would be one flavor of ice cream and not 258 flavors, I think, at last count. It’s the same principle, in a kind of grotesque application of the same principle.

And as if this were not bad enough, the Emperor Trajan in the year 107 of our era, had a triumph. You know, it’s a special state occasion like this. He had 5000 pairs of gladiators. You know, my combat is bigger than your combat. And there were shows going on in other towns of the Roman Empire outside of Italy, as we can tell from the amphitheaters. And it’s a very – you know, if we had more time I would go into the whole ritual with you. It’s extremely fascinating – anyone who’s getting a PhD in anthropology should really study this. But I’m going to try and define it to the part that’s of interest for us.

Well, who are you going to get to go in there and kill each other? Chiefly, slaves and criminals. So, you’re starting to see an overlap here with the criminal justice system. And you actually see a statement by Cicero who was asked, “Do you think that these gladiatorial games are good for the state?” And he says, “Yes, I do. They are good for the state.” They get rid of criminals. They amuse people, part of the bread and circuses kind of thing. But above all, and I don’t think he was conscious of this, to quote René Girard, “We have discovered at the heart of every religion the same single central event that generates its mythic significance and its ritual acts. The action of a crowd as it turns on someone it adored yesterday and may adore tomorrow and transforms him into a scapegoat in order to secure by his death, a period of peace for the community.”

So that is ultimately what the psychological function of these games is. Everybody is together in the audience, practicing unanimous violence against the gladiators. And so many interesting things. But I’m just going to conclude with how this ended. Obviously,

the Christians felt a little bit uncomfortable with this institution. It wasn't sort of exactly what they thought Jesus was about asking them to do.

So, they decided, you know, they wouldn't go there.

The Importance of Will

And there's a very gripping story about Saint Augustine, one of his students, his name is Alypius. He made a vow probably around 300 AD. He made a vow, Alypius did, that he would not go to the games. It was not a good thing for a philosopher to do. He was not quite a Christian at that point yet, Alypius wasn't. But his philosophical commitment was getting in that direction.

And but he's sitting around one night and what do you know, the door bursts open and in come the boys. And the boys say, "Hey Allyp, you know, there's this terrific gladiatorial contest going on down in town." We're way outside of Italy now. We're in North Africa. And Alypius says, "No, no. Sorry. I don't do that sort of thing anymore. It's just not good." And they say, "Oh man. What a drag." And they start putting various kinds of social pressure on him. And he succumbs, to an extent. He says, "All right, all right. I'll come with you guys. But A, I'm not going to buy any popcorn because I'm a vegan. And B," he says – I just made up that part – and B, "I'm not going to watch. Okay? I'll keep you company, but I'll keep my eyes closed." They said, "We don't care what you do with your eyes. Just come along." And they said, "We feel good," because, obviously, they don't feel all that great themselves about going to the games. They want him to buy in so they will feel better, which isn't going to work.

So then comes the really gripping story. He sits there, the fight is going on, and then comes the climactic moment, one gladiator kills the other. The crowd roars with obscene excitement and delight. And involuntarily Alypius' eyes fly open. And then Augustine, with his poetic genius says, "Then Alypius was more deeply wounded than he whose blood was ebbing out on the sands of the arena." Because he had lost control of his will, violated his sense of self, and hurt him more psychologically than the poor guy who was bleeding to death.

Okay, so this sets up our – do you have a question? No, okay. This sets up our story. The gladiatorial games were finally forbidden under Emperor Honorius who ruled from 393 to 423. They probably didn't completely disappear. They became CNN – I mean they went underground in various ways. But now the famous story about how it happened. Apparently this story is true. We have two accounts of it. There's no reason to think that anybody has made it up. They differ slightly in details, but ultimately, it's quite consistent. It concerns a monk whose name, at least in one version, was Telemachus. And as you might guess from the name, Telemachus is Greek. He's living in Cappadocia in Asia Minor, part of what is today, Turkey.

And Telemachus must have been praying or something and he hears the voice of God, always dangerous – remember what happened to Gandhi – and the voice says to him, “Telemachus,” he calls in the [unintelligible 01:04:46]. “Telemachus, I want you to go to Rome and end the games.” “You want me to do what?” He said, “Yes, go to Rome. And these things are an abomination in my sight. I want you to stop them.”

So, Telemachus then proceeds to walk from Cappadocia to Rome, taking ships where there isn’t any road. And he gets there just as a big game is going on. And he walks straight into the amphitheatre, he doesn’t even check in at the local Holiday Inn. He just walks right into the games. And these two men are facing off against one another. They didn’t have very good security in those days. He walks right up to them, and he says, “Don’t do this. It’s not right.” And they say, “You know, we kind of didn’t like it ourselves. Thanks for that.” That’s a good excuse. Hell with this, no fighting anymore. They put their swords down and walked away. Okay. Story is not over, unfortunately. At this point the crowd was so frustrated that they stormed down onto the arena, and they beat Telemachus to death.

Okay, so I promised you there will be a few stories in which nonviolence did not work. So far this is one of them, but we’re not finished yet. It turns that Honorius himself was in the audience, and he was so revolted by the reaction on the part of the people. You know, it was this nice controlled ritualized violence. And when it broke out of control he saw how ugly it really was. He immediately goes back up to his scriptorium, boots up one of his scribes, and writes a re-script or an order forbidding the games. So that’s how it happened.

It was historic and can be believed and there’s no reason to think it cannot be. It was an act of pure nonviolent sacrifice which did not work in the sense that it wasn’t too healthy for Telemachus. But it definitely worked in the sense that it accomplished the end game he was aiming at.

Student: [Unintelligible 01:07:19]

Michael: Yeah. Though I wonder because it did work.

Student: [Unintelligible 01:07:29]

Michael: It got him killed, but nobody – God did not say, “Go and stop the games and I will guarantee you that you won’t get killed.” It was just not part of the contract. It’s not like the famous conversation that Alan Arkin has with Peter Falk in a cafeteria in midtown Manhattan where he’s trying to recruit him into the CIA. And he says, “But you have to stay alive. That’s the key to the whole benefits program.” It was not like that. There was no guarantee. It’s like the death of Father Kolbe in Auschwitz. He did not bargain to get saved. All he bargained to do was to sacrifice himself for another person and thereby to shock the Nazi’s into seeing what they were doing. And it apparently was brilliantly successful on that level.

Now this brings us to another interesting point, however. And that is the question of martyrdom.

Violence and Martyrdom

Is martyrdom violent or nonviolent? Now there are those who think – I just read a quote recently that – talking about two millennia of Jewish martyrdom, this commentator said, “Nothing could be more pacifist than that, whether voluntary or not.” That is not how we think about it in PACS 164.

Intention and will have everything to do about it. Accidentally getting killed has nothing to do with sacrificing your life because you feel that you’re in Stage 3 of the curve, which Telemachus obviously was. You know, he’s one person against an entire enormous mass of desire to have these things go on. And he’s intervening at a very late stage. People are standing there with swords at another’s throats. You cannot expect if you wait that long to come out of it without some sacrifice.

But so, there’s this whole question of martyrdom and there’s an interesting ambiguity about it, which I don’t think that we’re going to be able to resolve. Certainly, it was the case that, as Augustine pointed out, one of the things that led to the strength of Christianity was that the early Christians, when they were attacked, they did not fight back, but they allowed themselves to be martyred.

But there was at least one group, probably several, who were opposed to martyrdom, partly for the obvious reason that you and I are opposed to martyrdom. All those who would like to get martyred, stick your hands up please? I thought so. But there’s that obvious reason, but there’s also another reason, that they did not want to be part of this system, because they felt that martyrdom was scapegoating and, you know, it was unanimous violence.

So, there were some Christian groups that – the Donatists in North Africa and the Gnostics before them – were hated by the other Christians, as you might imagine because here, the other Christians are getting themselves killed, and these people are wriggling out of it. You would tend to hate and despise them. But their reasoning was that you must not participate in the system either as an executor, obviously, but also not as a victim. So, they actually went partly underground and disguised their Christianity until the spasm of martyrdom had passed over.

All right, well, I want to get just around in the remaining few minutes to finish up the story that Eli touched upon which is the Christian commitment to war fighting. In the year 295 in North Africa there was a young man who was 21 years-old. His name was Maximilianus. And they came to induct him into the army. And he said, “[*Non possum malem proceri, Cristianus sum.* 01:11:53] I cannot do this evil thing. I am a Christian.” And so, he was immediately executed.

And he has been proposed as the patron saint of conscientious objectors. So, for about 300 years, Christians basically did not serve in the armies. And that worked fairly well because it was an all-volunteer army. There was no draft, for the most part. There were these informal things that they tried to do to Maximilianus. But there came a time when the emperor's wars were getting bigger and bigger, and they needed more troops. And especially more and more people were becoming Christian. And if none of the Christians would fight, you would have not enough men in the army. Like what we're facing today in Iraq.

And, you know, there's only so many prisons and shopping mall strips that you can go to and recruit people who are down and out to fill the ranks. And there comes a point where you just need more men. So, the tension resolves itself in a remarkable event. We assume that this is more or less historical. There was a pending battle in the year 312 at the Milvian Bridge where Constantine, the Western emperor, was a rallying force against the Eastern branches of Christianity. And just before the battle, apparently by his own report, he had a dream in which he saw the cross. And it had these words appear somehow saying, "[*In hoc signo vaca 01:13:43*]," which means, "Using this symbol you will win, you will prevail."

Now the fact is that he probably didn't even convert to Christianity, but he immediately normalized Christian commitments and stopped the persecutions. They would be fitful persecutions briefly after that, but for the most part the Roman persecution of Christians was over. And he paved the way for it to become the state religion. Now once the religion is the same as the state, of course, what Lactantius says, "We don't recognize the state. That's why we don't kill." That's all over.

So, there's a rather – from our point of view, rather sickening turnaround. And within 100 years of this episode, you had to be a Christian in order to be in the Roman legions. And there are wonderful mythological stories that come along explaining how this commitment works. There's one tale called, "*Duodecom legio Fulminata*, the Thunder blasted 12th Legion," which is about a legion that was bivouacked in what is today, Switzerland. And the camp was struck by lightning, but nobody was hurt.

And why was nobody hurt? Because all the soldiers were Christian. That proves that being a Christian will get you not killed. And it was the exact opposite of what happened 100 years before. It was like the best way to get killed by the Roman Empire – the best and the fastest. And so, as some scholars say, the barbarians militarized Christianity. Because of their attacks on the Roman Empire and the need to defend it militarily it became impossible in the 4th century for Christians not to fight.

Okay, well, looking at that institution, war fighting and the others, I think what I'll do is talk very briefly on Thursday about how rediscoveries and renewals kept happening. And come down rather quickly to the Quaker phenomenon in the 17th century.

19. Medieval and Modern Nonviolent Christian Sects 2: the Society of Friends (Quakers)

Michael: I understood that you saw the very moving documentary last time and had a great discussion about it. I miss all the best discussions in this class. I wonder why. And this puts us – we’re going to go back a little bit so it’s sort of like a modern film. We’re doing a flashback now to look at the lead up to the sources of pacifism and nonviolence more generally – especially nonviolence in the U.S.

So, because I was out we have to do the switch this way. It won’t be too confusing. I have a couple of little announcements. The Nonviolent Peaceforce is doing a big push for its fundraising pre-end of year, and they wanted some people to get brochures into bookstores and places like that. Unfortunately, they didn’t quite get me the name of the person for you to talk to, but I want to alert you to this so that if you’re interested in helping out on Thursday, I’ll come in with that information.

And also, the other information will be about the exact time of a meeting we’re having on Thursday afternoon. You remember, I mentioned to you early on in the semester that we have some kind of a relationship struck up with Berkeley High School. It’s actually Berkeley International High School. I don’t know if this is a different institution. Any Berkeley High people here? Most people are from L.A. or places like that.

Anyway, we will be meeting with a guy from Berkeley International High School Thursday afternoon, late at Metta’s new office. So, hold on to that time. It will be around 3:45, I think. And let me know after class on Thursday if you’d like to come along. Okay?

Posse Comitatus and the Gladiator Redux

So, I think before I get into the history of these “Manichean” movements, and I’ll tell you what that term means in a bit, I thought I’d start us off with one of my traditional depression observations about contemporary culture, because those are always good to sort of flatten us out and make us reach for the nearest bottle of Prozac. There are two interesting things that came to my attention last week. It was not the best time to be coming across depressing items like this.

But they seemed to define the problem between them. One thing that you are all familiar with, was that the president is trying to overturn the – middle of the 19th century somewhere we had an act called, “Posse Comitatus,” which prevents the President of the United States from using troops on U.S. territory. So, it’s supposed to be this separation between the army which fights “bad guys” and the police which fights internal bad guys.

And modest as that may seem, it has – could put a check on the possibility of America degenerating into a military dictatorship. So, the president wants to get rid of that annoyance. And at the same time there this is – you know, I told you I sometimes look at the local newspaper and there this article about the new event that’s going to take place at the Santa Rosa Fair. Now you think of the fair, you know, where 4H kids showing off their calf, and the horse whisperer showing up, and there’s some bluegrass banjo picking. That’s what I associate with the Sonoma County Fair. That’s why I go there.

But they have a new event now where they put two guys in a cage (Literally it’s a chain link square enclosure) with boxing gloves on and they’re to beat the living daylights out of one another. And what does that sound like to you? It’s the gladiatorial redux. Yeah. Only this time we don’t have Christianity around to – for some little monk in Cappadocia to get a leading from God and come in and put a stop to this thing.

And in fact, the newspaper even uses the term, “Gladiatorial,” in the article. And – okay, so for one thing, you have this problem with the president, but on the other hand you have this problem with the ordinary people in their tens of millions. And it’s a much, much harder problem.

Lack of Purpose to Scapegoating

And if you know anything about the rise of fascism in Europe, this is exactly the way it began. We all think Adolf Hitler, you know, strutting around the podium saying, “[Werden erostretter ehar deering 00:05:07],” and stuff like that, and telling you how hateful and angry he is and everyone going, “Yay, yay.”

But the fact is that most of this stuff took place in beer halls, you know, the famous Beer Hall Putsch that brought Hitler to power. And you have these people called, “The Brown Shirts,” who were just kind of very angry young men who had no outlet for their anger. They had no way to resolve their frustrations. They saw no purpose in their life. And these were the gangs which he then was very easily able to recruit into doing his dirty work. These are the gangs who prowl the streets, you know, beating up “bad guys,” whoever they were defined to be.

And, you know, I think we know how to deal with the problem that the president is causing. You have – there’s something going on today, you know, where you change the people who are in office. Thank you so much, Laura. And – oh good, you are an angel. Thank you. You already knew that.

So, we know what to do. We have different legislatures. We pass laws. And if that doesn’t work, we do civil disobedience. But what the hell are you going to do – pardon my French – with somewhere around 50 to 80 million extremely – what does she call them? It’s dehumanized, enraged, hyper testosterone people who are so enraged that they’re just looking for a way to get organized and kill people. I think I’ve read that

there's something like 10 million – I'm so bad with numbers, but you know, 10 or 15 million vigilantes in the U.S. These are groups that go out into the piney woods in Georgia and practice the weapons that they learned how to use in the army. And they get ready to kill. They're not sure whom. That's the funny part. It's as, you know, when we were talking about scapegoating, it doesn't matter who the scapegoat is. You've just got to find one.

In fact, there was a guy on campus a few years ago who had a goat here for sale. He was selling it as a scapegoat. He said, "Everyone is looking for scapegoats. I've actually got one here." So, I'm making light of it, but it's an extremely dangerous phenomenon and we're having exactly the configuration that you saw with the rise of Nazism in Germany. And it's not at all clear what to do about it. I think the one thing that can be said about the Brown Shirts, whatever we shall call them in our own society, is that the only way we're going to fix that part of the problem is to change their culture.

How exactly do you do that? I'm not entirely sure. You teach courses, start nonprofits, things like that. Now we're on that little phenomenon of the gladiators, it was quite remarkable to me what one of these lads had to say. Let's see. "It's the oldest sport. If you look at it, Greco-Roman style, with two people beating the blank out of each other until one gave up." Okay, first of all, they don't – they beat until one person falls unconscious and surrounded by screaming crowds. But they don't refer to it as that. They say, "The person went to sleep." So, the guys says, "I'm not trying to hurt the person," said one of them. "If I hit him or he goes to sleep, I'm going to be the first one to pick him up and see if he's all right, buy him a beer afterwards." Isn't that nice? "I expect the same in return."

Now this phenomenon interested me because it seemed to me – and I'll get back off this depressing contemporary stuff very soon. But it did seem to me that here we are looking at the blatant absurdity of certain features of Greek sacrificial ritual, for example. Remember, they bring the sheep up and they say, "Oh, sheepy-weepy, would you like to be sacrificed now?" They sprinkled water on it, and it goes like that. "See?" That's transparent, and you can see that it's absurd if you're outside the culture.

When you're inside the culture something happens. And it seems to me that what this person is doing is saying, "Oh, you know, I don't want to hurt the person. I'm just hitting him in the head until he goes to sleep," is being as absurd as these ancient ritual believers were when they made these fantastic stories about what they were doing and how the sheep would go to heaven afterwards and stuff like that.

So, I guess we're all prone to falling into these very deep deceptions and fooling ourselves when it's convenient for us to do so. And it's mainly convenient for us to do so because we have not figured out a way of getting rid of violent institutions in our culture. And to go back to what I was saying before I succumbed to the tender mercies of an intestinal parasite last week, I don't think we're going to get rid of these institutions until

we come around to approaching the whole thing from a positive standpoint and saying, “What does work? How can we use it to build institutions and so forth?”

Student: Was it a boxing match you’re talking about?

Michael: It’s not exactly a boxing match because these guys are not obeying the Marquis of Queensberry Rules and they don’t have rounds – I don’t think. And by the way, this is only one version of this. There’s also an even less formal thing that’s going on in garages in Palo Alto and places all over the world where people just get in and they beat each other with hockey sticks. We’re just descending into a spiral of savagery. And it’s from these people that clever politicians can employ, can recruit for a completely – well, I’ll just have to use the word – fascist. Alana?

Student: This is probably an impossible question to answer, but I know that you said that in order to fix this, you know, we have to work on this [unintelligible 00:11:59] this positive cycle and changing the paradigm. But in the meantime, when you hear about this or some shooting or something upsetting that’s going on now, I don’t really understand how you keep that from – like for me, personally, I felt like this paralysis of depression when I hear something upsetting. Like we learn about it every day. Like how does a nonviolent person deal with that?

Coping with Violence Using Principled Nonviolence

Michael: Right, well, Alana’s question is of absolutely fundamental importance, I think, for all of us. If we can’t figure out how to confront the violence that’s going on on every level without being pulled into it, we’ll be useless. So how are we going to maintain some kind of – what shall we call it? Emotional, psychological, spiritual cushion? And I don’t think it’s an impossible question. It’s a difficult one. And it may be more of a personal one than we can go into very deeply here.

But I think this is one of the reasons that I’ve been emphasizing, that most of the people who really lifted nonviolence, if you go down the list of, you know, the really prominent people who managed to do this, every one of them had a secure firm grounding in some kind of faith. Now as I mentioned before, in the 20th century – what century is this? 21st century now. Keep me posted. It may not mean having a denominational commitment and a set of beliefs that you can formalize and share with others, a set of practices.

The nature of modern life is such that they may not be available or helpful for some of us. But there has to be some awareness that with all of this negativity that’s going on, there is something that that it does not touch. And we have to come in contact with that ourselves. That’s why Gandhi, who owned very little, he had these three little statues on his desk, “See no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil,” reminded him to withdraw into that awareness that he had which was ultimately just not touched by all the stuff going on in the outside world. And to use that as a source of recuperation and regeneration and

strength to come out from that basis into the world. That's the start of an answer anyway.

Again, I'm reminded that Thich Nhat Hanh said that you can believe in nonviolence, you know, you can take Nagler's course – he didn't actually say that – but when you get out there and they're shaking a billy-club in your face or the dogs are barking at you, it's all going to go out the window unless you have some meditation practice because that's the way you get in touch with some kind of grounding within yourself that you can hold onto while all of this is swirling around on the outside.

Let's continue to think about that and let's see if I can think of a better way – and maybe others of us also. Maybe we can set some time aside. Because if we can't do that, what you're talking about, Alana, I don't think we'll be of much use.

Transforming Anger into a Constructive Force

Just to share with you a little story that I have been telling for a long time, but I don't think I've told you people yet. I had a friend who was head of a very important international peace group. In fact, it was the International Fellowship of Reconciliation.

And he came back from a meeting in Italy one time, and he looked kind of shaken and I said, you know, "What's up, Bob?" He said, "Well, I finally found out what is the function of the Peace Movement. And I said, "For God's sake, tell me. I've been doing this for 30 years. What is it we're doing?" He said, "The function of the Peace Movement is to take the angriest people in the world and keep them out of the military." Now what I'm getting at with this, again, rather depressing little story, is that we have to have that other dimension of being able to overcome, deal with the anger in ourselves. In fact, that's why I started off at the beginning of the semester saying, "Nonviolence is some kind of transformer that you have to transform anger and fear into a creative counterpart."

Once you can do that, once you know it's possible in your own psyche, then other people's anger and fear is not going to be such a threat. And the fact that it seems to be all pervasive, it's all you read in the newspapers and see in the mainstream media, it doesn't matter because the newspapers, the mainstream media, history, they do not tell you about what's inside a human being. They just do not go there.

So let me quickly share with you my other news item, which is not nearly as depressing, I would say, though it isn't inspiring. I think I sent you a CourseWeb about this play that's going on called, "Sammy," A play about Gandhi. Well, it's showing on the 19th down in a place called Palo Alto. Some kind of a dinky college there. Anyway, it's Sunday the 19th and, you know, I was suggesting maybe we should all get together and go down there. We could visit the Martin Luther King Center, that college, and see the place.

So anyway, there's a video of the play. And I watched part of this video. And I was a little bit disappointed, but in an instructive way. And that is that character who plays

Gandhi is completely wrong. He's just completely out of character. He's more like a Noel Coward comedy. There is – where I was thinking about what is missing, absolutely not a trace of gravitas and no strength. No strength of character. Gandhi without strength was sort of like, you know, physics without Einstein.

He's a very clever little twerpy guy with lots of fast lines. He comes across as a weirdo of some kind. And this is an entirely Indian production. This performance was in Delhi. So, I'm going to watch the rest of it and see if it gets rescued at the end. If it isn't, I'm not going to recommend that we go down and see it. Maybe we should go down and protest. That would be a good idea. Your Gandhi is not our Gandhi or something like that.

But I was thinking, now if I were very good, you know, had a very good life, and I can be reborn as a sociologist. Wouldn't that be wonderful? How would I analyze this? I would draw one of these diagrams that sociologists are so good at, and I say, "Look, we have two variables to talk about here. People can be kind or unkind." This, of course, is an oversimplification. That's what sociologists do, sorry.

And you can be strong or weak. And if you think about what happened with this play, we know that you can be kind and weak. That's what this person really was portraying, it's what he was all about. We, of course, know that you can be unkind and strong, right? Right now, millions of our fellow Californians are voting for a person who is unkind and strong because their main criterion is "strong."

And, of course, you can be unkind and not have much that you can do about it, you know, be unkind, weak, so other people will fix you, take care of you. But it's like we don't have a check mark in this box. The idea that a person can be kind and strong, it's not in our mental framework somehow. So, when they think of a play about the life of Gandhi, obviously, he has to be weak, because that's the only box that's left.

So, this is what we really have to fix. When we talk about fixing the culture, coming in from a positive standpoint, you have to establish the idea in people's minds that you can be very strong and yet kind. In fact, you really cannot be kind unless you're strong. That's the simple secret. Okay, so thank you. I always appreciate your letting me vent off all of these frustrations that I accumulate over the weekend. And, of course, it's been very frustrating and a longish weekend.

So now let's – oh, let me just share with you one other thing really quickly on this box. You know, we had this president who had been a movie actor, not going to mention his name. He played opposite a chimpanzee at one point. He had a slogan, "Peace through strength." And I was writing op-eds in that period, and I said, "This is exactly the wrong approach. What we need to look for is strength through peace." Peace is strong. Established peace will get strength out of it. So, I wrote an op-ed called, "Strength Through Peace," and it was published. But guess what happened? Yeah, they switched it back around. "Strength Through Peace," but that goes to show you, you know, you take people and drag them out of there to here, [Indicating from weak/unkind corner to

strong/king corner] let go, right now they'll shoot right back down to there. So that, at least, is a Venn diagram of the problem, if this is indeed, a Venn diagram.

Okay, so, let's then take a look at what some of the historical background is that made the Civil Rights Movement possible. When Professor Charles Henry is here I always have him come in and give a talk about the immediate historical background and [Jolina] is going to do that for us on Thursday.

Martin Luther King Jr. & Christian Pacifism

But he always starts off by saying, you know, a couple or three things you need to know about Martin Luther King, and one of them is that he was a Black Baptist preacher. That's what he was.

And so, everything that he was doing and saying, his whole strength, that was his genre. That's where he was coming from. So, the Civil Rights Movement, while it took on other colorations and went in different directions, one of the things that made it possible, it would not have been possible without it, was an echo of Christian pacifism which we talked about in that apostolic period of Christianity from Year Zero to Year 312 when Christians were not fighters.

And as I've mentioned a couple of times, and as this [unintelligible 00:23:44] will tell you, there were waves of rediscovery of the Christian commitment to the sanctity of the individual, and consequently, to nonviolence. They just seem to hop and skip, you know, four or five centuries at a time down through Europe.

Particularly in Eastern Europe, there are the Czech brethren and the Anabaptists. And particularly this Anabaptist Movement is important. Anabaptism is from a Greek term – made up Greek term – meaning, “To baptize again.” And the point is, that you can baptize a baby when it's born, and its sort of a ritual thing, but it wouldn't have any significance unless the person wanted to be baptized.

So, you did re-baptism as an adult and that meant that the religion was internalized. There was not just like part of your DNA or something like that. There was a wonderful Ian Carmichael comedy called, “Heavens Above!” I've seen all the Ian Carmichael comedies. That's almost all the movies that I've seen. And in this one he plays the part of a country preacher. He's actually Jesus who has come to be a country preacher somewhere in England, and he's baptizing all of these adults in an English church.

And what he has people do is talk about – list off their sins – like that Red Book survey that we talked about, really serious sins, like wearing lipstick in church, to not so serious sins like participating in war and things like that. You list them all off and you're supposed to say, “I renounce them all.” And there's a simple woman there who is not hearing him very well and she smiles and says, “I announce them all.” Anyway, from this Anabaptist movement, which goes back and is sometimes put under the category of Manichaeism. I'll just tell you a very little bit about that.

[Writes Manichaeism and Anabaptist] Okay, that's the two terms. About the middle of the third century of our era in what is now Iran there was a charismatic man by the name of Mani who claimed that he was Jesus, or he was the next Jesus. We're not sure exactly how he put it. He collected a lot of followers. There was a movement which, strangely enough, we happen to know now is very environmental – environmentally conscious. It's a funny thing. There was this little black cube about yea big which was ancient papyrus which had gotten fused in the – I believe it was the Vesuvius eruption. Or no, it couldn't have been. Of course. Sorry, sorry. It was two centuries too soon. Way, way after that.

But anyway, it had gotten burned and there was somebody who knew how to unroll, reconstitute papyri in a very secret process in a laboratory in Germany. So, a colleague of mine, carried this black little thing into that lab and they unrolled it and started reading it. And the first words on the first page, when they unrolled, were, "Ego [Mahios 00:27:42]. I, Mani." In other words, this was a handwritten document from him. So, we suddenly, again, discovered some information about a form of, well, Christianity, if you will accept it as such, that got suppressed. Incidentally, the secret process that helped restore papyrus – charred papyrus documents, you inject them with papyrus juice. I'm sure the guy had a PhD and got a Nobel Prize in Papyrology for figuring this out. Pardon my jealousy.

But anyway, we say that a lot of these newer movements are somehow picking up the Manichean religion, which was not much of a religion in Augustine's time. They believed in this fantastical mythology. But they were a sect in the sense that they were outside the cultural mainstream. They were a troublemaking group. And whatever may be the historical affiliation, it's the same general ideology that war and killing are not permissible. That existed then and it keeps coming back through the – in the 12th century you have the Cathars in south of France and so forth. And then in Eastern Europe you have some important figures like Petr Chelčický, that's not necessarily somebody you need to remember, but he wrote a book called, "The Net of Faith," in which he, you know, just lays it out very clearly that this is what the gospel is about.

And things like this will eventually influence Tolstoy. But from these Anabaptists there come three groups that still exist, and which still maintain more or less, but kind of more, a pacifist commitment. And they are the Quakers, the Mennonites, and the Brethren. In the United States today these are the historical peace churches. So, if you are afraid there is going to be a draft and you don't want to be part of it and you don't want to live in Canada, you had better join one of these churches because this one of the ways, traditionally. You can just say, "Dear Draft Board, Ha ha." No, I wouldn't do it that way.

But actually, when I was living in Greenwich Village we had many ways of getting out of a draft. But the official ways were to be a Quaker, a Mennonite, or a Brethren.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:30:27]

Religion and Conscientious Objection to War

Michael: No, it's more complicated. If you want to actually be a conscientious objector, at least in the preceding draft, when the new one comes in, all bets are off. You know, they'll consult with some of our dear colleagues in Boalt Hall and these all rights will be abrogated. But if you wanted to be a conscientious objector in WWII, the only way you could do that was on grounds of religious conscience – faith. And you could do that automatically if you were a Quaker. If you were not a Quaker, which I was not, then you had to argue yourself blue in the face explaining it's against your conscience to kill people and you had to convince the board.

But once they drafted you, they would do with you what you would. In fact, the Quakers in America had a lot of difficulties – I'm skipping ahead a little bit. Quakers in America had a lot of difficulties during the Revolutionary War. There's a largish group of them that were physically dragged out of their homes, I think, in Pennsylvania and were sent to Valley Forge with rifles – muskets strapped to their backs, but they refused to use them. They refused to give in in any way. And to his credit, I have to say that when George Washington found out about it, he immediately released them and sent them back.

Quakers and Resistance to Assimilation

So, of these three groups – the Quakers, the Mennonites, and the Brethren – the Quakers are particularly important. And it's that group that I'm going to focus on. They're important because, for one thing, and this is a direct quote from Peter Brock, that Quaker – he is a Quaker actually, a Quaker Canadian historian that I told you about. "The Anglo-American Society of friends," otherwise known as the Quakers, "presents the only example so far of a major pacifist group which made the transition from sect – countercultural group or movement – to a denomination without eventually discarding it's pacifism in the process.

But he goes on to say that the North American Mennonites are possibly going to be another. Actually, the Mennonites have been very effective and very useful in the last 20 years or so in the area of third-party nonviolent intervention. Before I go into the history of it, I'm going to just continue telling you why there's such an important outfit. For one thing, they get away from legalism and gospel literalism. And they rely upon what they call, "The Inner Light."

Now there still are Quakers today. I there's a little over 200,000 of them worldwide. Now, you know, that probably your local mega-church has more people in it than the entire Quaker movement, but they've been very much more effective than the numbers would indicate. So, one of the characteristics that made them so effective is this inner light belief that they have that you should do what you do – you should stand up for

what you stand up for – because it is revealed to your own conscience and not because you read it in a book, or the society thinks you should or something like that.

So, if you've ever been to a Quaker meeting – are there any Quakers here, by the way? Given 200,000 out of 6 billion it's not likely that you'd get any in this class, even in Berkeley. But if you've ever been to a Quaker meeting, Quaker meeting for worship as opposed to a Quaker business meeting, they will sit in silence and wait for some sort of what they call, "Leading, or guidance or some sort of light." And then they will – I have a friend who's a Quaker. I think I'll bring in him here and show him to you and send him back to San Francisco. He'll appreciate that.

They speak up because they are moved to do so, not because they have any particular role. And so, they have always avoided structure hierarchies within the church. Kevin?

Student: Yeah, my great aunt is a Quaker, but she obviously saw the problems with that though. It's really hard – I mean she lives in Santa Rosa – but it's really hard to make decisions sometimes because people don't speak.

Michael: They don't speak, and they certainly don't like to vote. They want to make decisions by consensus. It does work, but you do need more time. In fact, in pre-colonial New England, that was very widely practiced, but that's because life was very, very slow in those days. You had a chance to do that. So, there are problems with it, no doubt. And that's probably why there's only 200,000 Quakers. They haven't taken over the world.

So, you avoid hierarchy, and you avoid legalism and you do try to ground yourself in some sort of personal revelation. There isn't going to be like the revelation that Jesus gets on Mount Tabor, but it's something of a bit of an insight. And you can tell why I think this is one of the most important characteristics of the movement from the point of view of nonviolence, and that's that it is a mature strong Stage 3 type of commitment where the religion comes from the person's contact with the divine and not from an official or a structure or a document.

Another thing, they have a tradition which is very rare in the Peace Movement. The Peace Movement has been plagued by an issue-specific kind of existence. An atrocity comes up or a war comes up. You get all exercised, you're going to stop this war. You're going to march around saying, "I won't go." You chant, you do stuff like that. In some cases, you get yourself arrested. But when the war is over, because of whatever reason, there's just so many people killed they can't do it anymore, or whatever. There's no movement anymore. So, there's a lack of continuity. Has been very serious. And so, you have a movement here that goes back to the later part of the 17th century, and it's maintained its tradition. That's the second thing.

Not only that, but within that tradition you have what they would call in India, "A Parampara." You have a person-to-person transmission of the revelatory authority. You know, Indians are very proud of saying that the only thing that's different about India is

that for 5000 years there's never been a time when there has not been someone who was aware of God in that country. And so that continuity has been maintained unbroken. And that's in ways that we don't understand. It's extremely important. And I'm going to be talking to you in a little bit about who some of the big people are in this Parampara.

They have also been able to strike a balance between quietism, that is the kind of withdrawal that was I just advising Alana to practice. And assimilation. They have not been assimilated into the mainstream, but they have been active. So, they're able to stay active without being swept up into the mainstream.

My son-in-law, you know, my son-in-law, the doctor. He was in the Peace Corps in Paraguay. And he remembers going upriver one time in some kind of boat. And there was somebody on the boat who was wearing black to head to toe. That seemed kind of odd because, you know, what the weather must be like in a Paraguayan jungle.

They came around the bend in the river and there was a jetty, you know, a quay going out into the river. And there were about 50 people on the quay all dressed in black waiting for this guy. That's because they were Doukhobors or Mennonites or one of those other groups which were like the Quakers in that they both come from an Anabaptist idea, Anabaptist commitment.

But they are what we call enclaved societies. They withdraw completely and say, "We won't have anything to do with war, but guess what? We won't have anything to do with anything else either." These are like the Shakers and some of those people. Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:40:13]

Michael: They have always tended to. Although, the Mennonites, less so. They've been coming out of that recently. But from the very beginning the Quakers have been able to strike this balance being a part of the world, but not letting it affect them, like what we're going to be continuing to talk about.

And finally, they have a knack of working with people who are dogmatically different. They're not like ideologically boxed, you know. "We won't work with you because you're not a Quaker," is not something that you ever hear. Sometimes you're startled to find that a person that you've been working with is actually a Quaker all along.

And this means, of course, that they have, throughout history, had to find ways to make some kinds of compromises. There's a very interesting book. I forget the title of it right now, but it's about Quakerism in India. There's a sub-part of our story, and it's a very interesting story.

Strong but Kind

And an anecdote in this book is about somebody who's standing on the wharf in Bombay and a ship is coming in – this is in the 18th century. A ship is slowly sailing and

just bristling with cannons. And so, the person is standing next to a sailor he says, “Whoa, look at that ship, you know. Boy, what a nasty piece of equipment that is. I wouldn’t want to mess with that.” And the sailor says, “What, that ship? Don’t worry about that. Them’s Quaker guns.”

And it turns out, that what they did was they would carve these guns out of a solid piece of wood and then blacken them with boot black and stick them through the porthole or whatever you stick guns through. So that potential pirates would see all the guns that this ship had, and they wouldn’t attack. So, you might say that this is sort of a compromise. You’re going to be strong, but kind. Or maybe you’re faking? Whatever.

So given that you have a strong tradition which is so prominent in practically every piece in nonviolent operation that goes on, the famous Freedom Rides, Congress of Racial Equality, those all came out of Quaker groups or Quaker fronts like the Fellowship of Reconciliation. And so far as they came out of the north.

George Fox - Foundation of the Quakers

Where does this stuff come from?

Well, the founder of Quakerism was a man by the name of George Fox and his dates were 1624 to 1691. And my chalk is over here. He was born in a little village called Drayton Under the Clay. You really have to be English to have a village like that. You know, I’m born in Brooklyn. You’re born in L.A. or someplace. But he was born in Drayton Under the Clay. And he was a son of a weaver. So, he’s from an artisanal caste.

He seems to have had some sort of education. He was able to write. And by the way, I do also equate those two things in my mind. And he seems to have had a reasonable amount of money. He – I mean modest, but he could get along. He could buy a horse. He could get married. He apparently was tending sheep for a while and was apprenticed to a cobbler. This a century of tremendous spiritual upheaval.

We’re heading into the Cromwellian Revolution, the Restoration. And George Fox was tormented. As a young person he was tormented by the evils of the world. And if you think it was bad then, you know, it’s a good thing he’s not around now. And as he writes in his journals, he got a sort of revelation, a voice came to him saying, “There is one even Christ Jesus who can solve your ills and heal your wounds,” or something like that.

“And these things I did see, I did not see by the help of man,” he writes, “Nor by the letter, though they are written in the letter.” Now this is very typically Quaker – the Bible is a truthful document, but don’t think it’s going to do it for you. “But I saw them in the light of the Lord, Jesus Christ and by his immediate spirit and powers as did the holy men of God by whom the Holy Scriptures were written. In other words, this is a person who believed that he was, in some way, working his way back to the apostolic era.

And he managed to make himself incredibly obnoxious by doing that. He caused so much trouble, it was not unlike Abdul Ghaffar Khan. He spends about between a third and half of his life in prison. British prisons in the 17th century were run on a very bad institutional idea which we're now bringing back. And that is they were privatized. Well, they didn't have to be privatized, they were private. So, people would buy the rights to house prisoners from the Crown and exploit them. You know, not feed them unless they paid you and things like that.

So, he had a magnificent constitution, traveled incessantly, not only up and down the British Isles, but he went to Holland, Germany, and he came to the colonies. But eventually, he broke his health.

Tradition of Imprisonment for Moral Virtue

He suffered eight imprisonments between 1649 and 1673. Now how did he get himself in prison so often? Well, one thing he would do is he would go to churches and at the end of the sermon he would challenge the minister.

Now in those days, there wasn't any separation between church and state and that was one good way of getting yourself imprisoned. You could also get yourself very badly beaten up that way if that was what you wanted to do. But he would challenge these people and say, "Look, are you standing in the light that Saint Paul stood in?" And the person would say, "No, well, you know, I have a degree from Cambridge." And what George Fox said, you know, would expose this person and take everybody out of the church.

By the way, he wouldn't even call it a church. He called it, "A steeple house." Church was the community. A building with a steeple on it was not a church. So, he would take all these people and go up to a nearby hayrick and give them this really inspiring sermon. And he would not comply with social norms. He didn't like them. So, he called everybody, "Thee," instead saying, "Thee and thou," to subordinates or close friends and saying, "You," to people who were superiors. So, all you had to do to throw George Fox into prison was to call him in for questioning. And he wouldn't wear the right kind of hat and he didn't say the right stuff and didn't believe the right things and you could throw him in the clink.

But he was, nonetheless, a tremendously charismatic and powerful person. In 1651, on one of his episodes of being in prison, when the wars of the Restoration, the pre-Restoration were raging, there was a group of soldiers that needed a captain and they offered George Fox that they would buy him out of prison and give him a "preferment" and make him a captain of horse if he would lead their troop.

And I mean just imagine, the guy is up to his knees in sewage with rats swimming around and it's dank and never sees the light of the day. And they're offering him, "You can come out. We'll give you your freedom. All you have to do is cash in your

conscience.” And in the words of another English writer from that period, “I would rather suffer the rest of my days in jail than make a butchery of my conscience.”

And it’s on this occasion that he reads them the famous testimony, “I don’t need your preferment,” he says, “because I live in the virtue of that life and power that takeith away the occasion of all wars.” This is going to be a really important element of Quaker faith, to live in such a way that you are not a war causer in your daily habits – one kind of habits or another, as we will see.

And this is very important because this is one of the first times that this connection is being made. And he goes on to say, “I am come into covenant of peace which was before wars and strife.” In other words, he believed that peace was a primordial condition, that human beings can regain it. And when they did and lived in accordance with that state, they were no longer participating in the causation of wars. And therefore, they could say to the state, we don’t want your protection and we don’t owe you any service.

Finally, this – let me just find it here. This belief was formalized in what’s called, “The Richmond Declaration of Faith.” And that took place in 1659. Let me see if I can find the exact words or just I’ll tell you – yeah, here we go. This was their protestation. George Fox still being alive, “We utterly deny all outward wars and strife and fighting with outward weapons.”

Jihad - Inner and Outer Struggle

Okay, one of the things that I forgot to tell you, because I guess I was already getting sick, otherwise how could I have possibly made such a slip when we were talking about Islam. I was going to talk about this notorious concept of jihad.

You know, we talk about people being jihadists and so forth. And what Westerners think Jihad is, is a commitment to wage outward war against infidels. But there is a hadith, a story about the prophet, that he was in a battle with his companions, and they won. And they’re riding back from the battle. And one of his companions proudly says to him, “Well, we have won. We have succeeded in the jihad.” And Mohammed the prophet immediately says to him, “That was the jihad al-asghar. That was the lesser jihad. What I want you to succeed in is the jihad al-akbar, or the greater jihad.” And what he meant by that is the jihad al-akbar, the great jihad was the inner struggle, which is not against others, but against negativity, anger, fear, so forth, greed in ourselves.

So, when the Quakers declared in Richmond in 1659 that they were opposed to all outward wars, they meant, “No thank you. We’re going to struggle with the forces of evil within ourselves and not against other people.” And I guess there is nothing that we could say is more fundamental to nonviolence than that. The basic commitment to violence is to fight against bad guys, never against yourself. You know, kill 560,000

Iraqis to bring them democracy, but let's never talk about what you're doing to democracy in your own country. That's the ultimate characteristic of all violence.

And conversely, the characteristic of nonviolence is not that only you avoid outward struggle, but that you undertake inward struggle and that takes up all of the time and energy and effort. So, to continue with this famous declaration, "We utterly deny all outwards and strife and fighting with outward weapons for any end or under any pretense whatsoever. The Spirit of Christ by which we are guided is not changeable so as to command us from a thing as evil and again, to move unto it." In other words, the commitment has got to be absolute in terms of this declaration or it doesn't make any sense.

"And we know that the spirit which leads us into all truth will never move us to fight and war against any man with outward weapons neither for the kingdom of Christ," that's very important, "nor for the kingdom of this world." What's inevitably going to go on, if you compromise this commitment, is you're going to fight for a kingdom of this world and pretend that it's for the kingdom of Christ. Why? Because I said so.

But look at history and I think that's what you'll see. So, let's see. I'm going to try to talk about all three of these people today, so I've got to make this a little bit quick. The Quakers were severely persecuted by the Anglican Church, and that's one of the reasons that they came to this continent where they didn't always fare much better. If you ever go to Boston there's a statue in Boston Common of a woman named Mary Dyer who was hanged there in the 17th century just because she was a Quaker. On one occasion, this again is anecdotal. He was in Virginia talking to a Virginia planter, and they were arguing about whether Native Americans had souls.

And George Fox was getting very upset by this line of argumentation, and he called over – there happened to be a Native American person standing there. He called him over, and he said, "Tell, me do you ever tell a lie?" And the Native American person said, "Yeah, you know, sometimes I guess I do." And Fox said, well, how do you feel about it?" And he said, "Eh, not so great. I really don't like it actually. I feel terrible."

And then Fox turned to this Virginia planter and said, "See, that proves that this person has a soul. He has a conscience." So, what we're looking at is not just a rejection of "outward wars" and so forth. But a rejection of every aspect of violence. That's the one really inspiring characteristic about George Fox. He's holistic. He's completely a person-based person who's against violence in any way, shape, or form.

And the Quakers – incidentally, they got this term because they had these revivalist movements where they would get the spirit and it would cause them to quake. So, people called them, "Quakers," as a term of deprecation, an insult, but they decided to adopt it. Which again, is a pretty nonviolent thing. Many letters and replies in Gandhi's newspapers where someone will send him a very angry insulting letter and he'll say, "Hmm, that's interesting. It looks like this letter was intended as an insult, but I'm not going to take it as such," and he would go on from there.

Where was I? Oh yes, this phrase of theirs which is – probably if we had to sum up one thing, very important. There is that of God in every person. So that, what you find today, is that Quakers are at the forefront of practically every aspect of nonviolent reform that's going on.

George Fox and William Penn

Now one of the many followers that Fox had was someone who's very important for us in the U.S. of A, especially if you live on the East Coast, and that was William Penn. Now let me put his dates down also.

I really would be happy if you would remember these three people and their dates. I haven't asked you much in the way of dates, but somehow I just think this would be a good orienter. [Geo. Fox 1624-91. Wm. Penn, 1644-1718.] So, he's 20 years younger than Fox. And he comes from a very different background. His father was an Admiral.

And in fact, his – he had one – a very important battle against the Irish for Charles the II. And therefore, Charles II owed him a lot of money, much more money than he could possibly pay. So instead, he just gave him a little possession. This little possession is what you and I now know as Pennsylvania. And that was in March of 1681 when William Penn was sent to the colonies to become the governor of this vast tract, which is more or less modern Pennsylvania.

But William Penn had fallen under the influence very heavily of George Fox. On one occasion – he was a military man – Penn was walking around with this sword. And he suddenly got nervous about it, and he said to Fox, "Should I carry this sword?" And Fox said to him, "Sir, wear thou sword as long as thou canst." In other words, "If you don't have an inner revulsion against the thing, you better carry it." So again, it is characteristic of a principled nonviolent approach to warfighting and conscientious objection that, "There shall be no compulsion in matters of religion." And you cannot compel a person even to desist from war fighting if they don't believe that it's wrong to fight. You'd have to try to wake them up.

Penn's Letter of Tolerance and the Great Law

So, he did two things rather quickly on arriving over here. He wrote a letter – in fact, before he even got here he wrote a letter – to the Delaware Indians, which is a famous document in the history of racial tolerance where he said, "Okay, God has put me in charge of you people. But I'm going to try to exercise love toward you in all ways." I'm just sort of paraphrasing. It's really quite a beautiful letter in which he said, "You know, let's live together in love and peace." You know, you might argue that it would have been better to say, "I won't rule over you at all," but it just wasn't possible at that time.

So, there's this famous letter of toleration towards the Indians. And in December – on December 7th of 1682 – and I recommend that this December 7th be celebrated instead of December 7th, 1941, or whenever that was – 42 – Pearl Harbor. He promulgated what came to be known as, “The Great Law.” And the Great Law was about as nonviolent a set of regulations as you can possibly imagine, especially for that period. There are only 12 capitol crimes. You might think that's 12 too many, but remember, you live in the 21st century, right? This is the 21st century? And he's working in the 17th century.

And in England at that time there were 200 crimes that were punishable by death. Things like stealing and debt and swearing and drinking the wrong kinds of beer and things like that. So, to reduce it from 200 to 12 was a big deal. He also – this is so far ahead of his time, it's almost unbelievable – he tried to organize the penal system so that people would not be put in prison for debt. And people who were put in prison, would be enabled to [Nagler's mic cuts out. Remainder of recording is from the camera mic] find employment of some kind, and make reparation for their crimes, and work their way out of it.

Another part of the Great Law was complete religious tolerance. And bear in mind here, we're talking about 1682, so these people were ahead of their time. And this led to what has become known to American historians as, “The Holy Experiment.” It lasted about 75 years. In fact, Penn called it, “A Holy Experiment.” Said, “There may be room here-” sorry. When he was in England talking about setting up an ideal Christian community in this country – [unintelligible 01:03:49]. He said, “There may be room there, though not here for such a holy experiment.”

He also – I'm not getting the exact years of these. Well, it would be for about 1682 down for the next 75 years, slightly past the death of William Penn. Basically [unintelligible 01:04:16] vast tract of territory but didn't have as many people. Probably one neighborhood in Philadelphia has more people than the entire colony had at that time. But the entire area was [unintelligible 01:04:30] principles. And that means that there were no wars between the pale face and the Native Americans in that part of the country.

So, it shows that not only is it doable, but it's robust. A Quaker historian and [unintelligible 01:04:52] by the name of William [Diamond] said, “The only natural opportunity the Christian world has afforded us, ascertaining the safety of relying on God for defense has succeeded.” He's talking about the 75-year-old experiment. And incidentally, this quote comes from a book – I just want you to have this information – by Adin Ballou who in 1815 started a colony. He's not a Quaker. He's a founder of Unitarian Universalism. He wrote in the early 1800's an amazingly good book called, “Christian Nonresistance in all its Important Bearings,” [unintelligible 01:05:50]. They really did titles right in those days. Sometimes all you had to do was to read the title. You didn't have to get through the whole book. But this book is amazing in its accurate comprehension of the basic principles of principled nonviolence.

Okay, well, the Holy Experiment came to an end not because it was overrun by wild Indians wearing war garb, but because they were under a lot of pressure from the Crown. And unfortunately, in the next generation, people didn't see the light. They didn't uphold the values. They decided to use their power to cheat the Delaware individuals. And in a short period of time, Pennsylvania more or less joined the mainstream. Though you still have a city called, "The City of Brotherly Love," in that state. There's probably more Quakers per square inch in Pennsylvania, if not Philadelphia than anywhere else.

Strength of Kindness

Just to share one other story with you of that pre-colonial era, we don't know exactly when and where this happened, but there was a Quaker meeting of worship. And they were sitting in their rough log cabin with their eyes closed, not saying anything. There was a war party of Native Americans sneaking up on them, deciding to attack and scalp and do all those things that these people did, according to Hollywood. And when the – when our Friends – capital F – Friends opened their eyes at the end of the meeting and turned to leave, they were surprised to find all of these Native Americans sitting there with their eyes closed, all dressed up in war paint with their tomahawks on their side.

So, they said, "Um, hi. What are you doing here?" And they said, "Well, we came here to kill you. But when we saw that you were worshipping the same great God that we worship, we just decided to join you." So again, you can be kind and strong. [Motions to the blackboard] And we can put a checkmark in that box.

Now the third – oh, it's kind of a shame we only have ten minutes for him because he's a really sweet guy. But the third important American Quaker that I wanted you to know about is John Woolman. His dates are 1720 – so not quite any overlap – to 1772. And we're back in the [civil 01:08:53] artisan caste. And if – the big lesson that William Penn endorsed is that it's possible to have nonviolence from the top down. So, this gets back to my famous formula, not so much about having different kinds of people in power, but a different kind of power in people. You can organize nonviolence from any sector of society. That's the importance of the Holy Experiment.

The importance of John Woolman is [unintelligible 01:09:28] really understand the significance of the [unintelligible 01:09:32]. He was an abolitionist. And his journal is recognized as one of the classics of spiritual life in a greater tradition. Until he was 21 he worked for his father who was a farmer. And then he moved to New Jersey, Mount Holy, to take up a trade. Again, he was – he made a little money as a Quaker – gosh, I'm losing it today – he made a little money as a – nobody ever made money as a Quaker [Laughter]. [Unintelligible 01:10:20] make more money as a professor than as a Quaker – as a tailor I meant to say. You can make money as a tailor. He started that in 1743. But he could write, which not everybody could do. And so, he offered – he also had work as writing legal documents for people. And in 1743 he was asked by his employer to write a bill of sale for a slave. And that faced with a quandary.

Again, the famous ability of nonviolent people, when they cling to the principle, their ability to compromise on inessentials, even though these in essentials freak us out and we say, "Oh, we should never do that." We say, "What he should have done was throw down his pen and say, "I will never work for you again. The hell with this. I'm going to get an honest job in a nonprofit in San Francisco and leave." But he didn't do that. He said, "Okay, I'm your employee, I do not have the right to tell you what to do. I don't have the right to refuse. So, I am going to write this bill of sale for you, but then our relationship comes to an end. I'm not going to do this kind of work anymore." And he spent the rest of his life mainly working against slavery.

And I'll say something about that in a second, but he also had a wonderful relationship with Native Americans. On one occasion there were rumors that there was going to be a war party. So, he and a friend decided they would just walk into Indian territory, contact those people, "Hey, what's your problem?" Do a real Johan Galtung approach to them. And crammed himself in this little hut. And sure enough, a Native American person came in with a very nasty looking tomahawk on his belt, glowering at him. And John Woolman got up and smiled, embraced him, sat him down and tried to have a conversation, which wasn't all that easy because they didn't have a common language.

And the person got up and left. And John Woolman went to look at his friend who was terrified. His friend said, "Didn't you notice that he had a tomahawk?" And he said, "Yes," John Woolman said, "it did have a rather disagreeable appearance. And it struck me that perhaps the person was frightened. So, I decided to resolve his fears and show him that we were friends and he had nothing to fear from us." So, I've been repeatedly admonished by friends of late to add, this does not always work. Don't go out and get yourself killed and say, "Professor Nagler told me it will be alright." It doesn't always work. But there is something there will always have an effect."

Now okay, so his approach, similarly, to slavery, was unique. If you contrast him with William Lloyd Garrison – he's one of the later abolitionists – they were very anti-slaveholder. It got to the point where there were almost more anti-slaveholder than there were anti-slavery. And this goes on today in some groups which are anti a particular kind of violent abuse. They get so angry at the abusers that it ends up not being a very nonviolent thing. We'll talk about that next semester.

But he decided to do a remarkable thing which was to go down south, which is not easy to do in those days, and talk to slaveholders. Some of them were Quakers. So, they would take them in. He would stay with them, and he'd say, "Let's talk about this slave thing. Why do you do it?" And they would explain, "It's the only way we can get enough cotton picked to make money." And he would actually enter discussions with them about how they could make a substitute livelihood. So, in other words, he's seeing it from their point of view, acknowledging that they have a different [unintelligible 01:14:52] and trying to work with them to see if there's a better way to resolve it. So, it was an entirely constructive, positive way to approach the slaveholding issue.

The other commitment that this led into is really one of big significance for us – to see the economic connection. And he writes a lovely little book called, “A Plea for the Poor,” which you can get out at the library. And I want to read you just part of one page. “This is like a chain,” he says, “in which the end of one link encloseth the end of another.” Okay, got the image? Let’s go. “The rising up of a desire to obtain wealth is the beginning link. This desire being cherished, it moves to action; and riches thus gotten, please self.” And they’re pleasant for you. “And while self has a life in them, it desires to have them defended.”

At the end of the semester, we’re going to talk about the Gandhian answer to this, and I’m actually looking to teach a course in Gandhian economics in the foreseeable future. But “Wealth is attended with power by which bargains and proceedings, contrary to universal righteousness are supported.” So, you’ve got wealth. You start to take pleasure in material things. You want to defend them. On the other hand, you have a lot of power, and you don’t have to hold reason and persuasion anymore. Link by link by link you’re led into war by the desire for wealth.

“And hence oppression, carried on with worldly policy and order, clothes itself with the name of justice and becomes like a seat of discord in the soul.” So, he’s tracing that back. And he says, “Oh, that we who declare against wars, and acknowledge our trust to be in God only, may walk in the light, and therein examine our foundation and motives in holding great estates! May we look upon,” This is the famous sentence that I’ve been leading up to. I hope you enjoy it. “May we look upon our treasures, and the furniture of our houses, and the garments...and try whether the seeds of war have nourishment in these, our possessions.”

So again, this is something that we take for granted, but we could broadly take it for granted because they did it 200 and however many years ago. Once he reached this realization, the women stopped dyeing – wearing clothes that were dyed. So, it’s very similar to Gandhi wearing homespun khadi because there were lots of things wrong with the dyeing industry. And as a matter of fact, he looked like quite a freak.

And he goes over to England toward the end. This would probably be 1770 – 1771. And goes to a London Quaker meeting, where I’ve also visited, and he’s so weird that they ask him to leave. You know, when he realizes what’s going on he gets up and does a beautiful little speech. He says, “I’m so sorry. I didn’t come here to make you feel uncomfortable. If you don’t want me here, I’ll be happy to withdraw myself.” And before he could get out the door they realized their mistake. And they said, “We’re sorry, you know, you’re one of us.” He contracted a fever and died in London in 1772. Apparently, he had a vision toward the end of his life, and tells people standing around him, “I see all of humanity as one yellow mass of suffering.”

So, let’s figure maybe next Thursday what that means. So, on Thursday, actually [unintelligible 01:18:58].

20. The American Civil Rights movement: Guest Lecture

Michael: Good morning everyone. I hope you've enjoyed your first full day under a democratic administration, sort of. I was hoping that maybe Alana would be feeling a little better considering the problems, the very demoralizing problems, we were talking about yesterday and I want to talk about again next week. I actually started to think that what we're doing in this class is probably the most hopeful and encouraging thing that we can do for ourselves in this kind of a situation. And I'll try and explain why I'm more excited about that than I am about the election on Tuesday.

I mentioned that the Nonviolent Peaceforce is having a big fundraising campaign, and they would like some help putting out brochures. And if anyone would have some time to go around to bookstores and stuff in the next couple of days, that's what that top line is about. That's the email address to use. And those of you who have an interest in working with Berkeley High School, Berkeley International High School, I'm going to be meeting with the director of that in the Metta office from about 4:00 to 5:00 today. Okay?

So, as you know, today, Jolina, this is part of my ongoing attempt to exploit graduate students. Jolina, who is actually getting a PhD in African American studies, is going to give us a kind of a historical and other overview about the Civil Rights Movement and King. And then we have a very special guest today, Prasad, who is from the Sarvodaya Movement which is the – Sarvodaya means, "The uplift of all," which is one of Gandhi's concepts spread to Sri Lanka and elsewhere. And I have just been talking the whole morning with him about programs for exchange between our university and theirs – there are a couple of universities in their grassroots programs in India. So, any of you who are PACS majors or even if you're – PACS majors with an emphasis in nonviolence. And we've, you know, been long saying to you, but we don't have a graduate program for you, but now we do.

It's in India. And if you talk to [Persad] after our class and he might be with us at the Metta office this afternoon also. In fact, I think if we can get it arranged between 3:15 and 4:00 he and I will be having an interview there about the status of Gandhian struggles in India today. And any of you who are free, please feel free to join us. If you go to 2330 Durant, which is Durant between Dana and Ellsworth – I should know where my own office is – and you go around to the back of the building and there's a long wooden ramp that leads you into our meeting room and then another one step further. Just make a lot of noise and we'll hear you, come out and get you from the office.

Okay, so what we're going to do today is Jolina is going to give us this power packed – you've heard of power slides, well, this is a power packed introduction. I always do this to my colleagues, make them give us 50 years of history in 40 minutes. And I hope we'll have time at the end for some questions. If not, hold your questions, if you'd be so kind. And we'll hear from Prasad because he's with us only here today. And then we'll take

the questions over the weekend. And what I'd like you to be thinking about, for next week, when we're wrapping up the Civil Rights Movement, is an overview kind of comparison. If you'll compare and contrast what is similar and what is different between the Civil Rights Movement in our country and a movement on which it was partly based – the Freedom Struggle in India.

Okay, so I'll get out of the way and let Jolina take it away from here. You know how to put this on? You were so clever to wear Black. Okay, that has to clip on you somewhere.

Intro to the Civil Rights Movement

Jolina: Okay. So, I think it's not absolutely realistic that I'm going to get through all the information today. So, I kind of would like to plan for a few minutes next Tuesday so that I can finish. But what I wanted to start off with – and I wanted to say thank you for the guests that we have today. I wanted to start off with this idea that what we generally – when I first came into the Civil Rights Movement with was the very superficial idea of what the Civil Rights Movement was, which is what I wrote up here.

In the 1960's in the south, Black ministers led a nonviolent movement for the civil rights of Black Americans, which isn't entirely untrue. But it's this idea that it's very much like the top of an iceberg. In reality, a Civil Rights Movement, like an iceberg has a top that we can see that we're generally knowledgeable about. But there's also all of this. It's underneath the surface that we really have to acknowledge to get the real sense of what the Civil Rights Movement was. Or in that case, to get the real sense of what this iceberg is.

So, what I'd like to do today is to really start to unpack almost word by word this statement so we get a better sense, not only in the Civil Rights Movement, but what we can learn from it as students of nonviolence, but also as activists because I know that many of you are activists. So, the first thing, so in this sense that I want, I'm just going to reiterate, if we think of the Civil Rights Movement – each part of this sentence is like an iceberg. So, in the 60s, in the south, Black ministers led a nonviolent social movement. So, all of these different things are like the top of an iceberg.

If we think of the Civil Rights Movement as only this part above the water, we fail to comprehend the true reality. Some elements of this "true reality" are revealed by looking at the Civil Rights Movement. And these different elements of the true reality include; first is this idea of the oneness of past, present, and future.

So, I'd like to talk about the past, the history that came before the Civil Rights Movement and how that directly impacted the nature of this movement, how our actions may not have immediate visible effects, but they do make significant impacts later. And we'll see this, for example, Ella Baker was one of the Civil Rights Movement leaders.

And the organizing that she did say, 10 – 20 years before the movement had significant direct impacts during the movement.

Also, what I'm going to draw out of this lecture is this idea that swadeshi, this idea of starting with change at home or change within ourselves wasn't a hard and fast rule in this movement, but we can definitely see how people working within their individual communities, whether it's in Chicago, New York, or Nairobi, or London, that people all over the world that were becoming active. They didn't necessarily have to go down to the south to impact this movement. Rather, where they were also had effects worldwide, but particularly on the Civil Rights Movement.

Another point that I am pushing to get to the lecture so that I can bring out is that the Civil Rights Movement was, indeed, a people's movement, that we like to talk about King because he was significant. He was an amazing human being, leader, Christian, etc. But it, indeed, involved tens of thousands of people. So, I want to bring this out. There was also this combination – and this goes into our – the way that we talk about King in the movement – that it was a combination of both leadership, of having someone strong guiding the movement, but also this idea that so many people were empowered to create change in their communities and their lives.

Okay, I'm going to go – just start the lecture and the other few ideas will come out.

Tradition of Activism

So, starting in the 1960's. And I'd like to suggest that instead of this idea of in the 1960's, it's more like in the 1960's after 100 years of anti-racist activism. Okay, so in 1865 slavery was abolished in the United States. And immediately after there were some political rights granted to people, particularly in the South. We had African Americans elected to public office – into Congress, and we had two Black senators which didn't happen for many, many decades – decades, decades after. So, it's this idea that African Americans were starting to become active politically in 1865, 67, 68. So this is kind of really early history.

We also had Black leaders who were emerging in the turn of the century like Dubois and Booker T. Washington. Dubois was born in Massachusetts. He ended going to Harvard to get his PhD. He ended up going to study sociology before it was sociology in Germany. So extremely well-trained and he was not only an intellectual and a very successful one, but he was also an activist. So, he was one of the founders of the NAACP. He spoke out during WWI with this campaign of the Double V. So, victory at home and victory abroad.

And through the NAACP, really, the early years were dedicated – dedicated a lot of time to making noise about lynchings. And so, while they had –

Student: [Unintelligible 00:10:39]

Jolina: Lynchings. So, in a sense, they were doing anti-violent work, not necessarily nonviolent work, but they would – in their office in Harlem they would post – they would have a big sign and say someone was lynched today so that people knew, so that this violence wouldn't go unheard.

So, these Black leaders had different ideas of what Black activism would be. Washington believed that we need to stay a little more quiet while we get training. So developed the – or he became active at the Tuskegee Institute getting Black workers trained. So, moving on. So, we had this idea, political rights, Black leaders, and Black intellectuals.

But the activist base, particularly in Harlem, had a lot more to do with nationalism. So, we have Marcus Garvey who's coming from Jamaica and suggesting that Black people need to unite. There are thousands and thousands of dues paying members who had this idea that they were going to create a Black nation. We also had a lot of communist/Marxist activity also in Harlem. And they were particularly active with the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters. Again, they were extremely active, but there was this contentious relationship between the nationalists and the communists and the Marxists.

There was also concurrent activity beyond what I've just spoken of. So, we had, again, anti-lynching struggles. We had reparations struggles. We had different battles for voter registration. So really, this idea that Black activism emerged in the 1960's is not a reality. The reality is there was tons of activism, particularly anti-racist and Civil Rights activism extending significantly between the abolishment of slavery in 1865 and the Civil Rights Movement which actually started in 1954.

Okay, so the idea that the Civil Rights Movement was a 60's movement is not really true. It started in '54 with Brown versus Board when I guess segregation of public schools was outlawed. And in 1955, we had the official kind of activism starting beyond the legislative changes. We had the Montgomery Bus Boycotts. And so, they started in '54, lasted until '56. And it was significant because it was a people's movement that succeeded. And we had bus boycotts. It had happened before. We had had sit-ins. It had happened before. We even had freedom journeys that had happened before. But this was the first one that was significant. It was successful.

And these people stayed off the buses for 381 days. These were women – you'd just see them marching in their heels to work to work all day as maids and then marching home. We had people sacrificing their cars when cars were really expensive, to drive people around. So, you had intense organization. And you also had these mass meetings, sometimes twice a week, sometimes more, where people were, again, after marching to their jobs in the morning, working all day, marching home, feeding their children. They would then congregate at these mass meetings and talk about peace and this freedom struggle and what this meant and how they were going to win and how they would become victorious.

Okay, so this hopefully deconstructed this a little bit – unpacked this idea that it was a 60's movement.

National Movement for Civil Rights

And then I'd like to unpack this idea that it was a Southern movement. So again, this brings us back into history. And first of all, I would like to talk about – there are two great migrations of African Americans to the North. And these migrations really blurred the lines between the southern “negro” and the northern “negro.” Before we had African Americans who were living in Philadelphia for hundreds – I mean well, that they knew themselves as northern African Americans or African Americans of New York who were grounded in the North.

But now you had thousands – waves of thousands and thousands of workers, primarily men, who were boarding trains and busses, etc., and making a new life in the North. The second migration, which was most significant for the Civil Rights Movement happened between 1907 and 1929. And it really brought this idea of the old negro, i.e., which is a pejorative term, I might add, where it's the southern negro who was slow, who's lazy, who's – you had images of minstrels and this idea that southern negroes were silly, and they were like clowns. Whereas the northern negroes were educated. They were politically aware and active. They were well dressed. They were modern. They were contemporary. And this was not only an idea that was propagated by media, but particularly propagated by Black people in the north. And I guess that's not so surprising, but also particularly propagated by artisan intellectuals like Dubois.

You also have this exchange which further blurred the lines between Northern African Americans and Southern African Americans, there was constant exchange. So, people would move to the North, but then spend their summers down South. Or they'd move to the North, and everybody – like their congregation would move north. They still had kind of a southern community up north. A lot of kids would spend years in the South with, say, their grandparents and then come up and live in the North. So, there was this constant exchange and this idea of home for many people was actually down south even if their permanent residence was in the North.

And then moving further into the Civil Rights Movement, the people who were involved in the different organizations were both Southern and Northern.

In Friendship for Civil Rights

We had, for example, a group called, “In Friendship.” In Friendship was founded by Ella Baker, Stanley Levison, and Bayard Rustin. Ella Baker was born in the South. She went to college in the South and then she moved up North and started becoming politically active there. Bayard Rustin was born in Pennsylvania. He had become active a little bit

in the South, but he was primarily a Northern person. Finally, Stanley Levison was very much a Northern person.

Student: Can you talk a little slower?

Jolina: Okay. Good. So, he – this idea that the – okay. So, In Friendship, the organization's task was to raise money for the bus boycotters in Mississippi. So here was a group of people who originated from both the North and the South. Their headquarters were in the North, but all of their fundraising activities were for the South. So, this is further extending this idea that having this movement as just a Southern movement in opposition to it being a Northern movement or kind of a national movement, is problematic, because again, we had organizing in both places.

Campaigns of the Civil Rights Movement

I guess next we have also this idea that the great campaigns – Montgomery, the Montgomery Bus Boycotts, the sit-ins in Nashville, the Freedom Rides, and I'm going to go through these later – that indeed they were in the South, but a lot of the Civil Rights Movement had more – was more than just these particular campaigns. It was about this idea of changing the nature of the United States and its culture. And so, we had journalists, artists, activists, educators – and the list goes on – who were active in the North, in the West, in the Northwest. Really, throughout the country people were standing up and making change in their own communities, and people's minds were being changed not only in the South.

Spiral - 1961

One example of that is in New York. There was an organization that was started in 1961 by an artist named Romare Bearden. It was called, "Spiral." And these artists got together, and they created these various art shows that would travel throughout the United States. And they were speaking out against lynching, and they were speaking up for the bus boycotts and they were really trying to get the idea out that this was significant to them as New York-based artists. So again, it's this idea that – just kind of bringing it back – that it was not just in the South, that the activity was really going on throughout the country.

I'm going to skip one and just go to the kind of final point in really pushing this idea forward, is that – I feel like I've pushed it into a space where it's, "Okay, not just the South. It's also the North."

Civil Rights and Human Rights

But this Civil Rights Movement also had a very international component. First of all, we know that it was very much influenced by the Indian struggle and their independence.

Let's see. There was also the impact of the Cold War which we could really spend a few lectures on, the impact of the Cold War and Cold War politics. But it was very clear that Washington – they were reacting to King, to the Civil Rights Movement, to the different activity, with a very developed awareness of how this was affecting their ability to spread democracy abroad when, in fact, democracy wasn't really happening at home. And this was being pushed into the media globally because it was now so obvious. Do you have a question?

Student: Does this fit in with the idea of non-embarrassment?

Michael: Jolina, repeat the questions.

Jolina: So, the question is, does this fit in with the idea of non-embarrassment? It does. And so, there was – actually, there was an exchange between Martin Luther King Jr. and Kennedy which had to do with this particular idea of – just like we're not explicitly trying to embarrass you, but we are – we have to get these ideas out. We have to demonstrate to the world what is going on. So, I don't know how well that answers your question, but we can certainly discuss it.

Michael: I think it slightly went the other way too because it became an item in the Cold War that America was disgraced by its treatment of its own Black citizens. And that become something that communist countries could actually exploit. So, in a way, the issue was de-non-embarrassment. It was like the opposite of non-embarrassment. It was “disembarrassing” the United States, in way – if you could get people to see it.

Leaders of the Civil Rights Movement

Jolina: Okay, so that moves us out of – and making a point and getting a fuller understanding that it wasn't just a movement that was of the 60's and a movement that was of the south. But also, this idea that it was Black ministers or a Black people's movement. And it certainly was, but it also involved white activists and was particularly influenced by Jewish activists. And so, the white activists that were involved, who weren't necessarily involved in the church, were people like E.D. Nixon who was a labor activist, A. Philip Randolph who was also a labor activist. And also, it wasn't only African American activists, but you also had Caribbean activists like Stokely Carmichael who became active towards the end of the movement.

The Black church activists are pretty obvious. So, we have King. We have people like Vernon Johns and Howard Thurman. You have the entire SCLC which is the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. And so, it's a group of Black ministers. But the idea is you had Black ministers and Black people, but you also had Jewish friends like Jean Steinberg, who worked at the SNCC office (Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee), became very close with Ella Baker. You had Stanley Levison who was one of the advisors of King. And you had really countless others.

You also had FOR, the Fellowship of Reconciliation and CORE, which became a branch for the Congress of Racial Equality which was certainly an interracial group, certainly a combination of white activists and Black activists working together. And finally, what becomes kind of significant is this idea about who made the ultimate sacrifice for the movement and many – King died for the movement. A few Black activists died for the movement, but so did white activists. And I find it very interesting that the organization that later became the Black Panthers, which was founded in Alabama, was inspired to start organizing after the death of two white activists. And so, I found that very, very interesting.

Finally, just to further push forward this point, is that not only was it Black, white, and Jewish activists. It was also ministers and lawyers and grassroots activists and students and farmers and educated and church members and the list goes on. It was men, women, people who were gay, who were straight, who were rich, who were poor, who were secular, communists, capitalist. I know I'm saying this fast, but the idea is that this was really a people's movement. That it wasn't just ministers. It was people from all sorts of different backgrounds who were able to participate in many different ways.

Let's see. So unfortunately, this idea of a people's movement – I mean people certainly talk about it. But it's difficult, in part because there were so many factions. So, what happens is you'll get a book on the women in the Civil Rights Movement or Bayard Rustin. And it's been hard to talk about all these people at once. And so, I'm struggling with it to an extent that I'm going to skip to the ministers and kind of the front line leaders.

You had Ella Baker, for example. She's one these people that often gets thrown in with, "The People." I mean she was a person, right? She didn't have a lot of money. She was a woman. She was married for 20 years, but nobody knew it. So, people thought she was either a lesbian or she was single or something like that. She was old. She felt one of the reasons that Martin Luther King Jr. and SCLC ministers weren't so interested in working with her was because she was an older woman.

Let's see. We also had people like Septima Clark who became the Director of the Highlander Folk School. The Highlander Folk School, I would suggest, really brought grassroots organizing to us, to the U.S. I mean it was really intense, and she was the director of this school. This was a Black woman raised in the South. Diane Nash, another person – a person we probably won't hear of. She was raised in Chicago. She was a candidate for Miss America. She went down to Nashville, was extremely upset about the segregation practices there, became involved, and one of the pinnacle moments of, I think, the Civil Rights Movement, is she goes up to the mayor and says, "Do you think the segregation between Black people and white people is moral?"

And he stutters and he says, "No. I don't think so." "Do you think that lunch counters should be desegregated?" "Yes." I mean it's just like, Oh, my God, here's this young woman. She's – you know, I'm so excited – because this is a person that's standing up.

This is not King .This is not Abernathy. This is not even Bayard Rustin. This is this young student, woman, our age, who was so pivotal in the desegregation of the South.

So, you have these different women involved. You also had men involved who we don't hear so much about. John Lewis is one who was born extremely poor in, I think, it was Mississippi – Alabama? Okay, extremely poor and there was a concern that he didn't speak well enough and didn't dress well enough. He was a little rough around the edges, but he also became extremely influential in Nashville. He was trained very, very rigorously in nonviolence, and he became a leader in the movement.

And then we have people who we do hear a little bit more of, Wyatt T. – they call him Wyatt T., Reverend Abernathy, and other ministers in the SCLC. So, what I'm really trying to tease out here is certainly there were ministers who were willing to give their lives. And most significantly and most regularly it was giving their livelihood because these people were getting sued left and right to become intimidated. Let's see. So, we have this idea of it's a people's movement. We also have these leaders who are coming from different backgrounds.

Intro to MLK Jr.

And then we have King. So, King got involved – let's check the time. Cool. King got involved in the Civil Rights Movement in 1955 officially. But his involvement in the Blacks' freedom struggle really started well before then. He was born to a Black Baptist Minister who was also – well, he was a third-generation Black Baptist minister. He became a third-generation Black Baptist minister. So very, very much involved in the church and exposed to the church. He ends up going to more houses and beginning to explore the idea of him becoming a minister there.

He ends up going to Crozer Seminary Theology School and studying Christianity there, which I felt was significant because he's starting to move north and starting to explore these kind of broad ideas of what it means to be a Christian, what it means to be a minister, what it means to create – well, a kind of, I guess, Christian practice that sit right with him instead of just adopting what it was that was around him.

He ended up going to Boston University, and he received his PhD in 1955. Also, significant because King's idea was not to become the greatest Civil Rights leader that – rather his idea was, "I want to be a professor. I want to teach people about ideas. I want to have an office. I want to kind of live a little bit of a secluded life." But that was really far from what he ended up leading.

So, he was an intellectual, but also, even though he wanted to kind of lead a secluded life, he had really proven his oratory skills, both at Crozer and at Boston University.

MLK and the Mississippi Improvement Association

So, with the combination of his intellect and his speaking abilities, and his family background, he was appointed minister at Dexter Church in Montgomery, Alabama.

But it was while he was at Dexter that he became involved in the Montgomery Bus Boycott. And it's this idea that the Montgomery Bus Boycott was already going on – or it had been started. Rosa Parks had courageously decided not to move. There was some idea that, okay, this is our chance to really move to create a bus boycott. The Mississippi Improvement Association was founded. And then King was appointed the president of this association.

So, he became involved and through his involvement he really, really proved himself as a leader. The kind of speeches he gave, the kind of discipline he provided was really, really significant.

CORE and SCLC

But what was also significant was he had advisors. He had advisors particularly for nonviolence. And so, he first brought down a man named Bayard Rustin who I've mentioned a few times already today. Write it on the board? Okay. [Writes Bayard Rustin] Okay, so Bayard Rustin was one of my favorite people of the Civil Rights Movement because he was very eclectic. He was born as a Quaker in Pennsylvania to a very interesting family, becomes involved in different kinds of activism, goes, stays, spends some time in the East Village, very bohemian kind of life. And he ends up being one of the founders of CORE, the Congress of Racial Equality.

He gets brought down to assist Martin Luther King, to really think about nonviolence, how it can be applied, how they can sustain the movement through nonviolence. Really, this very rigorous academic, pretty much scientific study of nonviolence. But there's a problem. Bayard Rustin is not only bohemian which isn't really welcomed in the South, he's also gay and people know this. And the SCLC, well, what becomes the SCLC and the Black ministers, and really people were concerned that this would raise some controversy that the movement wasn't quite ready for.

So, Glenn Smiley, of CORE, then came down to the South and he kind of replaced Rustin and furthered this study of nonviolence. He provided trainings. He really enabled this movement to understand, and King in particular, what is nonviolence – particularly, what is nonviolence from a Gandhian perspective.

So, with the help of these two advisors and with the work of the people, clearly, this bus boycott was tremendously successful. In '57 the SCLC was founded with the idea that they are going to apply nonviolence and Gandhian principles to social change, that they are going to push forward this bus boycott in creating a broader social movement.

1959 - MLK's Trip to India

And in 1959 Martin Luther King Jr. made a trip to India. He was invited by Nehru, and he met people like Vinoba Bhave, who we'll study next semester, who was a student of Gandhi.

This was really an opportunity for King to further understand what Gandhian nonviolence is, how it was applied. He met 500 members of the Shanti Sena. Like he saw that nonviolence is real and that it works. He was so inspired – it's really tremendous because he continually talks about the influence, not only of this trip, but of Gandhi and this movement afterwards.

1961-62 Montgomery Bus Boycott and SNCC

In 1961 and 1962 there is still this idea that something has to happen. This movement has to be sustained further than the Montgomery Bus Boycott. And in 1961 to 1962 there was further activity that happened in Albany, Georgia. Now this was a difficult movement which I'm not going to go into too much today, but this was difficult because we had factions arise between some members of SNCC, the students who were active in Nashville and who came later. And between the SCLC and King. We had King and the different ministers really dedicated to this idea of nonviolence, but we had doubts arising and a lot of the other people were saying, "Wait a second. We're being beat up. We're being terrorized. And you want us to love these people? You think this is going to work?"

And they were not so happy. They felt like King was kind of taking the spotlight off of the people of the movement and again, pushing this towards a leaders-based movement. This is really upsetting to the young people, the students, the poor people, the farmers, etc., who were working really hard, and they felt like they were not getting their just due. So again, Albany was, I would suggest, significant because there was a little doubt arising in people about if nonviolence really works.

1963 - Birmingham

In 1963 though, we had Birmingham. And people start organizing in Birmingham which is also known as, "Bombing-ham." It is the most segregated city in the South, intense terrorism. And it's called, "Bombing-ham," because there are basically bombs going off all the time, particularly in Black homes and Black churches. This is the place where four young Black girls were murdered on Sunday morning.

So, I mean it's like intense violence. But what's really amazing about Birmingham is that it was so successful. This was a place where Martin Luther King Jr. wrote his Letter from a Birmingham Jail. And among other things this became a very widely read letter which is why I thought it was so significant. One of the first pages of the letter says, "This nonviolence, it's very clear. We have a very clear strategy. And there are basically four steps. One, it's a collection of the facts to determine whether injustices are alive."

So, we're not just marching because we feel like we need to. This is part of a strategy. The first strategy, of course, is again, collecting facts. The second is negotiation. We're willing to work this out. We want to talk with the white governor or mayor or businesspeople. We're really trying to do this through conversation and dialog. The third is self-purification. And the fourth, this is the final step, is direct action.

So, he laid this out in a letter particularly directed to white Christian ministers. But, of course, it was read by many people throughout the movement. So, it's pushing this idea of nonviolence theory, this idea that there's something to this idea. These are four steps of nonviolence. This is a method of social change, a very clear and scientific method. Okay, so Birmingham was a great success. 1963, we have the "I have a Dream," speech.

Michael: What was the issue that [unintelligible 00:38:05]

Jolina: Yeah. Well, so they clearly wanted – they wanted voter rights, but they had a whole list of demands that they wanted. And one of them was integration of downtown eating facilities and clerks that were selling at the different stores. So, they had quite a few demands in Birmingham.

So, in 1963 we had the march on Washington which was organized by Bayard Rustin and A. Philip Randolph. And in 1964, Martin Luther King Jr. is awarded the Nobel Peace Prize and goes to Oslo and receives that.

1965 - Selma - Bloody Sunday - End of the Civil Rights Movement

Now in 1965 we have – it's Selma, Alabama. And so, we have a mass movement, okay? And on – let's see, I guess I don't even have the date here, but what was significant is they – it was also voting rights. And they were trying to organize a walk from Selma, Alabama to Montgomery. And on their first attempt for this walk, you have thousands of people organized, and they're trying to cross this bridge.

And on the other side you see state troopers. And it's this question of, "Are we going to progress or are we going to turn back?" And then his conflict ensues. And I mean I wish I had footage of it because, you see, the people – the storm troopers and the police with these billy-clubs, just starting to beat people and horses trampling people. And I mean it is just absolute chaos. 70 African Americans were hospitalized and 70 more were treated for injuries. This became known as, "Bloody Sunday." And it was significant for several reasons, but one was this telecast through the world, particularly through the United States – and it was enraging, not only for the Black people who were involved getting beat up, but for people who were watching this and saying, "Wait a second. Again, we are getting beat up. And so how does this nonviolence apply to that? Are we supposed to?"

And I get the sense that this turn the other cheek idea that we had talked about early in our class, it was not fully understood in the sense of, “I don’t want to turn the other cheek and get hit again. I want to do something. I want to stand up.”

And then by ‘65 you had different armed revolutions that are going on in Africa. We have the Vietnam War getting started. So, you have these examples of violence in other places. And I mean we also have people who are speaking out, Black activists in the United States saying, “This is ridiculous. We need to fight back.” And so again, it was this moment, for many people who began to seriously question nonviolence.

Two days later though, King organized a second march from Selma to Montgomery and these were primarily faith-based organizations and people. And they successfully did march from Selma to Montgomery. And it was likened to the Salt March, the Salt Walk. This idea that all of these people were going to come together and successfully make a stand against this injustice. And I get the sense that as much as the first march was enraging, the second march was extremely inspirational.

MLK Jr's Continuation of Human Rights

Let’s see. Now Selma, for many people, really marks the end of the traditional Civil Rights Movement, but in ‘66, for King, he was certainly not done. He began organizing in the North. He organized nonviolent workshops for recruiting people in the North including gang members. And in the same year he led 40,000 people in Chicago – this is on July 10th on Freedom Sunday.

And on that day he was met by an angry mob. It included the head of the American Nazi Party. And King said that he had never experienced such hate, even in the worst moments in the south. In 1967 King spoke out against Vietnam, and he also was really starting to speak a lot about Black power during this point. He was absolutely not for violence, but he was for this idea that Black people did need to begin to understand themselves and their history.

In 1968 he was assassinated in Memphis while in support of the Sanitation Workers Strike. So, this, in about five minutes, was Martin Luther King Jr.’s life. And we can see that it was very intense. And intently inspirational. And so that’s back to this idea. That it was not just Black ministers. That people were involved. There are leaders of different backgrounds. And also, it wasn’t just many ministers, but there was also this inspirational leader who was King.

Okay, let’s see. Just one more kind of word on that idea between the people and King is that there are at least two ways that people were beginning to conceptualize leadership. And the first – so Martin Luther King Jr., for example – let me check the time. We’re done at?

Michael: We’re done at 12:30, but if you could wrap up soon, people have some questions.

Moral Leadership and the SCLC

Jolina: Okay. I think I might be able to do it. Yeah, I could. Okay. So, we had for King and members of the SCLC, this idea that you needed strong moral leadership. You needed someone to really guide the movement, like Jesus, like Gandhi. And then it became like King. And I feel like one of these sermons, I guess, that he delivers – really puts this idea in a way that I can really understand and pretty much agree with, is a drum major instinct. Where he talks about many of us have this drum major instinct, that we want to be leaders. We want to be in front. We want to be in charge. We want to be the drum major.

But for King, it's about if you're doing that, it needs to be – you're being the drum major for peace or the drum major for justice. That you're being a leader for something that is beneficial and in line with Christianity, for example. So, I'm just going to read a little bit quickly of this. It's an excerpt from that speech. He writes, "Every now and then I guess, we all think realistically about the days when we will be victimized. With what is life's common denomination? That thing we call death. We all think about it and every now and then I think about my own death, and I think about my own funeral. And I don't think of it in a morbid sense. Every now and then I ask, what is it that I would want said? And I leave the word to this morning. If any of you are around when I have to meet my day, I don't want a long funeral. And if you get somebody to deliver the eulogy, tell them not to talk too long. Every now and then I wonder what I want them to say. Tell them not to mention that I have a Nobel Peace Prize. That isn't important. Tell them not to mention that I have three or four hundred awards because that's not important. Tell them not to mention where I went to school.

"I'd like somebody to mention that day that Martin Luther King Jr. tried to give his life serving others. I'd like somebody to say that day that Martin Luther King Jr. tried to love somebody. I want you to say that day that I tried to be right on the war question. I want you to be able to say that day that I did try to feed the hungry. And I want you to be able to say that day that I did try in my life to clothe those who were naked. I want you to say that day that I did try in my life to visit those who were in prison. I want you to say that I tried to love and serve humanity.

"Yes, if you want to say that I was a drum major, say that I was a drum major for justice. Say that I was a drum major for peace. I was a drum major for righteousness. And all the other shallow things will not matter. I won't have any money to leave behind. I won't have the fine and luxurious things of life to leave behind, but I just want to leave a committed life behind."

So, this sermon, in particular, really puts this idea that, yes, I'm a leader. Yes, I'm a drum major, but I'm drum major for righteousness. I'm a drum major for peace. But this particular way of organizing was really not welcomed by everyone and not everyone – particularly meaning Ella Baker – who, as I've mentioned before, was also a leader in the movement, and she became highly involved in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating

Committee. She was, in a sense, the backbone of the committee. And she really felt like this idea of popular education, of consensus, of empowering – whether it’s sharecroppers or students or women – that that was really the central element, that that was really going to be the revolutionary element of this movement.

And it’s really no coincidence that she was one of the founders of the Young Negro League of Cooperation. She, like many of us here – she was a co-oper, right? She believed this idea of people coming together and empowering themselves which she felt, and many SNCC members felt that this was in contradiction to the leadership style of SCLC and of King.

Let’s see, so moving right along. This idea, so it wasn’t just led, but it was also empowered. It was also an issue of empowerment and it being a nonviolent social movement.

The Leader's Dedication to Nonviolence

Now it’s very clear that King, the students in Nashville, the members of the SCLC, members of CORE, were absolutely dedicated to principled nonviolence, to Christian nonviolence, to Gandhian nonviolence. They infused their Christianity with nonviolent action, and it’s very clear that many of them were prepared to die.

In Taylor Branch’s historical review, “Parting the Waters,” the story of the Civil Rights Movement, he details how students were writing their wills before they head out on the Freedom Rides, that they were contacting their relatives and saying, “I might not talk to you again because I’m heading on a bus down south.” And this concern was very real. And I’m going to read a little bit of – no, maybe I won’t.

Okay, so first, this idea of King being very committed. He not only had an intellectual training via Crozer and Boston University in the study of Christianity and Christian nonviolence, but he also – this is very interesting. He had a relationship with Howard Thurman, particularly through the book, “Jesus and the Disinherited.” We have an excerpt of that in our reader. And Howard Thurman was a minister who was one of the founders of CORE as well. And he was one of the first ministers to create an integrated church. And it was in San Francisco.

Moving along, we had Rustin Smiley Lawson, and these are the different ministers who either through their Quaker practices or through their travels to India became extremely, extremely dedicated to nonviolence. In Nashville, the students there were introduced to nonviolence through James Lawson. James Lawson was born in Ohio. He was a conscientious objector. He ended up traveling to India. I believe he spent three years there. He was studying nonviolence, studying the life of Gandhi. And while there he read about the Montgomery Bus Boycotts. He immediately came back. He actually ended up going first to study at Oberlin and there King found him and said, “You have to get involved.”

So, he gets involved with CORE. He's sent down south to Nashville, and he starts training people. And he starts what becomes, in a sense, a nonviolent institute. And it was likened to the West Point of nonviolence. It was so disciplined, and it was so intense and rigorous. And it's really proven because the students that he trains, Diane Nash, John Lewis, Jane Bernard-Lafayette and several others, this core group of people who are intensely trained by Lawson. They're sent on the Freedom Rides. They're sent to Birmingham. They're in Albany. So, they're really kind of these – they become the leaders of these nonviolent trainings.

Michael: Where was that place?

Jolina: Nashville. There was no name. He was just teaching workshops in churches. So, he was doing this intense training and these Nashville students were really at the forefront of the development of SNCC, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. And, of course, the student movement was really pushed forward through their vigilance and their understanding of nonviolence.

CORE and the Freedom Rides

Finally, you had – or not finally, almost finally – you had, again CORE and Nashville students coming together for the Freedom Rides. The Freedom Rides started in '61. So, this is a year after the students had started and they were organized by the Congress of Racial Equality. After sending the first wave of activists, I believe there were eight people, they realized that they needed a little more support and Diane Nash, one of the Nashville students, says, "We're on it. We're sending students."

And even though they had a sense of what they were up against it's still really, really intense. And I'm going to read just a little bit of what that experience was like for those Nashville students who head down South. And I'm sorry, the Freedom Rides were an intent to integrate the – they had colored waiting rooms and white waiting rooms. And also, the buses themselves, you were not allowed to sit in an integrated fashion. So, they were trying to desegregate the interstate travel.

Okay, so this is a description of what's going on in the Freedom Rides. So, they're getting on the buses in the North. They're heading down South. And then they want to get off the bus which becomes quite a problem. They want to go into the colored – they want to sit in the white waiting rooms and that becomes a problem. So, this is one – this is John Lewis' experience with the Freedom Rides.

"Facing a," he's getting off one of the buses, he says, "Facing a battery of cameras, microphones and notepads, Lewis got halfway through an answer to the first press question before falling strangely silent. Transfixed by what he saw coming up behind the reporters Norman Ritter, the Time-Life Bureau Chief from The Atlanta reacted to Lewis' face by turning to confront the dozen white men who had been standing in the door. He held up both arms to create a boundary for the interview. The men brandishing baseball

bats, bottles, and lead pipes pushed past him. One of them slapped Mo Levy of NBC news. And this first act triggered a seizing and smashing of cameras and equipment.

“Let’s all stand together,” said Lewis as the Freedom Riders retreated backward, along the enclosed loading platform and against a railing that ran against the retaining wall. They stood helplessly as white men barreled into them. Some of Lewis’ group jumped. Some were pushed, and some were literally thrown over the railing onto the roofs of cars parked in the post office lot below. Those who did not take their luggage with them were soon pelted with their own suitcases. Above, on the platform reporters who objected or who tried to take photographs of the attack were set upon by a small mob whose full fury was now released.

“Down below, the Freedom Riders realized that whites who had been secluded at various observation points were closing in on them from all directions. Some stalked and some charged, egged on by a woman in a yellow dress who kept yelling, “Get those niggers.” Fighting panic, the Freedom Riders made their way to two nearby negro taxis and jumped in to send the seven females to safety.

“The first taxi filled with screams and shouts found one of the two exits from the parking lot choked off by a stream of angry whites. Swerving around, bombarded with conflicting advice, the driver found the other exit blocked by cars. This was too much for him. He told the Freedom Riders that he was going to abandon the taxi. While some of his passengers tried desperately to calm him, others looked back in horror at the loading platform. They, along with several Alabama reporters standing closer saw a dozen men around Jim Zwerg, the white Wisconsin exchange student in Nashville.

“One of the men grabbed Zwerg’s suitcase and smashed him in the face with it. Others slugged him to the ground. And when he was dazed beyond resistance one man pinned Zwerg’s head between his knees so that the others could take turns hitting him as they steadily knocked out his teeth and his face and chest were streaming with blood. A few adults in the perimeter put their children on their shoulders to view the carnage. A small girl asked what the men were doing, and her father replied, “Well, they’re really carrying on.” The Freedom Riders in the nearby taxi turned away in sickened hysteria.”

I’m just going to skip down. So Siegenthaler who is one of Kennedy’s aides is down there, and he sees a woman being followed and beaten by other women. He’s shouting at her, “Come on, get in the car.” And he began to slide across the driver’s seat. He saw in a flash that another white student, Sue Hermann, whom he had not seen before had dived into the back. Wilbur barks, still absorbing blows, she shouted, “Mister, this is not your fight.” He’s trying to save this woman. “Get away from here. You’re going to get killed.” Siegenthaler jumped back outside where people were climbing over his car. “Get in the damn car!” he shrieked to Wilbur. Wilbur, not sure who Siegenthaler was, kept insisting during the struggle that she was nonviolent and did not want to get anybody hurt.

So, if anything, hopefully that demonstrates the intensity of the Freedom Rides. People were really, really sacrificing their life. They were making this ultimate sacrifice for change not only in the South, but the way that people were just dealing with each other, the way that people were conceptualizing race and really challenging the violence.

Okay, so hopefully that gives you an idea that CORE and Nashville students were sincerely dedicated to principled nonviolence.

SCLC and Birmingham

And then SCLC and Nashville students in Birmingham also pushed forward – good, I’m almost done – push forward this nonviolence in the Civil Rights Movement. But there were other factions also of the Civil Rights Movement and their feelings about nonviolence. Ella Baker, who I keep mentioning, and SNCC, for example, were more dedicated to strategic nonviolence.

And even though I’m picking up a book and reading it, this one is a lot shorter. It says, “Another philosophical position that distinguished Baker from King was the issue of nonviolence.” It says – and it’s a quote from her – it says, “Mine was not a choice of nonviolence, per se.” Baker indeed questioned the capacity of nonviolence to serve a philosophical basis on which to build the movement even while she was working for the SCLC.”

So, Baker, although an intensely significant leader in this movement certainly had her doubts about the impact or the usefulness of nonviolence. And you can see this is as SNCC develops and works further and further – moves further and further away from nonviolence, that this issue was not something that was set in stone, that this was not strictly a nonviolent movement although nonviolence was intensely, intensely influential in this movement.

Finally, we had – not finally – we had also the NAACP involved. They have, of course, different legal battles that were going on. And let’s see where we’re at for time. Okay, and we had other factions that were developing as the movement went on. We had Black nationalists, pan-Africanists, socialists, and the list goes on. People who began to become involved in the movement but had different ideological perspectives. So, with this, indeed, nonviolence was certainly involved in the Civil Rights Movement, but it was an idea that was contested, and different leaders had different perspectives on how it should be used.

Results & Influence of the Civil Rights Movement

And finally – and I’ll try to make this quick – the Civil Rights Movement was for the civil rights of Black Americans. And certainly, it was. Lynchings certainly did drop. Facilities were integrated. Civil rights legislation was passed. Overt and direct racism certainly did

become unacceptable. But it was also for the radical reconstruction of society, okay? So directly out of the Civil Rights Movement came the feminist movement. The LGBT movement was certainly inspired by the Civil Rights Movement. Disabled rights, certainly. The student movement, Mario Savio was involved in SNCC and got his organizing training from SNCC. The peace movement, certainly. The environmental justice movement certainly came straight out of the Civil Rights Movement. The Black feminist movement certainly came out of the Civil Rights Movement. Grassroots organizing certainly was inspired, influenced, developed, with the Civil Rights Movement.

So, it's this idea that, yes, it was certainly for the civil rights of Black American, but it was also for the radical reconstruction of society. And I'm just going to end with a quote from King, and he writes, "The Black revolution is much more than a struggle for the rights of negroes. It is forcing America to face all its inherited flaws – racism, poverty, militarism, and materialism. It is exposing evils that are deeply rooted in the whole structure of our society and suggesting that radical reconstruction of society itself is a real issue to be faced." And that was written later in his life, in '69.

So, by kind of hoping to unpack these different elements of the top of the iceberg, hopefully we got to some more substantial ideas that this was a broader movement, that there were certainly connections between earlier movements and later movements. And also, that it was a people's movement deeply inspired by this Christian spiritual leader. So, thank you.

[Applause]

Michael: I'm going to be easier to photograph because I don't move around as much. I just want us to be thinking about a few questions that came up for me partly while I was listening to you, Jolina. And these we will be discussing next week. The first one is this very important question of leadership.

Drum Major for Peace

Now Jolina was talking about King saying, "Yes, I'm going to be a public figure. I'm going to be a drum major." What is a drum major, actually? That's the people who go out there and [Mimics pumping a baton in the air]. I'm sure we have virtual drum majors today, not real ones.

But anyway, he was going to be a drum major, but he was going to be a drum major for peace. Now what I would like you to think about over the weekend is look back at what Gandhi said about leadership. I'm not sure I know how to point you to an exact paper. We did talk about what he considered his style of leadership to be. Remember he said that he was a general? But he said a few other things about that. And then let's go even

back further and look at the Gita Theory of Human Action as a background. I think this will be a very interesting comparison for us.

Then the second question, what is it – boy, if we could come up with an answer for this question, we'll all get the Nobel Prize together. So, book your passage for Stockholm or wherever it is that you go. But what is it that makes it possible for large numbers of ordinary people, people like you and me – in fact, in some ways, much less well endowed educationally – what is it that makes it possible for significant numbers of people to offer their life for a cause? What is that magic that makes an action like Rosa Parks' action in Montgomery become a tipping point? This is probably a flip side of that same question. Again, I will be amazed if we have an actual answer for this question, but I think it's going to be very useful to think about.

And thirdly and finally, think about the question of legitimization. Legitimacy and legitimization. We haven't really talked about that. But what is it that made racism which had been – you have to understand, not just legitimate it had been the foundation of the social order in the South. It was the source of order. What suddenly flipped it around so that you could see it as the source of discord? What were the actions of it?

Dr. Prasad - Study through Practice with the Intellect, Heart, and Action

Well, this has been a very complicated morning already, but we have a rare opportunity today to hear from somebody who worked closely with Vinoba Bhave and who is a major figure in Gandhian struggles today, both grassroots and academic and somebody who you may be studying with if you go to do your PhD in peace in nonviolence – and a good friend of mine who is known as Prasad. That's the first thing I always do, Prasad, is take my jacket off.

Prasad: Good morning and Namaste. It's a bit too late for me to be here with you. And I come here, I come more with a vision or an idea of being a student of Professor Nagler – more like a colleague of all of you. And I'm glad that such a large number of students take courses in peace and nonviolence. In India we have some universities offering. One of the vice chancellors of a university told me, "The students are studying nonviolence, but they're really violent in their approach."

So, I have to say that nonviolence can be studied not merely with the mind or with an intellect, but one has to study it with the heart, with involvement, with sadhana – that is, with practice. Without understanding what it is in day-to-day lives, I don't think we'll have a real glimpse of what nonviolence is. In fact, I heard a lot of young people in the Chicago area talking about 9/11 saying that there is so much violence around in this society – we are really fed up with that. We are really looking for peace and nonviolence.

So, I asked them, “Yes, you’d like to have a society based on peace and nonviolence. But is there anything like that you would like to contribute to nonviolence? Or you don’t want to contribute because anything cannot be just had for the asking we have to do something. We have to pay for it. So, is there anything like violence in your own day-to-day lives? Is there any violence in the food you eat? Is there any violence in the clothes you wear or in the articles that you use? Is there any violence in the language that you use?” Unless we are able to look into ourselves, unless we are able to be at peace with ourselves we cannot really transcend that peace into a community peace, into a societal peace, and a world peace.

Now when I talk about violence, it is not merely hurting somebody with a knife or killing somebody or the 9/11. It must have killed 6000 – 7000 people, but don’t you know that more than that number is being killed every day out of hunger, out of poverty, out of malnutrition? Can we see exploitation as a form of violence? Can we see hunger as a form of violence? Can we see poverty as a form of violence? Is there anybody in this world who says, “I would like to remain poor?” I don’t think anybody says that. But the fact is, that more than 50% of the population of this world, they’re suffering from abject poverty.

I believe that it is a system which has a vested interest in keeping such large sections of people under perpetual poverty. So, when we do courses like these in nonviolence we should be able to look for becoming messengers of peace, messengers of justice so that we just make a world free from anger, free from hatred, free from exploitation. And it is here I would say Gandhi who translated the mere abstract concepts of Sutta nonviolence into pragmatic weapons. He used them to show the world that we can win the hearts of people.

And when we look at injustice, he offered Satyagraha, insistence on truth. We are only known to punish the opponent, to hurt the opponent. But whereas he said, “I would like to win the opponent by myself suffering.” And it is this self suffering which gives him the force of truth, the force of soul, the force of love. It is this kind of a force when we are able to generate in this society. Starting with the individual we’ll be able to create a better world. So, Satyagraha, we are now in the hundredth year of the birth of Satyagraha. 9/11 we talk about, but it is that very 9/11 in the year 1906 in South Africa that this great tool was invented by Gandhi and applied in South Africa and later in India.

Swaraj, Swadeshi, and Sarvodaya - Rule Over the Self

Then we also have the concept of Swaraj which has given – which is nothing but Swaraj. Means, “Rule over the self.” Can I rule myself? And to rule myself, I should have self control. I should have the control of the mind, control of the passions. The passions of greed, the passions of aggression. Unless we are able to control, freedom or independence really make no meaning. So, for Gandhi, when he fought for the

independence of India it was not merely for a change of guard or change of the rule from the British to the brown Indians. He said, "It should be a transformation of a real society and the relations within the society."

So, we should now work for a society where every individual knows how to rule himself or herself? It is that kind of freedom, it is that kind of independence that we should look at? Now for that he also talked about swadeshi. How do you achieve that?

Swadeshi means, "The local economy." What desires I have, can they be fulfilled with what I can have, what I can get from around here? Or should I go to the ends of the world to get what I need, what I want? So, this is another very important question. So, when I say I want to get something from that country or from this country, invariably we are leading into situations of violence. So, it is the swadeshi.

Then he said, "Sarvodaya." Means, "Welfare of all." And when we talk about welfare, it is the kind of racism we talked about, just what we had been listening to in your presentation on the Civil Rights Movement. So why should there be a discrimination between a human being and another human being? Should we not see that the whole world, the whole of humanity is one? One world, one humanity. And can we, in fact, go towards that kind of an objective, the whole world converging into one single world? Why should there be this kind of [dimean 01:14:16]? Why should there be this kind of segregation? Why should there be this kind of hatred?

So, when we talk about Sarvodaya, welfare of all. All human beings are one. And it is not only human beings. We look for the welfare of all the sub-human world – the animals, the birds, the creatures. And then even the non-living like the hills, the ocean, the river, the forest, whatever it is. And it is that kind of feeling that we're able to develop when we follow Sarvodaya. I think we have to remember that we have come into this world only for a short period of time – and we go away.

And while we are here we should be the guests here, not the masters. So, when I come and stay with you at your house as a guest, am I playing the role of being a guest or am I going beyond that prescription of how to behave as a guest and become a master? Today, what man is doing as far as the environment is concerned, is precisely that. The kind of negligence, the kind of recklessness that he is using, the natural resources which would definitely belong to the posterity. It is a crime, I would say, against humanity.

So, I'm so glad that you're all studying peace and nonviolence. I am sure all of these wider aspects you'll be studying. And should say that I am jealous of you? You are students of Professor Nagler. And once I got an opportunity to meet him, coming here – in fact, I had the privilege of coming here and speaking to the class here last time. So, I would like to stop here.

Gift Presentation to Michael

And now as a mark of my respect, I would like to offer something to my guru. In fact, I dream that he is – Professor Nagler is my guru or my teacher – a small thing I just brought from India I'd like to offer.

Michael: I did not plan this. At least I did not.

Prasad: This is a cloth produced by my president in the Sarvodaya movement. Sarvodaya movement is a peace movement in India. And this is known as khadi, a cloth which is made from hand spun and hand-woven cloth. And our Sarvodaya movement under [unintelligible 01:17:01] president. He has a khadi unit, and he produces this. And we feel very peaceful when we wear a cloth like this. I would like to offer to my guru, Professor Nagler. [Applause] Thank you all very much. [Applause]

Michael: Okay everybody. We will get back to all the questions – if you had any questions that came up in your mind today and you didn't get a chance to answer them, why don't we start there on Tuesday?

21. Civil Rights Movement

Michael: My problem at the moment is I've got so much in my head about the Civil Rights Movement that it's not all completely sorting out. I have a very happy announcement to make and a few others. And then I think what I'd like to do is talk about the connections between the Indian Freedom Struggle and the Civil Rights Movement. Then move on to talk about one of the questions that we raised last week. And that is, the question was, "What makes it possible for large numbers of people – significant numbers of people anyway – and in a sense, even one can do it – to reach the level of commitment where they feel that an issue, a cause is worth laying down their life for. Question?"

Student: [Unintelligible 00:01:06]

Michael: Oh yeah. And so, what I've done here on this sheet, it's my own little chronology of the key events in the movement. And I listed the date, the city, and in some cases, some of the key actors, what the issue was, what some of the tactics for that issue, and finally, the results. And I will be sending you this on CourseWeb tonight. There's lots of chronologies and lots of biographies and lots of histories of the movement and lots of videos and documentaries to draw upon. But this will help us keep on the same page, so to speak.

By the way, those of you – Jason and others, who wanted your midterms back, they will be here. You can pick them up. Okay, so my first announcement is that at this point I would say that it is 98% to 98.5% sure that PACS164B will be taught in the spring. It will be taught, and it will be webcast. We are trying to get it to be a time when it will not conflict with another popular course for PACS majors – which is Laura Nader's controlling processes course. So, I'm going to try to have it be 9:30 to 11:00 on Tuesday and Thursday.

I imagine the group will be much smaller because it hasn't been available on [Televers] and most people think it's not going to take place. So, it'll be a nice intimate group, which is the way the course started out, actually, about ten years ago. But I feel very good about the fact that we'll have the whole year together in one year and that it will all be available on the Web. And I am hearing from people all over the world, people starting to complain they can't get it on their iPod and why don't I do something about it. Things like that. So that was one announcement.

Another one is that as I told you by CourseWeb last night, on Thursday I'd like to get proposals from you, which would be a description of what you're preparing to do for your paper. This is not absolutely required that you hand these in, but boy, you can save yourself so much grief if you do it because it is a reflection of the fact that nobody knows much about nonviolence and knows what it is, that people can pick up the stick

by the wrong end and try to do a paper which absolutely does not work. And we three now know how to spot those papers – having written some of them ourselves – and we can help you. In a negative sense, we can help you avoid barking up the wrong tree. And in the positive sense, if you're onto a rich topic, we can give you resources.

So, what this proposal has to be is, of course, an area in which you want to work. But much more important than that, what it is you want to question or establish. And as I've said before, I recommend that you start from something that has piqued your interest, but we went by too quickly and you weren't able to follow it up. This is your opportunity to deepen on that particular subject. But you have to have a question or a statement like, "I'm going to try to prove that Mahatma Gandhi was a charlatan," or, "I think that the animal rights movement is the cutting edge of nonviolence." Both of those would probably fail miserably. But at least that's an example of a statement of intent. And then if you add to that a paragraph or so of sample writing, we'll be able to give you very good feedback. If we get that from you on Thursday, we'll be in good shape for the paper.

I have a personal difficulty being at the final exam and so I think we're going to try to make it available for people early, if they want to take the final exam early. Usually, it's you know, people want to have more time to study, but sometimes people want to go home for the holidays and if you've been thinking that you might want to go home early, we will try to accommodate in terms of the exam.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:05:38]

Michael: The exam. We don't have to talk about it right now, but yes, it'll be very similar to the midterm.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:05:44]

Michael: I always hand out – oh, hand them out a little sooner? We will try. Yeah. After I'm free of intestinal parasites at this point and that's how we should have just – well, now I won't finish that sentence. I was going to say something unkind about a group of people I have to work with. I think we should be able to try to get them out earlier so that you can form study groups and be bugging Laura and Eli.

Little news – breaking news announcement. The film, "Lage Roha Munna Bhai," which is sweeping India and every part of the world where there are lots of Indians, like Silicon Valley and Houston, Texas and turning everybody's attention to Gandhi. And it is a statement about modern culture that has to be out there on video or it's not real for people. But not to get into that argument right now. Anyway, I'm happy to share with you that that film was shown at a full session of the United Nations. Like all these top-ranking diplomats sitting around watching 140 minute comedic production of the life of Gandhi.

A request – if anybody is familiar with WordPress and knows how to set up blogging software, please come and talk to me after the class.

Connections Between the Indian Freedom Struggle and the Civil Rights Movement

Okay, so now let's move into the question of the connections between the Civil Rights Movement as it happened here and the Freedom Struggle in India. This is one of those many things in the nonviolence world which we had sort of a vague feeling that it probably happened, but we really didn't have any documentary evidence. And then Professor Sudarshan Kapur who is at Naropa. There are two professors called Sudarshan Kapur. One is at Fresno and the other is at Naropa. They're both nice guys and they both study Gandhi, which is quite an astounding coincidence.

Anyway, the other Sudarshan Kapur, the one in Naropa in Boulder finally wrote a book called, "Raising up a Prophet," in which he documented the manifold connections between the two movements. As you know from reading my book, a delegation of African Americans showed up in Gandhi's ashram in the mid-30's and said, "You must come to America." And he said, "If I come to America I will fail in India and accomplish nothing in America. Whereas if I stay here, I may be able to create an ocular demonstration of the power of nonviolence which will be free for people to use." And Martin Luther King was, I think, about 6 or 8 years old at the time of that conversation.

So incidentally, what topic would we call this, Gandhi saying, "No point in me going to America. I'll lose everything. But if I do it here, the influence will spread?" Amy?

Student: Is it like no fresh issue.

Michael: No, I wouldn't call it that. I can see why you said that, but I wouldn't call it, "No fresh issue." Hami?

Student: Non-distraction?

Swadeshi, Swaraj, and Person Power

Michael: No. This is interesting. It's swadeshi. It's clearly a case of local activism and it shows – I mean in this case the locale is a subcontinent with 300 million people on it. But it does show you it's the same logic by which Gandhi had had to resist taking up the cause of the Zulus and the Khosa and other peoples in South Africa because to do that it would have been an enormous loss and efficiency because they would not have understood his culture and his language. But if by succeeding, he left them a legacy that they could learn to adapt to their own indigenous purposes.

Now one thing we haven't discussed in connection with these key terms, swadeshi, Swaraj, what was the other swa word? Swashakti – person power. One thing we haven't discussed is that it's characteristic of Gandhi's vocabulary that these terms can be read, can be applied on different levels. So, in the case of swadeshi, I would say the most superficial level is the political/economic level. If you boycott foreign goods, like

the Palestinians decided to boycott Israeli cigarettes at one point and smoke only Palestinian cigarettes. I think it would have been slightly better not to smoke any cigarettes. But anyway, from the swadeshi point of view, that was a good maneuver. That is a concrete, but rather superficial level at which the concept gets implemented.

But there's also the question of an indigenous culture. And it's here that Gandhi is able to see that turning India into a militant state imitating a Western national security state was totally wrong for India. That India was not a centralized nation state inherently. And it was definitely not based on military power. If they had gone that route, which a lot of Indians wanted him to do, he would have set up what he called, "Anglistan," and not a free India, but an England in India. So that's a much deeper cut at what the swadeshi means.

And finally, I think you can take it down to the personal level and say that, "Look, I have certain limitations." We're not going to discuss them here, right? I have certain limitations and certain assets. Those we can discuss. I have to know what those assets are and build on them, know what my limitations are and not try to base a career on them, but to overcome them. And that's my personal swadeshi. John?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:12:19]

Michael: You know, when you get down to the deepest levels – thank you, that's the other swa word I had forgotten. Swadeshi and svadharma would become very similar. But at the surface that they – on the surface, where we're talking about the economic interpretations, that they differ. If you're interested in this topic, care to write a paper on it or just want to follow it up, there is a book by Michael Sonnleitner – S-O-N-N-L-E-I-T-N-E-R. I think it's simply called, "Gandhi's Vocabulary."

Gandhi's Influence on the British

It's an important thing because it shows you that Gandhi had created a system which you could buy into at a relatively superficial level if that was where you wanted to start and that's all you understood.

But you could also eventually buy into it at a much deeper level if you wanted to go that far. So that enabled people to stay on the same page even though they had different degrees of commitments. See, this is a problem that we're always faced with in nonviolence. Okay, I hold out the image of principled nonviolence as very high-level stuff. And in fact, I want to share with you that I'm working on a three or four-page overview of the whole thing. There's the vision, the framing, everything down to the tactics. And have that for you by the time of the final and have it on our Web site.

But the fact is, my vision is a lot more than a lot of people are ready to buy into. And does that mean we have to wait until we have a small coterie of cloned Naglers running around before we have a movement? Perish forbid. But we want to be able to structure it in the way that Gandhi did where you have the pure vision at the top, a small group of

people who are completely on board with it. They inspire a cadre of people who are willing to behave along those lines regardless of what they believe or think. And then, you know, beyond that, people who will just come in on a particular tactic. And it's broad-based but coherent.

Okay, so this is the – with the swadeshi point, I think Gandhi did it exactly right. That he would have been, as he said, in nine days wonder if he had come to the U.S. But by being at home and doing where he could be most effective he created something that reached into many, many countries. There were lots of African soldiers who were in Kenya or South Africa or some other still colonized part of Africa that were sent to India or Europe to be part of the WWII effort. And in India they mingled with Indians and the Indians would say, "What the hell are you doing here?" And they would say, "Well, we're fighting for Britain's freedom." And the Indians would say, "Hey, I have a wild idea. Why don't you fight for your own first?"

And that actually launched – it triggered an avalanche of freedom movements. Some of which were very un-Gandhian, like the Mau Mau movement in Kenya, but others were explicitly attempting to follow Gandhian nonviolence as best they could understand it and implement it. And it, you know, it said that dozens of countries decolonized as a result of what Gandhi was doing in India. In that case, the British unwittingly messed themselves up by bringing in African soldiers to India where they were infected with Gandhian ideas. They went back and rebelled against them.

Gandhi's Influence on the Civil Rights Movement

But in terms of the Civil Rights Movement, this is probably the biggest post-Gandhi nonviolent movement. I would say that's still true even though there have been countries now, like in Eastern Europe where larger numbers of people were involved in terms of the depth of the nonviolence, in terms of the intensity of the dehumanization being way, way up there on the curve. This was the most spectacular movement – and it was early – starts in the middle of the 50's.

And the fact is, which we completely did not know, dozens of Gandhian activists came to the U.S. and dozens of civil rights leaders went to India before the movement started. So, when we're looking next semester – I'm happy to be able to say we really will be – looking next semester at what are the ingredients that help the movement succeed. One of them is contact with the past successful movement where lessons have been learned and what to avoid and what to do.

Now at one particular example from Kapur's book, a man named Dubois who – Dubois, as Jolina mentioned last time – he had a journal called, "The Crisis." And in 1929 – that's interesting, you have a journal that's called, "The Crisis," and it goes on and on for years and years. You're lurching from crisis to crisis. "The Crisis" celebrated its 20th anniversary in 1929. Dubois invited Gandhi to contribute to this issue and Gandhi wrote

to the American negro a message from Mahatma Gandhi. And just to read you one paragraph from that.

Gandhi said, “Let not the 12 million negroes be ashamed of the fact that they are the grandchildren of slaves. There is no dishonor in being slaves. There is dishonor in being slave-owners. But let us not think of honor or dishonor in connection with the past. Let us realize that the future is with those who would be truthful, pure, and loving. For as the old wise men have said,” this is 1929. In 1999 you didn’t talk about old wise – dead white men anymore. But they are out there. “As old wise men have said, ‘Truth ever is. Untruth never was.’” This is Gandhi trying to condense himself into three sentences for the American negro. “Love alone binds and truth and love accrue only to the truly humble.” So that was one paragraph of this thing which was widely read. It was recirculated in other journals like New York, Amsterdam News and so forth.

One other quick thing. Much later, in 1951 a Gandhian by the name of Lohia and another by the name of Krishnalal Shridharani. These are not names you necessarily need to remember for your final, but Krishnalal Shridharani wrote a book called, “War without Weapons,” which is an important anthology of Gandhi’s stuff. And Lohia, also North Indian, they toured America. They went to Fisk University, which is a Black college. He urged African Americans to do, “A little jail going,” rather than facing indignities on a daily basis.

And the president of the university said, “No. We are not like India. Here, we have the law and Constitution on our side,” which is a point to which we have to recur, incidentally. “Besides,” the president added, “we are too weak a minority in America – just 13 million. It can never happen here.” That was 1951. Four years later Rosa Parks refused to get off the bus and it all came down. Another place that Lohia visited was – and again, this is something that Jolina mentioned last week – Highlander Folk School which is a good example of an institutional training center which at least inspired people to stand up on their own two feet.

In the immortal words of Charles Hamilton Houston, Black lawyer who had argued for desegregation much earlier. He said, “I would rather die on my feet than live on my knees.” At least inspired people with that. Rosa Parks went to that school, and they did learn stuff about nonviolence there.

Importance of Training

I keep coming back to this because I really feel that the biggest leverage we have now to tremendously increase the effect, the power of nonviolence in the world is what we sometimes call in the Peace Movement, “Interpretation.” It’s packaging what has happened so that other people can learn from it.

And discontinuity has been the biggest problem in the Peace Movement for decades. Every time some kind of atrocity happens, they invade yet another small country

somewhere, people say, “Oh, this is too much.” They have to reinvent the wheel, start from scratch and we’re very, very weak that way. This problem is slowly being fixed. But I think that education and training are key elements to increasing the power of nonviolence.

There’s still the magic, which we’re going to talk about pretty soon. But what happens to inspire people to stand up there and say, “Go ahead and kill me. I’m not going back.” That’s something that you don’t achieve by mere education. There, I said it and I’m glad. I hope I’m not a traitor to my profession, but that is the actual fact.

Gandhi's Influence on MLK Jr.

Now I’d like to tell you a little story which encapsulates the effect of Gandhi on the Civil Rights Movement. I am, again, about 98% sure that this actually happened. Martin Luther King does not talk about it in any of his writings. But I heard it from Arun Gandhi, and he heard it directly from a person who was the curator of the Gandhi Museum. And I’m not even totally sure what city it was in, but let’s say it was Madras, as I think it was in the south. It’s not the famous one in Delhi, but the house that Gandhi used to stay in when he was visiting Madras, whenever he went there

So, Martin Luther and Loretta come to India, the Mahatma has been gone for almost ten years. They go and visit this house and they show Martin Luther King the room that Gandhi slept in. You know, it said, “Mahatma slept here.” It’s got this glass door. You can look in. You don’t want to disturb anything. You have all of the enormous possessions, as you can easily imagine, piled up on the desk.

And Martin Luther King said to the curator of the museum, “May I please go into the room?” And this person said, “Well, we don’t let people do that, you know. That’s why we have this glass door. No, but on the other hand, as a famous Sufi Sheikh said, “Rules and regulations are for the protection of the feeble-minded.” This person said, “Alright. Am I going to say no to Martin Luther King Junior? That doesn’t compute. So okay, yeah, go ahead. Go in.” Didn’t probably even ask him for a bribe.

So, he goes in there. And it’s, you know, like 2:00 in the afternoon and then comes closing time, 6:00 in the evening or something. He goes up to the room and King is still sitting there in the corner. He taps on the glass and says, “Time to leave now. We’re closing up the museum.” And Martin Luther tells him or her by sign, “I’m not leaving.” So, you know, this guy knows how to do a sit-in. So, it’s not going to be very easy to dislodge him.

So, the curator is getting very nervous and very unhappy, but she – I think it’s a she, again, you know, Martin Luther King, you’re not going to say, “You can’t stay there,” probably be changing the course of history for the worse. So, this person went home, repeating his mantram or her mantram, I’m sure. Saying, “Oh, I hope I don’t get in

trouble.” Goes in the next morning, opens up the museum at 10:00 o’clock, still no Martin Luther King.

Long story short, after lunch, sometime about 2 o’clock in the afternoon, at least the door opens and Martin Luther comes out, comes down and quietly says to this person, “Now I can go back to my country and do my work.” So, what went on in that period of time, we do not know. I don’t think we’ll ever know. Joy?

Student: Where was this?

Michael: As I said, I don’t know for sure. So, the point is that he felt that he had absorbed some kind of influence and some kind of strength from the Mahatma even in his physical absence and I am not going to sit here and say that such a thing is impossible, that when the body dies there’s no more person there because that would not be what I believe. So that’s just an insider story for y’all. Hope you enjoyed it and be sure to attribute to the Metta Center if you go and publish it anywhere.

It just shows you – I have a couple of other stories too. If we have more time, I would share them with you also – that show that while we’re finished reading Sudarshan Kapur’s book and we’re talking about all these people and ideas traveling back and forth. There’s also an unseen influence which nobody at this point in time knows how to document.

A Way Out of No Way - Andrew Young

But that does bring me to the next question that I wanted to discuss with all of us and that is what makes this possible for people to really, really respond in the face of horrendous threats. If you read “A Way Out of No Way,” by Andrew Young, who is one of the several civil rights activists who became quite successful in various kinds of careers. Because of the high prestige of the Civil Rights Movement, you know, you get streets named after you and things like that. No concrete changes, but cafes, streets, things like that.

John Lewis, whom you mentioned, Jolina, he’s actually a congressman now. He’s one of the 25 members of the Peace Caucus in the American – in the U.S. Congress. Maybe it’s like 30 members by now after last week. But Andrew Young was one of those who had quite a brilliant career, but at this point he was just a young Black guy who was part of the movement. And he talks about being at a demonstration where they were trying to move into a particular area. They were being blocked. It was a classic case.

We’ve seen this ever since the South Africa days. You want to go somewhere, and prejudiced people are saying, “You can’t come in here because you’re the wrong race.” They were brutally attacked. Andy Young was beaten unconscious, and they dragged him away to recover. And as soon as he recovered consciousness he said, “Where are

they? Let's go back." Now that, to me, is absolutely incredible. Here you are, you're just beaten black and blue. You don't know whether you've got all your bones intact.

And frankly, at this point in time, I cannot see myself doing something like that. But I know that there is some kind of magic that enables people to operate from a much deeper level. There's a little story about a woman in San Francisco heard a noise out in front of her house and ran out. A car had turned over and had pinned her 2-year-old boy underneath the car. And all these men were standing around, "Oh, my God. What are we going to do? You know, get a tow truck, get crowbars." And this woman ran out, picked up the car, they lifted out the boy and she put it back down.

It just shows you this is – it's a little bit like that, only maybe not so much in terms of physical strength, but we have these capacities. We don't know we have them. We read 3000 commercial messages that tell us we do not have them. We have to buy something from outside to make ourselves happy and so on and so forth. Something manages to turn that around. We come out from under this – what my friend David Korten called, "Trance – the mass media trance," and we can behave like real human beings.

Incidentally, to finish that story, they did march right back up to those same men who had just beaten them so viciously. They heard the sound of breaking bottles. You know what that means, you know, they break an empty bottle, and they push it in your face. And they were walking right back into that same crowd when the sheriff's car came up – zoom. It stopped in between the marchers and the rednecks, rolled down the window and said, "Let 'em through." And drove off and that was the end of it.

Time for Justice

So, this is my question. And I want to start us off in our discussion of it with a comment that was part of the documentary that you saw, "Time for Justice." And in fact, it was Andy Young, the narrator who makes this comment. He makes it in the context of the beating of the Freedom Riders in Aniston, Mississippi. And you saw that famous image of this theology student, Jim Zwerg pulling some conveniently loosened teeth out of his lower jaw. Zoe?

Student: Yeah. When you were talking about some kind of change of heart that happens, that occurs when people commit themselves to nonviolence, I actually thought it changed Zwerg because when they arrived at Aniston, you know, people were crowding the bus terminal. It was obvious. And obviously, the Freedom Riders departed. They only met [unintelligible 00:31:46]. And James Zwerg looked at the crowd and he walked right into it, and he said – he went first off the bus, and he said, "If you want to hurt my brothers, you're going to have to kill me first and he just walked right into [unintelligible 00:32:03] and then this occurred.

Michael: Yeah. For the benefit of our international audience, what Zoe just shared with us was that at that terrible scene in Aniston where you had this most menacing imaginable mob, James Zwerg walked into that mob and said, “If you’re going to hurt my brothers, you’re going to have to kill me first.” And they practically did. So, my theory is that every one of us is capable of that. But at that moment, personally, I don’t feel like I can do it. Somebody in this class a couple of years ago once asked me, “Do you think you’d be able to do that, Professor Nagler?” And I said, “Well, if you guys were watching me, I guess I’d have to.”

But there is something – you called it, “A change of heart,” Zoe. I guess that’s as good a term as any – that makes this possible and it makes it possible to happen in a sustained way to a large number of people. And once that force is unleashed I’m going to say there is nothing in the world that can stop it. So that’s the real mystery. So, the statement that James [unintelligible 00:33:16] makes is you feel the pain – now this is subtle stuff here. You feel the pain, but you don’t get bitter because you’re involved in a struggle that’s bigger than yourself. Okay?

Now next semester – it feels so good to be able to say that – next semester we’re going to look at a film which is a documentary on four people’s power uprisings that have happened since the Civil Rights Movement. One of them is Chile. And in one of them, a woman says – and I wish we could hear the Spanish because I’d really like to know exactly what words she’s using. But this is a woman whose son, 23 – 24-year-old son was disappeared by the Junta under Pinochet.

And she said, “At a certain point what I felt was not so much anger, it was a rage.” Probably even [Spanish]. And what seems to me is going on here is that people are – and it’s invaluable to have the experience of people who are actually going through this. They’re looking into themselves and they’re seeing some kind of transformation taking place.

Inner Transformation - Paradox of Inner Repression

So, I wanted us to talk about that a little bit, what do you think this transformation is, what are the key elements, what enables it?

Nobody has any? Yeah?

Student: Kind of like a paradox of oppression, like on a spiritual level. When kind of – I don’t know. I keep on thinking of Mario Savio and that speech of the wheels of – you know, it gets so, you get so pent up. It’s like a paradox of inner repression, I guess. The only catharsis is not, it’s not verbal, it’s action.

Michael: That is extremely interesting. I’m really glad I opened this up for discussion because that had not dawned on me. But you’re calling this – and I think we can add this to our vocabulary – the paradox of inner repression. That in order for there to be a paradox of repression in which communities react and say, “We can’t go on living here.”

And partly, this is an external thing and there's a sociologist by the name of Ted Gurr – G-U-R-R. He's written a book called, "Why Men Rebel," and he talks about crossing the line from poverty to destitution. People can endure poverty for a long, long time. But destitution means you can't live anymore. Your kids are dying. You got to fight back because whatever will happen to you is not as bad as what's going on.

But what you're talking about is a much subtler inner changeover where something inside you just stands up and says in the immortal words of E.E. Cummings, who's an important poet from my generation, "There is some s-period I will not eat." You just reach a point where you say, "I don't care what you're going to do to me. It's not as bad. And you very rightly emphasize that you need some outlet. And that outlet has to be in terms of action and not just in words. There's a film clip that sometimes I use which, of all things, is taken from "A Bug's Life" animation. You know, the last scene in "A Bug's Life" where the grasshoppers are terrorizing the ants? And the ants, of course, are much more numerous, but they're ants so they don't know that they have any power.

So, there's this one ant who's – he's a little bit – he's a troublemaker in the community, actually. The queen is not so sure she likes this guy, unhappy about the fact that her daughter is falling in love with him because even ants deserve a little happiness, I guess. And this guy, when the grasshoppers are terrorizing them he makes some trouble. And Hopper, who's the chief grasshopper – I'm a little bit embarrassed about sharing this certain scene. [Laughter] I hope my colleagues don't get wind of this. Hopper just goes [Snaps fingers]. And one of these big grasshoppers walks over on four of his legs and beats – thud – you hear a thud. And all the ants are going, [Covers face] "Oh, oh." So, they think they've taken care of this young ant whose name I forget. You know, they tend – they look alike to some extent.

But then Hopper is going on about, "You ants, you're dirt. In fact, you're lower than dirt. Look at you. You're living down under the surface of the earth." And suddenly, this little voice pipes up and says, "That's not true, Hopper." And our little ant hero has gotten up and he starts walking towards hopper, irrationally. And all of these, you know, millions of ants, they suddenly link arms, which is very impressive since they have six apiece – click, click, click, clackity, clackity clack, clack. It's like this monster zipper going around. And suddenly you have to realize that he's had it because something has roused these people. They've done their worst and it wasn't enough. In fact, it was – it backfired. So that's a very good way, I think, to start thinking about it. It's a paradox of inner repression. People just reach a point where they can't take it lying down anymore. Mm-hmm?

Student: It's also important to know that violence also is a possibility or an outcome of such inner – paradox of inner repression. Sometimes violence can be the outcome.

Michael: Of course, people can respond with violence. Personally, I think that that change is really not as deep. It's on another order of magnitude because really, what

you're just doing is reflecting back to the person what they've come at you with. But to respond with nonviolence is to say utterly, "No, I will not do this."

Michael's Beginnings with Nonviolence

In fact, just share with you how I got started in nonviolence, I was sitting on my motorcycle in Greenwich Village. This is a very embarrassing set of disclosures all day here. [Laughter]

And I was on Houston Street in front of our favorite coffee shop. And talking with somebody and there was a convertible behind me with the radio on. And it was a meeting, a rally going on in the South with Civil Rights people. And one of the Civil Rights people said, "Well, they beat up on us. How come we don't beat up on them?" And the person said, "Because we're not like that. We are not that kind of person. Let them be like that if they want to, but that's not who we are." And that – just the scales fell of my eyes. They're probably still lying there in the gutter on 4th Street and Houston in Greenwich village.

But it's not very infectious sometimes, that realization that you can be a different kind of human being. And I don't think that that's happening if you respond with violence.

Response of Violence, Cowardice, or Nonviolence

Now having said that, there is one case that Gandhi considered somewhat of an exception to what I just said. The invasion of Poland, 1940, I think. Something like that. You weren't around then. Gandhi said, "The resistance by the Poles, by the Polish Army to the Germans I'm going to call almost nonviolence because they knew that they would be crushed to atoms, but they felt that the most noble course open to them was to resist."

So, if you don't know about nonviolence and you're trapped in a situation of fighting back or getting run over, getting walked all over, fighting back is a long second, but much better than the worst thing that you can do is let yourself be overrun. So, but you're doing it not in the spirit that maybe we'll win. That's the difference. You're not – you're doing it not in the spirit of I've got to express this anger, I've got to show these people how much I hate them. But in the spirit of no, we are human beings and we're not going to let you do this to us. We're going to use whatever we've got.

So, Amy, you had something to contribute? That was then, this is now. Okay. Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:42:57]

Nonviolence Science

Michael: And don't forget that we also, now in addition to quantum mechanical explanation, which is really just sort of a theoretical, a groundwork explanation, we now have all of those and magnetic resonance imagery studies that show A; that when you decide to do something selfless, which is kind of similar to this switchover that we're talking. You say, "I'm going to use integrative power," it has immensely beneficial effects on you, the same parts of the brain light up – that light up when you're having a deeply pleasurable experience. It immediately it communicates it to others through mirrored neurons and thirdly, that it can be influenced by conditioning, by cultural imagery.

So, all the ingredients that we need to need to know that this channeling or whatever we're going to call it, this influencing happens, we're now in a much more scientific footing for all of that. And by the way, this is the first time in the history of PACS 164 that that research was in and that I was able to share it with you.

Freedom from Bitterness but not Pain

Let's see, a couple of episodes from "Stride Toward Freedom" might be helpful here. So, I'm going to work backwards from second to the first one. "There was a bombing at King's house. Coretta and Yoki, their daughter, was safe. When I walked into the bedroom, " this is Page 116 – well, of course, you don't have this anymore. I'm sorry. Page 116 if you come across some used version of this book. "When I walked into the bedroom and saw my wife and daughter uninjured, I drew my first full breath in many minutes." They had heard something fall on the front porch and jumped up and ran to the back of the house. If instead, they had gone to the porch to investigate, the outcome might have been fatal.

Now here's the key sentence which somehow, for me, is triggering – no, wrong word. Is pointing to something about this miraculous transformation. "Coretta was neither bitter nor panicky." And remember that came up in Andy Young's narration also. I said James [Vaughn] before. It was Andy Young. Andy Young saying, "You feel the pain, but you don't get bitter." And later on, King will say that violence leaves you a legacy of bitterness whereas nonviolence leaves you a legacy that leads you to the beloved community.

So, these are various people who are on the frontline who are experiencing this, who are seeing the fear, are overcoming it, and one of the key words that they come up with, I think, is a very good clue for us is, "bitterness." And that leads me to the next insight that I want to share with you. It's going to be very difficult to prove any of this, but on reflection I think this is what we're learning from these people.

Think about what are the experiences that make you bitter? And what you'll inevitably come up with, I believe, is you get bitter when you're focused on your own personal viewpoint. How could they do this to me, is a typical response of a bitter person. Whereas that's unfair, I'm going to do something about it, is a very, very different mental attitude, very, very different mindset.

So now let's think our way all the way back to the paradigm case which is Gandhi getting thrown off the train in Pietermaritzburg. And saying that the transformation that happened in him was he knew instantly that this was not something that was done to him personally, this was racism. And beyond that, even bigger, it was an example of man's inhumanity to man. And right now, you remember what Andy Young said, "You don't feel the pain. You don't get bitter." Why? Because you are involved in something that's bigger than yourself.

I think these are two very, very valuable clues. On the one hand, you're frame of reference is bigger than you personally. That's sort of the vision component, your framing of the offense. On the other hand, there's the emotional reaction response that goes along with it. I don't know which comes first, which is the chicken, which is the egg? I don't know – being a vegetarian. But I think those two things are important components. John?

Student: I don't know if this is too far off, but if you're this type of person with interaction with someone, but it's not racist or anything. Or [unintelligible 00:48:59] for some reason, it's not part of anything bigger than that, bigger than just you two. How would you try and not feel bitter?

Michael: So, John's question is how are you going to not feel bitter if, in fact, something has aimed at you personally and it's not a bigger story even. You know, I think I would say – now this is off the top of my head so it bear some with some consideration, but I think I would say that there really is no such thing as offense to another person which is not part of a larger picture. In fact, the problem with the offender is that thinks it's just you and him. But you, if you're a nonviolent actor, you have committed yourself to constantly trying to see the big picture beyond that. So, it's always man's inhumanity to man, even if you have to be the man at that moment.

Zoe, were you just adjusting your beret, or did you have a question?

Student: I was going to make a comment about what you were saying about how a lot of social justice figures have been tied for having practice in some form of spirituality because a lot of times activism is motivated by an internal understanding of non-duality. And from non-duality there's no crime against – there's no crime against man against man, because there is no man. It's the concept of dual [unintelligible 00:50:43]

Acceptance of the Nondual Reality

Michael: This is a very good observation that if you come into nonviolence because you already have a vision that we are not separate for one another, where you're calling it, "Non-duality," then already in your worldview, there is no such thing as a personal attack by one individual against another because the whole of an individual is radically separate that his or her wellbeing can be served by the suffering of another is completely false. So that's very true. If you have come into a nonviolent posture through

the Royal Road of having already seen this spiritual reality underlying life, then you probably will not have that problem at any point.

But there are those who have backed their way into nonviolence by an offense of some kind and just saying that this is intolerable and something in them allows them to see more deeply what is so intolerable about it. And then you have to, obviously, rise above the response which says, “I’m going to get even with that person,” because that’ll just recycle you right back into the old duality framework.

So, I guess at a certain point we don’t care how a person gets into nonviolence, given that we’re so different from one another we’re bound to come into it in different ways as long as we end up sort of understanding where we have ended up. Okay, now the other episode which I wanted to mention to you and it’s in “Stride Toward Freedom.” You have read it. It’s also in this book that Clayborne Carson – no, sorry – James Washington edited called, “I Have a Dream,” which is a collection of Martin Luther King’s writings and speeches.

It’s the famous episode that I call the coffee epiphany. The house had been bombed and MLK was feeling that he wasn’t at all sure that he could go on with this. And he says, “Unless you have looked into the eyes of your loved ones, knowing what this is costing them, you cannot appreciate the agonies that I have to go through.” And, of course, Gandhi had to go through that too. I think I shared with, I think, the story of when they had these horrific riots, and he was going to one location. There wasn’t – he couldn’t be in two locations at once. He called on this young woman, 18-year-old, and said, “I need you to go that village.” And Madeleine Slade said, “What are you talking about? They’re raping people. They’re killing people. You can’t send a young girl there.”

He called this girl over in front of Madeleine Slade and he looked at her and said, “I don’t believe in death. Do you?” She said, “No, Bapu.” He said, “Very good. Go.” Well, not unlike that, Martin Luther King was suddenly feeling that he was not only risking his own life, but he now had – there’s nothing like having a three-month-old daughter to change your outlook on life. I had this phenomenon only once, for one month in my life.

But it is – there’s nothing like it because you can make – you sort of make peace with yourself and your risk and you probably have read that other episode where he’s in Dexter Baptist Church and he got up and he said, “I hope nobody has to die in this movement. But if somebody has to die, I hope it’s going to be me.” And the audience was just, “Whoa!” you know? “No, no! Don’t let that be!”

He was in such a state that he couldn’t walk off the platform. He had to be practically conducted off by two of his friends. Uh-huh?

Student: Isn’t also – I mean I feel like when you have kids that you have to consider your death. I guess it’s just a –

Michael: Yeah. When you have children, even your death is hurting those children, not to mention the fact that they might get damaged – injured in some way. It’s ghastly. I

mean we're going to be talking about – I mean at this rate, we might not be talking be talking about it, but we're going to be talking about the tactics that were developed after Montgomery where when they went into a place – Albany, Birmingham, wherever it was, they tended to put the kids in the front row – the front line.

And if the kids got beat up and the press was there, it was paradox of repression in spades. They had a few very successful goes with this technique. But it's a technique that I personally feel a little bit uncomfortable with. Children, they don't understand what you're asking them. You are putting the white policeman in a position of coercion where they either have to do something that's going to fall on their heads or you're forcing them to let you through, not because they want to, but because you've just caught them in this vice.

So, it's an agonizing problem, there's no question about it. But the way that I suggest we approach the problem is think about what are your children's chances if you don't do this? If you don't sacrifice yourself and maybe risk their happiness here in the short run, what kind of world are you leaving them to grow up in. That may be an approach to answering it.

But anyway, our main topic here was to try to get at that inner transformation that I've been talking about from time to time and shed a little more light on it. And we've said that it had these two components. You're not looking at it as something that affects only you personally and you're not yielding to bitterness. There may be a response which is very powerful and may deserve the word rage, but somehow rage is different from anger – the way these people are using the word.

Rage is, "This is intolerable, I must do something." Where anger is, "You are a no-good blankety-blank and I'm going to make you understand that." Okay? So that's two things.

MLK Jr's Epiphany

Now the other episode that I wanted us to have in mind, and I'm sure you're quite familiar with it, whereas, you know, the bomb had been placed on their porch. He was thinking now not only about his own safety, but this new vulnerability that he had having a three-month-old daughter. Which is, like I say, there's nothing quite like it to make you feel vulnerable.

He goes into the kitchen. He gets a horrific phone call. You know in those days they didn't have spam filters, so he has to listen to this cracker going on and on about, you know, we're going to kill you and your children and all this. It's in the middle of the night. And he goes into the kitchen, fixes himself a cup of coffee and he says, "Dad. He's not here now. My mommy's not here now."

He starts praying, "Lord, I'm not sure I can go on." And he hears a voice saying, "Martin Luther. Stand up for freedom and I will be with you always." Now whatever we may say about that moment, whether we – you remember, we faced a very similar question in

1931 with the epic fast where people are saying, “Why are you doing this?” And he [Gandhi] said, “Well, God told me to.” Some people said, “You might be having a hallucination.” And he said, “Don’t worry about it. I know what hallucinations are. This was not it.”

So, without getting into that question at all, about is there really a God and did he really speak to Martin Luther King at that moment. Without even going there, the fact is, that that epiphany, whatever it was, changed him for the rest of his short life. From that point forward in his career he was basically immune to fear. Basically, he was. Not that he never felt a fear, I’m sure he did, but he had a way of transforming it automatically.

So, one of the documentaries, one of the many that I did not show you, he’s coming out of a meeting somewhere. Somebody throws a stone and he’s hit and the person standing next to him says, “You’ve been hit.” And he says, “I’ve been hit so many times.” It’s just not going to stop him anymore.

Okay. Oh, I guess – let’s see.

Violence, Bitterness, and Gandhi

I may have something else to share with you here. Well, this is the exact wording for something that I quoted to you before. “The way of violence leads to bitterness in the survivors and brutality in the destroyers.” You remember what Gandhi said about WWII? Anybody remember that horrible observation he made where they asked him, “What’s going to happen?” Amy?

Student: To use their method, to [unintelligible 01:00:40].

Michael: It was a little bit worse than that. You’re on the right track, but he said, “The Allies will win, but in order to do so they will have to become more brutal than Hitler because they have chosen to use his methods – dot-dot-dot. So, this is what King is also talking about. The way of violence leads to bitterness in those who survive the attacks, but it leads to the brutalization of the survivor – of the dominators.

And incidentally, there’s an excellent documentary out called, “Ground Truth,” which was done by a friend of mine in L.A. Interviews with vets from Iraq, what this has done to them emotionally, spiritually. Brutality in destroyers, but the way of nonviolence leads to redemption and the creation of the beloved community. Okay? Yeah, this is something that he said over and over again, and you’ve read it several times in “The Stride Towards Freedom.”

“The tension is not in the South, is not between white people and negro people. The struggle is rather between justice and injustice, between the forces of light and the forces of darkness. And if there is a victory, it will not be a victory merely for 50,000 negroes,” probably talking about Birmingham, “but it will be a victory for justice, a victory

for good will, a victory for democracy.” So that was that component of always being able to see the big picture. Now what does this remind you of in Gandhi’s writings? Sid?

Student: When he was talking in “Hind Swaraj” about just stopping the British from oppressing the Indians, not only for the good of India, but also the good of the British.

Michael: Yes. Exactly. Getting the British to stop ruling India would be for their good as much as it would be for the good of the Indians. And over and over again in “Hind Swaraj” he will say that this is a clash between two civilizations. Now one of them you might call, “Western Civilization,” because the West has adopted it rather more enthusiastically than we have, but it is basically what he called, “A diabolical civilization,” based on materialism versus the civilization based on love and whatever.

So that’s why it is not just a case of not a person against another person. Not a case of a people against another people even though that’s how the oppression had been organized. I think it might be worth revisiting that wonderful quote of Toynbee’s who’s seeing it from the other side, you know, being British he said, “Gandhi made it impossible for us to go on ruling India, but he made it possible for us to leave without rancor and without humiliation.” And that is the secret weapon of the nonviolent actor and I think it’s also our responsibility to remember that.

Principle of Dignity/Non-embarrassment

All right, well, let’s move on. There’s an episode – and I tried to find out – remind myself exactly where this happened, but I couldn’t quite get it. I’m going to say that the person in question was Commissioner of Public Safety Eugene Conner, otherwise known as Eugene “Bull” Conner. And this is Birmingham where the famous episode takes place where the marchers have been stopped and they walk right through the police and the firemen. It was a very hard-fought bitter campaign, of course, not quite as long as anything that took place in India.

But at a certain point in the campaign, it’s basically King against Conner – unless I correct myself next week – and King found out that it was Conner’s wedding anniversary. So, he called off the movement for one day so Bull and Mrs. Conner could celebrate their anniversary without having to worry about the Civil Rights Movement. Now anyone except [Elana], because this would be a piece of cake for her, but anyone, what tactic was this? What do we call this? Somebody who hasn’t often weighed-in. This is a pretty clear example of something. What is it? Andrea, would you like to try it?

Student: Non-embarrassment?

Michael: Exactly. It is an example of non-embarrassment. It’s a classic example of non-embarrassment which is, as we said, after the midterm – and remember, the way the term is used, it doesn’t mean you never do anything to embarrass anyone, which also happens to be true. But it specifically means that if you’re carrying on an intense

negotiation and words and actions with an adversary and that adversary is distracted, you back off. Classic cases being the Railroad Strike in South Africa and WWII in India.

And you do that because for you, a nonviolent person, your struggle is more like a conversation than a fight. In a fight – let’s say you’re Mohammed Ali and you’re in the ring. You’re much bigger than me and you’re duking it out with this other person. And the other person’s name is Joe or something. And Joe’s girlfriend is sitting right by the side of the ring, and she says, “Hey, Joe, I got to go. This guy sitting next to me is kind of cute.” Joe turns around, drops his gloves. What’s Mohammed Ali going to do? Bam! He’s going to deck that sucker. That’s how – that’s what you do when you’ve chosen a way of violence and you’re fighting with somebody. You do that in the ring, or you do that in these horrible cages in Sonoma County or wherever it is. That’s the way of violence. You’re going to take advantage of every weakness because your goal is to defeat the person.

But the way of nonviolence is not that. You never want to defeat the person. You want to educate the person. And in order to do that you have to keep in contact with them. Over the last weekend, as you know, a UN envoy from Sweden – yay. This is the Swedish corner over here – went to have a talk with one of the most violent people on the planet, this Kony who’s the head of the Lord’s Resistance Army. We’re not going to start a description of what he’s doing in Northern Uganda, but I don’t think there’s a more dehumanized person operating at any scale on this planet right now.

And this UN envoy went to have a talk with him. And by golly, he showed up. Three hours late, but he showed up. So, they’re meeting in this very, very remote location. And I forget the name of the Swedish envoy – said, “You know, we’re not going to talk about – I have no influence with the International Court of Justice. So, we’re not going to talk about that. But we are very concerned with the human rights abuses. We want you to release some of the men, women, and children.

At the end of this conversation Kony, this person who’s in such a horrible state of mind shook hands and smiled at him. And our Swedish counterpart shook hands with him, but he said to the journalist, “But I didn’t smile at him. I know what he’s been responsible for.” At that point, all PACS 164A or B should rush in there in helicopters and say, “You blew it, man.” You had a really big chance to start winning that person over. When you smile at a person, you’re not condoning what the person is doing, you’re affirming that he’s still a person. And that without that, there is no way that you’re going to get anywhere with that person in terms of a real change.

Still, I mean don’t get me wrong, to take a helicopter into a remote village and talk to the most violent person on the planet and shake his hand, you know, my hat is off to him for doing that much. Okay, so that’s one – I’m sorry, I kind of took the bit in my teeth. But what we’re talking about was non-embarrassment.

And there's a classic case, one of the many ways in which we see that King had learned his Gandhi very well or he just instinctively was able to see the truth of this particular tactic.

Albany, Georgia and Chauri Chaura

Here's another example – takes place in Albany, Georgia. We're going to talk about Albany in a little bit because this was one of the big non-successes of the whole Freedom Struggle for various reasons.

And the repression was off camera, so it did the movement no good. And at various time it was very, very bad. And the Black marchers who were the victims of it at one point lost their control and they started throwing rocks and bottles back at the police. When Martin Luther King heard this he immediately called off the movement. Okay? Name the precedent. Give you hint. Two funny words. Alex, you haven't said anything yet today.

Student: After Chauri Chaura.

Michael: Right Chauri Chaura is our precedent. And just as in Chauri Chaura in 1926, similarly in 1962 in Albany the other people in the movement did not understand what King was doing or why he had done it. He said, "You're losing your nerve. You're weakening. What is this?" "You know they beat us up so much. Surely, we can beat them up back a little bit." They didn't get it. And it's really around this sort of issue that, as Jolina was pointing out to us last week, the thing is going to divide into two streams at one point.

And because of Nagler's Law it's going to lose some of its effectiveness at that point. Well, okay, that's great. That gets me about 1/5th of the way through the stuff that I had gotten ready for you all. Here's where I want to go next, and this is – I'm opening it up to you. Let's step back, having looked at these particular issues, of course, in connection with basic principles, as we always do.

Overview of the Civil Rights Movement and Indian Struggles for Freedom

But let's step back and look at the overview of the Civil Rights Movement.

On the final exam, this will come as no surprise to you – whether you take it early or late or on time – there's going to be a question very much like the one you already had on the midterm which said, "Take either the South Africa phase or the India phase of Gandhi's career, tell us what happened. Give us a sense of the whole pattern and pull out of it episodes from which we can learn key principles of nonviolence." You're going

to have exactly the same question, but it's going to say either South Africa or India or the Civil Rights Movement. So, let's get ready for that question right now.

What was the overall pattern? What long-term developments do you see? If it's helpful, compare them with the Indian movement. Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:13:22]

Michael: No. I will ask you specifically not to do that. Do not redo your former essay on the midterm and do not give us the substance of your term paper. Instead, pick a part of the history that you have not treated and do the same kind of thing with it that we asked you to do on the midterm. So, start anywhere. Take any criterion and look at it. Say, "Does this movement have a climax? Where do you think it was?" Does it, you know, there's a case to be made that it goes off the rails in some ways.

First, let me start us off maybe with this observation, that in way the Civil Rights Movement is more of a parallel to the South Africa struggle than to the India struggle, if you look at the big picture and the opposition and what you're going to use for your legitimacy. Do you see why say that? Amy, you have notion why I might be saying that?

Student: Well, I was thinking in terms of like what they actually achieved in the end at this point.

Michael: The issue was certainly similar to South Africa. What they achieved in the end was similar. What I'm thinking of is – yeah. I'm thinking actually, before I call on you, [Elana]. I'm thinking of that comment that we just read from the President of Fisk University who said, "Here, we are not like India. The law and the constitution on our side." Now that should immediately make you think of some big feature of the early phase of the South Africa struggle, if not the whole thing. Is that what you were going to try?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:15:39]

Michael: A state issue, you say? Okay, see if you – yeah?

Student: Was it that South Africa had the Black laws, and that the U.S. had the Jim Crow?

Michael: Yeah. They were both against similar kinds of dehumanization, violations of human rights, which had been encoded in the legal system. So, Martin Luther King would say, "Hey," in the letter from Birmingham Jail, "you're telling us not to violate the law. Hey, there are two kinds of laws, you know? There's just ones and unjust ones. And I hope what we're doing is we are refusing to obey unjust laws." "And not only is that not the wrong thing to do, that is a requirement as the first responsibility of the citizen," to use Gandhi's terms.

But think of that comment made by Fisk, "Here we have the law and the Constitution on our side." Now to an extent this is true. The Constitution – Jennifer?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:16:53]

Michael: Almost had you there. The Constitution of the United States does not countenance racial discrimination in the interstate transportation system. So, what should this remind us of in the South Africa struggle? A hint, this is not necessarily a part of the struggle that we felt terrifically comfortable with.

Student: I was just going to say that that moment, like when Rosa Parks got – was asked to leave her seat. It was kind of similar to that moment where Gandhi was asked to leave his spot.

Michael: So that's self evident and, in fact, to me, I burst out crying out when I first realized that it's the same old story, you know? What Rosa Parks did is exactly what Martin Luther King did...well, duh, you know what I mean. At least I didn't misspell it, right? Okay, but here's what I was getting at because I know – yeah, did you want to try?

Student: Yeah, I was going to say like in South Africa it was more like the British government itself wasn't making any laws that were immediately just like against that population. So local government, [unintelligible 01:18:12]

Michael: This is the same situation, and this is the point that I was leading up to. Everything is that everybody said was perfectly valid. But what I'm leading up to is the framework of the situation is that they are against a part of a government which is itself, beholden to a larger framework that they're both in. In Gandhi's case, it's the Empire. Transvaal is a Crown colony. They're supposed to do what British law mandates for colonies. And what he's doing is forcing them to obey laws that they're supposed to obey. So, in a funny way it's civil obedience or it's civil disobedience/national or imperial obedience.

Now this raises a deeper issue for us and that is to what extent is this persuasion and to what extent is this coercion? And I understand that when you saw the documentary when I was out sick, when the 101st Airborne trotted into Central High in Little Rock, Arkansas you had some justifiable concerns about, "Hey, wait a minute. Is this nonviolence?" Just to give you a counter-instance, so you know what we're talking about, a group called – a group that had a name that I can't remember went into the Balkans and attempted to break the Siege of Sarajevo. And they managed to rent a couple of beat-up old buses and they were proposing to drive these buses down through sniper's ally into Sarajevo.

And UNPROFOR showed up and said, "Whoa, wait, this is dangerous. We can't let you do this. So, what we're going to do is we're going to give you an armored personnel carrier in the front and an APC in the back as your military escort." And this group, to their undying credit, been practicing third party nonviolent intervention, they said, "If we do that we might as well go back home. That's not what we're about. Remember

Nagler's law?" Well, he didn't actually say that, but some day – some day they will say that. Violence plus nonviolence equals violence. No, we cannot do this.

So, they said, "Thank you, but no." They refused to accept the escort, and nobody was hurt. So, contrast that, if you will, with the 101st Airborne and we'll start from there on Thursday. So, if anybody knows that blog program that I mentioned – what's it called? WordPress – please come and tell us about it and see you Thursday.

22. Civil Rights Movement II: Kings Last Years 1

Michael: ...everyone and happy Islam Awareness Week. I have two quick announcements that I put on the board. One is there's this institution – it's actually a thing called, "The Peace Boat." That goes on tours around the world and Amy and Shannon, and I have seen in it. And Carrie, it's definitely real. It's the biggest damn thing you ever saw. And it's kind of expensive, but you know, think of it as a cruise. And the U.S. leader of the Peace Boat is coming to campus next week on Tuesday. We're trying to set up a meeting for her so she can tell you what it's like to see if you'd be interested.

As you know from CourseWeb the PACS164B is on the books now. It's a kind of small room, Warren Hall, which is probably going to be okay because we're getting the word out so late. But that's when and where the course will be. I don't have the course control number with me, but I put it out on CourseWeb for you.

Okay, and now I think that's the only announcements. So, I'd like to roll onto the Civil Rights Movement and the end of it. And we are going to be exactly one day behind schedule because the syllabus says that we're going to be talking about the legacy today. But that will actually be on Tuesday. And we discussed some really important issues last time.

What Makes Nonviolence Possible?

What makes principled nonviolence psychologically possible under really tough circumstances?

We haven't yet discussed how that influenced that personal change, transfers itself to other people, but I was really glad we had that discussion, and we can continue it. But I'm going to try to sort of step through the events and pick out particular key points of interest for us in our usual fashion, that is looking for general principles illustrated in specific concrete events. And wherever possible, though it's going to take a little bit more time, I'd like to read you the direct words of Martin Luther King on these subjects because if anybody could write and speak more passionately Gandhi, it was King.

Eknath Easwaran who was my spiritual teacher and who wrote two of the books that we've got, a book on Abdul Ghaffar Khan and "Gandhi, the Man." He heard Martin Luther King speak when he was in Minnesota in the late 50's. And he had never heard of him, just one night there were posters all over the campus that Martin Luther King will be speaking. And so, he went to hear him, and he said he could not believe it. He thought he was listening to Gandhi again. Not since he had heard Gandhi had he been so – had heard that passion and that purity. So, I'll be, to the greatest extent possible, relying on his words.

Five Questions of Nonviolent Movements

And I'd like us to think about – I guess I have about five questions here which partly pick up the ones we're already considering. Okay, what is the overall shape of this movement? It's this rhythm thing that we've been talking about. Does it have phases? Does it escalate? Does it have a climax the way we said the Dharasana Salt Raids was the climax of the Indian Freedom Struggle. Does it kind of come apart at the end? Does it, in other words, evoke problems which tend to break up its momentum toward the end of the movement? Of course, you'll not be overwhelmed with surprise to hear that, I think, the answer to that question is, "Yes."

So, what exactly were those problems? We talked about the introduction of the 101st Airborne into Little Rock and I want to get back to that when we get up to that episode. It's more than just the way that Gandhi appealed to the Crown for help because he did not ask the Crown to intervene militarily. He just wanted it to intervene legally. So, this is a step beyond that. I mean even St. Augustine faced this issue where he had to call upon military generals to keep order in North Africa and it leads you into a very, very awkward position.

So obviously we feel uncomfortable about having those soldiers there in Little Rock in Central High. It's clearly not a persuasion thing to have national guardsmen tramping around with guns. But I'm not sure that this totally means that under the circumstances, given what was available, was this the "wrong" thing to do? Did it set the movement back? I'm not sure about that. I wanted to discuss that with you in a little while. Then let me read you – let's see if I got the right thing here – yeah.

Read you from another great book of King's which you have in your big anthology. Where do we go from here? Chaos or community? This is Question Number 2. He's talking about the achievements of the Civil Rights Movement, and he says, "The historic achievement is found in the fact that the movement in the South has profoundly shaken the entire edifice of segregation. This is an accomplishment whose consequences are deeply felt by every Southern negro in his daily life." Or assumedly, her daily life.

"It is no longer possible to count the number of public establishments that are now open. The persistence of segregation is not the salient fact of Southern experience anymore. The proliferating areas in which the negro moves freely is the new advancing truth. The South was the stronghold of racism."

Now actually, that's a bit of an exaggeration. It's been said and I think it's true, that there's as much racism in the North, but it's a different kind. In the South you could get as close as you wanted, as long as you didn't get high. And in the North, you could get as high as you wanted, as long you didn't get close. But it ends up being as deeply entrenched and in some – in terms of its ultimate consequences, probably just about as vicious in the North.

So, King and the movement in general, they have this success in the southland. He's from there. Most of the people are there. We're going to see several of the major episodes in the movement are not started by people outside those communities although as Jolina was pointing out, you do have to bring non-white [non-black?] people and non-southern people into it at key moments. And we'll be talking about this a lot next semester because although the theory is that one person can do it herself, and you don't any – you don't need numbers, you definitely don't need outside interference – intervention, shall we say.

Swadeshi and International Attention

In theory, the fact of the matter is that if you look at the nonviolent insurrections that have taken place in the last 40 or so years, the correlation between those that got international attention and those that succeeded is very close fit. It's like if you didn't get the attention of the international community, you failed. So, all right, you do need some help from people outside the community, but it is still basically a southern movement, and it works very well there.

And this is the issue that I'm leading up to here and talking about is what? I'll give you big hint, which "swa" word applies here? Alex? Swadeshi, yeah. Because it's a region. The region has a culture. And the people working on that region are doing a form of constructive program, though it has to be very obstructive in some ways in their region. And as King points out, having done it right in the region in then spreads to the rest of the country. And so as far as that's concerned, the swadeshi formula is working for us very well.

But we get to a point in the movement where he goes north. And that raises a question for us. He has some conspicuous setbacks in the North. I think Chicago was worse than Albany, Georgia for him, worse than Fort Lauderdale, Florida which was – he called it, "The lawless city in the nation." And that raises a question for us. Similarly, the next question I want us to think about – I'm lining these out now because I have so much material that I want to share with. I'm not at all sure we're going to get to it, so I want to have this at least in the back of our mind.

So, we have the gray area of invoking the military force at Little Rock. We have the moving beyond your cultural circle. What was the timing of that? After all, we're saying that Gandhi's career had two phases, but the second phase was closer to swadeshi than the first phase, right? Because he starts in South Africa, a thousand or so miles from home. He comes back to India. King, on the other hand, starts on the South and moves into a different cultural zone where things are expressed differently. Was there a loss of efficiency due to a violation of swadeshi in that move? Once again, let me hasten to submit I'm not saying it was necessarily wrong because we're talking of the real world now and having to act within constraints. Stan?

Student: I was just wondering why – I mean it’s just a different region of the country, but he still needed their – I don’t see it being the same thing as [unintelligible 00:11:06] South Africa.

Michael: Well, it’s definitely not the same as moving from South Africa to India because you’re moving closer to your swadeshi in Gandhi’s case. But King is moving outside. Now remember, you know, it’s not the fact that it’s in the same nation state that really matters. What matters is communication. And remember Gandhi’s reason for not getting embroiled in the uplift of Black Africans because they wouldn’t understand him. You know, they probably have just as much nonviolence, but they express it in a different way. Whereas in India, all he has to do is say, “This little community I’ve just started is called Sabarmati Ashram. Get it? Ashra?” And everybody knows that he’s being – he’s leading a spiritual movement whereas, you know, to the Xhosa, the Zulu, wouldn’t have had that much meaning.

So, it is plausible that moving from the South where he was “among his own people” to going up to Chicago and places like that. He was getting outside his cultural area. So, the question we’d have to ask is one of timing. Because remember, swadeshi doesn’t say, “Hey, you get back in your cultural area and you stay there.” What it says is, “You start there. And when your job is done there, it will expand without you doing anything. But also, if you want to move out into a larger area you can.” So, you see why I’m –

Student: Yeah I was just – because it seems like India is a huge country too and you have cultural differences just like –

Michael: There are definitely cultural differences in India, God knows. I mean there are like 200 basically not mutually intelligible languages going on in India. It’s a country of enormous diversity compared to the U.S. You know, you go to a shopping – if we parachuted you into a shopping mall tomorrow and took your blindfolds off, you would not know what city you were in or what region or anything.

So, it’s an enormously diverse civilization, but at the same time there’s a cultural continuity to it. Even across the communal boundaries of Hindu Muslim. Still, there’s appeal to spirituality that works pretty much the same way even though one group says, “Hey, you know, let’s have hamburgers for lunch.” And the other group says, “This is greatest possible sin.” Still, you know, underneath all of those particular ways, there’s – if you go to a religious Sufi in India and a religious Hindu in India, they will be on the same wavelength.

So, whether or not I’m right about India and there’s no reason that I should be. I’ve never set foot on the place. But whether or not I’m right about India, the general principle obtained – it’s a question of – if you’re talking about social swadeshi as opposed to personal swadeshi, it’s a question of whom can you communicate readily with? Who will look upon you as a native son or as we say in urban areas, “A homeboy?” Who’ll consider you a homie? Okay? So that’s the question. And I can’t

promise you will arrive at answers to any of these questions, but these are the important issues that I see coming out of the movement.

No Fresh Issue and Vietnam

Another one – and this, I’m not just making it up. This was explicitly raised and raised as a direct criticism thrown at King by people in the movement and outside of it. And that was the famous Riverside Church talk of 1967 where he came out against the war in Vietnam. So, what’s our issue here? What are we calling this? Amy?

Student: No fresh issue.

Michael: No fresh issue. Is this a fresh issue? And I’m just putting it out there for now with a question mark. Finally – two more questions, I guess. Yes, John?

Student: When Gandhi [unintelligible 00:15:48]

Michael: Well, that, I think Gandhi assumed that there would be people who believed in God in America. And at the time, of course, it was wrong. Now we have them in the highest offices in the land, having prayer breakfasts and getting ready for Armageddon. I’m just being sarcastic. But note that his definition of God in that speech was about as non-sectarian as you could possibly be. He did not say, “I do dimly perceive that God is blue and he’s wearing a peacock feather and he has four arms. Or he’s dancing on my ego.” He said, “I do dimly perceive that whilst all around me that is ever changing, there is something that isn’t changing.” That’s about as universal a definition as you can possibly get.

I think that was not a violation of swadeshi to talk to Americans, to come here and try to get involved in American politics and raise some movements here, that might have been a problem. But by the time he had finished doing his ocular demonstration, to use his words, that you had so many Indians coming over here as advisors. I’m going to characterize that as educational intervention which is totally appropriate. It better be because that’s what I’m doing with my life.

But in fact, there was a time when the ideology on the left was so rigid that people were not just opposed, they were morally outraged if, for example, someone like me were to offer – let’s say you had this nonviolent movement in Tabasco going on. If I were to go down there and share some of what I think are the general principles of nonviolence, there were people in the left in those days who would call that, “Peace imperialism.” Say I’m arrogant and I’m a white male, part of which is undeniable – namely the arrogant part. And I never – I didn’t see it that way then and I don’t see it that way now and I think you can point to the results. I am one who believes with Gandhi and Kant and a few other heavy weights, that if you do the right thing, it will have a positive effect in the long run.

And I think we can say that the results of not sharing what we know about nonviolence with incipient movements around the world had been disastrous. And the results of sharing them had been amazingly efficient. And I'm not just talking about, you know, "work" winning. But uplifting consciousness and making positive changes. So, I'm unwilling to say that going around the world and sharing information is wrong.

Student: So then with that logic how can we discount Martin Luther King for speaking up against the war when that's – it's not like he was leading an anti-draft movement. It's like he's sharing his opinion as much as Gandhi was against segregation here.

Michael: Yeah, it's a good point. You're Amos, right?

Student: Yeah.

Michael: If there's a new fresh issue it would be because he had based his whole reputation on the Civil Rights Movement. And suddenly he's stepping outside of it. Now I'm not saying it was a violation of no-fresh issue. But I'm saying it was called that even by people who didn't know the term. So, it wasn't because – after all, he's an American citizen, right? His country is waging this war. He gets to speak out. But the platform he's using – and this another point – the legitimacy that he had was as a person who had stood up against racism.

So, what was involved in him expanding that circle or should we say, "Stepping outside that circle to talk about war fighting? And there's no question – one second, Amy. There's no question that he alienated Johnson partly around that issue and partly around the poverty issue because Johnson prided himself on building a great society and there's going to be no poverty when he was finished. Amy?

Student: I think probably to King it didn't constitute a fresh issue at this time because I know like he was working more towards eradicating poverty at that time. And he probably saw the spending going on [unintelligible 00:20:59]. I know, again, where do we go from here? He talks about the triplets of racism, materialism, and militarism.

Michael: Yeah. Racism, materialism, and militarism. Well, since we're there already, discussing this issue which I was just kind of flagging for us to get to it, but who cares? If it's not a no fresh issue, how would you characterize it? It's definitely a change of focus, right? It's a change of issue. I mean after all, that's contrast – although King himself had nothing to do with it, let's contrast the 101st Airborne marching into Central High, trump, trump, trump, with their Garand A1 rifles on their shoulders. Contrast that with saying, "My nation is the greatest purveyor of militarism in the world."

Student: I think whether it's no fresh issue or not, it might be an issue of just a missed definition of what his original issue was. But I don't think – I mean I don't think he would ever claim that his original issue was purely racism. I think it was more an issue of equality and being alike across the board. So that c[unintelligible 00:22:16]. But the war, poverty, and everything. So, I think the racism issue was sort of just have that touch

down most readily what he wanted. And so, I would say it's the same issue, just sort of widening the scope maybe publicly.

Michael: Yeah. Well, I totally agree with you, and I think you put that very well. It was the – this was the issue all along. And racism is just where that issue touched the ground for him there. And it was very swadeshi of him to deal with racism in the South from his pulpit. That was the swadeshi way to start. I would even go maybe a half step further in this. And I think he says as much. But I'm not sure where. That in a way, for me, I think this was a deepening of the issue. This was a getting down to the root cause of the issue.

Which is what he said about the first go around with racism. He said, "By getting at racism where it is most entrenched and most legitimated by legalization in the south, most in your face, he has gotten that racism everywhere. But I was going to be leading up to this with a big dramatic fanfare roll of snare drums and so forth, but here it is, so I'll just tell you right now, hope it's not anti-climatic. When we talk about what I the end he and the movement really achieved I believe we could make this generalization that he and they – it succeeded in de-legitimizing racism. Not just him but actually Hitler helped, you know. He had made racism so ugly that people were sent reeling in shock.

And so, then when he sweeps in and humanizes Black people he kind of puts the death knell on the legitimacy of racism. But to finish my sentence I don't think for some reason he quite succeeded in delegitimizing violence. And that's as far as he got. That's my real overview of what the achievement of the movement was. And that's where the dream has to be carried now. This is the task of our generation. For the moment I'm identifying with you and your generation.

But we have to, I think, do exactly what he did, which is to carry the thing step by step, closer to the belly of the beast. And when you stop and think about it, is this not what Gandhi did? He dealt with rights and discrimination in an outlying colony. And when he succeeded there he said, "Okay, now let's carry this home. So that in the end, I think, as far as the swadeshi thing is concerned, we have kind of a mixed bag. It was perfectly okay in several ways.

Delegitimate Racism by Delegitimizing Violence

One of them, the most important one, perhaps, being that if you really – I guess I have to finish my little formula now. If you really want to eliminate racism as opposed to delegitimizing it, you have to delegitimize and eliminate violence because racism is a form of violence. As long as there is violence it will take whatever form it wants to touch down at in your particular situation. So, you could get rid of every single line of racial legislation in a regime. You can de-habituate people from the practices of racism. And if they still don't have a nonviolent worldview, it's potentially going to come back.

It's just like they said about the atomic bomb. We could dismantle every atomic bomb on the planet, which I think would be fantastic. But we won't be able to take the knowledge of how to build them out of people's minds. As long as they're University of California, I'm embarrassed to say, there will be highly paid scientists – again, my jealousy speaking – who are as Tom Barnett once said, you know, “We say that nuclear war is unthinkable, but we pay tens of thousands of people to think about it every single day.”

So, we really need to get down to the root and I think that's exactly what Martin Luther King was doing. But the fact is that strategically it did not work very well because he alienated a lot of his own followers and he alienated Johnson because this is Johnson's pet little war. I won't even quote to you some of the phrases that he used because they're not suitable for mixed company, about what he was doing to Ho Chi Minh and things like that. He was – Johnson was a very complex person – the war.

You know, there are those who say – we're never going to get to half of this material. I hope that's alright with you – there are those who say – now this is a really unfortunate thing to have to be considering – but the fact is that nobody really knows who assassinated Martin Luther King. That's a legal process that has been stymied and that truth has not come out. There are those who believe that the reason that King was assassinated is that he went against the war. And that the powers that be, believe it or not, we like to think of them as primarily racist, but racism is just a tool for them.

I had – in the early days of Peace and Conflict Studies we had a famous couple from the South, Miles and Wilma Horton came up here to speak. And, you know, Black sharecroppers in origin from Mississippi. And I just practically dropped my jaw open. They got up to speak to my students and the first thing they said was, “You know what folks? Racism had nothing to do with it. It's about greed and class discrimination and racism is a convenient way to organize it. But they were as vicious to poor white trash as they were to Black sharecroppers.”

So now that might be an exaggeration to say, “Racism has nothing to do with it,” but in a funny way, violent and ugly and clear as it is, it's obviously a clear violation of humanity. There couldn't be a clearer one. It isn't the root issue. The root issue is violence itself. And so, we're looking at this at two different ways. We're saying that King was homing in on the Vietnam war as the manifestation of violence knowing full well that that's what he was after all along. And unless he was able to do something about that he would not have permanently resolved the racial issue.

And then if you believe in this particular conspiracy theory, the powers that be were really alarmed when he said – and he did – that he was going to organize another march on Washington, only this time it was going to go to the Pentagon and it was going to be about the Vietnam War. And it was shortly after that that he was assassinated.

So, we're left here with just a horrible unscientific inference. And, you know, there's no way of proving this one way or the other. I hope that I'm totally wrong and none of this stuff is going on. But I have the sickening disquieting feeling that I'm not. Usually, I love being wrong. Jolina?

Jolina: [Unintelligible 00:30:55] that I mean he did what he did and of course [unintelligible 00:31:02] but there's also violence going on in the Black community by that time, that [unintelligible 00:31:09]

Civil Rights Movement and Constructive Program

Michael: Yeah. Not only more action would have been beneficial to help resolve the violence within the Black community, but this is a criticism, if you will, that I think may have some validity. But as soon as I finish saying this, I'm going to talk about all of these criticisms. This criticism may have some validity that when it comes to constructive program, he talked about it, but he didn't do a whole lot about it. Whereas Gandhi said, "I don't care how long it takes, I'm going down to the smallest hardscrabble village in the remotest corner of India and I'm going to get people to clean their latrines with my bare hands and plant their crops and start educating them and build it up from there."

So then when he would go to people and say, "You have economic independence. You don't need to rely on the British cloth or British anything else." He had actually put this stuff in their hands. He had put the bread on their table. Whereas Martin Luther King didn't go quite that far. He said, "We can do boycotts. We have buying power. And we have got to stop the drinking and the violence and all the rest of it." But he didn't actually build constructive program very much.

That probably was a problem that probably somewhat limited his effectiveness. But now let me hasten to add about all of these criticisms to the extent that they're valid, we have to weigh something against that criticism, those criticisms in the other pan. And that's the letter from Birmingham Jail where all of these white ministers say to him, "Oh, you're going to get emancipated eventually. You know, why push it? Why raise all of this ill will, this dust?" And he said, in effect – paraphrasing him, he said a couple of things. "You know, you don't understand what it's like to live like this for a hundred years. There comes a point where you lose your humanity, and you can't get it back and you cannot let that happen."

We're moving from, if you will, a form of poverty to a form of cultural destitution. But the other part of the question is this, it's also the timing question, you get these windows of opportunity in the real world. We cannot have the Free Speech Movement next Thursday, unfortunately. Don't ask me why. If I declare a rally next Thursday, even though we now have the Internet, then all we had was coffee shops. And in fact, we didn't have very good coffee for that matter. Even though we have all this wonderful communication techniques you know perfectly well, if I were to call a rally against some

issue, you know, Zoe and Emily and Mia and another handful of people would be there. I know because I've done two rallies in the last couple years. It's kind of disappointing if you are in the Free Speech Movement and you're used to hearing roars of approval from 20,000 people. It's really terrible for your ego.

But that's not the point.

Raising Consciousness to a Tipping Point

The point is – let me remind myself – the point is, for reasons which we don't fully understand, tipping points happen. Consciousness suddenly explodes across the whole community of people. I've already mentioned the example that we'll talk about next semester of getting General Pinochet out of power in Chile. Wouldn't it have been lovely if you could have called a meeting with him every Tuesday, let's say, take him out for some Sangria and talk to him about why you shouldn't torture people, especially if they're pregnant and things like that. And slowly, over a period of ten years, persuaded him to step down. That would be ideal. That would be persuasion, not coercion. But in the real world, the opportunity was boot his blankety-blank out of there or put up with 12, 15, who knows how many more years of brutal military dictatorship.

Likewise, the Civil Rights Movement happened at a time for a reason. And I believe that even in terms of his personal career, that Martin Luther King knew that he wasn't going to live very much longer. And he knew that he had to get what he could get when he could get it. And so, all of the things that we feel uncomfortable with and should feel uncomfortable with from the point of view of principled nonviolence, they have to be weighed against the realities of the situation. It either was to get something or get nothing.

Okay, then did you still have a comment or a question?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:36:16]

Michael: Okay. Well, then I forgot my answer. Well, where shall we go from here? Sorry, terrible pun.

The Strides Toward Freedom

Let's talk about the events that we have on our little chronology. And you now have it out there on CourseWeb and maybe think of some way of getting it on the – out for the webcast people. Can you do a screenshot of this? No? Okay.

The event that we probably know best for various – because he writes “Stride Toward Freedom,” about it, is the bus boycott. And I want to point out something about actually – now that I look at it, for 1, 2, 3, 4 – the first 5 events were not started by Martin Luther King. The bus boycott, as we know, he was just being a Black Baptist minister at that

point and following in the footsteps of daddy King. And as everyone knows very well, it was Rosa Parks who had been radicalized/educated at Highlander Folk School.

One day, for reasons known only to herself and God, she said, “No.” And decided not to move to the back of the bus. She was not just anybody. She was a very prominent and respected and loved person in the community. The community pulled together to decide what to do about this. And it’s in that context that Martin Luther King rises to a position of leadership at age 26. Little Rock, not only did he not instigate it, he had absolutely nothing to do with it. And if you read books by people like Melba Beals who writes a book called, “Soldiers Don’t Cry.” She was one of the nine Black high schoolers who integrated that school. That whole book, from cover to cover, she never mentions the name of Martin Luther King. I have a feeling there may even have been some bad blood there.

Greensboro, on February 1st, 1960, four students from North Carolina A&T – that’s probably agriculture and technology. They were talking – it’s always dangerous for students to talk to one another. They decided – that was a joke – they decided to, “Why don’t we just walk in and sit down at a lunch counter and just not go away until they serve us.” So that was February 1st. By the 10th of February, it had spread across five states.

And let me read you – I’m partly talking about the issue of leadership here. I was afraid of that. It looks like I’ve got the wrong book. Autobiography, Page 54. We’ll have to go back and erase the last five minutes of that tape. I had the wrong site there. But so now when it comes to the next year, 1961, the Freedom Rides, we can’t say he had nothing to do with it. Those were organized by the Congress of Racial Equality, CORE, and they were, in turn sponsored by Fellowship of Reconciliation. Incidentally, one of the things that I didn’t put on this list, partly because I didn’t know how to get Microsoft Word to do five columns instead of four – I worked for a couple of weeks to get this to come out right.

I haven’t discussed the organizations. Jolina mentioned them, but it is in itself an interesting story because you had for 100 years, you had organizations that were dedicated to the amelioration of the position of Black people in the south. You had, of course, the colored porters – what was that one called exactly? The Brotherhood of Negro Porters or something like that.

Student: Sleeping Car Porters.

Michael: Sleeping Car Porters, that’s right. And of course, you had the famous NAACP which still is in existence. But the thing that sprang forth in the Civil Rights Movement was way beyond their – it was out of the box for them. And if they had wanted to be involved they would have had to have changed very deeply and very quickly. And that led to tension and ill feeling and loss of resources and so forth. But I’m not talking too much about organizations, but Fellowship of Reconciliation based way up north played an important role. I was in their main offices in Nyack, about five or six years ago.

They're housed in a beautiful old mansion. Somebody gave it to them. Someone from FOR was riding on a train with this person and he told him that, you know, we have this organization. We're looking for a place. He said, "Oh, I got a place for you." And he gave them this huge mansion on about five acres right on the Hudson River." Unbelievable. So, I was walking around drooling – I mean enjoying meeting all these people.

My eye was caught by a little three by five card, you know, like a file card that they used to have before they had computers. It was up on the mantelpiece. And Richard Deats said, "Oh, you want to see that? Go have a look." I picked it up, it was an enrollment card. Someone had just paid \$25 to join the Fellowship of Reconciliation. And I looked down at the signature and it was Martin Luther King Junior. That was his enrollment, and it was probably around 1955 or something like that.

So, he did get involved in that. but then again, in Albany, the thing was started without him being there and he was dragged into it most unwillingly. Was not able to control it very much. And in fact, it was one of the famous failures of the movement.

Nonviolent Leadership

Now leadership is one of our questions. I had mentioned one thing about Gandhi's style of leadership. I want to add another in case I haven't mentioned it yet.

The one I have mentioned is that Gandhi said, "When we get rolling with Satyagraha in the smaller sense, obstructive program is rolling, there's no time for democracy." He didn't say that, but I'm saying that. "We're not going to sit down and have town meeting, all right? I am your general. I expect you to obey me implicitly." The difference been that in the case of actually five star general, you can't fire them if you don't like what they're doing anymore unless you're the Commander in Chief of the armed forces.

Whereas with Gandhi, he said, "The moment you people don't want me here, I'm out of here. But if you want me to be your general, then you have to do what I say. Otherwise, I can't function." The other thing about his style of leadership that he insisted in – and I may have put an article in the reader that says this. And I don't quite remember whether I got it in there or not. He also said, "I have never really started anything. I watched the people very carefully. I sense what they want. And I help facilitate it for them."

Now in a way, this is also going to be King's style of leadership. There are some events where he sits down with Abernathy and Shuttlesworth and Andy Young and Jesse Jackson and all the rest of them and he says, "Where should we go from here? What's our next move? What's the issue? How do we do it?" But those were in the minority and most of these things were very grassroots in terms of the sparkplug that got them started. And some of them he even didn't have an opportunity to get involved, but in others he came in just to lend what resources and prestige and legitimacy that he could.

The Ego and Non-Triumphalism

Okay, so starting with the Montgomery Bus Boycott there was an episode or – hopefully this is the right book this time. Yeah. I don't know where my head was when I was writing all these page numbers. All these little hard soft-covered book look so much alike. One more book. Ah, okay. The movement almost fell apart around a very interesting setback at a meeting with the white citizens council of Montgomery when they were almost – they had almost reached agreement when somebody said to the sheriff or whoever was there, "If we do this the negroes will say that they won and that is intolerable."

To me, this was very, very clear. They had just worked out all the issues. Remember me saying from the get-go, one of the things that a nonviolent person believes is there are no unresolvable conflicts of interest, really. When you get down to basic needs, there is no reason any person or group has to fight with another person or group. And the most dramatic example of that was the one I borrowed from Johan Galtung, who traveled around, did a lot of interviews, came to the conclusion that the needs of the West are access to cheap oil and the needs of Islamic people in the Middle East are for respect for their religion. There's absolutely no reason why we have to be carrying this ghastly conflict. But to say there's no reason doesn't mean there isn't a cause. There is a cause, and the cause is ego.

There's a really neat book that's come out that I saw in some book catalog that has a button – I don't know if it's a real button. If it is, I want to buy one. It says, "It's the ego, stupid." That's a real issue. It's not the economy. It's not immigration. It's not gay marriages. It's not abortion. It's the reason we're fighting one another is all about ego. And this is a very clear example of that, and it sunk in for King and he internalized that lesson.

They worked it all out on the level of detail. There was no reason why they couldn't integrate the busses. And as a matter of fact, when they did integrate them, the whole thing was over in 24 hours. In 24 hours, you riding on a bus in Montgomery, you would not have known that there had ever been segregation in that city. The first 24 hours was a bit uncomfortable. There was one lady who was sitting on a bus and a Black person sat down next to her and she said, "What will these," I won't use the word, "think of next." But that was about the extent of it.

And by the end of the week, it was like it had never been any different. So, it's a very good illustration that the underlying problems can always be resolved. And what makes it into a conflict is ego. And therefore, from this point on, King was very careful not to – he was very careful to discourage triumphalism in people. Let's not go around crowing and saying, "Ha ha, we won, you know. Take that whitey." You don't do that. He said, "It's very important to avoid the psychology of a victor. Yeah? And your name again? Elizabeth."

Student: Is it right that I was just reading this, and I wasn't sure if I was reading it the right way, that part of the agreement or what they were fighting for is that it would be on a first come, first serve basis on the buses, but that whites would sit front to back and Blacks would sit front to back.

Michael: Back to front.

Student: I mean back to front.

Michael: Yes. That was the agreement at one stage, but it was complicated by the fact that the federal government stepped in and outlawed it. So right at the same time when the white citizens council or the city council, rather, was saying, "No, you can't do this," the federal legislation was making it irrelevant. So, but yes, it was really very gentle compromise that they were going for. They were not saying it's just totally mixed. There isn't a trace of segregation going to be left. But yeah, if you're Black you start at the back, come forward. If you're white, start at the front, go backwards. And if you overlap, that's okay also as long as you don't actually have children right there on the bus.

And everybody knew that this was a step towards complete – because once you break the mystique, the mystique is that whites are privileged, Blacks are not. And contact with them is contaminating. The minute you show that contact with them is not contaminating the mystique is broken, the legitimacy is gone, and then it's a just a matter of time before it will be more complete desegregation – integration. Yeah. John, I think you had a –

Student: [Unintelligible 00:51:26]

Michael: I think the only term for it is non-triumphalism, or just to avoid triumphalism. Remember, non-embarrassment as we use the term is a technical term with a limited range of applications. I wouldn't apply it here. But the concept of – let's call it, "Non-humiliation," to distinguish it from "non-embarrassment." Non-humiliation is the big principle. You never humiliate anyone. And you never accept humiliation from another person. That's critical.

But non-triumphalism is very similar to no fresh issue in a way. Now do you see why I'm saying that? What did I claim is the underlying reason for not admitting a fresh issue when you've got a little bit of momentum? You've got some clout. Why don't you? Shannon?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:52:32]

Michael: Right. Because it changes your relationship, your interaction from a conversational one. The point of which is education and reconciliation to a power struggle, the point of which is domination and winning. So similarly, triumphalism would psychologically reinterpret the conflict that you just had in the terms of a power struggle and winners and losers. Interpretation can be all important because of this principle that there is no real conflict among us.

Greek Example of Non-Triumphalism

Every now and then I like to use an example from ancient Greeks just to show that my whole education was not a complete waste.

There was a battle that took place among these two city states in Greece. It was around the middle of the 4th century B.C., I believe. And the winning party, they had some – some of their people were dead and they were out of reach on the other side. But they had won. They won the battle. They've driven the other guys off the field. But then they went and said, "If you don't mind, we're coming across to get our corpses." And those people said, "Tee-hee-hee. No, we don't mind. Come on ahead." Let them come in, let them get their corpses and immediately declared victory because that was the symbol.

If you go and collect – if you had to come on over and collect your dead, you were the loser. So, it had nothing to do with the fact that they had a lot more people who had died. Nothing to do with the fact that they literally had turned tail and run off the field. It wasn't the facts on the ground that we're always talking about. It was the interpretation of those facts. In the mind where ego has full reign that really gives you your final payoff in terms of your relationship and nonviolence.

Invalidating Violence

Okay, still on Montgomery. And on the end of the struggle there is a really important event – two important events really. One of them is that there's a final spasm of bomb throwing. Some people threw some bombs and again, it was kind of an interpretation thing. What was the response to the bombs that were thrown after desegregation was already in place? The response was nada. Nothing. Nichts. People decided to ignore it. And amazingly enough when they ignored it, it had no effect.

So, what's the very, very deep Gandhian principle that applies here? I think we've mentioned it before. It sounds almost incredible when you first hear it, but you see things like this – yeah?

Student: [unintelligible 00:55:29]

Michael: What is your name? Jocelyn, that's right. That wasn't the one I was thinking of, Jocelyn. But it's – I mean I don't want to be triumphalist about this, but yours is just as good. Yeah, you don't use their – if you don't use their weapons, you have moved the whole struggle onto a very advantageous location for you. So, if you don't respond to their bombing you have, in a way, invalidated the whole thing.

The principle that I was thinking of is where Gandhi says, "Evil has no existence. It seems to exist because we support it." And one of the ways we support it is if somebody threatens us, we get frightened. That supports their threat. If somebody threatens us and we don't get frightened, we've withdrawn our support. And that evil ceases to exist.

Then it's a just a big noise and some molecules banging around. So that was one thing that happened.

And the other thing that I want to draw attention to – in this case I actually do have the right page and the right book, so let's enjoy it. This was Wednesday night, November 14th, they decided to call off the struggle because it was no longer necessary. That night the Ku Klux Klan rode. And of course, that's special language. When the "Klan rides" they are, in effect, being a posse. They're being – this is a special social form within the scapegoating dynamic where it's called by a German word – this desk was getting a little hard anyway so I'm going to write something on the board.

This is called, "A Männerbund," because it was first discovered by German scholars actually on the eve of WWII, interestingly enough. A bund is a gang, group. And Männer just means of men. So, it's a male sodality, but it has a special meaning because groups of men sometimes get together for a violent purpose and they seem to enclave themselves out of reach of the society and it's norms and they become extremely dangerous. This has happened a lot in the Middle Ages in Norse countries. In some cases, there were communities in Greece where they actually trained the young men to form parts of these raiding bands where their only purpose becomes extreme dehumanizing violence.

And it's almost like these groups that run around in the woods, you know, tearing apart animals and things like that. It's this phenomenon is extremely dangerous. So now let me read the paragraph which you probably have already read. "Ordinarily, threats of Klan action were a signal to the negroes to go into their houses, close the doors, pull the shades, or turn off the lights. Fearing death, they played dead." This guy really knows how to write. "Fearing death, they played dead."

Remember that essay that I gave you in the Reader from Howard Thurman that it's when you internalize the untruth and start lying to protect yourself, then you're completely lost it. Okay, "Fearing death, they played dead. But this time they had prepared a surprise. When the Klan arrived, according to the newspapers, about 40 carloads of robed and hooded members, porch lights were on, and doors open. As the Klan drove by, the negroes behaved as though they were watching a circus parade. Concealing the effort it cost them," remember that phrase. We're going to comment on that. "Concealing the effort it cost them, many walked about as usual. Some simply watched from their steps."

And this is really rich, "A few waved at the passing cars." "Hi, you know, y'all come back." After a few blocks the Klan, nonplussed, turned off into a side street and disappeared into the night." So, what can we say about this? Start off by saying if we are thinking about rhythm, this is an important element. They have now played their worst card. They have done their most terrifying thing and it doesn't work. Camilla?

Student: Yeah, it's like a thing you were – what we were just talking about, the people [unintelligible 01:00:40].

Michael: Yeah. It is definitely an example of the fact that when you withdraw your participation from evil – and nobody’s saying it’s easy – but if you withdraw your participation, the thing loses its power and without any power, you might as well as say it doesn’t exist. Julia?

Student: I was thinking if you knew what the Klan was trying to convey by burning the cross. What did that mean exactly?

Michael: I have never been able to figure out what the Klan means by burning the cross. That is a very – you know, I’ve never been initiated. [Laughter] I don’t even know how to cross my left hand over my right. I don’t have a clue what those guys are getting at. But as someone who looks at symbols quite apart from what people think they’re doing, to me, part of the symbolism there – it’s ambiguous, as much symbolism is, especially in the realm of violence. Partly, burning the cross, they’re burning down Christianity.

Nietzsche said, you know, “Judeo-Christian religion has made us weak, and nothing is worse than that. We should – no more Mr. Nice guy.” And, of course, the Nazis picked that up. It’s not what he meant, but they didn’t care what he meant. They picked it up and used it. So partly they’re saying, “If you think that the cross is going to protect you, we’re dousing it with gasoline and putting it on fire.”

Another possible interpretation of that – and it’s really hard to know how symbols work sometimes. Another possible interpretation is they are taking – remember my model that religions deteriorate over time? The three stages? They get down to a point where they have nothing but their authority. And that authority is now used for exactly the opposite of what the religion originally stood for. So here what they’re doing is they are asserting Christianity as a religion of violence. It is coming with flames, so to speak.

And that would fit very well, the apocalyptic mentality of a lot of the fundamentalists who are practically a third of our country right now, actually – scary kind of thought. That’s not to say a third of our country would go on a Klan ride and put an old cannon percale sheet with eye holes cut in it. But a part of this mentality that, you know, “Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord trampling down the vineyards and all the rest of it.” That’s about the best that I can make of it. I’ve always maintained that it’s difficult to understand insane people. So, I think that’s about the best that I can do.

Okay.

The Nonviolent Moment

So, with the bombing and with this extremely dramatic episode of a Klan ride that fizzles out, I think we’re looking at something equivalent to the Dharasana Salt Pans. So at least within the Montgomery episode this is now the climax. The Klan has done its worst and it has no – it doesn’t work. So, at this point nonviolence has prevailed. But now – yes, John?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:04:01]

Michael: Good, yeah. Sure, you bet. This is a nonviolent moment. Yeah. We've got to get this into our film, as a matter of fact. Yeah. And that happens to be one that was instigated by the bad guys. And as you know, I don't believe in bad guys, but if I do, these would certainly qualify. This was started by them, but it does bring it out into the open. Okay, they've got their powers on the table, our powers on the table, and I maintain that whenever you can really do this in a clean, nonviolent conversation, nonviolent power will always prevail. This is clearly an example of that. Great.

But I did make a fuss for some irrational reason about the phrases, "Concealing the effort it cost them." Now your question is why is Nagler so excited about this phrase, "Concealing the effort it cost them?" So, I – yes? Jocelyn?

Student: I'm imagining that [unintelligible 01:05:14]

Michael: When the Klan threatens them, that is a form of violence. Before they get out of the car and start swinging their pipes and stuff, it's still violence. You can say it's almost as extreme. It just hasn't moved into the area of physical expression yet. And so, they are – these people are dealing with that violence. Rami?

Student: And they're also, in a way, they're taking on suffering [unintelligible 01:05:58].

Michael: They're taking on suffering. It would have been much easier, go inside, shut out the lights, this Melba Beals that I've mentioned who writes this book about the Little Rock – oh, I did want to talk about that episode. Anyway, they attacked her home one time, and it was the father was no longer living with them, so it was just here and her grandmother and her mother. And what they did not realize was that grandma had a shotgun in the closet. So, all of these people are making a lot of noise on the front porch and being very threatening, were coming in.

So, Grandma India just levels down on a trashcan in the front yard and shoots this trashcan with a shotgun. You can imagine what kind of noise that made. And in two seconds those people were out of there. So that is one response. Another response is to crawl under the bed and pretend you're not there. And I would say that both of these – these are like fight and flight. So, they're both in the general area of violence, but if you want to get in the general area of nonviolence, you got to walk out and look at those people going by in the convertible and maybe even see those eyes of hatred and wave at them.

Discipline of Energy

And the reason that I am so enamored of this phrase, "Concealing the effort that it cost them," is if you go right back to the first day of the course, you know, get that webcast, you will see that my definition of nonviolence is that it's a power that arises from the conversion of negative energies. And this concealment was actually turning fear into a

constructive outlet. So, while they're concealing the emotion of fear, the energy, the drive behind that emotion is propelling them out there.

And I don't know if you've ever had this experience, but have you ever been in a situation where you were afraid and you decided to act as though you were not afraid and you were just convinced that you were a complete flop, and everybody saw through it because you were so scared. And you felt that your teeth were chattering. And at the end, people come up to you and they say, "How could you do that with a trace of fear? Man, you were so cool." And you smile and say, "Oh, well, I always do it that way."

In other words, the emotion of fear is a little bit like a slideshow that's being put on in a part of your mind. And you can withdraw your attention from it and your energies can go in a very different direction. Now it's also in the context of Montgomery that – well, maybe it was a little bit later in the movement as a whole where King made his famous statement that there were no explosions of anger. Rather, we controlled anger and released it under discipline for maximum effect. It's a perfect expression of the psychological dynamic.

And this is a clue to why Gandhi said, "Give me an angry violent person and I can turn him into a nonviolent Satyagrahi. But don't give me a wimp. I can't do anything with one of those." Well, he didn't use the word, but you know what I mean." So, I think that we have just a little psychological insight that this is the actual power of nonviolence at work. If you have a negative response in you, fear, obviously – I mean it's scary even to read about this paragraph – if fear comes up, you decide not to act on it in either of the two traditional ways, you're going to do something creative instead, the energy of that fear actually rolls over into the creative action.

This is important enough I want to dwell on it for just a minute more. The clue for me was when I first read about that experiment by Davitz, which is my book right toward the beginning where they took this two classrooms of school children. It was late – right at the same time, actually as Montgomery. And remember, they trained one group to be – they just let one group be very aggressive and the other group, they wanted them not to be aggressive. They subjected both groups to exactly the same frustration experience and it was hair-raising even to read about it.

Give them candy. You tell them not to eat it yet. And then you sit them down and you tell them they're going to be watching movies. They had something called, "Movies," in those days. You put them in a big projector. And then you snap the lights on and say, "No more movies. Get back to your classroom. Give me that candy bar." You can't imagine doing anything more frustrating and cruel to these school children.

But then they carefully watched the two groups. And the groups that were trained to be aggressive, well, you can just imagine. They were super aggressive. They were punching each other out, probably tied up the teacher, set fire to the classroom. So, then you go over to the other group expecting it to be a little bit less dramatic. And not only is it a little bit less dramatic, but unprepared for this, what the scientists saw was

that the cooperative trained students were super-cooperative. They were being so nice. It was like almost disgusting already. “No, I don’t want this. You can have it. Sure, it’s my only piece of candy, but who cares? You’re my friend.” That kind of thing.

So, the only explanation is that you have this frustration energy, which is very negative, which could take all these negative forms, but you have carved a different channel for it to float through and it goes out in creativity. So, I think it is worth our having stayed on that for a while because this the bedrock, this is the core of nonviolence.

Okay, let’s see. Yeah.

Non-Weaponizing of Fear

While we’re talking about this fear question, there’s an interesting observation. When the attacks get started in Montgomery, King has – gets hold of a gun, keeps it in his house. Now, you know, this is kind of a natural reaction, right? People are attacking you out of the darkness through terrorism. You want to reach for the gun. And the house is being patrolled by armed bodyguards. And at one point they thought about this and decided that this doesn’t work. This is not nonviolence, and I don’t want anyone with guns around here. And he gets rid of his own gun, and he says, “I was much more afraid in Montgomery when I had a gun in my house. When I decided that I couldn’t keep a gun, I came face to face with the question of death and I dealt with it. From that point on I no longer needed a gun, nor have I been afraid. Had we become distracted by the question of my safety we would have lost the moral offensive,” he uses that language, “and sunk to the level of our oppressors.” That’s your point, Jocelyn. We’d be using their weapons.

So, he’s learning from direct experience exactly what the dynamics of nonviolence are and what they demand. I’m reminded of Jeannette Rankin – I don’t know how many of you are aware of her. She was the first female congressperson in the U.S. And she went to Congress just in time, 1916, to vote against the entry of the U.S. into WWI. And she made a famous statement, “I love my country, but I cannot vote for war. I say no.” And it was one against 495 in the two houses.

And after she made that, she was mobbed. Remember, she’s the first – she’s the only woman in the house and she’s against war. This goes along with what I said before, you know, you can take away racism. You can take away a lot of things, but if you start tugging on people’s war fighting capacity, they’re going to fight back with everything they’ve got, unfortunately. But that’s something for us to know.

Think of the Greek Junta. And I don’t often encourage people to think of the Greek Junta, but they were in power for eight or ten years. Nobody could dislodge it. And then they decided to raise an army and send it to Cyprus. They failed to raise that army. The resigned, to a man. They just walked out and said, “If we can’t fight wars, we’re nobody.” So that’s how they think.

Anyway, you can imagine how outraged they were against Jeannette Rankin. She actually had to run into a telephone booth in the rotunda of the House of Representatives and had to be protected by policemen. It was a terrifying experience seeing all of these colleagues, you know, pounding on the glass, “Get her out of there.” Just imagine. She was so terrified that she decided to – she needed a vacation. Went down to a cabin in the Piney Woods in Georgia and was recuperating.

And one night she couldn’t sleep. She was terrified. And she didn’t quite know why. Every time a pinecone dropped, which happens frequently in the Piney Woods, she would jump out of bed, “Oh my God, they’re coming!” And she couldn’t understand why. She had been sleeping fine, you know, up until that night. In the morning she discovered why she was so afraid. She had locked the door. Every night up to that point she had not locked the door. But once she enacted fear, she was afraid. She enacted danger. She responded to danger. So, it’s similar here, this similar discovery that King is making. It is very empowering to lay down the gun. We even have an episode about that in our DVD.

Okay. I’ve got about 95 other major points I want to make and 117 minor ones, but we’re out of time. We have one more minute in case you had any questions you want to raise? Okay, fine. Well, on Tuesday then we’re going to take a bit of a step back and look at the combined legacy. I think you have in your reader a little diagram called, “The wheel of nonviolence.” And we’ll be talking partly about that. Okay?

23. Civil Rights Movement II: Kings Last Years 2

Michael: ...to say a couple of things about writing. Writing itself, the style of writing your paper, there's been a tendency in modern English to drift into org speak because so much of the conversations that we have are artificial. "Thank you for calling Dell. How can I provide with excellent service today?" Or "This is the automatic answering machine of your doctor. Tell me your symptoms and I will run you through the computer, your diagnosis." So, what I'm trying to say is that conversation is degenerating and therefore thinking is degenerating and writing is degenerating. And I don't like degeneracy.

Even if I had not been a professor of comparative literature, I'm very keen on preserving the flexibility and the expressiveness of language. I know that it's not the same as thinking, but it's key to thinking. When people can't express themselves articulately, they usually can't think very articulately. And then if you tell them, you know, "Vote for the Republicans or Al Qaeda will get you," they jump for it. So, this is all very real to me that we should be able to think and write well.

So, I think some of the things to avoid so that this modern-speak doesn't get to us is watch out for the passive voice. After you've written your paper, look over the whole thing and wherever you say, "This was decided upon," go back and change it to, "the participants decided." And just try to use the active rather than the passive voice. You can see the connection between that and responsibility, actually.

Watch out for false subjects like, "The movement decided it would be a good idea." Movements are abstract entities. They can't decide anything. Only people can decide. So go back and write, "The participants in the movement on the whole decided so-and-so." Other than that, I think general ideas about writing simply and clearly wherever you can pick them up from any writer's guide. Generally speaking, like I have macros in my computer that knock out three words, five words, six words and this is basically what editing is about, is taking out words that don't need to be there.

I think that's about all that I can say. We tried making a few other comments on your paragraphs, the selected paragraphs when you have them to us. You did. Okay, Eli?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:02:52]

Michael: Yes. That was going to be my next thing. For paper topics, most of the topics that we looked at were very good. We're really looking forward to seeing them. A type of topic that may not get anywhere but is very tempting to try to do is a compare and contrast thing. Period, end of quote. Where you say, "I'm going to compare Gandhi's movement with King's movement. They have these similarities and those differences. Goodbye." That doesn't really get us anywhere. You want to have something that you're exploring. Why were those differences there? Were they differences because of a

different culture? Were they different because King saw things differently? Were they differences because he didn't understand something?

So set out with a thesis that you're going to use that set of comparisons and contrasts for or otherwise we have found in the past that these papers don't tell us much. Okay? So, remind you, the papers are due on the last class meeting, which is Thursday, December 7th. Remember, I have nominated that we reinterpret – reapply December 7th and celebrate the passing of the Great Law on December 7th – when was that? 1789 [Note: 1682: See <http://www.phmc.state.pa.us/portal/communities/documents/1681-1776/great-law.html>] or something like that when the territory of Pennsylvania adopted the Great Law under William Penn. That's what December 7th means to me.

Differences Between Gandhi and King's Leadership

So, what we're going to do now is I wanted to talk about three episodes or facts about the Civil Rights Movement and King very quickly. And then look at this sort of overview diagram that you have in your reader on Page 287 and we'll put here in a slide when the time comes. The three things I wanted to quickly touch on – I realize that we're falling behind, but that's the sign of a good course, right – or one of them.

First of all, there's a big issue that differentiates these two as people and possibly as leaders. And you pick this up right away in the last section of Frady's "Biography of Martin Luther King." And that is for Gandhi, brahmacharya was very important. It was essential. And you remember my little observation that he takes the final vow in July of 1906. And just three months later he's presented with this terrific challenge to which he rises on September 11th to launch Satyagraha at a very, very powerful and very deep level.

And he had various theoretical explanations of why control of the sexual faculty was important. And it goes very, very deep into his spiritual background in India. It was very important for him. You can say it was like central to his effectiveness as a leader. This is definitely not the case for Martin Luther King. Period. End of quote. I'm not going to say anything more about it. I just leave it for you to ponder and to reflect over. But on the personal level, this was a significant difference between the two people.

Ripples of Albany, GA in the Civil Rights Movement

The next two things that I have to say are much less controversial and they deal with two of the movements and things that happened there. We didn't talk much about Albany in 1961, 62. It was, in many ways, the low point of the entire Civil Rights Movement. King was not involved in the planning. He was dragged into it, unwillingly. He points out that one of the big mistakes they made was that they wanted desegregation. That's way too general. They wanted everything and got nothing.

Now he will be very clear that even though the Albany episode was a failure in terms of what we call “work” or success, there was still very significant gains that happened there. And if nothing – even if nothing had happened in terms of having an impact on the white citizens and on the rest of the country, the participants learned a great deal and citizens of Albany, Georgia, which was a very, very segregated area, were able to get up off their feet – off their back – I mean stand up on their own two feet for the first time. So, it’s a very good laboratory to look at “work” versus work.

But also, there’s a very interesting feature of the Albany campaign. And that’s why Laurie Pritchett’s name occurs here, the police chief on your little list. Because he basically outfoxed the movement. They had developed a strategy of provoking harsh response which was not very difficult in the South. You know, all you had to do was – like look at Emmitt Till. I mean all you had to do was whistle at a white woman and you could provoke a lynching.

So, it wasn’t hard to prod those people into a harsh response. In fact, I’ve made the case that if you look at the present administration, that’s a weakness that they have also which we have not yet exploited. But this little episode in Jackson, Oregon where protestors – all they were doing was holding up signs saying that they were not for Bush. And he ordered his squad out of these vans to beat these people and drive them back off the sidewalk. It’s easy to provoke a paradox of repression in certain people if you play your cards right.

However, Laurie Pritchett had read the papers and he knew what happened in Birmingham and Montgomery. And he instructed his police to be very, very polite to the protesters, which is what happens if you protest in Washington D.C. They’re very nice to you. “Kindly come this way for some pepper spray, if you don’t mind.” As opposed to just beating you over the head.

So, because the movement had really relied on this rhythm, in this scenario, they said, “We’re going to do something that’ll provoke a response. They will overreact and the press will cover it. The nation will see what happened and we’ll have an advance.” It didn’t work very well. They were kind of relying on this as a formula in Albany. It didn’t work because Pritchett was just a little bit smarter than they had calculated.

So, I think what we learned from this is not to rely on any one set of tactics because your adversary is not always totally predictable on a strategic level. On the theoretical level, King said, “This is an example of using nonviolent tactics for,” what he called, “an immoral cause.” And he said, “This is not right. You shouldn’t do it. You cannot use immoral means for a moral end, and you cannot use moral means for an immoral end.”

I’m more interested in the dynamic of it whether it works or not. In fact, what Laurie Pritchett did, as far as he was concerned, “worked” success in the short-term. It did work for him. And pragmatically, that does show you that you have to have different – you have to be flexible as far as tactics is concerned. You want to be absolutely

inflexible on principles. There are some things for which you may be willing to lay down your life. Absolutely unacceptable and non-negotiable.

But those have got to be very deep nonviolent principles and there'd usually be very few in number. Everything else is negotiable. And the most negotiable stuff is the particular tactic that you're going to use in a particular situation.

Voter Rights Act - Persuasion vs Coercion

What was the other thing? Yes, the other thing was the following set of events. King had gotten pretty close to Johnson – LBJ. And went to him at one point and said, “We needed a Voter’s Rights Act.” Johnson said, “We’re nowhere ready to do that. Can’t give you that. I’ll lose the South. If I lose the South, the Democratic Party falls apart.”

In fact, this is in the long run what happened. This is one of the reasons we have – I mean there’s several reasons we have Republican administration now. We don’t need to go into all of them, but one of them certainly is – one factor is that you had this weird structure in the U.S. where, “Dixiecrats,” as they were called, Southern Democrats were upholding segregation, but they were voting with the Democratic Party. I don’t, myself, even know how that ever came about. They were Democrats. And, of course, they left the party when the federal government weighed-in against segregation.

Anyway, King goes to Johnson and says, “We need the next step. We need a Voter’s Rights Act.” Johnson says, “I’m sorry. We can’t give you that.” King says, “Okay. I know what to do.” And he goes back out to the streets, and you have six more months of protest. And then he goes back in to visit Johnson again and Johnson not only signs the Voter’s Rights Act, not only gives him the pen, which is what they do in these occasions. But he sings, “We shall overcome.” And people who were in the Oval Office at that time said that that was the only time they saw Martin Luther King Junior crying in the entire ten years of the Civil Rights Movement.

So, it’s important for us to realize the complementarity of those two kinds of action. You make your pitch for the legislative where you put in your petition. If people say, “No,” then you go back out and change the situation on the ground and bring them around to the point where they have to say, “Yes.” I think we’re very much in that situation now. Okay, anything else then about the Civil Rights Movement? We had several unanswered questions, but we just may have to learn to live with them. Yes, John?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:13:56]

Michael: Yeah. It would be – well, the first step is definitely persuasion. You lay down your petition. Now whether – in this particular case – I think we can assume that Johnson pretty much wanted a Voter’s Rights Act, but he was not in a position to do it. They put him in that position. Yeah. I think you could call that persuasion. But it becomes a personal matter, you know, whether it’s persuasion or coercion. But it’s definitely the case that you have to know the different phases and do them in sequence.

You know, you don't do protesting and then come in and submit a petition because what you're saying in that case is that your opponent will only listen to pressure.

You give them the opportunity to be reasonable. Once they've demonstrated that they will not be, then you have to go to Satyagraha. Incidentally, I heard a talk by Dan Ellsberg on Saturday. He was just great. And one of the things that he reported is that President Bush said to the nation, "God told me to hit Osama and I did. You know, God told me to hit Saddam, and I did." And Ellsberg said, "If God tells you to hit Iran, will you please get a second opinion?" I'm not sure that's relevant, but I thought it would be at least funny. It wasn't even that. Okay.

So, anything else about the Civil Rights Movement? There's so much that didn't get to talk about that we could learn from it, but we have to start moving on. I have something I want to – did you have something Sid?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:15:52]

Michael: No, I'll talk about it.

Student: I mean I was just wondering because it seems like what Gandhi was very much in the setting of India and like this was a condition that people understand and accept. It seems like for Martin Luther King doing that was like almost alienating some people because they didn't understand [unintelligible 00:16:19].

Cultural Swadeshi

Michael: Okay. Sid's point is that we may have a cultural swadeshi issue here that, you know, Gandhi goes before the public and says, "I'm a Brahmachari. I am an [Arvaratu 00:16:31], all of these ancient terms that would be very powerful and very meaningful for them. Whereas in the Black Baptist community at that time it would be the opposite of meaningful. They would think it's at very least, weird and probably sick. However – hang on a second, Joy – however, this brahmacharya or control of the sexual faculty is a much deeper issue than a cultural issue. It's a deeply personal and spiritual issue.

And even if nobody ever found out about Gandhi's brahmacharya it would still have its main effect which is to re-channel a very powerful form of energy into the direction that he wanted it to go for the welfare of humanity. Now on that level, if we decide this thing works or we decided it doesn't work, it's going to be universal, right? Because here we're talking about psychic energy within the human being.

I may even have a slide that may be of some use here. Let's see where we go. If I don't have this particular slide, it's not a disaster. But if I do, it'll be neat. What it's going to be talking about – oh, here we go. Okay, yeah – it's this way. You can think of – ah, wait. Just watch this guys. Ready? Pretty cool, huh? If we think about political decisions like this is what Johnson has to make up here.

And then social pressures come to him from down here. Those are deeply embedded in cultural values and attitudes. And that's what you were talking about, Sid, the brahmacharya, like many other things would have one meaning in one cultural context, another in another. But there's a still deeper level where – which I'm calling it, "Spiritual," which deals with our vision of who we are, our sense of identity, our purpose. And even things which are not cognitive, but just – I guess the only term I can come up with is a prana or life energy.

This is part of our psychobiological inheritance. So, at that level it would have to be universal. And we can't say that at that deep level, that this would work for Gandhi, but it would not work for King. Yes?

Student: Did Martin Luther King give up other things like Gandhi did? [Unintelligible 00:19:41]

Power of Renunciation

Michael: Well, if you ask did Martin Luther King give up other things, he gave up his life. That's a pretty big one. He knew perfectly well – you read any of those speeches toward the end of his career, he knew that he was living on borrowed time. So, I think that's – once you give up that, I think –

Student: I think I meant more like material.

Michael: No, I know what you mean. He did not give up liquor, you know? I have no idea whether he was a vegetarian or not. Any of these things, he was not, Jolina's telling me. So that means that Hitler and Gandhi were the only two really prominent vegetarians of the 20th century. Go figure. But I think, you know, his renunciation of his family in the sense that he saw Coretta and the children – there were times there where he saw them maybe once or twice a month. That's a very, very heavy renunciation. So, I don't think he can be faulted in general, but okay, here's where we get over toward the segue that I wanted to make towards the economy part.

Conservation of Energy

He knew very well that there was buying power among the African Americans. And they should use that in the form of a boycott, though he didn't want to call it a boycott. He wanted to call it, "Noncooperation with evil." He also knew that they had to improve their own economic circumstances. But as I've mentioned before, he didn't actually go in and physically set up those programs where people would be spinning, making cotton, buying and selling, setting up networks.

The whole incredible network of activities that khadi led to was basically reorganizing the whole country from the village on up. He didn't actually get involved in doing that. Again, he had 10 years, not 50 and he sort of knew that. So, he knew perfectly well that,

you know, people would say, “Oh, if I sit next to a Black person on the bus something terrible will happen to me. I’ll get sickle cell anemia, or my ideology will be corrupted or something.” But this is that sort of in this level here. And in reality, when it comes right down to it, people will be much more driven by what affects them economically. And event after event when he was able to exert economic pressure they forgot about all of these ideologies. There is one other point I did want to make, actually. Joy, did you have something to add?

Student: Well, I mean you think that is like a personal thing? Like depending on how you view sex. I kind of think people’s, you know, idea of sex is one static thing. Like some might think it’s [unintelligible 00:22:46] energy producing experience. Some might think it’s like, you know, indulging the senses.

Michael: Okay, Joy’s question is a very good one. I had no intention of getting into this area, but here we are. All I can tell is you is my opinion. My opinion is, since you asked me, it does make a difference how you think about it. If you’re just indulging in it and, you know. As we all know very well, sex can be the most violent force available to human beings. Rape and war is like – it’s like just an extension of the most violent thing you can do. On the other hand, it can be the most loving and it can be the most creative.

I have a very dear friend who is six months pregnant. And up in Canada everybody goes in for ultrasound at, I guess, Week 17 or something. So, she’s sitting there with her husband and the radiologist and herself and the unborn – the not yet born. And, you know, they turn on the machine and the screen is dark and then it starts to take shape. And they see this little baby lying on its face. And then it turned. It turned the camera and opened its eyes and looked at its mother and father and said, “Oh, it’s you,” and went back down.

So, what am I saying aside from sharing stories with you? The fact that it – it, sexual release can be either the most violent or the most nonviolent thing in human experience. Just goes to show you how much power it has. So, what I want to say in response to your question, Joy, is it does make a difference what your attitude is and how you’re thinking about it. But there’s a level at which no matter how you think about it, it is a tremendous expenditure of energy.

I remember when I was an undergraduate so, you know, this is a while ago, but who’s counting? There was a psychological experiment where they were measuring the amount of energy that was expended in sex. So, I thought, “Oh, this is going to be interesting.” So, what they were looking at was like how much energy does it take to unbutton your shirt. To lie down. It was so stupid. Like that is 1000th of the amount of energy that’s going to be expended in that experience. But that was the point at which I decided I was not going to be a psychology major, by the way. But I also didn’t major in economics for obvious reasons. We’ll get to those in a second.

But what you want to do with that energy, at some point is even deeper, I believe, than your attitude. So, there are universals there. More than this, I don't know what to say. It's just an extremely interesting observation and something that was – and by the way, Gandhi did not go around saying, "I am a Brahmachari." You know, as you saw from the Attenborough movie the only way you knew was asking his wife. If you remember that comment that she makes, Kasturba, "Oh, this taking vows of celibacy is easy. He did it five times." So that also is an indication of how much power is involved.

Clinging to Truth and Globalization

Okay? Anything else about the CRM or MLK before we move on?

All right, may we have the house lights dimmed, please. What I'd like to do now is show you a picture of the diagram that you have, but just a little bit prettier. I'm sorry we can't pull this shade because the budget doesn't allow for that. Jolina, could you get the back lights too? So, here's my little diagram of the proposition that what Gandhi developed was applicable not only to conflict, but to basically every problem that we're facing in the modern world.

Again, a version of this is on page 287 of your Reader. So, what this means is – I put सत्य [satya] in here, the word for truth in Sanskrit. And [deva nogri 00:27:36] and quite apart from just showing off my reason for doing that is I wanted to show that, you know, this, in a way, is a very, very deep eternal principle.

Satya means, "Truth," But you have to remember, for Gandhi, it means truth as opposed to falsehood. It means real as opposed to unreal. And it means good as opposed to not good. You know, good as opposed to evil. All three of those things are in this very powerful concept that he puts at the center of his life. And you remember he said that truth and nonviolence are two sides of the same coin, but really truth is the head and nonviolence is the tail. Nonviolence for him, as important as it was, was instrumental and not primary. Everything was rooted in his search for truth.

And in the course of developing this, you see the arrows going out into the world, you come up with some basic principles and here's one of them that we've talked about already. Swadeshi which means, "Start within your own circle." And that as interpreted economically in terms of, for example, not buying British cloth using homespun cotton instead. So, you have this contrast between swadeshi, what comes from your own country and vedeshi, what comes from somebody else's country.

And although he applied it as a means of breaking the economic stranglehold that the Raj had on India, it's a key principle that we can apply today to the empire squared, or the meta empire, which is globalization. At the time when I did that chart, I just used the word, "Globalization," but today we would call it, "Globalization from above." In other words, the organization of the world as a – basically, a network of corporations and as David Korten has pointed out recently, when we measure the success of an economy

today, we measure economic growth. What we're measuring is the transferring of resources from the earth into garbage and the transferring of wealth from the poor to the wealthy. If you look at the economic indicators, an economy will have marks when it does those two things.

And the opposite of globalization, which is centralize everything, you know, get network of trade regulations so that corporations have absolutely control. The opposite of that is swadeshi where you build up control from the most local level to the most global. And you do go up to the global level. You don't stop with your own circle, but you have to start with your own circle. So, when you think that it takes 265 calories to ship a strawberry from San Francisco to New York, and when you eat that strawberry you get 5 calories out of it, you'll realize that globalization is not sustainable.

Gandhian Economics and Education

We're going to have to rediscover swadeshi on the economic level.

Swadeshi on the political level meant that instead of creating a body called, let's say, the United Nations and give it an army and absolute power over the whole world, like a super nation state, you organize the world so that – and this is a direct quote from Gandhi, “The individual serves the family. The family serves the village. The village serves the district. The district serves the state. The state serves the nation. The nation serves the world.”

So, you operate – two things are hugely different between present attempts to organize the world in Gandhi's alternative model. One is that you're starting from the individual, not from a map of the world with little triangles and force parameters and stuff. You're starting from the bottom, if you will. Not from the top. And secondly, that the mode of relationship from one unit to the next is service, not extraction of service. Not exploitation.

So let me just quickly go around the problems and the concepts that could be applied directly to those problems and say a little bit about each one. And then for now, pull out the economic ones. And maybe after Thanksgiving, which I wish you a happy one of, by the way, look at the conflict ones and some of the others. So going around here to 2 o'clock we have a humongous problem which was not nearly as big in India as it is here today. We have in the United States, we have 2 million people who are in the criminal justice system. There's about slightly under a million unnaturally incarcerated and others of various kinds of difficulties.

Now there were several different things that Gandhi said about crime in different contexts. But the one that I pull out as the principle within constructive program that would fix the criminal justice problem is the one that he called, “*Nai Talim*,” which means, “New education.” Gandhian education scheme is actually something that's still

very much being practiced in many, many little rural schools all over India. I have met people who were raised in Gandhian schools. Joy?

Student: So, this is like spiritual –

Michael: Okay, here's how *Nai Talem* worked. Here's how the educational system worked. First of all, you – whatever you learn, you had to learn from hands on practical experience. And as you're going to learn math – okay, the teacher is not going to come in and write algebraic equations on the board and say, "Memorize these. This is math." Instead, you're going to go out and let's say, harvest the rice that you grow. You have an edible school yard like they have in Oakland. You harvest the rice. You bring it in. You weigh it. That gives you numbers. You work with those numbers. From those numbers you work up to a knowledge of mathematics. It is spiritual in the sense that you started everyday with prayer meetings. It's spiritual in the sense that you are learning to develop your capacity to serve. Yeah, Amy?

Student: Is there like a place in that for literary studies or academic scholarship just for the sake of studying?

Michael: You know, Gandhi didn't spend a lot of energy on that. He probably would have felt that literary experience can be a mere indulgence, or it can have some use. If it's a mere indulgence you become what they call in German, "[*Ein sein geist* 00:35:41]." You're just, you know, looking for aesthetic pleasure. I don't think he had much interest in it. But if you're going to help interpret the Bhagavad Gita, the Mahabharata, or use it in prayer meetings and things like that, he was very interested in it. So *Nai Talem*, I guess, Alana, your question really is was *Nai Talem* designed for a higher education? He hadn't really thought that far. It really was a way to raise school kids. Joy?

Student: So was it kind of like to raise one's consciousness more than [unintelligible 00:36:21].

Michael: Yeah. You have to remember that in the Indian – the traditional Indian image of the human being, intellect does not have the highest place. When Swami Vivekananda came to this country 103 years – 106 years ago and he spent some time exploring the U.S. He made a few statements about where we were at from his perspective. And he could shed some light coming from a different culture. And one of the things he said was, "The besetting evil of you people here in the West is that you educate for the head only and not for the heart." And he said, "That will only make you ten times greedier than you already are." And he said, "That will be the ruin of you."

And frankly, because you haven't asked my opinion, I will nonetheless tell you that I think he was absolutely right. And for me, the classic example of misusing the intellect is the nuclear weapons labs being run by the University of California. I can't imagine anything that would pervert education more deeply than that. And please don't get me started because I worked on this issue. I'll be crying here, and it'll be very embarrassing.

But for another example, the Californian magazine or alumni magazine cover professor this quarter was from the law school's Professor John Yoo. It's the person who has given the president the legal language which enables him to practice torture and override habeas corpus which takes us back to the 12th century in terms of human rights. But we're not earlier than the Magna Carta in this country.

And the subhead for the article was, "John Yoo says we have to practice torture and all this stuff. Does he have a point?" Now the question is not does he have a point. Of course, you have a point. You can always make a point. That's what studying the law is for. The question is not does he have a point, it's does he have a heart? Does he realize what he's empowering, an extremely short-sighted person to do to human beings.

And once you ask the question, "Does he have a point?" Nobody is going to come up – nobody except us – is going to come up and say, "Wait a minute. That's not the issue." So actually, I think this is actually getting around to your question, Alana. I think Gandhi was not terribly interested in developing the intellect for the intellect's sake. But he felt that if you gave people an orientation and a purpose in life, if they had a good intellect they would use it. If they didn't have a purpose in life, their intellect would use them.

And they would be like – what is it that Gandhi says? Gandhi? Dante says about people in the lowest circle of hell? He meets people down there, [*Quiano perdoti el ben de intellect* 00:39:44] they've lost the good of their intellect. It's going to be like what we were saying about sex, in a funny way. The intellect has a lot of neutral power that you can use for very good or very bad purposes. Okay, but let's move on.

Poverty and Wealth Distribution

If you can read it, this problem down is poverty. And in fact, I wanted to show you something about the distribution of wealth in the United States, if you haven't seen this chart.

This chart was actually drawn up by an astronomer who did it because he had a hard time getting his students to kind of sense what a billion meant. You know, if you're an astronomer, you have to talk billions, trillions, and it's all just a few letters. So, he's trying to give them a sense of what a billion is. And he thought the best way to do that was to make this chart of the economic distribution of the United States. So, the poorest people are here. You know, we're right here. And the richest people are here.

And what you're measuring is what is the height of your income in hundred-dollar bills because your students, you're off here in the end zone, right? You're just negative income at this point. But professors are about here at the two-yard line. So, he thought what he would get was a curve, where you had, you know, poor people and then not so poor people and rich people and then Bill Gates. But in fact, there is a small number of people who have so much wealth that they're literally off the chart and everybody else doesn't even make a blip. We're not a pixel on a computer.

And then you ask yourself, “Well, how far off the chart do these people go? That’s how far. This is Mount Everest right down here. And here’s – you know, this is like a handful of people. Less than a half pixel wide of people on the football field. So, this incredible maldistribution is also the same picture can be duplicated worldwide. There’s two hundred people that have more wealth than the bottom 400 million people or something like that.

So, poverty and maldistribution of wealth is a humongous problem.

Trusteeship and Stewardship

And the issue, the principle that solves it – and I pulled out that can solve it. You could do this other ways as well. Something called, “Trusteeship.” And let’s get back to that very soon and talk about what trusteeship means and how it fits into Gandhian economics as a whole. Now about racism – I don’t know if you can read that, but that’s my bottom problem here. The people [principle?] that fixes it is heart unity. Anybody want to paraphrase just quickly what heart unity means? You are going to be very sad if you can’t do this on December 10th or 14th. Amy?

Student: This is the idea that we are all interconnected. [Unintelligible 00:43:12]

Michael: Okay, that’s part of it. That’s definitely the basis of it. Hang on. Let me repeat for you. That we are all interconnected and there is some unity among all of us is the basis of it. No question. Phillip?

Student: You want to see your compatriots succeed ever more than you, perhaps.

Michael: That is really how heart unity works. You want the other person to succeed, whoever that other person is. You want them to be fulfilled. And remember, that one of the definitions of violence by Johan Galtung, in fact, was any avoidable compromise or inhibition of a person’s fulfillment is violence. If somebody is not being fulfilled in a way that I could have done something about, I am, in a way, involved at least in structural or indirect violence against that person.

So, the reason that this is called, “Heart Unity,” that it’s to differentiate it from social unity, financial unity, skin color unity, DNA unity. Any of those things. All of those things are on the surface, and you do not have to have unity in regard to any of them. In fact, you basically don’t want to. But if you have nothing but these surface differences to think about, as we’ve seen over and over again, it’s going to precipitate horrendous conflicts.

So, this is a unity and diversity model and the key to it is that you have to hold unity at the heart level and diversity at the surface. You don’t want to mix them. You don’t want to have diversity at the heart level because then that becomes disunity. And you certainly don’t want to have uniformity at the surface level because then you’ll be

saying, “I only like people who have the same characteristics that I do,” and so on. Yeah, John?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:45:18]

Heart Unity at the Intersection of the Environment, Poverty, and Violence

Michael: You don’t have to – I am getting carried away with this talk. You don’t have to limit heart unity to humans. I’m going to come back to this. I’ll just put in on the board now and we’ll come back to it later. [Draws three intersecting circles on the chalkboard] But I see the problems of the world right now as three intersecting ones. And it’s the environmental – and don’t worry that you can’t quite see it yet – and the question of violence and the question of poverty as sort of the three big intersecting areas.

And the reason I mention it here is in a way, the earth, you can either think of the earth as a living system – this is the Gaia hypothesis – if you don’t do that you have to recognize it as a life-support system. If you damage the earth’s ability to support life – remember that ozone layer that we saw on the last slide? You are – you’re violating the earth. And I guess we came in – we backed into this through the question of heart unity, and I think I went a little bit too far with talking about the earth as a creature. But yes, you can have heart unity with creatures.

I mean I live in this place out in the country, and we have a whole bunch of creatures living with us – major creatures. I mean as opposed to mosquitoes and daddy-long-legs and things like that. But we have foxes, deer, rabbits, and quail – occasional bobcat. Once we saw a mountain lion, but we don’t consider them part of our community – and turkeys. And the fact is we have a hard time extending heart unity to the turkeys. After they visited our garden and made off with two-thirds of our chard, you know. So, they’ve got a lot of problems for us. They’re ugly and they make stupid noises. They’re aggressive. They leave material that we can’t use all of our paths and stuff like that.

But the fact is, that from the nonviolence point of view, they’re just creatures trying to make a living. You know, just trying to pick up some seeds and reproduce and that’s what turkeys do. Unfortunately, they do it very successfully. And heart unity would say, “Okay, even though we don’t like the way you look. You have this incredibly stupid thing hanging down under your neck. Okay, but for you, you’re a perfect turkey.” No, I’m sorry, that sounded weird. But you know what I’m getting at. That we should want them to thrive. We do want them to thrive, but just not on our property, okay?

So that would be a place where we have to kind of push it to [unintelligible 00:48:26] but we should recognize that, you know, those creatures play a role in the scheme of things, and they have every right to live. And you know what? There were turkeys here on Turtle Island before there were pale faces. So, okay.

Economics of War and the Shanti Sena

Well, let's move on so I'll have enough time to get back to the economics part.

A little problem called, "War." Now I choose war, there's other problems of violence, of course. Sub – the smaller problems with armed conflict. There's violence in a hundred different ways. But I chose war because that's the biggest one in terms of scale. And it's always used as an excuse for why we can't have nonviolence. So, if nonviolence does not come up with a response to the war system, it basically won't get very far. You will not be able to establish itself as a principle in nature – in human nature which we can use.

Now Gandhi had an invention, which is not just a concept, he actually put it into practice – called the Shanti Sena which stands for, "The Peace Army." And out of that institution since he passed on we have developed two responses to the war system which are based on nonviolence. And we'll talk about them after the holiday, but I'll just mention them now. One is called, "Civilian based defense," and the other is called, "Third party nonviolent intervention. Civilian based defense or CBD is something that you basically do yourself, your own society, third party nonviolent intervention is where you go and intervene in a conflict that's taking place somewhere else in the world.

And if you think about the Shanti Senas that Gandhi set up in India and you think about the story of Abdul Ghaffar Khan, we'll have a good background for going into both of those things. And what I'll do is talk about the general principle here and then next semester we'll talk about what's actually going on in both of these areas. TPNI is much more dynamic than CBD right now, just as a trailer for PACS 164B.

Resisting the Normalizing of Alienation

Now the last one is a general – the general question of alienation. I was thinking about this this morning. I almost never see films – commercial films, that is. I see documentaries five times a week, but I never see commercial films unless I have a special reason to. And I used to see these billboards for a movie, it was called Mr. and Mrs. Smith. It's this very ordinary handsome couple, except they're carrying weapons. I had no idea what actually went on in the film.

Then I went to Houston, I think, to give a talk and they were showing Mr. and Mrs. Smith. And so, it's not like I actually put my earphones on and listened to it, but I could see what was the plot of this movie. And what the plot is, these people are professional assassins who fall in –somewhere in Central America they fall in with one another. They're both physically attractive. They don't believe in brahmacharya. [Laughter] So this is Hollywood.

So, the next thing you know is the next thing you know. But in this case they also actually get married and the marriage lasts about three weeks. It's not based on service.

It's based on self-gratification, and they get bored with one another and the next thing you know, there's a hit on one of them and it's farmed out to the other one. So, I think it's Mrs. Smith who gets the contract to kill Mr. Smith. And the last part of the movie is how they try to kill each other.

So, you know, my spiritual teacher, Eknath Easwaran used to say, "Modern literature is a literature of alienation." This proves that. Yeah, I cannot imagine anything more alienating than this movie. And now why did they call it, "Mr. and Mrs. Smith?" What is the point here? They are trying to normalize alienation. They're bringing it into the – Smith is like the quintessential Anglo name, right? This is the most common Anglo name. It stands for, you know, it's like Giuseppe in Italian or Schmidt in German for that matter.

So, what they're trying to do is take this extreme alienation, could not be more extreme. But one person is literally trying to kill the other person and embed that as an absolute norm of bourgeois American existence. So why am I saying all of this? Because I obviously had a horrible time on that airplane, and I want to vent and make myself feel a little better. And also, because I'm trying to say that alienation is a huge problem in our culture. And I think that if you wanted to pull out one – you could do it with heart unity, you know. You could do it with others.

But one that's left over that we haven't touched on yet, and which will also be part of the economic set is service, once you have people feel that their purpose in life is to be of service to others, then they will overcome their alienation. I teach a little sophomore seminar called, "Why are we here? Great writers on the purpose of life." And the purpose that comes up most often anywhere is we are here to help others.

In fact, there's sort of a joke that somebody came up with. We start off the course with where somebody says, "We're here to help others. That is for sure. What others are here for, I haven't the faintest idea." Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:54:46]

Michael: Well, if there's any reason to think that a relationship had any basis, alienation will betray that relationship. Yeah. Alienation is radical separateness where it's the belief in win/lose structures of relationship such that in order for me to be happy, you may have to be unhappy. In fact, in the extreme form it's through your unhappiness that I get happy. That's where you have gladiators. John?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:55:22]

Michael: The prevailing paradigm because it is based on materialism, inevitably brings up a separate model of – it says that all creatures are separate because they're bodies. And just look at them. And then that means that alienation is inevitable, right? Okay. So, I feel this is a very good introduction except that it took too long.

Nonviolent Economics

So, let's shut this down for the moment and talk about Gandhian economics and let me give you my version of what some of the basic principles are.

Here's [Magdali] again. I'll be seeing her in a couple of weeks. It's very nice to be revisiting her. Okay. Thank you Laura, Jolina. First, a quote – three quotes actually about the present economic order. The first is from Martin Luther King so you get a nice transition. In talking about his own upbringing and his intellectual development, which would be called [unintelligible 00:56:45] if it were a German novel, the story of my education – he said he looked into communism because after you've had a good look at capitalism you would want to look around at some of the alternatives.

He looked into communism and was partly taken with it for a while, but he finally discovered that while capitalism forgets that man is individual – sorry. Capitalism forgets that man is social. Communism forgets that man is individual. Right? Communism says the individual as an economic producer and in every other sense belongs to the state. And in capitalism, you're actually saying the state belongs to the most aggressive individuals. Basically, you use the state to pass laws so that you can have unbridled competition in which the most aggressive win. It's basically – unfortunately, that's basically how those systems play out.

Now John Kenneth Galbraith, the well-known Canadian economist had another take on it which was, you know, also very devastating and much more amusing. He said that in capitalism man exploits man whereas in communism it's exactly the other way around. In other words, they're both systems of exploitation, but who does the exploitation is slightly different. Okay, Joy?

Student: So, in communism it's not good because they try to like, I guess, homogenize everyone. And there's like a really large state?

Michael: You know, there's a fairly good literature now on the differences between Gandhian economics and Marxism. And probably one of the best books is by a fellow called Madhu Dandavate. Dandavate means, "The person who has a stick," if you wondered why he had that name. Just by the way, Eli, would be – could you turn off the projector? Do you know how to do that?

And his book is simply called, "Marx and Gandhi." And rather than go into in detail here, I think I'll just say one thing, which was that both systems are basically materialist systems.

Marxism was paraphrased as dialectical materialism. And for Gandhi, he said, "I don't care whether it's dialectical or non-dialectical. If it's materialism, I can't use it because it denies the spiritual nature of man – I think I took care of the computer. It's just – yeah. Okay.

So really Gandhian economics rejects both these systems and a quote about modern economic theory that I got from a book called, “Essays on Gandhian Economics,” of which there are, I think, four chapters in your Reader.

This quote said that all economics, like most social science, is based on the assumption that the human being is a self-interest optimizer or maximizer. The whole system is oriented around capturing that drive for self-aggrandizement and putting it to work in a way that won't destroy the whole systems, which actually turns out to not be possible. And so now we have the system collapsing around our ears. If we have a little more time next time I'll bring in some of the observations we made by David Korten about how modern economies are imploding. And they're not imploding because the systems need to be tinkered with. They're imploding because the systems are based on a false proposition about human nature. Namely, the proposition that the best you can get out of people is to harness their greed.

Reverse. Back to the first talk we had back whenever that was. Remember we were talking about negative energy and positive energy, how people thought that they could fix Ladakh by introducing greed, not stopping to ask themselves, “Is a greed a positive or a negative form of energy?”

So, Gandhi's economic system takes off from an entirely different concept of the human being. And I'm going to tell you because we're a little bit short on time, just my own sense of what are the important principles of it, but there are also different versions which are a little bit more complicated. But first there's, you know, those three things that we never really commented on.

The first is trusteeship which has to do with the relationship of the person to possessions in this case. But it could also be the relationship of the person to nonmaterial possessions like personal qualities, capacities. You have, okay – do you have an intellect? If so, how are you going to use that intellect? Are you going to use it to get appreciation from others? Get a salary to get a high position in the nuclear weapons system? Or are you going to use it, you know, go to one of these nonprofits of which there are many.

In fact, a friend of mine has recently calculated there are 90,000 organizations worldwide that are doing very, very good work, that are part of the new paradigm, but they don't know about each other. Are you going to join one of those?

So, the trusteeship is one easy way of looking at it. It is the nonviolent equivalent of ownership. And ownership we say, “Okay, what is my relationship to that laptop.” In ownership we say, “I own that laptop. I can prove it. I stole it fair and square or however I happen to acquire it. In this, I paid my hard-earned money which is the taxpayers of California's hard earned money to acquire it. And I've got a bill of sale. And it's illegal for you to take that away from me without asking my permission.” You can spam it. You can do things like that, but you can't take it away.

Trusteeship and Ownership

Student: Does trusteeship involve material and nonmaterial?

Michael: Yes. Yes, trusteeship relates to both material and nonmaterial properties. It relates to capacities as well as it does to entities, to objects. Thank you for that, Julia. Now what trusteeship says is, “No, Nagler.” Trusteeship isn’t very polite. “No, Nagler, you don’t own that laptop. You are its trustee.” Which means that you have the right to use it as long as you are doing useful work with it. Like showing slides in PACS164A is a perfectly legitimate use of your laptop. And you get to use it for that, and nobody can come and take it away from you.

On the other hand, if I start, you know, looking into pornography sites or something like that, that would violate brahmacharya and then I would no longer be a good trustee of that resource. Okay, psychologically, the important dimension here is that my value does not come from that object. Whereas this is the big problem in ownership, in capitalism. That’s why we have that red line shooting up higher than Mount Everest for some people while everybody else is just lying flatso on the football field. It’s not that people who have \$50 billion need \$50 billion, but they are trying to gratify themselves in a way which is impossible.

There is a statement in the Sanskrit scriptures, “Na vitana tarpanio menushyaha 01:05:50]. Four devastating words. It says simply, “A human being can never be fulfilled by wealth.” It just does not work. So once you get into this trap of trying to gratify yourself with possessions you never get out of it. You just need more and more and more. And this is where Gandhi steps in and says, “There’s enough in the world for everyone’s need. There’s not enough for everyone’s greed.”

Now basically then this is an economy of needs. This is as important as the trusteeship element whereas modern economics are based on wants. And even in “Hind Swaraj” he said, “A time is coming when we will look at this mad race for increasing human wants and we will say, “What have we done?” This is a disaster.”

So, let’s talk – this will relate to both of these things. Let’s talk about kind of the classes of material possession in Gandhi’s scheme. There’s a basic level which is the food, clothing, and shelter stuff. We might call this the pre-Maslow needs. Remember, we were talking before about new models of human needs. There is no question that as embodied creatures we need food, shelter, and under most circumstances, clothing, right? There’s certain bike rides where you don’t need any clothing, but mostly in order to function socially as a human being and not get arrested, you need clothing. Even if it’s not cold, which it sometimes is – though we’re fixing that. [Laughter] It’s not going to be cold anywhere in a little while.

Now the point is that these different layers of needs are qualitatively different. Like up to the point of food, clothing, and shelter, everybody is in that situation. Everybody needs those three and they’re roughly the same. You know, you need about 1800 – 1500

calories a day. I throw on a couple of lattes just to make it a little more amusing, but basically to keep yourself alive, that's what you need. And it's qualitatively different in this sense also, that as far as Gandhi was concerned, this is the responsibility of the society as a whole. Okay?

We have, what, 90,000 homeless people in Northern California alone? Or something like that, I forget where. If you have one homeless person, society has failed. I was shocked to see even in Kyoto, by the side of the Kamo River under a bridge there, some huts that some homeless people had put together. They were a lot nicer than some of our huts, but you know, that's a comment on Japanese architecture, not a comment on our economy.

He felt that if there's one person who doesn't have enough of these basic things, it's the responsibility of society to fix that problem. Now the next set of needs is qualitatively different and that is that we need tools to do our work. This is very appropriate for us to have these objects, always keeping in mind that we are trustees for those objects. We are not the owners of those objects.

But every person has a right to develop his or her capacity for service. And in some cases, that means some tools. In some cases, it's these other tools.

Here, they start to be very different. To do my work, you know, for various reasons I need a hybrid car and two computers. I actually have more than that, but in terms of the tools that I need to do my work – I can identify those things. Now the qualitative difference here is while I have every right to have access to them, I do not have a right to say society, "You owe me a new Prius and a Dell laptop." It's my responsibility to get those tools, but I have every right to get them. In fact, I have the responsibility to get them.

And here, my tools will be different from another person's tools because their work is different. Everything above that though is excess. And in a really strapped economy, like India, you shouldn't even have it. So here society owes it to you. Here, on the tools level, you owe it to yourself. And there's no owing at all. You just should not have things for which you do not have a legitimate use. Once you start accumulating them, we're going to be back on the same old go-around again where I'm better because I have more and so forth. Yeah, Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:11:25]

Michael: Yeah. Remember the Gita's Theory of Action that every person has an appointed work. That we're basically – we're born with a set of capacities and weaknesses. And those define what we can do for those around us. Okay? So actually, I guess what I should do is pull this down here primarily because this relates to needs. We have this set of needs, this set of "needs" and that set of non-needs.

Now the beauty of trusteeship was, among other things, that it gave you a way to do the transition from the present economy to an economy of simplicity and nonviolence

without having a revolution. The problem is that once you're on the 100-yard line, you're up there above Mount Everest, people come and say, "We don't think you need all that money. We're going to pass tax laws and take them away from you." And the person will say, "Oh, yeah? I'd like to see you try it. Fact is, I own all the media networks and I'm going to frame taxation as a burden, not as a dues that you pay to the culture. And I'm going to frame non-taxation as a revolution. We'll get Jan and Garvis and Garvis and Jan in here – whoever those two guys who are. And they took away basically the tax base from the State of California. That's why our schools are now crumbling into the dirt.

And what I'm getting at is that it's very difficult to dispossess wealthy people of their wealth. They don't like it. They have a lot of power. And it leads to revolutions which have been very, very bloody and they have basically failed everywhere – conspicuously in the communist countries. They didn't even get off the ground.

So, you need not only a system which is sustainable, but you need a way to transition – I know, it's not really a verb, but let's pretend – a way to transition into that system without violence. And Gandhi's point was with trusteeship you do not have to dispossess anybody of anything. You just have to educate them so that you change their attitude towards it. The minute you feel that you're a trustee and not an owner, you start looking around and say, "Well, I'm not using this. There's no need for me to keep on possessing it. And eventually you would get to a state of simplicity where you had what you needed and not anything more.

Actually, in ancient Greece the Greek philosophers had an interesting term, "πλεονεξία [pleonexia]" "Pleon," which means, "More," and "Exia" means, "Possession, having." And they also felt that there was a definitely qualitative line that you passed where you had what you needed and one ounce more would not only mean that somebody else had to have one ounce less, which is the way the world seems to work, but it would mean that you would get yourself psychologically disoriented and be off on that slippery slope.

Okay. There was only one other – yeah, one other major principle that I wanted to put down here. We can go into this more next week if we want to. And that is that economy is like everything else under swadeshi, should be local and not centralized. Okay. Trusteeship and an economy of needs are – really, if you had to reduce it to two principles you could do it with those. Okay, I'm sorry I've run over a little bit, and you need to pick up your proposals. So, let's do that really quickly and get out of the way for the next folks. And have a nice Thanksgiving, by the way. Have a nonviolent Thanksgiving. I'll just put that in on –

24. The 'Wheel of Nonviolence' 1: Gandhian Economics

Michael: ...Thanksgiving break. I've reached that part of the semester where I say, "Oh my God, how am I going to get through all this?" So much stuff that I wanted to share with you, and you don't want to load up any new material next week. So, what I'm going to try to do this week is look at three sectors where the Gandhian experiments with truth are working themselves out in the modern world. So, this will be a little bit of a segue into PACS164B for those of you who are taking it.

And incidentally, those courses have not been very heavily subscribed yet, so if you were thinking of taking 164B, might as well go ahead and sign up on [Telebear] so I know how many books to order and things like that. And the classroom is also not very large, so it's nearly as large as this room so you might want to sign up sooner rather than later. And Amy, did you have any copies of black and white?

Student: Yeah.

Michael: Okay, you passed them around. Good. So put those posters up in your dorm room or subway or wherever you hang out and you think students might see it. As far as the paper proposals are concerned. Most of them looked very good, as you know. But from the conversations I've had with people since then I would just like to clarify a couple of things. These are not – you're not publishing these in a scientific journal, although if it's a good paper it may end up in Peace Power. And, you know, from there, the world is our oyster. It goes out all over the world.

So, you don't have to say something that no one else has ever said. I'm not going to run the library and say, "Oh, you know, Galtung said this 40 years ago." That's not the point. The point is for you to be able to delve more deeply into nonviolence and some aspect of it that intrigued you, but you were not able to follow up on. It may well be that your investigation will raise more questions than answers. That's perfectly okay. You want to say, "It seems to me that from what I have said, the following questions would be important to consider, but you know, we won't have time to do them here. That's absolutely fine.

You should come to some conclusions somewhere. That's not like the whole paper should just be interrogation mark after interrogation mark. But it's not – if you want to – for example, we were discussing someone who's comparing or probably will not be comparing, but was thinking of comparing the Tibetan Freedom Struggle, the Indian Freedom Struggle, and saying that, "Okay, it differs from what Gandhi did in India for the following reasons." Okay, given the slight differences in culture, we would expect these differences. So, we put those aside. But we are left with some real differences in nonviolent conception, nonviolent commitment, nonviolent strategy.

Then you go on to look at the fact that the Indian Freedom Struggle succeeded or “worked” as in “work” versus work. And the Tibetan Freedom Struggle so far has not done. Now you have no way of proving that the differences from the Gandhian effort account for the differences in success. And I’m not expecting you to be able to prove that. But if you have a – it’s logical and you’re trying to back it up with some historical evidence. And you don’t overreach the evidence that you’ve got.

In other words, you don’t say, “This proves that Nagler was wrong,” or whatever it is that you’re setting out to prove. But rather, “This would lead to the impression that from the available evidence,” that’s fine. You don’t have to go further than that. Okay, it’s particularly important this year for you to get the papers in on time, which is to say, December 7th, the last class meeting a week from Thursday because of my travel difficulties. I’m sorry about that. But it’s usually good to get papers in on time anyway. That’s sort of a nonviolent thing to do.

Analyzing Violence in the Marketplace

So, what I’m going to try to look at this week is say some more about Gandhian economics and then I’m going to take one problem of domestic violence and one problem of interstate violence and see how the Gandhian legacy would apply to each of them. The material that I did touch upon in my book, so it’s not like you wouldn’t be absolutely unfamiliar with it. But I also want to do one other thing each of the four days that we have left to meet. And that is you know that there’s going to be a different kind of question in addition on the final.

You know about ID’s, you know about the DACE method for knocking ID’s PACS164 courses, patented proven success. You know about essays. But there’s going to be another question in-between those two where I’m going to give a passage. It could be from something that you’ve read before. It may not be. It won’t make much difference. The point will be to ask yourself, “What are the assumptions that this writer is making? What does this writer know about nonviolence? What does he or she not know?”

And so, each time that we meet I’m going to try to give you a specimen passage to try testing ourselves out on. And I realized this morning that I have the perfect passage for us to try because it’s a good connection between violent stuff and the economic stuff. But it’s not a written passage. It’s a tape. It’s an audiotape. And so, I have to run down to [Dwinell] and get this boom box which I hope among us we’ll be able to figure out how to make it work.

Examples of Violence in Marketing

The way this came about is I was in a little shop one time in Petaluma, which is a town where I was living in. They were playing the radio and they played this advertisement for a product called, “Protech.” I hope they are no longer in existence otherwise I’ll certainly

be sued for what we're going to do here today. But even that name should be a kind of tip off. On the final I said, "There's a company that sells burglar alarms and it's called Protech. T-E-C-H. What's the assumption here?" Even that is something you should be able to write a few intelligent sentences about.

But I was listening to this add and my jaw just hung open. I never heard anything so outrageous in my life. Just like violated everything I believed in. So, I said, "What company is that?" They told me. I wrote to the company and said, "Gosh, I was really interested in your ad. I wanted to share it with my students." So, they sent me a cassette. Little realizing that what, of course, I want to do is expose them and do counterculture and what's it called? Culture jamming. Yeah, we're going to do some culture jamming.

So, it was just a very brief ad. We'll play it at least once. The acting in it is about on par with most advertising acting which is to say it's extremely corny which, in a way, is very good because there's going to be no subtlety involved here. We don't want subtlety. And if I – unless I have to rewind this, listen to it. We'll play it again if you want to. And ask yourself what are the underlying assumptions behind this piece of hype – or I mean text in this pitch? What are the underlying assumptions, bearing in mind that when you have a message for someone you communicate what you're saying, but you also communicate the underlying assumptions of what you're saying, possibly even more deeply.

Okay, so let's see where we're at with this.

Radio: It's hard to believe that what you just said, treat your neighbor as yourself.

Michael: What? What? No, this guy is good. Let's see. I may just have to do this ad for you. I've listened to it several times. I'm a better actor than they are. Nope. Okay. I'm sorry. I thought I had a recorder in my office, so I was going to listen to this this morning. I found out at the last minute that I don't have one. So, let's see if this works. Nope. It's just boring old me. Well, I think it's so much more fun to listen to the tape than to hear me act it out for you. I'd have to do a female impersonation and all those things. But let me try and full around with it and see if it is actually on this thing. And if it is, we'll do it for you on Thursday, okay?

But while we've got the word, "Protech," on the board which itself is kind of a giveaway. What would you say about that? What is it trying to communicate? Yes, Phillip?

Student: They're going to capitalize on the fear that crime [unintelligible 00:10:43] able to protect yourself.

Michael: Yeah. And how are you going to protect yourself?

Student: You're putting more of your faith in technology than people.

Michael: Exactly. Yeah. So, it's fused into a single word that you should be afraid. You need to protect yourself, and you're going to do that by technology. And, of course, the – yeah, Joy?

Student: How do you get the idea that you should be afraid from the word, "Protech?"

Michael: Well, if somebody comes up to you and says, "How are you going to protect yourself," wouldn't you get afraid? I mean unless you're a really advanced meditator and look at them and say, "I don't have to be in your space." Somebody says, "Protect yourself," you're going to be afraid. So even with – okay, even if we were to set aside the fear part which is definitely part of – that when you hear the tape you'll be – you'll definitely understand that, assuming that the message that I want is actually on this tape. If not, I will have to act it out for you.

You will see that they're definitely playing on fears and they're definitely playing on the idea that the way to protect yourself from danger is technology. And that's very good for the economy, very bad for reality and everything else. I have quotation from a magazine called, "Guns and Ammo," which is an NRA front magazine which a person says, "There is a profound sense of security felt by 35 million Americans knowing that they have in their home, a gun." And yet, the statistics are that you're 35 times more likely to either have your gun stolen or shoot somebody in your family by mistake than to defend yourself from an intruder with a gun in your home. So really out of sync with reality.

Conflict Model

Okay, let me do something now which is share with you a conflict model that I was going to save until next week, but I think you might find it useful in your paper writing, so I'm going to do that right now. And then we'll get back into the economics thing. Okay. This will be a comparison and a contrast between the people – as you can see, this is really going to be brilliant – between people who are in the dominant paradigm and people like us, who are part of the cutting edge. And where do we differ?

Well, interestingly enough, with regard to conflict, we used to think that us nonviolent people are against conflict and try to get rid of it whereas dominant paradigm people like the people who came up with the United States policy that was on the headlines today that since Iran and Syria are very important countries for us to talk to, we will not talk with them. So, people who have that paradigm, you can maybe explain to me what the logic of it is, they always increase conflict which this will certainly do because ruling out the conversation leaves only one remaining way to adjust power differences and desires. And that is by fighting.

So, they're making conflict inevitable whereas we try not to have conflict. But especially in the area of conflict resolution we came to understand that actually without conflict you do not adjudicate differences and you do not have a [chance of] resolving injustices very

often. So really, we new paradigm people, whatever want to call ourselves – some very honorific term, without getting into triumphalism, but some honorific term.

We agree with the dominant paradigm folks that conflict is inevitable. It's a part of life and we're not going to set out to change that because that would be quixotic. It's impossible. There's always going to be conflict. But there, the similarity ends, and we start splitting off into very, very different domains. We think that conflict is inevitable because of the diversity. Right? No two people are alike and that means that even their viewpoints will differ in some ways.

There have been, you know, studies of identical twins who were separated at birth and they have remarkable convergences that you never would have predicted like here are two twins who never even knew that they had a twin. They discover one another when they're 25 years old. And it turns out that they both work for the same telephone company and they both married a woman named Joan. But even identical twins who have grown up together will have certain differences in viewpoint about stuff.

Whereas dominant paradigm folks who are in charge of our foreign policy right now think that conflict is inevitable because of separateness. That is to say there are existential differences among people. By which I mean in order for one person to succeed another person probably has to fail. And you go to further point and say the success of one person will be measured by the failure of another person. There's even this horrible paragraph which I would not give you on the final, from Göring, I think, Nazi leader who was saying, "You look out there and you see 100 people lying dead or you see 1000 people lying dead, or 5000 lying dead and you know that really have got your work done." Or something like that.

You measure – ultimately, if you follow this logic you go down this slope you end up in a place where another person's misfortune is your fortune. But at least there's this initial stage where in order for you to thrive, the other person may have to suffer. So, our whole concept of what conflict is all about and what we want to do with it is – becomes radically different at this point. We feel – and I just came up with this this morning, as you probably are aware – so I need to check my notes.

Treating Conflict Through Mutual Learning

We feel that the way to treat conflict is through mutual learning. That is this diversity includes a certain amount of misperception. And it's from that misperception that differences in outlook start leading toward conflict and possibly toward dispute. So, before it gets to dispute where I'm against you, we think that this misperception can be cleaned up, cleared up by educating the other person – persons. Not necessarily educating them in an academic sense, which is the first stage of the escalation curve. But opening their eyes to something which they're at this point not willing to see, which involves us in the Law of Suffering -- which is the second phase. But in both cases it's a kind of enlightenment of the understanding, that leads to the clearing up of the conflict

and the ultimate result that we're aiming at is unity – reconciliation and unity. And we see this as part of the purpose in life.

There's this marvelous Surah from the Koran which says, "Oh, human beings, I made you into different tribes, countries, and individuals. Not that you should despise each other, but that so you could rediscover each other." You could find each other. You could find their unity. Now you might ask yourself why did Allah go to the trouble of dividing us up in the first place just so that we could get back together again, but nobody has ever been able to explain this. It's called, "*Lila*," in Sanskrit which means, "A game or a joke of some kind."

Dante, as I mentioned last time, calls it, "The Divine Comedy." It's just a situation we have to accept. The world is a world of diversity, and we have to sort that diversity out. We have to keep it in its appropriate level without letting it obscure the unity. So, we have to use the diversity and go towards unity and create a unity and diversity type of world order. World order based on unity and diversity. And this would naturally tend to be from the bottom up.

Circular Economy

I can't, at this moment, remember whether I actually shared this model with you or not. I probably did when we were going around the wheel of nonviolence. But Gandhi has this world order model which is not a [parametal 00:20:19] one, but a circle. And the way it works is the individual – you start with the individual. Oh, we did go over this. Individual serves the family, the family services the village, the village services the district, on up to the entire planet. The way things are going, we may have to include the solar system, other galaxies and so forth. Same principle would apply. Except there are fewer planets right now thanks to an act of the Science Federation.

But this is the way it goes. We both consider conflict as inevitable. We say it's because of the diversity and perceptions and because of a certain amount of un-clarity of understanding which seems to be the human condition. We're supposed to use conflicts to clear up those misunderstandings and get to a unity that embraces everybody and preserves their diversity. That's our model.

Domination vs Mutual Learning

Now the model that we're not suffering under is very different. The strategy is not mutual learning but domination. And I don't think I'm just stereotyping this. I think this is what it is. After all, the National Security document that the United States right now states that the country's policy is full-spectrum dominance. We're the Number 1 superpower, we should dominate everybody.

And not that this is going to lead to perpetual suffering in their mind, though inevitably it does. George Cannon said, “I can promise you this, this world will never be governed from one single power center. It never has been, and it never will be.” Alexander the Great failed not because he didn’t have the Internet and inter-ballistic missiles. Its just human nature will not let you go there.

So, what they think they would like to reach is a kind of hierarchy following the natural process of competition where the weakest fall to the bottom and that’s where they belong and the strongest rise to the top and that’s where they belong. As I said, I’m going to add something to this on Thursday or next Tuesday which will, I think, bring it even further into focus for you, using in your papers, but for right now I think that may help start sorting us out. Anybody want to comment on this? Add something? Because you know this is brand new with me. There may be parts I’d be happy to add or subtract if you think it works, doesn’t work.

You know the old Roman expression, “*Qui tacet consentiret.*” If you don’t have any objection, I’m going to assume that this is a valid model. I haven’t decided yet whether it’ll – yes, Shannon?

Student: My question is that [unintelligible 00:23:23].

Michael: Well, let’s put it this way. You and I believe that that will never work. All you can do along those lines is lurch from crisis to crisis. You can never arrive at stable peace. So, it aims at hierarchy, but because hierarchy is inherently a lie, if you will. It is not true that one human being is worth more than another human being. The hierarchy is always going to lead to more and more exploitation, paradoxes of repression, and it will always fall apart.

And if you just – I have to say, blindly and stupidly, go back into it. And say, “Okay, it didn’t work in Vietnam, but that’s because we didn’t do it hard enough. Now we have a real man, and it will work in Iraq.” We keep on going over and over with this. It will never lead to a stable situation. And the further you go in time the more drastic the deteriorations are because people are in the long run very slowly learning. Rami?

Search for Common Ground

Student: I was going to ask what happens when you have people that have fundamental belief differences? How does unity, you know, like say not violent people, but I mean say on like abortion or some issue where mutual learning is kind of like – it doesn’t seem possible.

Michael: Well, you picked the issue of abortion which is probably one of the naughtiest and we should think about that. I have a good friend in Washington D.C. who runs an organization called, “The Search for Common Ground.” And what they do is they take people who have radically different beliefs, just like you were saying, Rami. And they sit them down and say, “Okay, you believe this. This person believes anti-this. But what do

you have in common?” And see what happens is when we think about the difference, we go off into the world of difference and we forget that we could have anything in common. We don’t search for it, and it becomes impossible to proceed. We just – from there we just generate into a fight.

But it turns out that even in these two very polar cases, both groups – pro-abortion and anti-abortion – they both believe in the value of life. One group says that you become sacred let’s say after the first trimester of gestation. And from that first trimester until birth, life is sacred. After that, you know, you can join the army, if we’re in a gang war we can execute you. All that stuff, life is sacred anymore. I’m making fun of this belief system, but there is an actually underlying belief.

Now you and I – okay, now those of us who are pro-choice, why are we pro-choice? Because we think human life makes sense and therefore consciousness and reason are of value and people are not like ants. You know, they’re not just supposed to be put in a place in somebody else’s hierarchy. Everybody should have choice. So, the difficulty really is that the people who are against abortion, it’s they’re not doing it 100% because of their belief in the sanctity of life. Part of it is because they’re scared stiff, and they want the state to control people.

So once we clear that up and we say, “We’re going to fix abortion.” Here, this could be a whole PACS164A paper right here. We’re going to fix abortion by educating people into not only safe sexual practices, but into other modes of fulfillment. And we’re going to reduce abortion much more than you will by bombing clinics and we can prove it. Here are the facts.

This is assuming that, at the moment, you’ve got them rational and they’re listening to you. And we’re actually going to enhance the sanctity of life by not having the state tell a woman what she can or cannot do with her pregnancy. So, underneath that difference – what I’m getting at, I guess, Rami, is it’s not really an underlying difference in value, it’s a difference in strategy. What you mistake for a difference in value, everything gets polarized and then you can’t see the other party.

So, what I just stepped you through is very similar to what Search for a Common Ground does with people. It’s like – hang on one second. Yeah, when I was invited – I don’t why I didn’t get around to wangling another invitation this semester because I have so much fun doing this – but I got myself invited to the National Security class in the Air Force Military Affairs Program. And I walked into that class – nice group, not as big as this group. And, you know, about a third of them were in fatigues and they were looking at me.

And, you know, coming from my standpoint, I have to come from, “Okay, what do we have in common?” Which is not immediately apparent. I said, “You know what we have in common is we both want the United States to be secure.” I said, “I promise you, I am a deeply patriotic person.” I didn’t – except in the karmic sense, I didn’t choose to be born in Brooklyn, New York. You know, it could have been anywhere. But now that I’m

born here, this is my country and I feel for it as much as you do, and I want it to be secure.” That’s why I like starting off with that first panel, what we have in common.

“But your image of security, your definition of security is very different from mine. Mine is an image of what is called, “Common Security.” Yours is separate security.” But I think it’s very important to be able to start with that thing we have in common, which I think I’m going to hypothesize that the more you differ from another group, the deeper the commonality will lie. So, I’m – I guess what I’m proposing is that we should always be able to discover that.

Incidentally, Saint Augustine said the same thing in Book 21 of “City of God” where he says, “We have people running around fighting wars all the time, but what they want is peace. They think when they conquer the other person and get them to do their will, peace will supervene, and they’ve got what they want.” So, what they want and what we want is the same. It’s just that their definition of it is a little bit – what shall we say? Hopeless. So, it becomes, to be sure, in a deep way, not just cognitive, but it becomes an educational task. Yeah?

Illusion of Separateness

Student: Can you talk about separateness a little bit? Is it like othering or – I’m confused.

Michael: Yeah. The way I use the term separateness, it sort of accepts the surface of the universe as real. You’re probably too old to remember, but in the early days of computers they had a concept called, “WYSIWYG,” which stands for, “What You See Is What You Get.” In other words, if you see something on the screen when you hit the Control+P, it’ll print out what you’re looking at. Well, I borrowed that term and what I say is that there are some people who think it’s a WYSIWYG universe, that because you look around this room and there are 65 separate individuals here, we think that’s it. It’s 65 separate individuals.

But the new paradigm – looking for a better word for it – but the nonviolent vision is that we’re not denying that there is a level of separateness, but it is relatively superficial compared to an underlying unity. Now how deep that underlying unity is, that may differ among people of good faith. We say we’re intensely interconnected so that if I pollute the atmosphere – or let’s say you live in a third world country, and I sell you some polluting poisonous product. And I think, “Ha ha, I got rid of it.” That works its way into the ecosystem and comes right back to me.

So, you may go that far, or you may say with the wisdom tradition, that we really are one in some way that does not appear in the macroscopic world. And even real science would have a hard time disagreeing with you. So, the different depths of that, but what I’m calling separateness is this position that because we look separate from one another we actually are. That’s all there is to it. So, it’s perfectly reasonable that if you

suffer – I either wouldn't care or I might even be happy. There are no mirrored neurons in this world. Does that clear that up?

Student: What is the underlying cause of the conflict, is the loss of human dignity?
[Unintelligible 00:33:30]

Michael: This actually a very good example. What if the underlying conflict is a loss of human dignity? Well, remember what led Richard Attenborough to launch his mighty project which 25 years and \$25 million became the “Gandhi” movie. It was one statement that he read in Gandhi where Gandhi said, “I have never understood how a human being can believe that through diminishing another person he enhances his own dignity.” Because that's part of separateness.

Separateness vs Dignity

In separateness, and the more we talk about it, the less I like it, in separateness, I would actually believe that I could embarrass or humiliate, let's say, Alex or Amy, and I would benefit from this. But that's only seeing things – you know, it's like looking at life at the very, very top. Not seeing that underneath, if I humiliate another person I have humiliated humanity in which I participate. Not to mention the fact that if I humiliate another person I have created a really serious breach of unity between us and I suffer from that on a level that I may not be aware of.

So again, it just becomes a question of awareness. What the nonviolent person will do is bleed in front of the person who's doing that in such a way that they have to see that they are hurting themselves by hurting you. And that's where this new science – and incidentally, there's a new term of – oh good, Alana, I'll be able to see you better from here. There's a new term for this, that I wasn't aware of when we first went over the MRI studies and all that. And that's positive psychology. I think that's a very good term. It means everything from Freud to Maslow was negative psychology. We look at neurotics and drowning rats and things like that. We derive principles of human psychology from that.

But they're now looking at these bonds of association among us. So, I would say that on – if the criterion is not, say, a material kind of diminishment, but dignity, that's going to be the major – the most important criterion from the nonviolent perspective. Yeah. So, when you elevate the dignity of another person you have elevated your own.

We can go a step further, Martin Luther King had this amazing statement about how we need the diversity in its place. I'm sure you know the statement I'm thinking of where he said, “I cannot be what I ought to be until you are what you ought to be. And you cannot be what you ought to be until I am what I ought to be.” So, this whole idea that by impeding the fulfillment of another person you enhance your own totally does not work. Okay? any other – this was helpful. Any other comments on that?

All right, good.

Needs vs Wants

Well, this – if you’ll allow me now, I’ll just jump back into the economy part instead of gracefully segueing into it through the Protech ad, which you’ll hear about next time. But I gave you what I think are the absolute core principles of Gandhian economics last time. And those were first of all, that the nonviolent economy will be needs-based and the present economic systems of most of the world, these developed systems are wants-based.

And right away we think they’ve gotten into a terrific problem. I’m going to – I have a quote that I think remember it closely enough to use it. It’s from a tremendous figure, probably the greatest woman mystic, certainly of modern India. Her name was Anandamayi Ma, illiterate Bengali but she said one time, “Man,” meaning, human being, “seem to be embodiment of wants. Want is what he thinks about and want is what he gets. Become aware of your true nature or else there will be wrong wanting, despair, desolation, and death.” It’s a really good quote so I’ll bring in the exact wording next time.

But the point that I’m getting at is this, wants, when they’re not connected with real needs actually lead – cannot lead to fulfillment. And because they can’t lead to fulfillment, they get into what Freud called, “A repetition compulsion,” where you say, “Oh, if that was the wrong flavor of ice cream, let me try another one.” You know, when Dolly Madison invented ice cream in 1926 all it was was ice cream. She thought that was terrific. It was the world before ice cream and the world after ice cream. People liked ice cream a lot, but then they said, “Just plain ice cream? Let’s add a little chocolate to this or a little cherry.”

And now, as you know, at last count there’s 128 flavors and going. It’s because – and it’s easy for me to say this. I know this is unfair. It’s easy for me to say this because I don’t eat ice cream. But the fact is I do not believe that a human being can be fulfilled by ice cream if he or she could, or a little one could, we would have been fulfilled a long time ago. But you can see what happens when you start arousing wants that are not directly connected with real needs. They just proliferate and that has gotten us into this economic disaster that we’re in right now. John?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:40:17] How people live in society where everyone around you is based on wants?

Michael: Okay. This is a very important question. Let’s say we believe all this and actually think Gandhi was right and we start living in accordance with it, you’re going to be 180 degrees from everybody else around you. This is no easy question. I think the only way to resolve it is by looking upon those differences as diversity misperception and not dividers. So, you have to be able to stand there and know that what a person is doing is hurting themselves and hurting other people, and not get hysterical about it. Try to do the best you can to show them that they’re going the wrong way. Period, end of

quote. No getting attached to the results otherwise you drive yourself crazy very quickly with this stuff.

But you also have to be secure enough in your own beliefs that they don't threaten you. My experience, people influence one another very strongly on this dimension and on this level of wants. And if they say to you, in effect, "Here, smoke this funny little cigarette and you'll be happy." And you say to them, "Get thee behind me, you know. I'm going to report to do the Narco Policemen, or this is against Islam or any of these things." That will not work. You completely cut off the conversation.

But if you say to them, "I'm happy already." They will look twice at you. It will sink as probably the best you can do for that person. It's – this is a very real issue and I think it impedes us very often from experimenting with these principles is we say, "Oh my God, I'm going to, you know, I'm going to look pretty weird." And there used to – I don't know if she's still around. I haven't seen her recently – this woman, Julia Wintergrad, used to hang out in Berkeley. She's always dressed black from top to toe. And it wasn't fashionable then, by the way. So, she really, really looked strange.

And she always carried a little bubble pipe, and she was just blowing bubbles and walking around dressed in black and selling poetry. And so, somebody from, I don't know, the Daily Cow come up to her and said, "Now why do you dress in black and blow bubbles and go around selling your poetry?" And she said, "You think it's easy being weird in Berkeley? You have to really, really work at it." [Laughter]

But the fact is, if you start moving along these lines, in some ways, you know, they'll say, "Oh, just say he's green and she's a vegan. Some of my best friends are vegans. It's not a problem." But when you really start getting to some of the deep-lying things, you are going to look very different. And I think at that point we get a little scared. So, I think it's safer to trust your own experiences and feed them back and see what's happening to you than it is to look to the people around you for guidance. Okay?

Hind Swaraj and Economics

Where were we? So, I'm up to this – I'm starting with this needs/wants business because that's where Gandhi started already in 1909 when he wrote Hind Swaraj. He said, "The time is coming, and it won't be very long when we will look at this mad pursuit of multiplying our wants and say what have we done? We have gotten ourselves into an incredible mess. It's not going to be easy to recover."

The other principle that I highlighted – I think I'm going to be forgetting one so help me out here, is swadeshi whereas the "wants economies" just naturally tend towards centralization and globalism and globalization. And we'll talk more about those next semester. Okay? But I think you get the general idea. Power and wealth tend to be sucked up. You remember that set of slides that I showed you, that the wealthiest

people are up way past Everest and the rest of us are laying face down on the 50-yard line somewhere. Julia?

Student: I have question about needs and wants and swadeshi. Like tools for [unintelligible 00:45:20]. It's hard to distinguish like needs from wants with tools of society, or tools for service in society. Like how do you really distinguish the needs and wants?

Distinguishing Needs and Wants

Michael: Well, to distinguish between needs and wants, that's why I gave you that three-tiered breakdown last time. That we have, you know, pre-Maslow needs for food, clothing, and shelter. And they're qualitatively different from the next tier which is the needs to fulfill ourselves in terms of the service we can perform for society. And then the top tier just being for show, for comfort, and stuff like that. So that's a rough and ready way of distinguishing.

Student: But for tools [unintelligible 00:46:04]? How do you distinguish like this is a want that I – this is something I want to perform my service, or this something I need?

Michael: I never said that any of this was going to be easy. It's very difficult to distinguish between needs and wants. And it's easy to fool yourself. Yeah?

Student: How do you do it?

Michael: How do I do it? I was just thinking about that. The fact is, I don't do it very well, so that's why I didn't launch into an explanation. But it's kind of complicated. But let's say I have been sucked into an ad for a new electronic device. I mean outside of lattes this probably my biggest difficulty that I'm struggling with is a faster CPU or a lighter laptop or a snazzier beard trimmer or something like that. Some of you don't need to worry about this for one reason or another.

There's no question that when I'm looking at those catalogs, be they online or in the slick pages of the magazine in front of me or shop window. There's no question that there's a part of me that's about 8 years old that's jumping up and down and saying, "Oh, goody! I can afford one of these. And would I have fun buying one." And so, what I do is I try not to do a whole lot of impulse buying. If I did, I'd be very poor, and my office would be packed with Dell computers from floor to ceiling.

But at the same time, I mean maybe this is a weakness, but I think I need a certain amount of fun also. It even says in the Bhagavad Gita you should have entertainment. So, I'm not going to spend like \$5000 for some entertainment. But if I spend \$1000 on something that I can use, you know, actually make my work faster, I don't begrudge myself getting some entertainment out of it. So that's my life path. Yeah, Dan?

Student: I just – I've been doing a lot of reading about Gandhian economics.

Michael: It won't hurt you any to do a lot of reading.

Student: Yeah, well, it just seems that – I mean one of the rules he's – I mean not rules, but one of the things Gandhi seems to focus on is, you know, not having anything that makes your job easier or not that, or just it takes, I guess, for example, like a cell phone kind of breaks – I feel it breaks – might break down, like, the community because you're not going up to a person and talking to them. However – and also – and so if get –

Michael: Yes, I agree with you.

Student: So, it seems like there's so many ways in which it's just, okay, now then let's get rid of cell phones. But it seems like that would just affect so many other things like the manufacturers of cell phones. That's how they get fulfillment. And that's also how –

Michael: I would hesitate –

Student: You're also taking away those jobs from those people who are making those. And so, our society now where everything is linked into one another, it seems like getting rid of one thing just causes a whole bunch of problems for everything else.

Michael: This is correct. And that's why – and thank you for reminding me – we had this other principle of trusteeship and non-possession instead of ownership. In other words, we don't have to, "Get rid of cell phones." We have to get rid of the sense that by making \$8 billion selling the Razor phone, Motorola was fulfilled. So now they're going – I happen to know this – they're going around sucking up every high-tech company that they can purchase. That's not what I'm calling fulfillment. That would be a wrong use of the need's hierarchy. That's just profit.

Student: It just seems like –

Michael: Hang on, let me finish. But there's no question that we have to transition somehow. Well, under a capitalist or a communist regime, we're going to yank those possessions away from some people which won't help them psychologically and may well lead to them fighting back. So, what we do is try to educate their attitude towards the thing, that they're a trustee. Then they can back out of it in a reasonable way. It's not that there won't be any pain, but it won't be cataclysmic.

Economics and Suffering

Student: Because it seems that our economic system is fine if everyone's values are at the same – like our –

Michael: I don't think our economic system is fine in the sense that I don't think it's sustainable, to use the prevailing word. I mean when I was an undergraduate student at NYU, New York University, the registrar made a mistake and it looked as if I had to take an economics course. So, I protested, "But I don't know math. But I live in Greenwich

Village. I'm a folk singer. I don't know anything about money." They wouldn't listen. I had to take an economics course.

So, I went into this class, and I was learning some stuff. The instructor was young he was interesting. But I began to feel that something was terribly wrong. Like either these people were crazy, or I was crazy. And I preferred to believe at that time that they were the problem. Because what they were saying is that all economies will be fine as long as they constantly expand. Even back when I was an undergraduate student, you know, I wasn't very smart, but I knew this was a finite planet. You know, the universe was not pumping 100 million gallons of crude oil under the surface of the earth every day.

So, I don't think that the prevailing economy is going to work. And in fact, if you read, "The Great Turning," by David Korten you'll see that it's coming up against a really big brick wall really fast.

Student: But I mean I kind of feel like you could divide a lot of the population of people who – I mean I know this is going to sound funny, but –

Michael: It's all right. I sound funny all the time.

Student: People who believe that Star Wars is possible or something like that – in the future where the expansion takes place. I mean the universe is infinite and we can continue to just expand outwards into it or we're going to have to completely give that up and –

Michael: But even there, you have to realize that those people have to be made to realize – I see you [Gerald] – get to you in a second. And the more they suffer, the easier it is to tell them why they're suffering. You have to realize that they're not getting any happier. They're just getting more and more insecure all the time.

Gross National Product vs Happiness

And so, there's been this whole shift just as – and I'm glad we're talking about this, but just as we talked about different human needs assessments and having to do with the different concept of human nature, similarly, in economics people are starting to step away from the Gross National Product as a measure of anything but the Gross National Product.

So, we've been assuming that the bigger your Gross National Product was, the happier you were. And so, there's a new triple bottom line idea, you know, human well-being, preserving the support system of the planet, and material well-being and profit. And then there's the Kingdom of Nepal, where the King of Nepal has decided that he's not going to measure the Gross National Product anymore. The IMF can do that if they want to. But he's going to go around asking people are they happy? Whoa, what a concept.

So, it takes a really small Himalayan kingdom to do this. So, he has his people go out and say, “You know, have you been divorced recently? Any suicides in your family? Are you okay with what you’re getting?” And they’ve also done this in smaller studies in the U.S. and they’ve shown that at a certain period of time where the economic product of the United States doubled, Happiness Index was absolutely flat. In fact, it bears out what we were saying about the three tiers of human needs because once you have satisfied the needs and you’re launching up into the wants, that Greek concept of πλεονεξία [pleonexia], you are launching into make-believe. You are fooling yourself that you’re going to be made happy by those things.

Now given powerful media, hitting you with a 3000 message per day barrage, you can really be made to believe that. But I have to say I don’t think that that belief is very deep. Just as I don’t think the people who believe that they feel more – they feel more secure because they have a gun in their house, I don’t think that’s a very deep feeling of security. You remember that story that I told you about Jeannette Rankin, that she goes down South and one night she locks the door of her house and that night she can’t sleep she’s so insecure.

Student: But it still seems like you’re not really changing any common system. You’re just changing the thoughts of people.

Michael: Just changing the thoughts of the people is everything, man.

Human Nature vs Objectification

Student: No, I understand that, but it has nothing to do with capitalism or anything like that.

Michael: Hey, I have no problem with capitalism, believe it or not. There, I said it and I’m glad – right here in Berkeley. I have no problem – I don’t care whether you have capitalism, communism, whatever, as long as you have trusteeship and you’re not a materialist.

Student: Yeah. But you’re – yeah. And that just seems to be what his principle is getting to.

Michael: That’s what his principle is getting to, right. I wouldn’t say that – okay, having – I made my extreme statement, and you made your extreme statement and I’m going to back away from mine a little bit. I don’t think it has nothing to do with the economic system. Because given human nature, if you present human beings with certain objects, they will respond in a certain way. There’s a study that’s just been published. It’s in a magazine called, “Psychological Science,” where they took – I guess they took college students – they always take college students because they’ll do anything for 3 bucks an hour, I guess.

And it was men – so it's already kind of a problem. And they tested their testosterone levels. And then they divided them into two groups. And one group was given toy guns to play with – which they enjoyed immensely, I'm sure. And another group was given some kind of children's game which was innocuous. And then they were tested again to see; A, did anything happen to their testosterone level. And B, would they be more aggressive? No surprise here folks. Testosterone level rose upon playing with a little plastic gun and they got more aggressive in certain ways.

So that means there's a limit to how much I can hold my extreme statement that the system doesn't matter at all. But rather, it's the case that a kind of natural system will come out of a non-materialist needs-based system. And another kind of system will grow out of a materialist wants-based system. But the fact is that there's really nothing inherently wrong with capitalism if by that you mean that some people accumulate material resources and are able to do things with them. It's what kind of things do they want to do. That's our problem.

Student: Yeah. It's just what you choose to do with it.

Michael: What you choose to do with it.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:58:11]

Michael: Or maybe you just choose not to – I'm not going to choose to exploit anybody. I just want to become rich.

Student: I mean which almost makes it frustrating because it just doesn't get – it just shows that you don't have to flip the whole – the way the world works. It just seems like everybody has to just take this class.

Michael: Yeah. Everyone has to take this class. That's what I've been saying all along. Yeah. This is not an easy change to make. But I'm saying, I guess, that A, it's not harder than a revolution where you take all the money away from the rich people and it leads to a permanent fix.

Student: It's a change that requires no resources.

Michael: No material resources, basically. Right. Give me an iPod and I'll get the message out and we can do it. Yeah. Okay, Joy, and then Sid.

Sustainable Economy

Student: I really don't see how any rational person can make a car payment for this economic system considering –

Michael: For which?

Student: Our economic system.

Michael: For our economic system. I agree with you.

Student: Just given what you showed us about that vast disparity between rich and poor. And I think that's evidence of a severe pathology. And like when do you step in? It's like a morbidly obese person. Do you just allow themselves to consume until they die?

Michael: Well, Joy, I think you gave the answer to your question, right? Right in the first phrase when you said, "I don't see how any rational person could sustain the economy that we've got. I don't either. But that's not the problem with it. Let's put it this way. There are people out there who are capable of behaving rationally, but they're not being persuaded. And I've actually been studying this – hold on just one second. I was listening to an ad – not, as you know, I have absolutely no contact with the mass media. But I do have to learn Spanish. So, when I'm driving down our access road and I'm not going to endanger anybody, I turn the car radio on, and I listen to Spanish.

Well, one day I accidentally got on the wrong channel, and I was listening to an advertisement. And it's an advertisement for growing your hair. So, it caught my attention. It really hit me where I'm weakest. And at the end of the ad, you know, it took me a while to realize that this wasn't going to work, and I got back to [unintelligible 01:00:45]. But at the end of the ad the person said, "Scientific studies prove that this product works 50% better." Okay, now you know perfectly well that there were no scientific studies. And if there were, they would not prove anything. And 50% better doesn't make any sense. If you wrote a sentence like that on your paper I would say, "Than what, man?"

So, the problem that I'm getting at is that we have been lied to so often at such a deep level that we no longer behave rationally. We – not in this class, of course, being programmed to respond to signals, not to use our reason. And then when you try to run a democracy on a bunch of people like that, it is not going to work very well. Sid, and then we'll get back to you.

Student: I was just going to say about capitalism, like a lot of the problem I found just reading Gandhi's stuff and like just trying to think about the way capitalism works. Since the separation and the modes of production. Like is the fundamental basis of capitalism. You have to take people away from the modes of production. It just seemed to go against like the idea of self-sufficiency and Swaraj and being able to like control yourself. Like Gandhi didn't even want doctors and lawyers in Hind Swaraj. And that's like – so it's like you don't want someone making your clothes and making your food and doing all these things for you.

Michael: Yes. He was pretty extreme about self-sufficiency. But remember, he was operating in a particular cultural environment and there's this story about an American who came to him with some hanks of cotton that he had spun in America and presented them to Gandhi. And Gandhi said, "You're bringing me this from America? This is the

craziest idea I've ever heard of." So, we may not have to be quite as extreme as he was in self-sufficiency and separation of production and so forth.

But remember, he was trying to give shock therapy to a people who had been completely hypnotized by this separation. Don't forget heart unity though – and mutual cooperation. So now there's a wonderful documentary film that was made by the BBC and E.F. Schumacher appears in that film and talks about Gandhi as an economist. And he says, "You know, you don't have to have – you cannot – the fact is, you cannot make wristwatches in a village. They have to be made in some kind of special facility. And they are useful. So, you get into an arrangement where you send them carrots and they send you wristwatches.

But you don't want to get into an arrangement like the one my son is working on right now in Nicaragua where these villagers – they're not peasants, exactly. Villagers, they harvest sea salt, and they sell the salt to somebody for about 40 cordobas for a kilo. Or, I don't know, maybe it's even 50 kilos or 100 kilos. I'm not – as I told you, I flunked – I left this economics course. But they're selling it for a pittance. And then it's being bottled and sold in upscale grocery stores, you know, like whole foods and Oliver's for \$5 for an 8-ounce bottle. That's where you don't want it to go.

So, there is a certain amount of room for specialization. But what you don't want to bring in is the exploiting your capacity to do something, to make a product that a person needs. You don't want to bring that. And the way you block that is through trusteeship route, getting people to look upon the tools of their production as trustees. Now there is actually in this world of ours, at least one experiment. There probably are more of them now, probably one experiment in capitalism with a human face.

It sprang up in the Basque region of Spain. There's a lot of tensions and passions around that but let me just use that term for now – the Basque region. And they had a special kind of culture there which lent itself to this and there was a priest named Father Arizmendi who went around to bars at night and started to talking to people about their work in factories. And they organized a kind of capitalism which actually avoids the things that you and I hate. And all people of goodwill, must of course hate them from the bottom of their very good hearts.

So, they have these factories, and they try to democratize production such that, first of all, everybody in the factory owns capital in that factory. If you're a poor person and you come in to work on a machine and you don't have any capital, part of your salary goes into your accumulating capital in the factory. So, everybody has a stake, okay? There is a strict limit on the difference between what the top managers will earn, and the line workers earn. You know, this is one of the things that's gone off the charts. And I think in Japan where they're so much more productive than we are, I think it hovers around 20 times more. But in the U.S., you know, you look at people like the head of Disney and things like that, it's like hundreds and hundreds of times more what the factory worker earns.

Gandhi had a discussion with the Viceroy at one point where he showed him that he, the Viceroy was earning 5000 times more than the peasants over whom he was ruling. So, they have a strict limit on that. And they don't pretend that everybody is a good manager. You know, if I were to go into a factory and say, "I have a PhD. I could be a good manager." And if they forget to ask me what my PhD is in, namely, comparative literature, and they give me the job, that factory will head south in a week. I mean I couldn't manage a chicken run. I'm absolutely hopeless at it.

But there are other people who are good managers. So, you do let them manage and they do earn more money than the line workers, but they are elected positions. And every four years or five years the factory gets together, and they decide, "You turned out not to be very good at this. We're going to put back on the line. You're great, continue what you're doing."

Mondragon Cooperative - Democratic vs Authoritarian Capitalism

So, if you wanted to learn more about the Mondragon Cooperative – and that's the name of the region in Spain.

There's a fellow named Terry Mollnar who's been working on this for decades. You can contact him through an interesting organization called, "The Social Venture Network," which tries to bring together successful entrepreneurs who have agreeing heart. Okay.

So, I think, in fact, the Mondragon Cooperatives were very successful and at one point, although they are only territorially population-wise, I think they're like 3% of "Spain." They were like 20% - 25% of the economic product in the manufacturing of Spain. So, you know, they're very successful. And so, I think this shows – if you care, and I don't – I think this shows that capitalism itself is not the problem. You could conceivably have a capitalist order which would not lead directly to the gross kinds of abuses that we're seeing. However, as I say, I have almost nothing to say about what kind of order economically we should have, assumedly, if I had stayed in that course at NYU I would have something to say about it. But I tiptoed out before they discovered that I thought they were crazy.

Okay. So, let's see. Let's cover about .4% of what I was hoping to get through today. Anyone else have a comment because this is much better than what I had planned. Yeah?

Student: I just want to say like you basically made this point. Somebody was like [unintelligible 01:09:23] capitalism as – I mean so you can defend it rationally. You just have to have a certain kind of moral ethical standpoint you're doing it from. And like you just said, you can have capitalism as long as you change your morality – if morality is behind it.

Michael: Yes. Myself, even though Gandhi used the term morality a lot, I don't use it. I think it's become kind of slippery and maybe not helpful. But be that as it may, I think we could both agree on using this kind of vocabulary. If you can get greed out of the picture, you could run a capitalist system and it would be fine. For that matter, you could run a communist system and it would be fine, although –

Student: I just wanted to say there's nothing irrational about it. It's just whether you agree with the motivation behind it.

Michael: Right. No. I think that all –

Student: [Unintelligible 01:10:14]

Michael: I think his system was perfectly rational and perfectly defensible. It's even utilitarian, but it does rely on a different concept of what a human being is. And even that can be tested scientifically. We got positive psychology has shown that human beings are fulfilled much more thorough service than they are through acquisition.

So, it was often said of Gandhi that he was one of those people who did not believe that there was a difference between what was going to work and what was going to be good. They would always end up being the same thing.

So, for my money, pardon the pun, these are the three basic, basic principles underlying the Gandhian economic system. But I'm not an economist. For that matter, Gandhi wasn't either, he was rather proud of the fact. But there are people who have looked over his system and they've come out with slightly different lists, and I think should share them with you just in the spirit of open-minded generosity.

And these are from a book by – “Gandhian Economics,” by Shriman Narayan. I think his full name is Shriman Narayan Agarwal. Which was published in 1970 at Navajivan Press. Navajivan basically is in charge of the Gandhian literary legacy. And these are his four principles which are a little bit different from mine. They're going to not be discordant but, you know, it's a different way of cutting it up.

First, simplicity which basically is the same thing as needs versus wants. If you can fulfill your needs, you're going to lead a materially simple life. And I think this is important to add that word, materially simple, because you can lead a life that is nuanced, rich, in relationships, ideas experiences, growth, all of those things. But be extremely simple materially. And that's what we've gotten confused in thinking that a cell phone is going to make me richer than I was.

And then this is not going to be a big surprise, nonviolence – well, let's do it my way. Nonviolence and that would mean towards other people and that include structural violence. So, we're not going to have any exploitative systems. Back on the simplicity point just for a second. I read a recent edition of “Yes Magazine.” I don't know if you're familiar with that magazine. It's very, very nice. “Yes” and “Ode,” they're actually

tracking all of these Gandhian-like experiments going on all over the world and reporting on them. And the latest issue was about economics and localism.

And they listed several instances of countries which like imported 24,000 tons of wheat in a certain year and exported 21,000 tons of wheat. Or they would import, you know, 18,000 million gallons of something and export 16,000 or 24,000 gallons. They're just not looking, you know, at what they're doing. Okay. So, the second – Agarwal quotes the Atlantic Charter which said, "That all the nations of the world," and you'll like this. You'll like this one. "All the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons." Those two being indistinguishable. "All the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons must come to the abandonment of the use of force." Now this would include, of course, nonviolence toward the environment, towards creatures, as well as it would be structural or physical violence against other people.

The third important principle which I haven't really brought into my list was the dignity – sometimes he even said the sanctity of labor. So, one of the programs in constructive program as you know, we talked this over, is bread labor. And one of the – I mean there's a number of good things about bread labor. You remember what bread labor is? It means spending some time manufacturing one of the three basic needs. You're getting involved in one of the three basic needs or something like that. Food, clothing, shelter. So, for most Gandhians it was khadi. You spent a half hour, an hour a day spinning khadi.

Or when Mr. Prasad was here a couple of weeks ago I interviewed him, and he talked about a Punjabi peasant who was a huge strapping person. Obviously, the guy needed at least 3500, 4000 calories a day just to keep walking around. And they brought him to a meeting. He doesn't like spending his time in meetings. They were in an all-day meeting. At the end of the meeting, they brought out some mangoes or something. And this guy ate two mangoes. And he said, "That's going to be enough for you?" He said, "I have not touched the plow today so I will not eat." You know, he was just a peasant, but he just felt that you had to be involved in producing food before you have the right to consume it.

So that was an important principle. And let's see, the fourth one is kind of vague in this guy's list. And I'm not entirely sure what he means by it, so I'll just give it to you. He says, "Human values." I mean hey, I've got human values. You got human values. Let me read you what he says here, "It seeks – Gandhian economics seeks a change in the standard values in which economics and ethics are no longer divorced. Thus, it is sinful to eat American wheat when my neighbor, the grain dealer, starves because he has no customers."

Now I'll give you a slightly different example of this. You know, I live near the now of Petaluma which had a flourishing small business district in the middle of the town. Some of you have seen it. And it's collapsing now because these big multinationals are coming in. And there's a pathetic story about somebody going into a local, I think, a

hardware store. The person wanted four items. The person found three of those items, brought them up to the counter, said, “Do you have the fourth item?” And they said, “No, we don’t stock it, but I can order it for you.” And the person said, “Oh, never mind.” Dumped all three items on the counter and walked out and said, “I’ll just get it at Target, Wal-Mart,” or something like that.

So, I think that we would have to adjust or apply Gandhi’s principles so that we would not do that. Since you’re interested in my lifestyle here, we have a section of Petaluma which is called an “Outlet mall.” And big, big manufacturers are there like Brooks Brothers. You can hit a Brooks Brothers in Petaluma, California. Most the people that are out there shoveling turkey manure all day long and they’re going into Brooks Brothers to buy themselves coveralls.

Anyway, I made a vow when this outlet mall was built that I would never go in. And basically, there was only once when I had to break that vow because they [have] one product. Obviously, a technology device that I wanted that I couldn’t get elsewhere. But basically, I just don’t go there. And I don’t care how weird people think I am. Okay, so simplicity, nonviolence, sanctity of labor, and human values. Now I would also say – oh my gosh – oh no, we’ve got it here. “Trusteeship,” is absolutely critical. All right, very good. I enjoyed the discussion today. I’m going to try to cover restorative justice and international conflict on Thursday, but if we don’t get there, that’s all right too. And next week will be for review.

25. The 'Wheel of Nonviolence' 2: Gandhian Economics

Michael: I'm done congratulating myself. Don't have any announcements today. And unfortunately, a serious one just came in.

Zimbabwe Nonviolent Resistance

There is a women's group in Zimbabwe which has been carrying out and developing a very interesting nonviolent resistance. I'm sorry, actually I didn't want it done yet – an interesting nonviolent resistance in Zimbabwe. The regime – especially the police – and it's just been recently a very unpleasant arrest. And there's a woman named Jenny Williams who is the mistreated and sequestered there. And so International Center for Nonviolent Conflict has sent out an urgent call and would people please – if you can afford it – call Zimbabwe and tell them we're monitoring what's going on there and we want you to release Jenny Williams and general stop doing that.

Okay. so, in a minute we're going to have that – I hope – we're going to have that machine and we're going to listen to this tape. But in the meantime, let's get started back. I wanted to first finish the sort of grid that I was laying out last time that you might find helpful as a way of organizing material that might be particularly useful for your papers. By the way, this is also pertinent to us though. I forgot the room number. I will probably show up at the right room, but this is for our early final.

Strategic vs Principled Nonviolence

If you think about – you know, we talked early on in the semester about how there's a difference between observable behavior and the forces that are actually in play in an interaction. And you can look at two people – oh, I knew they wouldn't be able to resist you, Alana. Thank you. So let me just do that and then I'll plug this in. That one of the reasons it's hard to talk about strategic and principled nonviolence is it is not a WYSIWYG universe. It's not the case that what you see is what you get. You can look at two groups of people and they'd be behaving in the same way, but unless you know how to observe them very closely, they would actually be motivated very differently and we in the principled nonviolence community believe that it's the motivation and it's the quality of the energy that goes into the system that determines what the outcome is going to be. So that's one of the big difficulties.

And I kind of spread it out. Here you have people – this is all people who have decided not to use violence, that is to say not to use physical, visible violence in a given situation, what could their reasons be? And you can put them out on a spectrum. I

started this because I was reading about a group of people who did not use violence. I don't even remember which group it was because it's not the kind of thing that interests me, particularly.

And they were asked, "Why didn't you use violence?" They said, "We didn't have any guns." So, this is sort of – it's sort of lame. But I suppose even if you don't have guns you could try to bite people and curse them and things like that. So, let's call this a form of no-violence going on, but certainly, it's been taken out of your hands in terms of human choice and it's not going to really make a big difference from our point of view.

But then you can talk about people who chose not to use violence even though it was available to them, but they decided not to because something in them thought that it would not work. It would backfire. And at this point, we're starting to get closer to our kind of commitment and the line between strategic and principled is a line between – through a group of people who choose not to use nonviolence, but one group is doing it because they don't think it'll work in this situation. That's the big difference. Restructure the situation. Give them another chance. They'll go ahead and use it.

And this is what Gandhi said about the Suffragist Movement in Britain, that yeah, they're not using violence and we're not using violence. The difference is that they're not using it because they don't think it will work for them. And you give them back a situation where they can use, they've promised to use it effectively, whereas we have decided never to use it under any circumstances.

And of course, later on, we'll build in a little exception about the mad man with the sword, but leaving that aside from the time being, we decided not to use it under any circumstances. And that's equivalent to saying, "We have decided not to use violence on principle." Now when you decide not to use violence on principle and you just rule it out, the world is not going to immediately configure itself into a very sweet wholesome place where you don't need to defend yourself. You don't need to protect anyone else, and you don't need to do anything about injustice.

So, I regard this situation, someone who chose not to use violence for principled reason as being – what's that term in chemistry where you have a state that's very unstable and it transitions to another state? I forget. Very bad at chemistry. But, you know, you have a chemical that doesn't actually enter into the reaction, but it precipitates a reaction happening. This is – a catalyst. Thank you. There we go. Of course, I knew that. A catalyst. This state is like a catalytic state in that in itself it's not stable. You keep going around just saying, "I'm not going to use violence. I'm not going to use violence."

Eventually, the pressures will build up where you have to use something. And it's at that point where you might choose – what is it that I am going to use? And I've gone on record as decided to use a four-letter word here. [Points to "Love" on the board] I hope maybe it's small enough that some of you can't read it. And we won't get into any trouble. But the choice not to use violence should be a precursor to the choice to use love, choice to love to use some positive force.

And I have no objection really to any of these positions, but ideally, it should progress to that final state and that's the only one that is really stable. That's the one. Once you figure out what you can do, you can stay there, and the rest then just becomes a question of learning the principle well enough that you can apply it in whatever situations you find yourself. Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:07:26]

Violence vs Not Violence

Michael: Well, one of the reasons that I'm spreading things out on charts like this, horizontally and vertically is to get away from the yes, no, dualistic, is this violence or is it not violence? Now in the kind of situation you described has two important characteristics from our point of view. One is, that it's an emergency. You're not talking about a woman walking around with a bottle just in case she gets attacked. And two, it's a question of self-defence. And I think becomes a personal issue.

And it's a rare individual who can live in the state that they will not use violence to defend themselves even if they're suddenly attacked. There are such individuals, Gandhi was one of them. There are several episodes of him being attacked and never lifting a finger in his own defense. He said his son should have defended him if he was there, which is interesting. Defending another person is a little bit different from defending yourself. But he wouldn't even defend himself against cobras or anything like that.

So, I don't think – Alana?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:09:14]

Michael: Oh, would he defend his son? I expect so, yeah.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:09:24]

Michael: I think we're all – all these cases are in the ballpark of the mad men with the sword. There are emergencies and you have to defend someone else and you're only option is to do so through, if necessarily, lethal force. He went on record as saying that the person who does that will have done the community a favor. And I assume that the equivalent is saying this was not a violent act. But remember, we had some criteria for the mental state that's involved here. This is a good little spot quiz. How many of these can we remember. Suppose this situation comes up, you find yourself in Oakland or something that like that and somebody is attacking someone, and you have to intervene with force and it's dangerous. It could even be lethal. You want to come back and tell me that it wasn't violent, what other criteria. Anybody remember those? Amy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:10:45]

Michael: Well, all of those things would generally be true. You have to be detached from the results. But detachment from results has a special twist in this case. Anybody remember?

Hypothetical

I think the example I used was what if the door burst open and somebody came in here with a submachine gun and special student killer ammunition and I just happened to have a 9mm in the drawer here. I'm sure the classroom of the future, they'll all have handguns for such an emergency.

And of course, I don't kill that person. That would be real world. What we do is we take them out. I take this person out or some other euphemism. And I want to say that I did it nonviolently, what do I have to be able to say? Rami?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:11:49]

Michael: Okay, what would my first instinct be? Shannon?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:11:57]

Michael: It's already a lost situation. It's not an emergency. But let's say, okay, this will satisfy both Rami and Shannon. The person comes in. I'm looking for a ruler so I can go and slap him on the wrist, which is what teachers do. And I say, "Oh my gosh. Someone has left a 9mm here and he's about to..." [Laughter] I think we've made the point that this is not a very likely situation to happen. And that's good because we're not talking about things that you should anticipate. But theoretically, they're of interest. Okay? Sid and then Catherine.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:12:40]

Three Criteria of Nonviolent Violence

Michael: Right. It's very important that I don't say, you know, I hate people who kill students. I call them some dehumanizing word like student killers or something like that – the blam, blam, take that. You deserved it. That's one kind of an act. And another kind of act is, "Oh God, why do I have to do this?" Of course, I would get Camilla by mistake. But, you know, what I mean, I am not motivated by hate. I'm mainly motivated by love, but what happens to come out looking kind of weird in this situation. So that's the main thing. Catherine?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:13:24]

Michael: Yeah. That's about the same. I'm not acting out of anger. But there were two others of which the second is kind of interesting. And the third is extremely important, almost as important as the first one. Anybody remember them? Yeah, Phillip?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:13:48]

Michael: Well, that is another – that’s a very similar case and I think you’re right, Phillip. It’s not totally involved, but it is interesting where someone wrote to him and said, “A bully slapped me, and I felt humiliated, and I didn’t hit him back. Wasn’t that wonderful?” And Gandhi said, “Frankly, no. You should have hit him back.” But then he said, “Why were you humiliated? That’s the problem. It does humiliate you if another person attacks you.” Once you’re entangled in it in that way, you’ve lost it psychologically. You can only do the next best thing, which is to defend your dignity, which is much more important than defending your body. Okay, the first criterion is I do this not out of anger, the second is that let’s say the person sees I’m about to take him out and he twirls, and he wings me, which I think is what you say in Western movies, you know, “I’ve been winged, pardner.” I’m not going to go and complain about this, you know. I’m not going to, “Here I was, trying to do my duty as a professor and I got shot. It’s not fair.” So that’s not going to be done. I entered into a situation where the best option available to me was one, using physical violence. I’m not going to complain if I got hurt.

But now comes a third criterion which is probably up there with the first one in importance. And that is remember the non-triumphalism. I’m not going to say [Mimes blowing on the muzzle of a gun, twirls it in the air, and then puts it in a holster on his hip], “Always keep a loaded 9mm in every classroom. That’ll take care of these varmints.”

Instead, I’m going to say, “Where have we gone wrong? What kind of society is this that people who go bananas and pick up guns and try to kill – there’s bananas right there – innocent people. Let’s not get into a scenario where we’re throwing bananas at each other. That would take us too far afield. But really because I have used superior force to prevent a use of violence, I am not going to say that this situation was a success. I’m going to say it was the best we could do. It’s an indicator that things are very wrong, and I now commit myself to fix them so that this doesn’t happen again.

If I do all of those three things, in my mind, especially the first and the third, I’m going to say that this was not really a violent act and if people complain about that I’ll take them back. I’ll rewind to the first or second lecture where we were talking about ahimsā which literally means, “The absence of the intention to harm.” I was not intending to harm even that person. I was intending to stop him or her. Unfortunately, I had no other way of doing it. Shannon?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:16:58]

Michael: Clearly, it would be preferable to do things with a taser than with a bullet. But even there, as you can see, problems develop because then the police get more willing to shoot and there’s been at least one case of someone who was killed with a taser because this thing delivers a powerful shock. And I think you use the right expression. I’m taking away their choice. So, in no way is this going to be an ideal persuasion

versus coercion solution. We're talking about emergencies. In emergencies, we don't expect to do something ideal. We expect to do the best we can.

But I think one of the most interesting things is like here is Gandhi who is completely committed to this and he's intensely active for 50 years, 15 hours a day, 7 days a week, the situation never arose for him. So, it's not likely that it's going to arise, but it does help us understand what we really mean by nonviolence. Rami?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:18:24]

Michael: That's a good question. I think somebody should be able to answer it because there is a – on this one, there's a very clear answer. How do I stop this – the example that I just used – from becoming an excuse for any group that feels that it's under threat – and there are many such – going and arming themselves? You used the example of the Black Panthers, but we could use a thousand groups around the world today. What is the difference? Hold on a second Joy. Let's see if somebody else can. This is good stuff for you to know. Catherine?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:19:40]

Preparation for Violent Response vs Nonviolence

Michael: The key term which you almost used is preparation. The logic here is this. If you have time to prepare violently, then you have time to prepare nonviolently. So, you had a choice. You know, this is not a good or bad thing, but if you have a chance to prepare, then you have a chance to prepare nonviolence. On many different levels, prepare yourself psychologically. Think strategically about how you're going to cope with the potential threats and so forth. As long as you've got a chance to prepare you can prepare nonviolence. But we're talking about a situation which hopefully will never occur. It never occurred to Gandhi, but it's interesting. A situation where there is no time to prepare. You've got to use what's at hand. John?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:20:52]

Michael: Okay. Let's see if I still give you the same answer today.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:20:56]

Michael: Well, when people use the term, "By any means necessary," as they do in the Berkeley group by that name, it usually is a foregone conclusion that the necessary means is a violent one. And my argument all along has been that when you really take a pragmatic look at what the results are, especially if you're willing to look beyond what happens right now to the long-term results. You'll see every single time that nonviolence is much more effective. So, you cannot argue that it's necessary to use a means that doesn't work.

Yeah, in strict logic, if you actually believe that you're going to use any means necessary, you obviously would want to use ones that work as opposed to ones that don't work. And if you know what "work" versus work means you'll choose nonviolence every time. Once again, we're not even invoking moral or ethical considerations. Yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:22:19]

Michael: God gave me these teeth and I'm responsible for preserving them. That kind of thing?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:22:44]

Michael: You know, my experience has been that it's going to be very difficult to make a yes/no decision about these different grades. It just doesn't seem to help a whole lot to understand the situation heuristically. I know that there are cases of people who have – and remember when we were talking about the Civil Rights Movement we said, "What gets a person into a state that they can face a really fearful threat and not even try to defend themselves?" All I want to say is, "We know that this is possible for people to do.

Nehru describes being in a Lahti charge with people who were coming down and beating with these clubs and he said he knew instantly that he could pull a policeman down off the horse because he was a very good polo player. He'd probably seen some John Wayne movies too.

But he said, his exact words are, "Long training and discipline held." And he didn't even lift up a hand to defend himself. And they say that the same was true in that in the salt pans, the Dharasana Salt Pan Raids, that most of those 238 people who were hospitalized, they even overcame what we might call the instinctive reaction to raise their hand to defend themselves. So, I can't answer the question, you know, is it violent if you raise your hand to defend yourselves? It's not exactly how I approach it. I just know that ultimately the human being can reach a state where you don't even do that.

And that state seems to have a kind of protective power. Though if – this is tricky. If I go into it and I say I'm not going to raise a hand to defend myself because I know that vulnerability is a better way to defend myself and I definitely don't want to get hurt. I want to preserve my teeth. That doesn't seem to work as well as saying I'm not going to use physical means no matter what. That seems to be somehow very powerful.

Right away, let's be very clear about this. People get killed. People get hurt doing nonviolence. But they tend to get hurt and killed less often than when they use violence. Here's a quote. "A handgun is often used to," oh no, sorry. That was the wrong quote. This is the quote that illustrates something else. But it's been calculated, if I remember correctly that somewhere between a third and a half of homicides are what are called, "Victim precipitated homicides." The victim pulls out a weapon to defend him or herself and immediately gets blown away. So, I guess I'm saying that it becomes a personal matter and, you know, look at the whole spectrum. It's amazing to realize that people

can overcome even what we think are very, very basic primal instincts that are hardwired into us. And when they do, it has a certain kind of power.

Next semester we'll be looking at a film called, "Where there is hatred." And in it there's a rather long sequence on the people's power uprising in the Philippines. And there's a priest who discusses that movement there toward the end and he said, "We've figured out to turn our vulnerability into a form of power." And that's a very interesting concept. The power of vulnerability.

I think that, rather than saying exactly what you should do in this, and such a case is about the best I can do by way of approaching it. Okay?

Example of Protech - Violence in Marketing

Now a word from our sponsor. Okay. If we can get this to work, what you're going to hear – this is going to be a little bit more difficult than seeing a text in writing, but on the other hand, this is very transparently obvious what's going on here. As you know, this is an ad for a type of device made by a company called, "Protech." There it is. Play. Hmm.

Okay, it looks like I may have to – I may have to act this out after all. This is amazing. It's doing that because it's at the end of the tape, right? Is that why it's making that noise? Try this one more time. Well, I'm flummoxed. Does anybody have a notion why this might – oh, could I have put this in wrong? No. No, that was right. We'll have a terrific time with this next week. I'm going to flip it over one more time. Let me try. We might be getting somewhere. It's working. All you have to do is get anywhere near it.

[Recording]

Male voice: Hello?

Female voice: Hi honey. This is Ruth. Did I wake you?

Male voice: Honey, it's 1:00 AM. I'm at the conference day. What's the – is everything all right?

Female voice: Yes dear. Well, I've been – something's happened.

Male voice: What? What happened?

Female voice: Well, you remember the new Protech alarm system you had installed in the house? Well, about an hour ago it went off.

Male voice: It went off?

Female voice: It woke me up and so I looked out the window and I saw two strange men jump over the fence. I called the police, and they came, and they caught the men, and they took them away.

Male voice: You poor baby. You had quite a night.

Female voice: Well, we're all okay. I just wanted to tell you.

Male voice: What is it, honey?

Female voice: Thank you for having that Protech alarm system installed. It may have saved our lives. [Unintelligible 00:29:44]

Child's voice: Mom, [unintelligible 00:29:45], c'mon mom, please?

Michael: Okay, so before we rush out and buy a Protech device what are some of the underlying assumptions going on here? It's almost too ridiculous. You could not get away with this today anymore. This is obviously – yes?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:30:16]

Michael: That the two men would have killed them? Yeah. To save their lives. That's – Phillip?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:30:22]

Michael: Yes. And as we know very well from experiments and from observation this fortress mentality leads to insecurity, unhappiness, and danger – ironically enough. So, we turn every house into a fortress and they're going to call that, "Security." Let's dig around deeper. What are some of the other assumptions? What are some of the things that made us laugh hardest about all of this, Sid?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:31:02]

Michael: Right. Sexism you could cut with a knife. That was fantastic. Women are hopeless hysterical creatures that stay at home that have to be defended. And now here's where it really starts to get interesting. Men do not have to stay at home to defend their spouses. Their role is not to support the family. The role is to go out and catch antelope or I mean raise money and – think about that. I think really the most pernicious line in the whole four minutes or however long that was – the most pernicious thing is the very end. Remember what she says, breathlessly? "I love you." That you earn love from your partner by purchasing a mechanical substitute for yourself.

And this is ultimately – it has to be the thrust of all advertising that every serious human value is purchasable. And what leads to – we're not quite through with this stupid ad yet, but there was – ah. What this leads to is rather than emphasizing the character and use of a product, American advertising firms highlight its personality and charms stressing illumination instead of lighting fixtures. Prestige instead of automobiles. Sex appeal instead of soap. And so on. In other words, what you have to do is convince a person that they're buying these absolutely un-purchasable human qualities when they buy a particular product. And this is one of the main reasons that the economy that we've got leads to absolute disaster. But we're also going to transition very soon into discussing criminal justice.

So, I wanted to talk about that part of the ideal scenario here. “And the two men were strangers, and I didn’t recognize them. I called the police. The police came and took them away.” What are we supposed to believe about all of that? Yeah, Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:33:42]

Michael: Not only that the State can protect us, but yeah, of course, that’s true. And, you know, you purchase a device that delivers the State, and it can protect you. Julia?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:33:58]

Lack of Reconciliation and Restorative Justice

Michael: Yes. Yes. Right. And the way you protect the good guys is by getting rid of the bad guys. I mean the ad does not go on to say, “And so in the morning dear, I’m going down to the police station to talk to those two men and see what made them do this and maybe have some reconciliation with them.” No. The idea is – remember what we were saying about the – me shooting the assailant situation. If the idea is that the situation is resolved when you’ve captured the person causing the situation, this is an extreme case of hating the person instead of the evil and it’s what has led us into probably if we didn’t have so many other crises that was so severe I would say this is our most serious crisis in this country right now. It’s been called, “A stunning moral crisis,” that we have 2 million people in the criminal justice system, if not actually incarcerated.

And as the system tends to perpetuate itself – I know I’m correspondence with an inmate right now who was eligible for parole about six years ago and he’s absolutely a model prisoner. He should never have actually been convicted in the first place, but he’s been before the parole board around six times, and every time he’s been there they said, “Oh, yeah. You’ve got a terrific case.” And then they did not parole him. And the reason is that you have a prison guard’s union and they – quote from a friend of mine, “They want more prisons and more prisoners in them.” Because it just is, you know, it’s for their own financial benefit to do that. So, we used to have a professor here who was arguing – she was in the geography department, and she was arguing very passionately that never mind the getting rid of the death penalty. Let’s just get rid of the whole prison system and really we would be much better off not arresting anybody. There would actually be less crime in the long run.

This argument is not absurd as it sounds because we know that people who are arrested and put in prison, it gives them the notion deep in their mind that they are criminals and they just spend their time in jail learning how to be more efficient criminals, just learning how to do it better. So, when you really look at the numbers, this argument is not as absurd as it sounds. But it raises for us, I think, a very interesting big picture question.

Renunciation and Constructive Program for Institutional Reformation

Gandhi was very radical in some ways, and he was willing to lay the ax to the root of a lot of deeply invested social institutions that people cared about a lot. But the Gandhi that we meet up with in “Hind Swaraj” in 1909, when he was giving shock therapy to these Indians who were absolutely hypnotized by the glitter of Western civilization. And he was saying, “Scotch the whole thing. No doctors, no lawyers, no railroads, none of that. He did mature later on, and he had an attitude towards institutions which I think we can learn a lot from.

And that is you looked at every institution on its own terms, not ideologically. Now you did not say, for example, all authority is wrong. He said, “There is appropriate use of authority and an inappropriate use.” And you look at every institution and you ask yourself, “Can this institution be reformed? Can it be trimmed down and pruned? Or is it absolutely hopeless and does it have to be chucked out?”

And the reason that this is a very efficient approach is that most institutions that we have, we have for a reason. They’re there to do something. When we get rid of them, what is going to replace them? Well, what’s going to replace them is often going to simply reproduce the problems that the original institution eventually degenerated into. And we’ve seen this over and over again in every large-scale revolution.

So, there was a document that turned out to be a forgery, but it was an interesting forgery, back in the early ’70s called, “The Report from Iron Mountain,” which pretended to be a report of a presidential commission on the uses of the war system. And actually, it was by someone who didn’t like the war system. But what he said was absolutely true. The fact is right now we’re using the war system for several different purposes. One of them is our economy requires about a 15% wastage of our domestic product or it won’t work. Remember, this is one of the reasons I walked out of my one and only economy course years ago. And if we get rid of the war system, how are we going to fulfill these functions?

So, what that says to me is that before you knock a person off their perch, to use that expression, before, you know, support out from under them you want to A, build the next perch for them to get over onto and persuade as many people as possible to switch over to the new system before you dynamite the old system. And then secondly, look very carefully to what you can salvage, if anything, from the old system.

This is the way Gandhi went about things and one of the cases that we probably felt most uncomfortable with – and I’d like to talk about it a little more right now before we get into criminal justice and so forth – is the caste system. First of all, anything we say about the caste system as he wanted it to function in India 50 or so years ago does not apply without changes to our culture. We are completely – we’re on a completely different footing than they were.

But what were the actual uses and benefits of the caste system? There are sort of two. One is nothing that you can ever do will prevent some people from being more aggressive and capable than other people. If you tried to level everybody off you'd probably have to lobotomize everybody at birth and what you would get is some kind of horrible uniformity dehumanization instead of diversity.

When you've got human diversity some people are going to be smarter, more capable, more confident, and more aggressive. So, if you just throw everybody out there in the market and say, "Let's see what you can do," the more aggressive, capable, and so forth people are going to claw their way to the top and pretty soon you're going to have that football field that I showed you a couple of weeks ago.

So, the caste system at least produces a kind of cushion or a hedge against unrestrained competition. And it does that in two ways. It gives people certain functions so that, you know, you might be very aggressive and capable at one thing, but it simply is not your role. You're going to do something else. Hang on just a sec. And over the long haul we have a tradition that's taken thousands or so years to build up as the caste system did, you bring in responsibilities along with privileges. Pop me your question, Amos, and then I'll finish that thought.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:42:48]

Reformation of the Caste System

Michael: I guess we're not quite saying that it's natural for human beings to be aggressive in the negative sense of the word, but rather it is natural for people to have different degrees of capability and different degrees of drive. And if you just had a system where the person with the capability gets the banana or the carrot or whatever is at the end, what's going to happen to the people who have less capability and less drive?

Now you could so reorganize the culture that people wouldn't abuse their capacities and that's what we're calling trusteeship. Yeah, if you could bring in trusteeship in a major way, then you probably wouldn't need the caste system. Julia?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:44:02]

Michael: Yeah. Okay, actually this is what Gandhi had to say about that. "The Varna system," which is, "Varna," means, "Color," and it's the caste system, "is ethical as well as economic." And this was an important feature of his economic system, by the way, that he felt if something was unethical it would be uneconomic. Okay? "It's ethical as well as economic. It recognizes the influence of previous lives and of heredity." Because remember, I was just telling you this isn't going to work in America? You're not going to go to [unintelligible 00:44:42] and tell people, "Well, look who you were in your previous life. That's why you have to be a professor or some other horrible fate."

Next sentence – just a sec – “All are not born with equal powers and similar tendencies. Neither the parents nor the state can measure the intelligence of each child. But there would be no difficulty if each child is prepared for the profession indicated by heredity environment and the influence of former lives. No time would be lost in fruitless experimentation.” You know, you spend three-quarters of your life discovering that you’re terrible at something. And then it’s kind of too late to go back and start something else. “There would be no soul-killing competition.” And hang on a second. Yeah.

“That there are four varnas,” or castes, “all equal in status and they are determined by birth.” Hold on. Hold on Julia. “They can be changed by a person choosing another profession.” Okay? They can be changed by a person choosing another profession. “But if varnas are not as a rule determined by birth, they tend to lose all meaning.” Okay? So, his idea was that originally the caste system did not lock you into your parent’s profession.

And he also had a very clever way out of this which was that no matter what caste you’re born into, you can do whatever you want, but don’t try to make a living at it unless it’s your caste. So, this allowed for people to experiment around stuff. Let’s say, you know, I really wanted to be, let’s say a writer. Let’s take me, for example. I know, it’s a very interesting example. At one time I was dead sure that I wanted to write plays. I mean really serious. Something between Eugene O’Neal and Shakespeare.

And I experimented around with it. I was a classic example of experimenting around only to discover that A, I wasn’t very good at it. And B, I didn’t really care about it. Or maybe I decided not to care about it when I discovered I wasn’t very good at it. Whatever it was. I stopped telling people that I was going to write plays and set about preparing myself for this highly lucrative profession that you see me in right now.

But the point is, under Gandhi’s scheme, if I really had an urge to do that, I could do that. But I should earn my living at something – most of the time I should earn my living at something within my varna. Shannon?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:47:37]

Michael: See, there is a belief behind this. If you notice, he talks about rebirth and stuff. There’s a belief that you – that Giva, the person about to be born, kind of like matches up his or her – maybe it’s not determined yet, his/her needs. Sanskara’s capacities with a given set of parents to whom that match will make sense. So, it’s not likely that you’ll be born into a family of warriors, and you really turn out to be Shannon McGuire and that’s the wrong place for you. So, there is some belief there that it’s not entirely – it’s not a great danger that that’s going to happen.

I’m saying we may not believe that and that’s okay. It’s just the general principles that I want to get at here and not the particulars for us.

Viśa Vaidya - Doctor of Poisons

And the general principle that I'm getting at to remind ourselves is what to do with institutions that aren't working? Of which we have gillions.

But let me just finish my thought about the difference between a traditional caste that's matured over thousands of years and just like a profession or a job or something like that where, you know, I was born into a Mafioso family so obviously I should be Joe Soprano or something. There is a caste – not quite a caste, but a sub-caste. A profession in Indian villages which are called, "Vaisya," sorry. "Viśa vaisya." Viśa means, "Poison." And – sorry. Sorry. I can't think straight when I'm in front of a blackboard. Viśa vaidya. Vaidya is from the word vidya which means knowledge. And vaidya as our word doctor means a learned person, but it also means a doctor.

So Viśa vaidya is a doctor of poisons. A poison doctor. What that means is, you know, we have to realize that it's not true in North America except certain parts of Texas and Oklahoma where they have sidewinders. But we are not infested with serpents in this continent. Not as well off as Ireland which doesn't have any snakes at all. But in India, serpents, that is poisonous snakes, are a real problem. You're coming home, crossing a field, and bang something hits you in the ankle. You say, "Gee, what was that?" And you get home about ten minutes later, it's kind of swollen up and its red.

Then you start feeling woozy and you've been bitten by a cobra, and you got like 15 minutes or something like that to live. These things are very, very serious. And so, what are you going to do? Well, every village has a Viśa vaidya, a person who has this huge garden with hundreds of herbs and he takes one look at you, and he says, "I know just what that was. That was a *Krishna-sarpa*." It's the Sanskrit term for a cobra. Literally means a black creepy crawly. "And this is what you need." You know, he goes and plucks this weed and prepares it and gives it to you. Now just imagine in that moment if the person were to stop and say, "What kind of health insurance do you have?" Or, "You know those two cows that you've got that I've admired for such a long time." You see what I'm driving at.

You have the power to ruin a person. You have the power of life and death and the power to exploit to the end in this situation. So, it happens to be the case that these Viśa vaidya's have a – what shall we call it? A value a norm – I'm forgetting the exact term here. They simply never charge money. They never charge any fees whatsoever. So, the whole system, you see, has to come into balance where the village takes care of them, and they take care of these people when they've been bitten.

Now just imagine if I were to like, you know, take some kind of pharmacology course and learn something about snake poisons and set up shop in some little village in Kerala, but I haven't got this value that I've inherited from my parents that I'm not going to ever earn money. And the village isn't taking care of me. So, I would be in that dangerous situation. So, if you just wipe out the whole institution and then let the most aggressive people come into it who want to make a killing at it, you'll end up much worse off than you began.

So, I'm spending a fair amount of time on this point because it's not one that comes naturally to us. We see an institution that's absolutely rotten and we say to ourselves, "Let's ditch it." And this has happened over and over again – only to realize that the substitute has to come in because it did have a legitimate function. And the substitute will be less efficient than the original. Yeah. Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:53:33]

Economic Equality and Medicine

Michael: Well, there is a problem with that logic. But remember, as I said, I wouldn't even suggest that we start applying this in our culture. We just don't have the infrastructure for it. And I'm not even arguing that the way that he did it in India was exactly correct. What he held out for was if the varna system is a spiritual arrangement there cannot be any place in it for high and low. And he went on to say, "There are four varnas, all equal in status." Okay, maybe it would be impossible to reach that if you had varnas at all. They would never equalize out into – that also may be possible.

But what I want to emphasize is that the simplistic reaction that we tend to have is, "Okay, unplug this system." In the long run it does not work very well because then you get the football field where you have Bill Gates at one end and you and me at the other end and down we go. Julia?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:55:15]

Michael: Yeah. Well, they could be. We're pushing it in the other direction. I've just been reading an article about super-rich people and about among doctors which used to be considered a very well-off profession, some doctors are waking up and realizing that they can go into stock trading or medical legal stuff and they're getting super-rich where other doctors are just staying doctors. And there's no way that you can do that from a shoemaker position.

But if you brought in a certain dose of trusteeship, then I could easily imagine where doctors would feel very good about getting, you know, a comfortable compensation and no more. And like Viśa vaidya's, and not exploiting their leverage to get inordinate amounts of money out of you. There is, incidentally, a social thinking by the name of Ivan Illich who passed away a few years ago who wrote a book called, "Medical Nemesis." Sorry about that name. I know that there is a novelette by Tolstoy with exactly that same title, "The Death of Ivan Illich." And I don't what his parents were thinking of when they actually named him that, but that's another question.

But he started seeing, even before he went into this medical insurance legal thing, that the way we were using the medical profession, namely, using it as a milk cow as a source of income rather than as a way of preserving health was rapidly becoming a disaster. And his predictions, they were – were pretty right on.

So, it doesn't seem to me inconceivable that you could have a world in which people would be doctors and maybe even hereditary doctors and other people would be shoemakers. And they would be equal and dignity and roughly equal in compensation. It doesn't seem that could never be achieved. But anyway, I'm not arguing for it quite yet. Rami?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:57:41]

Uplifting the Destitute

Michael: His focus was definitely on the untouchables and on the destitute. And, you know, it's been pointed out that the Christian Bible refers to poverty as something a little bit more than 2000 times. And it refers to homosexuality 12 times. And you had this group that said it's all about gay marriages and nothing about – the head of the Christian Coalition had to quit because he couldn't get the coalition to even focus on poverty.

Now, so you made two points. One is that, yes, when you get to that bottom tier of needs, food, clothing, and shelter, the whole system is more or less responsible for making sure that everybody has enough of those. But the other point that you made which is difficult for us to wrap our minds around is, that a person's dignity does not come from their profession. We find it very difficult to have respect for a garbage collector because it's associated with refuse in our minds.

The person gets associated with the refuse which is ridiculous. Which is why Gandhi spent most of his time cleaning latrines. To show you that, you know, the person – that this is an honorable profession. If he could get dignity into that profession, you could get it anywhere. Yeah?

Student: [unintelligible 00:59:52]

Michael: Oh yeah. It wasn't easy. But at least there was some – there was a little bit of a cultural memory there that could be pulled into play. Yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:00:09]

Michael: Well, as a matter of fact, there are hundreds of experiments. Now probably thousands of experiments going on. That's why I brought in the latest issue of "Yes!" magazine to show you where people are trying to do exactly that. They're trying to uncouple their wage-earning from their spiritual development, their human relationships, and all of those other things. Just my general overview perspective on all of this is that every one of these experiments, you know, like local economies. And there are many communities in the U.S.A right now which are not using the federal currency. And that turns out to be completely legal.

I can go to the department's Xerox machine and print off scripts, you know, and trade it in for stuff and that turns out to be fine. There's barter economies and local agriculture

growing up under the radar of these huge agribusiness things. My overview of them is that they're not aware of how important they are and what precisely, what role they're playing in the overall revolution.

Let me read you a comment. I mean why should we talk about what I was planning to talk about, right? We were going to talk about third-party nonviolent intervention and criminal justice, and it doesn't look like we're quite going to get there.

Domination vs Cooperation

But this is from a book by David Korten who's connected with the Positive Futures Network that brings out the "Yes!" magazine. The book is called, "The Great Turning."

And here's one paragraph that's relevant for us. "Although the leadership styles of earth communities," he says there are two tendencies going on in the world. One is empire, which is the domination system. And the other is earth community which is the cooperation system. "Although the leadership styles of earth community may seem chaotic and diffuse to those accustomed to the dominator styles of empire," where you have, you know, the CEO and all the other stuff, all the way down to the janitor.

"They fit the pattern by which all healthy living systems self-organize." You know you cannot go into a human body – and I know, I've spent a year in medical school looking into this. You cannot go into the human body and say, "Ah, here is the chief cell. All the other cells have to obey this cell." It just doesn't organize that way. "They fit the pattern by which all healthy living systems self-organize. This pattern of self-organizing distributed power gives contemporary social movements their distinctive vitality and makes them nearly impossible to suppress.

So, to appreciate what's being done by way of building an alternative economy, we'd have to get a new set of lenses and learn how to look at these different experiments and then somebody would have to look at the whole picture and pull it into focus and do some strategic thinking with it.

Okay, we have been a bit of all over the map. Would it be alright if I talk about the criminal justice system for just a bit? Let's do, quickly, kind of a quiz by way of getting into it. Let's see if we can think of an institution in each of these three categories, an institution that we've got in our world today. And it might not be very easy, but have we got an institution which is A, okay and it doesn't need much reform? Maybe a little technical tweaking and something like that. B, have we got institutions that need serious overhaul because they've become abusive. In other words, they need to be reformed. And C, are there any institutions that are hopeless and need to be totally gotten rid of. What would be your candidates for anyone those in no particular order? Julia?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:05:09]

Differences of Institutional Reform

Michael: Yeah. Well, the death penalty, that's a little bit smaller than what I was thinking of as an institution. That's a practice within the criminal justice system. Anybody else have any candidates? These are helpful. Librarians of the world will appreciate you. Camilla?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:05:48]

Michael: I would almost put the media in the third one. That's interesting. I've had this argument with people like Norman Cousins and can it be redeemed? Theoretically, I think it could. You could have media that would be all like Sesame Street and it showed nothing but movies like, "A Force More Powerful," and things like that. But I'm one of those who thinks that the very fact of its artificiality and virtual-ness makes it so prone to exploitation that we might have to get rid of it. At least let's put it this way. If we threaten to get totally rid of it, we might give it enough of a shock therapy that we could reform it enough that it would be worth keeping. Jolina?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:06:38]

Michael: Yeah. Well, most people feel that the U.N. needs some serious reforming and they'll, you know, they'll lay that out pretty specifically. It was set up by conquering triumphant nations in 1945 who locked their own power in with this veto system. You're probably aware of this, but there's a movement to reform the U.N. and one of the things that they want to do is, let's take advantage of the fact that the nation-state system is losing legitimacy and let's reorganize it by putting in one representative for every million people.

And even Johan Galtung who is the first to admit that there'll be 4 Norwegians and there'll be 300 Americans. That won't be much fun. He still thinks that a better system. Represent people rather than representing nation-states. But that's an interesting idea. I mean I would have thought maybe something like motherhood, an institution that we don't have to reform. Julia?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:07:57]

Michael: I think it's just basically got to go. I mean you could argue that they make very good firefighters. But by the time you finished changing their entire training and all of their equipment and the funding structure, it would just be a different institution. Yeah. Yeah, Jolina?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:08:21]

Michael: Yeah. That, I would be happy to see the plug pulled out of that and just see it float off. Yeah. Well, okay. I think the point has been made that when we look at an institution we should first decide how bad is it and what kind of rot does it have.

Examples of Reforming the Criminal Justice System

And let me share with you briefly what people have been thinking about the criminal justice system. And from the nonviolent point of view the conclusion is that it needs deep reform in the sense that the very energy that has brought that system into existence was the wrong kind of energy.

And because you're intimately familiar with my book, you already know this – he smiled coyly. But our whole system is what's now called, "Retributive justice." And that's just a clear case of negative energy. And we know that Gandhi felt that in his ashram – I mean parent and child relationships is a little bit different, but in his ashram he felt that punishment was not appropriate. That you needed some other kind of sanction other than punishing a person who had misbehaved. Mind you, he's not saying there's no such thing as misbehavior. And he's not saying that one person is not responsible to do something about another person's misbehavior. This isn't like an anarchic system where anybody can do whatever they want. That simply does not work.

But you need it to find a moral equivalent of punishment. And do you remember what it was that he found?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:10:18]

Michael: Yeah. In other words, you take the suffering on yourself. And I don't know if I shared with you that story that Arun Gandhi tells of going driving the 60 miles from Tolstoy Farm where he lived with his father, who was Gandhi's son, to Johannesburg one day. To make a long story short – which is not a very Indian thing to do – he forgot to pick up his father at 5 o'clock and he was really, really scared.

When he finally went to get him an hour and a half late, he said, "The car wasn't ready," which wasn't true. And his father had already called the garage, so he knew the car was ready. So, Arun thought he was in for it. And in a way, what happened to him, which is worse than getting smacked around a little bit. His father said, "I don't know where we went wrong as your parents that you felt you had to lie to us, but obviously, the fault is mine. So, I am going to walk home." It was 16 miles, incidentally, not 60. And he walked 16 miles with Arun driving 3 miles an hour behind him. So, this is a fairly extreme example. I'm not saying that I necessarily recommend it.

What I'm saying is what we now are trying to promote is restorative justice where you look upon the offender not as a criminal who has to be punished, but as someone who has come somehow out of the social milieu and has to be brought back in. They have to be restored. And there are many experimental ways of doing this. And even the legal profession is starting to find out that they're more efficient than locking people away in warehouses where they become more and more criminalized.

Like I have another inmate friend who's been writing to me, and he's so fed up with violence. He just wants to get out of it, but he never will. He's going to die in there. And

he says, “I fall asleep at night with dudes talking about violence and I wake up in the morning surrounded by dudes talking about violence. And it just does nobody any good at all to do this to people.”

So, in restorative justice what we try to do is, first of all, we do not start with the assumption that the person is unredeemable. That’s never done. And second of all, we do not accept the assumption that the state or the society owns the crime, whatever it was. But rather, this is a matter between the offender and the victim. And so, one of programs for example that does this is, is called, “VORP,” which is short for Victim Offender Reconciliation Program. And what they do is, as it might – as you might think, they bring the victim and the offender together to talk about some form of restitution among themselves. With the state being there only as a facilitator and a mediator.

And then there are other experiences that go even further than this. And many times, we’re finding that this is the way Indigenous societies have survived for a long, long time. I’ve heard – and I haven’t been able to track this down. Maybe you can help me with this one. That there is a system in some Sub-Saharan communities such that if a person has offended in some way, the person is made to sit down and the entire community sits around that person in a circle, and they go around the circle, and everybody has to – has to do what? Everybody has to say something good about that person. Isn’t that amazing?

It’s the last thing you would have thought of. Obviously, you want to throw rotten eggs at them or something like that. Show them that they were bad. Well, of course, the problem is, if you show them that they were bad, it tends to reinforce their badness and they get worse. So how well does this thing work? Well, as far as I’ve been able to hear, usually you only have to go around – halfway around the circle and the person typically breaks down and weeps. And then they talk about what he – it’s usually a he – what he should give back in order to make amends.

And there are versions of this that are practiced in New Zealand, which is not a nonviolent society by any means. I’m talking about indigenous New Zealand societies – and many other parts of the world. So gosh, I wish we had a little bit more time to get into this, but there are experiments in industrial societies. They have got nowhere near completely revamping the system. Unfortunately, when you talk about looking at the big – at the system that’s in place, what you find is what just happened here in California – and I’ll close with this.

You had this young woman who was a warden in San Quentin. She was a remarkable human being. She tried to know every single prisoner personally. She would talk to them and say, “How are we going to get you out of there? How’s your kid doing?” Things like this. What the prisoners said about her was fantastic, “I’ve been in every house in this state, and I’ve never met anyone like Joanna.” Well, our governor, for all you might say about him and his funny background, he spotted this woman and made her the Head of Corrections in California. That’s the good part of the story.

The bad part of the story is she resigned about two months later because she absolutely could not get anywhere. So, we're faced with this dilemma where the big systems that are in place are practically impenetrable. And I think it's mainly a question of building the other stool, showing them that another system can work and then we'll get enough of a shift to happen.

Okay, I feel, on the one hand very happy. On the other hand, very frustrated. There's a lot of stuff we didn't get to talk about, but I'm going to turn it over to you next week and just do review and if there's time to do some new stuff, I will. Thanks.

26. Aspects of Nonviolence Since Gandhi and King

Michael: ...class and you were thinking of taking 164B, just sign up. The papers, places, what you're mainly concerned with now. Just on the technical side, if I could ask for a couple of things and make them a little bit more legible. Probably the most important one is to be sure to put in page numbers. I know at the last minute you're frantically taking care of it and it's the last thing that you want to be thinking about, but if you don't put in page numbers, it makes things more difficult for us in various ways.

And it makes them readable if you don't fully justify them. You know what I mean? Just left justify them and drag it right. Those three little icons at the top of the horrible Microsoft Word are up there. Do the left hand one. It just makes them a little bit easier to read. And we have to read a lot of them, so that would be – as far as references are concerned, you should know what to reference and how. Explicit – attributing the fact that you've gotten somewhere, and you can say, obviously, direct change or historical facts that you've gotten from some source, they need to be referenced and they need a consistent rational way of referencing them as well.

By rational I mean let's suppose you use the same book 35 times, you don't have to say each time, "[Search for a Nonviolent Future](#)," by Michael Nagler. Naropa Publishing. 2002, etc. Nagler op cit or something like that. If it has Latin and it's bound to be rational.

And more on the content side, what we've been seeing, and people have bringing us paragraphs and stuff to look at. So far, the tendency to have a lot of unsupported belief statements like just generalizations about nonviolence. Most of which you know perfectly well I'm going to agree with. But remember, we're not – you're not writing this paper for me. The exercise is for you and you're writing it for an intelligent skeptical – let's say I hope you won't find this to be stereotypical, but I often say, "Think of a friend of yours who is an engineering student or a chem. major or something like that." Not used to thinking about how you think through social, political, and [unintelligible 00:02:51].

Student: Does that mean if we're talking about another movement or comparing it to Gandhi's movement or something, that we have to really go into explicit detail about the nonviolence, since that's what we're talking about? [Unintelligible 00:03:06]

Michael: Yeah. I think you can – as far as giving us historical background is concerned, I think you don't have to do too much that would just take up a lot of our time and your point is not to put a lot of historical facts into the paper, but to analyze the things, use them to back up your hypothesis and answer your questions. So, I think you can assume that we know roughly speaking who the Khudai Khidmatgars were. If it's a movement that we haven't discussed in class, then [unintelligible 00:03:41].

So, it will be a little bit inconsistent. As far as the rhetoric is concerned, you're going to write for a non-PACS major. But as far as using historical documentation is concerned, there's no need to rehash things that were already [unintelligible 00:03:59]. I hope that that will make sense.

Student: Are the readers going to have [unintelligible 00:04:07]?

Michael: Well, let's ask them?

Student: I had them yesterday. [Unintelligible 00:04:18]

Student: [Unintelligible 00:04:27]

Michael: This is something – go ahead.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:04:42]

Michael: Okay. But this Web resource that I put up here, [Gandhiserve.org] I am surprised that I have not mentioned it to you before. I may have just mentioned it in passing. There are several ways that you can get access to – notice, I do put access [unintelligible 00:05:02]. There are several ways that you can get access to the “Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi” which is put online. And probably the easiest way is www.gandhiserve.org where if you have the right version of Adobe you should be able to search.

So, like for example, someone was talking to me this morning about heart unity, and you want to know more about what Gandhi said about it. If you just go to that Website, go to “The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi,” and maybe spend one or two cents. And then if you've got the right search technique you just put in, “Heart unity,” and you'll get a complete spill out of all the place where Gandhi used that phrase.

In case of heart unity, you'll probably have too much to deal with. If you have a direct quote from Gandhi, you know enough of the language and you find it on Gandhiserve, then you can use that as your reference. Yeah?

Student: Are we going to be able to get our papers back?

Michael: You'll be able to get them back, the question is when. I think if you get them – the papers that are in on time, which is Thursday, and I hope that will be most of them if not all, I think we should be able to get most of them back by the early final and certainly, if not then, by the – by the formal official final which is [unintelligible 00:06:46]. Julia?

Student: How many IDs are going to be on the final?

Michael: How many ID's? We haven't totally decided yet. Probably a little bit more than was on the midterm. Not a whole lot more. I hope that's not carpal tunnel.

Student: It is.

Michael: Not a good time for that to happen. Okay. So, no other immediate technical questions. Here's our practice passage for today. On Thursday I'll bring you the longer one. I thought I would just bring the snappy one. So famous quote ["You will get more with a kind word and a gun than with a kind word alone." Al Capone (1920), Donald Rumsfeld (2011)] it's originally attributed to Al Capone. You all know who Al Capone is? Yeah. And it was shadowed by Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld. And I've actually noticed that the present administration tends to imitate the rhetoric and the statements of notorious criminals.

I thought we'd make a study of this, but I have better things to do. But it's an interesting observation. I don't want to comment on that part of it. But there is the quotation. I suppose you got that in Roman Numeral II. Actually, what you'll get is a little bit longer, but just to give you one to work on. But suppose you had that quotation and I just said something like, "What do you want to say about this comment? Analyze, take apart."
[Unintelligible 00:08:26]

Student: I'd say something about what kind of power he's assuming that he's going to be using. Just that power instead of either exchange or integrative power.

Michael: Yes. So, tell us exactly – go ahead Mia, they're not actually filming. Stand tall. Tell us exactly what part is threat power and power is another kind of power?

Student: So, you will get a lot more of the kind [unintelligible 00:09:00] because you assume that you can force your – enforce yourself with some kind of a threat.
[Unintelligible 00:09:10] It's just the kind where [unintelligible 00:09:13] integrative power or exchange power even, but more towards even –

Michael: I think more integrative power. Okay. So that's a very good start. And as a matter of fact, it's interesting – I hadn't thought of that. So, let's say that a kind word is an example of integrative power – just give a quickie definition of what that is. A gun is a classic example of a threat power. Snappy example of what that was, dropping the work Kenneth Boulding so that everybody knows that you're totally up to speed. And what else would we want to say about this?

Student: You're looking at coercion and a powerful tool [unintelligible 00:09:56].

Michael: That's the gun part, the threat power part. Right. Coercion versus – versus what? Coercion versus what? Persuasion. Right. That's important. Alana?

Student: You will get a lot more sort of implies the economy of scarcity.

Michael: Good. If you start with the assumption that you want to get and you get more, you will find it very difficult to exit from the violent paradigm – essentially break. So, there's one other quite important thing to get out of this. Julia?

Student: It would almost because like glamorizing or stylizing violence and so looking at it for what it is.

Michael: Well, I think these are different versions of what we've said already. And they're all true. That this a person that clearly believes – there's one seat right here – this is a person who clearly believes – and I mean I'd have to say this is a very cynical remark by a very cynical hardheaded person. This is like a John Bolton or somebody like that. This person is saying that integrative power by itself doesn't work. And a couple of years ago we had an Air Force officer come and talk to this class and he said, "Yeah, I'm glad you people want to go out and do that stuff. But when you're facing a difficult opponent, would you please do me a favor? Have a rifle squad behind you when you're going and doing these demonstrations."

And I turned to the students and said, "Okay, who wants to start?" And somebody told him – it was Air Force actually – said, "No we believe nonviolence is its own kind of power." And then he added something else which is what I'm really fishing for. There's one other thing we haven't said about this [unintelligible 00:11:59].

Student: I don't know if it's what you're looking for, but this definitely an example of strategic nonviolence versus the more principled nonviolence.

Michael: Yes. That's true. Although it's not what I was getting at. Yeah?

Student: Sort of the idea of nonviolence plus violence is violence.

Michael: Yes. We haven't spoken about it very much, but I did mention Nagler's Law, the rather ridiculous formulation. $V + NV = V$. So, this is a clear violation of Nagler's Law. And of course, the tragedy is that if a person went out and said, you know, "Look, I like you, but I need your wallet." And if it led to some kind of bad result, the person would then say, "See, nonviolence doesn't work." In order to really see nonviolence, work it has to be merged with a background [unintelligible 00:12:56]. Okay?

So, I was going to just briefly – yeah, John?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:13:05]

Michael: Yes, thank you.

Student: 122 Wheeler from 9:00 to 12:00.

Michael: Yeah. 9:00 AM to noon on Monday in 122 Wheeler. Great. I think that's where we have our meditation class. That's terrific. That means we'll have all those vibes left over. [Unintelligible 00:13:31] That's great. In fact, we'll probably going to have to take five points off your grade because it wouldn't be fair to the other people taking the final in a non-meditation classroom. They wouldn't have that lift. I was just kidding. [Laughter]

Student: [Unintelligible 00:13:52]

Michael: Yeah. The other final will be as it was always scheduled to be.

Student: One more question about the final. If we said that we want to take the final early, but then we find we don't have time to study, can we just go ahead and take it on Friday?

Michael: Yeah. It doesn't matter. We're not going to – it's just if nobody shows up we'll be very sad. We really need this kind of timing to get your grades in on time.

Student: Cool.

The Nonviolent Worldview in Three Parts

Michael: Okay. So, if we – what I'd like us to think about is the nonviolent worldview and breaking it down into parts. And the first part that I want to talk about is vision. How when you've got principled nonviolence – you know, like I got religion. When you got it, how you see the world or what you happened to have seen about the world in order to move into [unintelligible 00:15:01].

And I see this is as very much a spectrum ranging from some kind of connectedness [Writes, "Connectedness" next to "Vision" under "The NV Worldview"] all the way to unity. In other words, you can have a premonition or some decision or some kind of hint that things are more interconnected than they look. Such that if you are unkind to somebody, that unkindness is going to have repercussions elsewhere. And it might eventually work its way around to you. But that can intensify all the way up to this great mystical vision that everything is one.

You know, the famous Quaker mystic, John Woolman on his deathbed - he had written [unintelligible 00:16:05]. He said, "I see the entire humanity as one yellow mass of suffering." The important thing, he saw us all as one. As one unit. And this contrasts with the way a not nonviolent person sees the world. You hardly want to call it a vision, but if you accept the material reality and the appearance of the world, the phenomenal world as it appears to us, where we all look separate, then you're going to have a hard time really grasping and using nonviolence effectively. Okay, so that's so much for the vision.

Then another characteristic difference is the way you frame relationships. [Writes, "Frame" under "Vision"] And as somebody just said, if you have this kind of frame, "to get more," is your purpose than you are living in what Ivan Illich called, "A paradigm of scarcity." And you're going to tend to try to build an economy of wants and acquisition in that kind of paradigm. But a nonviolence person does not frame relationships competitively and doesn't tend to not think of the world as a competition for scarce resources. And most importantly, when it comes to conflict as we saw in my other model last week, you frame this learning experiences and most importantly, as win/win opportunities. [Writes, "Learning" and "win/win" next to "Frame"]

In fact, one way to define nonviolence as a kind of energy and force, if I can borrow a term from [unintelligible 00:18:00]. "Nonviolence is a kind of a positive energy which can

act to heal brokenness.” Brokenness is a term that theologians have come up with. It’s very handy, which describes – I guess we can also call it alienation in the sense that you’re cut off from one another. In the famous words of Woody Allen, “We are at two with nature. We are at two with one another. And wherever we see difference, that can tend to be a cleavage plane and we can get into radical separateness and think that in order for me to be happy you have to be unhappy.

And eventually we can go all the way and say that my happiness consists of your unhappiness and then it’s finished. [Unintelligible 00:18:48] But we frame conflicts and relationships. We tend to look at ways of reintegrating. And so therefore our goal – I’m on the wrong page here. Yeah. Before we get to – well, we better mosey in just as well. Try this language. Just fit in that category there. “Our goals for the outcome of conflict include,” sorry. [Writes “Goals” under “Vision”]

This is just sort of a thought experiment that we’re doing to possibly end up on the Metta Center’s Web site. “Our goals for the outcome of a conflict include but are not limited to the eradication of an injustice that caused it. Reconciliation with the opponent becomes, if anything, more important because we are more aware of long-term growth and not obsessively concerned with short-term success.”

And then the next category that’s useful to think of – so I’m going to put down here, in fact, [unintelligible 00:20:23]. [Writes, “Reconciliation” next to “Goals”] including, but not limiting to the rectification of injustices which separate us. And finally, something to think about is beliefs. If you have a principled nonviolent worldview, what would you tend – what kinds of things would you tend to believe about the world? And for this one, let me throw it over to you so that we can come up with together and wrap it up and I’ll just open it wide for any questions you may have, ID’s or anything.

But first, what do you think, if like a Gandhi or a King or somebody who has gone along with them – Shannon, what do you think?

Student: I was just going to say I think a fundamental part of all this is that he believed he was capable of being peaceful, nonviolent and open.

Michael: Very, very true. And that, of course would mean that the present criminal justice system is utterly misconceived. Everybody is, in theory, capable of being awakened. Let’s put it that way. So therefore, since it’s possible to awaken a person, then it becomes obligatory to do it. You can only warehouse a person and say, “You’re a dead loss. We can’t do anything with you,” if you do not believe in the – I’m going to use the word, “Redeem,” but I don’t necessarily mean in the technical religious sense.

Student: I was going to say something along – you have to believe that everything and everyone is one. Because you’re all connected and even though we’re a little different, we have heart unity, I guess.

Michael: Yeah. I was kind of putting that under “Vision,” but you could also put it under belief. If you don’t a vision of it, you can at least operate on it as a hypothesis or a belief. John?

Student: I was thinking with unity, [unintelligible 00:22:29].

Michael: Very, very important. We can’t – a negative way of putting it is that we cannot be fulfilled by material possessions that we acquire. But the positive part is, if anything, more important that we can be fulfilled by things that are not scarce. So that, [unintelligible 00:22:50] said, “Human needs comes [unintelligible 00:22:53].” Meaning, “Respect.” Very others. What else? I’m not going to say, “What else do you have to believe?” Because you can practice nonviolence and not believe anything.

But it will help and in the success of your nonviolence will lead to your belief and experience. Yeah?

Student: Maybe that the current paradigm that we live in is just completely [unintelligible 00:23:22]

Michael: Whatever four letter word you want to use for it, yes. It’s a junk paradigm. There’s no question about it. Usually – I mean in the 70’s when we first started talking about this, we called it, “The prevailing paradigm, the dominant paradigm.” It’s totally non-sustainable based on falsehoods. And don’t get us started or we’ll lose our nonviolence thinking about it. It’s pretty much a disaster.

I was asked to give a lecture to some Dutch businesspeople last year about out of the box thinking. I started by describing the box a little bit, the dominant paradigm. The box has become a coffin. We really have to break of it. Or another very good image is from Einstein, “A human being is a part of the whole, called by us, “The Universe.” Apart, limited, in time and space. This limitation is a kind of optical illusion which acts as a prison.” So, break out of that prison and separateness becomes [unintelligible 00:24:31]. Very much a belief statement for nonviolence.

Integration vs Reductionism

Yeah, a couple other things we can add to this. Joy?

Student: I think that to not have a reductionist philosophy [unintelligible 00:24:42]. Announce it so how things are.

Michael: Right. Could you turn that into a positive statement? If we don’t have a reductionist philosophy, what kind of philosophy

Student: [Unintelligible 00:25:01]

Michael: Well, I would say that the opposite of a reductionist view is – the term reductionism which I use a lot, sort of has two components, I think. One is the belief that

if you break things down to very small pieces you will understand them. And that belief was kind of ended with quantum theory because we got down to the smallest possible pieces and we realized we couldn't possibly understand it.

So non-reductionist view is an integrated view that tries to see things whole. But reductionism is also used to mean if you limit people to the lowest possible motive and you like – if you're an advertiser and you have appeal to the lowest common denominator, so you get the most amount of people spending the most amount of money. That's reductionist.

So, in that sense, the opposite of reductionism is going to be what? It would be some exalted vision of what human beings are capable of. I see you Alana. I'll get to you in a second.

Vision - Framework - Beliefs

There's a wonderful film made by the BBC – interestingly enough, Gandhi's enemies during the struggle – made a film called, "Gandhi's India," which describes the failure of the Nehru economic policies which were the exact opposite of Gandhi's policies. Gandhi wanted decentralization, village industry, simplicity and all the rest of it. Nehru immediately went to five-year central planning kind of plan – an unhappy blend of communism and capitalism.

Anyway, in this film there is a woman who's teaching in a Gandhian school, her name is [Asha Davia Raniyani 00:26:49]. In fact, that'll be on the final. You have to spell it correctly. And she is asked by the interview, "Well, don't you think that Gandhi was unrealistic that he didn't really take into account the limit of human potential?" And she just kind of exploded in this wreath of smiles and fingers dancing all over the place. She said, "There are no limits to human potential."

That tends to be a way that nonviolent folks look at the world, that what you see is not what you get. Yeah, what you see is not what you get. You can get a lot more than what you see. Okay. Alana and then Alex.

Student: I was just wondering, if you can – it's possible to define what you mean when you say, "Vision for your beliefs." Like the differences, [unintelligible 00:27:46].

Michael: You know, I didn't quite get that. Try that again?

Student: I mean I get goals, but visions or even beliefs to me, like what I think they mean all sort of blends together.

Michael: Oh, okay. The vision is the whole – the big picture. The enchilada. The frame is how are we going to construe a certain type of interaction given that big vision. So, the frame is, "How shall we frame this conflict?" Is it to overcome the other person or is it a conversation to awaken them and learn something in the process? A good example of framing, [unintelligible 00:28:27] is very good at these things to remind me of that.

Taxes. Think about the term, “Tax relief.” Relief implies that taxing – that paying taxes is a burden and you could use easily feel that [unintelligible 00:28:45]. But suppose you think of taxes as dues that you pay to belong to an entity, a polity in this case. Then it’s not a burden. So, the words that you use are linked to metaphors which tend to put things in the brain. And those frames – you’re right, they’re a little bit like a vision, but they’re a lot smaller. And your goals are, given this framework, what are you trying to achieve?

If you frame taxes as a burden, you’re going to try and not pay them. If you frame them as dues, why then, you might end up being Swedish. They pay the most taxes in the world and have the highest human happiness index by any measure than anyone. Okay, having mentioned [unintelligible 00:29:34].

Student: I was just going to add to beliefs. I’m not sure that it’s unnecessary. [Unintelligible 00:29:39] having like a belief kind of positive force in the world, whether it be religion or just in community?

Michael: Yeah. Let’s just say a positive force in the world. Almost all the nonviolent actors have said, “The universe bends towards justice.” Or they’ve put it into some language that makes sense to them. And I would say it is, in fact almost essential to believe that because otherwise what, if you have renounced threat power, what kind of power is going to be working? Yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:30:15]

Conflicts in the Realm of Perception

Michael: Yes. That’s one of my favorites. That all conflicts are in the realm of perception. And therefore, awakening to a more accurate perception will make the [unintelligible 00:30:32] easier. And the most poignant example of that that we’ve used so far this semester is the conflict which is sometimes called, “The clash of civilizations.” Talk about a frame – framing our desire for Iraqi oil as the type of thing as the struggle between good and evil. But anyway, Johan Galtung, after much investigation of what people on both sides of that divide really want, came up with the idea that what people in the West want is access to rapidly diminishing oil reserves. And what people in the Muslim world want is respect for their religion.

So, when you understood that – and I suppose you can call this a kind of framing – but when you’ve understood that the conflict disappears. All you have to do is show them some respect. And the only thing that’s preventing you from doing that is egotism. When you have a president who says, “I don’t care what the facts are. I will never apologize for the American people.” Then you’re not going to be able to get out of any conflict.

Once you say, “Gee, we might have made a mistake.” And, “Gee, you probably have a point of view. Can I hear what it is?” Then you will rapidly find that there’s no such thing as – how do we say it in [unintelligible 00:31:56], an irreducible conflict, an ultimate

conflict. There's differences, but none of them has to become a me versus you difference. Okay, that was the belief that I had in my mind.

I guess we might add something which has already been implied and that is that positive energy will have positive results. Negative energy will have negative results. This is part of Alex's belief, that there's a positive force in the world. That's really about all I can think of is basic beliefs. Anyway, that's a lot that we're pretty much catching there.

Okay, so my contribution to PACS164A for Fall 2007 now comes to an end. And it's your ballgame. What questions do you have? I know that there was some items on the ID list which we didn't quite get to or only glancingly referred to. So, yes, Joy?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:33:06]

Three Stages of Religion

Michael: Okay, yeah. The famous modeling three stages of religion. Who wants to – mostly I'm going to chime in for fine tuning. What is this model and how does it help us? [Unintelligible 00:33:30] You must have a little bar in your mind that says, "Search," just put, "Three stages of religion," and see what comes up. This is not to be confused with the devolutionary process that religions go through where you have a revelation figure followed by a combination, finally followed by cooptation. Time to start the cycle all over again.

This is an evolutionary view. If we were [unintelligible 00:34:11]. Some of us may need a couple of weeks. We would – there would be a program there called, "The History of Consciousness." And this is the kind of thing which I think they should be studying [unintelligible 00:34:25]. Who wants to try it? What are the three stages? Joy?

Student: Potentially knowing what the three stages are, I just don't know –

Michael: Do you know them [unintelligible 00:34:35].

Student: I have them in my old notebook.

Michael: Okay. Go ahead. I don't care where you're getting it.

Student: Okay. Stage of reclamation.

Michael: No, no. That's the other – that's the devolutionary model. I'm sorry. They both have three steps though. All – once you get a PhD, you frame everything in three steps. This is more like the evolution of human consciousness, what are three major stages in religion? And mind you, I'm not going to hold you to this in detail because it's my own theory and I don't know if anybody else believes it or not. Yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:35:16]

Michael: That's the third stage. That's the first stage.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:35:28]

Michael: Anybody remember what the second stage is? In the community. Yeah. The state, or whatever. So, you said, "See God in," and I suppose for shorthand that will work, but it might a little bit safer to see the sacred or see power. So, what you see practice is, resigned to invoke and direct the power in.

The first take on that is the power of life is in the natural world. This is the pre-Woody Guthrie – sorry. Pre-Woody Allen on stage, when you see your own life in nature and nature in your own life, that's where you go to, as I say, invoke and manage them, however. Later on, the most powerful thing which now becomes the framework for sanctions and norms of human behavior is the community.

So, at this stage if the community decides that an individual shall die, no one pipes up and says, "Hey, the community has no right to do that." So, in effect, God is the community. And therefore, you know, Zeus of the Athenians is different from Zeus of the Thebans and so forth. And this is a setup for a really bad conflict.

And the third stage is where you see the ultimate reality, the ultimate power is – basically, it's in consciousness. It's a form of consciousness. And you can most easily, most readily access that – I'm sorry. Get access to that consciousness through yourself, through your own human person. Therefore, the person becomes inviolable, and the state no longer has the right to take his or her life. And that's the negative part.

Person Power to Attainment of Freedom

The positive part is when you want to look to regenerating society, you look at the individual. And a good example of that is Gandhi's world order model which starts, the individual serves the family. The family serves the village. And the village serves the district. You're starting with the power potential of the person and building up from there rather than starting from some kind of big abstract structure and saying, "What is this structure do to the individual?"

Student: So, what is the benefit of starting with the individual?

Michael: The benefit of starting with the individual, since you asked me, I will tell you, is that it's true. I think that the ultimate power is within the individual and person power is the underlying force in nonviolence. And when you have people power – we'll be talking about this toward the beginning of next semester. People power is the summation of person power. If there's no person power there, the people power is very shallow. It's just the power of numbers.

And you remember my famous quip – I hope you remember everything that I've ever said – a friend of mine had a demonstration when we were trying to break – sever the connection between the university and the nuclear weapons labs. A friend of mine said,

“If we had a million more people out here, we could stop this thing.” I said, “That’s right. But if we had one person who was a million times committed, we could also stop it.” And I’m not saying what that one person would do. He or she may act alone, or he or she may, you know, assemble other people.

So, I think that the benefit of that can be seen both negatively and positively. It’s like we were saying, there’s nothing wrong with strategic nonviolence. You can back into real nonviolence from a strategic nonviolence commitment. They’re saying, “Okay, I’m not going to use violence.” The question is going to come up is what the heck am I going to use? That’s going to go into principled. Similarly, if you say, “Hey, I’m not going to kill people because I don’t have that right, you have to think of very different ways of normalizing behavior and so forth. And so that’s the negative part.

The positive part is if you’re going to start a movement and you go into this by saying, “Hey, I don’t care what people believe, just get them out there.” You know, “Here, hold this sign, never mind what it says.” I mean I had a friend who was living in Paris for a year, and he walked past the building. There was a big crowd. They were milling around, shouting stuff. And he couldn’t quite follow what they were saying. And somebody in the crowd handed him a paper bag and set, “*Jet la. Jet la.*” Which he knew enough to, you know, he was saying, “Throw, throw.” So, he threw it at the building not knowing what was in the bag or what the building was. And of course, it was a bomb, and it was some kind of embassy.

So that, if you don’t believe that the individual’s belief matters, you know, then you can use individuals. Remember what Kant said, “That the human is never a means to an end. Human beings [unintelligible 00:40:46].” If you stop to think about it, we would all march up to the Haas Building, Haas Business School, and shut down the Department of Human Resources. Just based on the false belief that human beings are resources for something else. Whereas in reality, everything is a resource for a human individual.

Student: So, like a simple [garbit], is that what the individual is just not [unintelligible 00:41:16] and do whatever it’s told by the government is what’s [unintelligible 00:41:21] top down?

Michael: Yeah. Yeah. And now there has to be some kind of collection of decision making. Every time you have a decision you cannot have a plebiscite of 300 million people. It’s too klutzy. It just doesn’t work. So, you invite something called, “Representative government,” which when you were using it, it worked fine. Somebody said recently, “Why put the Iraqis through the trouble of writing the constitution. Let’s just give them ours. We’re not using it.” That’s one way.

The other way is – and for Gandhi and Thoreau and the other [unintelligible 00:41:56]. Okay, the individual’s participation in the government system and social order, social contract, is going to be only as far as it does not violate his or her conscious. In the system there has to be included a mechanism for individuals who feel that their conscious has been violated to resist the system. If they don’t do that, even if they’re

wrong and they make a mistake and they think is immoral and it's not immoral and they're wrong, it's their obligation to not let their conscious be violated.

In the long run that will add up to a much more stable order than an order in which people are paid, coerced, or be apathetic. Alana?

Student: Just – I mean I understand that there's a conflict that the individual can have. I kind of see what you're saying. But there's so many times when, you know, we talk about the Rosen –

Michael: Rosenstraße Prison Demonstration?

Student: Yeah. And other situations like that when – I don't understand how you really put it to that same effect if it was just one person. I mean they [unintelligible 00:43:13].

Michael: Yeah. There is no question that there are events where because of the time factor, numbers do count. We're not saying numbers don't count at all. But we are saying that numbers are secondary. And in the long run, if you need numbers, one really enlightened individual will collect those numbers. I'd like to think of an agency, Viva Zapata, where Emiliano Zapata is being brought down to Mexico City tied to the back of a horse. As he's walking along a peasant comes out of the woods and joins him. And then another peasant. And finally, when you get to the city the police turn around and there's like 10,000 people behind him and they realize they have to let him go. But he had to be that kind of person.

So, I don't know if you've read this book, "The Tipping Point," by Malcolm Gladwell. He talks about Paul Revere, anyone who has survived an American public-school education knows that when the British were attacking Boston Harbor, Paul Revere saw the signal and he jumped on his horse and he rode from house to house throughout these towns in Massachusetts, knocking on the door and saying, "The redcoats are coming! The redcoats are coming!"

Well, so that was the history that I learned, and you've all learned and as far as it goes, it's true. But it turns out that they actually sent out several individuals. And like another guy went south and Paul Revere went north. And this other guy, who's name I can't even remember, he would knock on the door and say, "The redcoats are coming." Some of them would look at them and say, "Who's that? Naw, never heard of him." Close their window and go back to sleep. But it's Paul Revere, it's "Oh my God, it's Paul Revere! Get your flintlock. Muster the troops." [Unintelligible 00:45:15] as my literary friend once said.

The Effervescence of the Crowd

So, there are individuals who seem to have a key power to focus the energies of other individuals. And that's – so there's kind of an in-between person power and people power. So, try to put together a big group without paying attention to who the people

are, what they believe, how deep their commitment is, is going to lead to a very shallow one-time only episode. We'll be talking about that next semester too. It's sometimes called, "The effervescence of the crowd." The crowd gets very excited.

But as you know from reading Renee Girard, or hearing me talk about Renee Girard, excited crowds, not always such a healthy thing. You know, just somehow with one wrong word and suddenly they're excited about the wrong thing. The next thing you know your effervescent crowd has turned into a lynch mob. So, for all of these reasons, I think we have to start with the focus on awakening the individual. You see how carefully Gandhi did this. The famous episode on September 11th, 1906, "I don't want you to take this oath unless you believe it in your heart, that you're not going to turn back no matter what. If you don't believe that, then resist us." So, these things can work together and we're not denying that there are episodes where numbers are called for.

But I think we have drastically underestimated the power of the individual. And I even believe that if one woman had marched into Number 2 Rosenstraße and said, "I want my husband back. I'm not going. I don't care if you kill me," that it could have had the power – much more than we sometimes realize.

In fact, there were some episodes like that in this book on Le Chambon. It's that village in southern France where they rescued so many refugees during the way, where just one or two people standing up and saying, "No, we won't go along with this," and change things around.

Okay, time is getting a little short now. Sid, did you have some?

Revolving Evolutions

Student: It was, I probably moved past it, but it was related to the stages of religion and relating that to religion and society. Is it – I don't know. It seems to like – it just feels like a more Christian idea, and I know there's [unintelligible 00:47:51] and stuff. But those ideas have been co-opted like eye for an eye and stuff to justify it. Like criminal justice and stuff. And that seems like it's like a reversion to Stage 2, almost.

Michael: It is.

Student: Like a community controlling the individual.

Michael: Yes. That's exactly what we're experiencing now. We're in a nominally Stage 3 religion [unintelligible 00:48:11] got to there and then it's an inversion to Stage 2. But in fact, it's a little worse than if we were just plain old Stage 2 because we're using the prestige of a fully developed mystical human based religion to buttress a state-centric order. Toynbee, the person who said, "He made it impossible for us to go on ruling India. But he made it possible for us to leave without rancor and without humiliation." He also wrote an article on falling back to the religion of the state because we have not grasped what the religion of a person is.

Student: So, the three stages of life are kind of like an evolving, like the second is like you only see the sanctity and community, right?

Michael: Not necessarily only. These can be cumulative. So, you do see the power of life in nature, but you also see it, you have – you sanctify this collective called, “The community, the state, the city,” whatever it is. And yeah, to see that the ultimate power is within the human individual is to see that it’s in other creatures and in the whole of nature. That’s how that Einstein quote ends. “We must break out of this prison and extend our sympathies to all of humanity and the whole of nature in its beauty.”

So, they are developmental and there’s nothing wrong with being in Stage 2 up to a point, but when you get to where Stage 3 has been discovered and you’re still clinging to Stage 2, then it’s a throwback. I mean it does problems. And where it’s a problem for us is that this Stage 2 is how scapegoat religions or [unintelligible 00:50:09] scapegoating impossible if you believe in the sanctity of every individual because then you don’t go around looking for the guilty individual to use as a scapegoat. Okay, Joanna, you had quite a few IDs for us.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:50:29]

Third-Party Nonviolent Intervention

Michael: Okay. There were a couple of very sophisticated initials, acronyms [unintelligible 00:50:39]. It may actually – you kind of go together and I had planned to talk about just the fact is, this has been my favorite topic. Sometimes I go on and on about it. But read it. You’ll get there. So, did anybody get there? Did you pick it out of my book or what?

Student: Book. I know what it is.

Michael: Okay. Start us there.

Student: Well, it’s when two groups are in conflict and if there are [unintelligible 00:51:06] not involved could decide both in between them.

Michael: Which one are you –

Student: Oh, third-party nonviolent intervention. [Unintelligible 00:51:16]

Michael: Yeah. Third-party nonviolent intervention. You’ll find, I think, an example in “Peace Power” magazine which is the ten cities where you Cripps and Bloods and people who come in between and set up tents and are living there 24/7 talking to the two people. And, you know, reconciliation between enemies is possible. But it’s all very, very difficult. And a third party can do that now in extremely large-scale intense cases.

We’re actually now at war that’s about to go on. And a third party gets in-between and says, “If you shoot, you’ll hit us.” Then you can actually see the application of

nonviolence to armed conflict to war. So that's TPNI. We'll look at quite a few examples next semester. Catherine?

Civilian Based Defense

Student: The CBD, the Civilian Based Defense.

Michael: Yes.

Student: Yeah. And it's basically where the like [unintelligible 00:52:22] or –

Michael: Yeah.

Student: So yeah.

Michael: So, what is the difference really between Civilian Based Defense and third-party nonviolent intervention?

Student: The civilians are doing it rather than like somebody else [unintelligible 00:52:35].

Michael: Yeah. Third-party nonviolent intervention has a third part. Like duh. And Civilian Based Defense is something you can do yourself. Yeah?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:52:50]

Michael: Both of these ideas grew out of Shanti Sena. Shanti Sena, you see was the bold vision that you could nonviolence at the biggest scale. And the most advanced forms of [unintelligible 00:53:10]. Latest maybe forms of [unintelligible 00:53:12]. So, in practice, what's grown up since the Shanti Sena model, which Gandhi partly developed, are these two forms. Really, they're not tremendously different. But it's slightly different kind of intervention-like dynamic.

Shanti Sena

Student: Can we talk about the Shanti Sena? [Unintelligible 00:53:32]

Michael: Yeah. The Shanti Sena concept was probably in the back of Gandhi's mind for decades. But when he finally institutionalized it, the way he thought of it was groups of volunteers who could ideally be from the community that they were volunteering in, would live in the community, offer good offices or services of one kind or another. And especially, when the need arose, be there to head off conflict. If you do this at an early enough stage, one of the classic forms of doing this is rumor abatement. Because this is the way inter-communal conflict often flares out of control. One of my colleagues at a peace conference said he's written a book about conflict [unintelligible 00:54:29].

It killed quite a few people in Northern India and got started because of cows strayed into somebody's garden. The next person said he sent that cow in there purposely. And

they said, “They’re sending their cows in there.” And the next thing you know, you have this upheaval. So, if you have a Shanti Seni or a Shanti Sena volunteer, they can go and investigate. They can ask, “Hey, are you guys sending these cows over?” They say, “No, no. That’s – the cow’s terrible. She always breaks down.” So, then you back and say, “No, it is [unintelligible 00:55:02].”

So, you do – you can squash rumors and offer your services in various ways, but Gandhi said if it’s too late for all that, you’re going to go out there and stand in between those two parts and say, “I don’t want you to do this. I’m not on your side. I’m not on their side. I am on the side of peace.” Rise above it. Now Gandhi notionally applied the Shanti Sena to – or the idea of it in any way to actual war fighting in the context of the impending as it was thought to be Japanese invasion. When you want men, women, and children, go to the border, stand there. Let them do their worst. Yes, they may massacre us, but if they did, as they said, “They would not be able to repeat the experiment.” No one who did that would be able to do that again. Just revulsion [unintelligible 00:56:03] as one of our beliefs right? That a human being is so utterly dehumanized that they can go on doing this forever. Yeah?

Nonviolence and the Nazis

Student: I had trouble over Thanksgiving trying to explain that to my dad. And he said that – he kept saying, “Well, how do you know that someone would be so repulsed? Like what about – I mean using – in WWII when their goal was to get rid of all these people. If they had stood up and said, “No,” they would have just plowed through them and been happy.” And I found it hard to come back with a response.

Michael: Yeah. The only way to take care of your dad on that question – and it comes up a lot – is to actual historical cases. There really are no cases on record – I think this is probably going to be true – of people who stood up nonviolently and said, “Go ahead and kill us if you must, but we’re not backing down.” And who actually simply were slaughtered and then who just went on to slaughter the next group and the next group.

People who say that that happened and what they’re confused about is there have been many cases of people who have been massacred. But they were massacred unwillingly. That’s very different. If they were helpless and they were killed, that doesn’t have the same dynamic. So, it doesn’t have that transformation of the human will. And even if there were a case or two, I think you could – there are so many cases on record of individuals who were about as dehumanized as they can get and yet something reached them. That I think we are justified in going on the belief that it would always awaken people.

Now mind you it’s not quite the same as saying it would always “work.” Maybe it might be too late. But hey, does violence always work? Certainly not. So that’s the way that we’re approaching it. We’re saying that it’s infallible on the level of psychic forces. Not

necessarily infallible on the level of the social enactment of those forces. But certainly, much more reliable than going the other way.

One of my favorite awakening stories is – it's in my book and I may have actually told you about it. Friends of mine who were working in the Polish underground. They were Jews who lived in Warsaw. Did I tell you this story? The Gestapo caught them in a raid, and they were about to take them away. They had a 2 ½ year old boy and he didn't know what was going on and he saw these shiny buttons on the Gestapo captain's uniform. And before anyone knew what he was doing, he was playing with these buttons.

The parents were absolutely frozen with horror and the captain looked down and saw what was going on. And he looked up and he said, "I have a little boy at home just his age and I miss him very much." And then he ordered his men out of the apartment. He said, "Your son has saved your life." So, if that can happen to a Gestapo captain in the act of raiding Jewish underground workers, I really cannot believe that there is any category of people so depraved that this would not work.

There may be some individuals who are so far gone that we're not going to be able to reach them in this life. So, then the nonviolent end to it is, how did they get that way? Let's find out. Which television programs they were watching and stuff like that. Yeah?

Student: How do you reconcile the idea of [Parkenviue], that there are people like that on the planet who are not?

Michael: Well, I guess I'm going to hold out for the belief that if you had "world enough and time," to quote, I guess, that's Shakespeare. No, it's Marvell. "If we had world enough in time we could reach anybody." But when I say that maybe some people who we cannot reach in this – in their lifetime and ours with the tools that we've got. We've got to do something else to protect ourselves and keep them from deepening their own criminality. It's a question of time, not a question of inherent possibility. Give it enough time.

Gandhi had this belief. Anyway, he was once asked, "Would you be willing to live with the devil?" And he said, "Oh, yeah, I'd be willing to. I'm not sure he would like it." The person said, "Why not?" And Gandhi said, "[Unintelligible 01:01:12]." So again, in 164A we want to talk about the ideal. In 164B we're going to have to talk about how to articulate this ideal reality with the real world that we live. No question about it.

So that's what I would say. Give it enough time and given a nonviolent enough person we can reach in. But given the real world and maybe some cases which are too hard for them. But obviously what we should then try to do is so organize our culture so that there are fewer, fewer of those.

Creating Fear vs Healing

Student: I was just thinking – I read this article this morning about San Francisco Police Department and how they’re using these guns that shoot like bean bags. Yeah, like lentils. And so, they stun people and probably knock them over and bruise them, but don’t actually kill them. They’ve been using them a lot on like mentally disabled people.

Michael: Oh my God.

Student: To like subdue them or people are like – they gave a couple examples. Like this woman was just in the – like trying to commit suicide and had a knife and was [unintelligible 01:02:25]. And so, they shot her and so they took the knife away and took her right to the hospital. And I wasn’t sure to think of it. Like if it’s just replacing one weapon with another and it’s just perpetrating the same system or if it’s like –

Michael: Yes. That is a very interesting question for us. Bean bag guns and tasers and things like that. If you have to subdue people by force, is it worth it to try and do it in such a way that you don’t kill them in the process? It raises a difficult problem for us because there is this principle that sometimes the good is the enemy of the best. I’ve noticed, for example, if you look at future projections of war will be like, like with Star Wars and things like that, what they have done is reduced war t overall level where it’s still fightable. You know? If everybody were armed with shoulder mounted atomic bombs, war would be impossible. The first volley, everybody would be dead.

So, they’re saying in the distant future, you’ll have these medieval swords, except they’ll be electronic. Something, “Jang, Jang.”

But I actually think that that’s a bad thing to do, to create what they still call, “Tactical nuclear weapons,” which are usable is not a step towards peace. However, there is the other side of it. If a woman was about to commit suicide, you’ve got to use what you got. And it’s much better to have – you’ll get more with bean bag gun and a .38 than with the .38 alone.

However – hold on just one second – I think that really for us to approach is why do we let things get like this? Why do we have a thousand people jumping off the Golden Gate Bridge. Prevention is where we want to start working. And we want to start working positive from a nice – borrowing Joy’s idea – non-reductionist view of the world. So that people have a sense of purpose and at least a glimmer of a hope that they can fulfill that purpose, at least in part. All this stuff wouldn’t keep happening.

That’s why I argue very strongly in “[Search for a Nonviolent Future](#),” that nonviolence actually is that purpose that we’re looking for. Yeah?

Student: I was just going to say there’s another article about how there was a guy who had like a seizure, kind of like a mental breakdown in a theatre and cops went in and instead of subduing him calmly, they shot him like 20 rounds. Killed him and shot another police office. So, it was there was two articles. It was like maybe we could just – maybe we could get rid of this whole –

Michael: We need to get rid of the whole thing. There really is no way to have a clean police force. Which I mean even British Police who for so many years did not carry weapons eventually it's just going to degenerate. Unless you're working on the nonviolent [unintelligible 01:05:33] of society [unintelligible 01:05:34] eventually, forcefully overtaxed. I mean look at this horrible thing in New York where somebody was coming out – of course, he shouldn't have been in this [unintelligible 01:05:44]. I know, I know. But if he had just gotten married so he would have bachelors at the bachelor party and he came out of this club and for some reason the police thought that was threatening them. And this plain-clothes policeman fired 50 rounds into the car and killed him and wounded two other people. It's not a very good record for 50 rounds. Only kill one person. That's not [unintelligible 01:06:12].

It's like what Norman Cousins said, remember there was this famous revelation that the U.S. Navy have steamed around in San Francisco Bay spraying bacterial agents into the fog to see what would happen. And what happened? A guy got sick, and he died. He was an elderly person. His grandchildren found out about this, and they sued the Navy. And like are we saying that this a good thing for the Navy to do? No.

But what we're saying is once you decide that you cannot defend yourself and you need an elite. And the elite has to be heavily armed so that they overwhelm the opposition. They are going to do things like this. And there's no such thing as a clean violent defense. Great, okay, Joy?

Student: I guess I was going to elaborate on that. But that leads to the San Francisco Police eventually [unintelligible 01:07:14]. So, I guess training would be a better option.

Michael: Training would be a better option if it helped. But still, what we should never – let's get back to the vision. We should never renounce – the ultimate goal of being able to live in a society where there is no violence at all. That has to be our ideal. We're not putting a timeline on it, but that's the ideal. And once we lose sight of that ideal than we're just tampering with various degrees of trying to keep violence contained. There's even an argument that human rights is a bad model because it just says you can't go beyond a certain point in abusing people. That being in – serving in the Ambulance Corps which our hero did several times. It's not a good idea because you're sanitizing war and it's almost better to let it out there. [Unintelligible 01:08:17]

Because it can be when people see this that they get disgusted with it. Admittedly, it takes a lot for people to get disgusted enough where they'll do something about it. Anyway, that's how the argument is going. Okay. Any other ID's, Joanna, that we didn't cover? Okay. Everybody's perfectly – you got that?

Theory of the Three Gunas

Student: [Unintelligible 01:08:46]

Michael: Okay. Fellow sitting next to you knows a great deal about that actually. This is the Theory of the Three Guṇas. Does anyone want to run through it very quickly and tell us how it becomes pertinent to nonviolence? What is the theory? What are Guṇas? Amy?

Student: The Guṇas are three states of energy. The first one, *tamas* is like inertia. And it's kind of [unintelligible 01:09:28] cowardice. And then the second one, *rajas*.

Michael: *Rajas*. It's not Spanish.

Student: Is like kind of like unfocused. Like chaotic activity. And it's just associated with like greed, which is kind of [unintelligible 01:09:45] violence. And then *satva* is associated with harmony and bliss.

Michael: Yeah. That's a perfect answer. The theory of the model is that all of phenomenal reality that can be analyzed as an interplay of these three basic energy states. The second proposition is that it's extremely evolutionary, development. And that in human experience. Well, if you look at evolution actually. What evolution – what were before we became creatures? We were rocks, right? That's very *tamasic*. We have these rocks that we found in a little trench that we were digging on our property. They have fossils in them. And so, we went to a local geologist and asked him how old those things are. He said, "300 million years." So that's real inertia.

And then we go to, you know, moving creatures and then finally we – at least so far – the final stage has been, you know, a Berkeley professor. Homo sapiens sapiens sapiens. Where you can not only overcome Stanford in a football game, but you can think, make my own choices, things like that.

So, this is evolutionary on the long scale. And it's also evolutionary on the long scale and it's also evolutionary on the individual scale in the sense that we have pockets of *tamas* inside of us. And the way to deal with them is to turn them into *rajas*. And the way – *rajas* is to guide and with *satva*. And you started to sketch in the tie-ins with violence and everything. And that's basically correct. Remember Gandhi saying, "I can make a Satyagrahi out of a violent person. I cannot make a Satyagrahi out of a coward."

You cannot leapfrog from *tamas* to *satva*. You have to pass through *rajas* at least provisionally. So, in many ways you will find that this is going to be a useful model. [Unintelligible 01:12:03] Alex?

Student: Is there [unintelligible 01:12:11]?

Michael: There is.

Book of Job and Scapegoating

Student: Okay. Just one of the terms, Job, the text, I don't remember if that was –

Michael: Yeah. Okay, does anybody remember why the Book of Job – how the Book of Job play in?

Student: Does it have something to do with scapegoating? Job's friends were saying that he deserved what he was getting because he did something to make God mad. Is that on the right track?

Michael: Yes. You're on the right track. Do you want to go a little further?

Student: Well, the story goes that Job was a God-fearing man and he lost all of his possessions and his children and became sick.

Michael: He was totally wiped out.

Student: Yeah. And his friends said that he needed to reconcile – he must have done something to make God mad and make all this stuff happen to him. Otherwise, it wouldn't have happened, and he kept saying, "I didn't do anything."

Michael: And what was Job's response to that?

Student: I think he said that he didn't do anything. And he kept on doing – I don't know what happened after that.

Michael: Well, there was nothing for him to do, but he –

Student: Accepted it.

Michael: He said to the comforters that, "I'm innocent. You can persecute me all you want, but I am innocent." And why is that significant for us? Take Renee Girard's old model. Yeah?

Student: Well, when you're scapegoating, it can only work if you're convinced that the person is guilty or believes themselves to be the cause of the problem.

Michael: Right. If the scapegoat image will, of course, not work if the victim wasn't guilty. And so, the entire scapegoating institution, which is still with us in many ways, is predicated on the belief which you can manufacture – you're being able to manufacture the belief that the victim was guilty. Girard talks about these myth – they're supposed to be chronicles – 12th century chronicles. It was this strange new town, village, there's a plague. They discovered it was the Jews. The Jews are poisoning the well. And they expel the Jews, the plague – so is this text which take as history has the same structure and has the same veracity – namely none – as all of these ancient myths and all these ritual practices that are used in this way and so forth.

So, his point is that the minute that you hold the microphone up to the victim and the victim can say, "I didn't do it." Which is what Lee Harvey Oswald said just before they killed him. He was interviewed on television saying, "I didn't do it." You know, you make lots of problems, "I mean I'm not saying I'm perfect, but I did not shoot the president." And so, they killed him within a couple of hours because that would have scotched the

whole thing. I'm sorry. I shouldn't have used that example. This is terrible. Forget I ever said that.

But what Girard says is Job breaks the model. Once you have the victim who is interviewed on Night Line and says, "I am not guilty. I didn't do the crime," the whole system breaks apart. So, who does Girard propose as the opposite of Job, the perfect victim? Like the victim to die for? Pay millions of dollars to have a victim like this?

Student: Oedipus.

Michael: Oedipus, right. Oedipus, of Sophocles famous play, "Oedipus the King," because he not only discovers his own guilt. So, you don't even have to pay to find out who did it. Most importantly, he punishes himself. Remember? Because you have all this rituals in which the person who kills the guilty person is also guilty. And then you go on and on from there like a domino effect. So, the perfect victim is one who says, "I did it. I would love to get victimized. Please kill me and the buck stops here." And is not pretending to be exorable at the same time.

But okay, so scapegoating is tremendously – what word do I want here? Common overused format. It's violence in especially violence of the social group. Anything that will help us break out of that. And notice, Job speaks as an individual. It's not like a jury of his peers finds him innocent. The individual speaks out, breaks the mold. Girard's point is that it's only in the Judeo/Christian religion that you advance into a non-scapegoating – where your God is not a god of compliance. God is the God of the victim for the first time. [Unintelligible 01:17:20] wrong about that, but just because he doesn't know anything about any of it anyways. But there's no question about scapegoating at this very stage can be very violent. And we have to break out of it.

Okay, well, I guess you'll all now just pick up a copy of this gorgeous text. And study hard. We'll have your papers in good order and [unintelligible 01:17:44].

27. Grand Overview

Michael: Okay, so this is our last meeting in this particular series. And I feel sort of the way Gandhi did at the end of Satyagraha in South Africa – bit of a pang. He had an incredible statement there that was in South Africa, “That I discovered my vocation in life,” becoming a Mahatma, ending colonial era. Probably the biggest understatement in world literature.

Anyway, 164B is full already, as is the meditation class. They’re both wait-listed and I’ve arranged for them to be put on manual waitlist. Which means the way to get into either of those courses is by being very, very nice to me. I will, of course, try to get anyone from A into B who wants to do that.

Programmed for Choice

I heard a very nice story yesterday from a friend which is remarkably parallel to the story that I just ended Tuesday’s class with. Remember the story about these friends of mine who are underground workers in Warsaw who were being arrested by the Gestapo. The child, their 2 ½ year old boy saved them. Incidentally, I didn’t go on to mention, though it is in my book that those – both those parents survived the war and ended up finding one another and getting married. I mean they were already married. The boy who saved them died, but they had another child. And that other child was a very good friend of mine who was for a while the Director of Fellowship of Reconciliation. So, it’s a very personal story.

But this story, I don’t have quite such a personal connection, but it’s quite remarkable. I have some friends who live in fairly rural place in Virginia in a town called Floyd, Virginia – named after a man named Floyd. And this couple has a large number of dogs. And the “alpha dog” is apparently quite a hunter. And they’re often distressed with him because he runs after wildlife, and he does predator prey thing when he catches them.

So, but one day they were startled when this big alpha male dog came trotting in with a three-day old fawn in its mouth. Apparently, the doe had died or something and this ferocious animal that loves to hunt little critters found this fawn and just was completely switched over onto a whole different wavelength and picked it up and brought it to them because he knew that his owners could take care of it. In fact, they took it to the Wildlife Rescue Center.

So, I’m not sure what this illustrates. I guess if you like the story, but it does show you, I guess, if we want to make a fuss about this having some meaning, that even creatures that are programmed biologically to be predatory can be switched over to different modalities of behavior. This is pretty common in the animal kingdom.

In fact, if a dog is having a fight – a male dog is having a fight with another male and the other male is starting to win, it will often do what ethologists call, “Going puppy,” as he’ll lie down on his back and whine and just wave his little paws in the air. And it might even pee to show that it’s completely helpless. And that often switches the aggressive animal over to a nurturing mode. So, I’m not saying we should try this. Especially some parts that are not appropriate for us.

But it does show you that there is a limit to biological control systems. They’re not – they don’t program us one way or the other. This is true even of animals on a lower order of evolution. How much truer must it be of human beings? So, my famous mantram in this connection is we are not programmed for war. We are not programmed for peace. We are programmed for choice.

Looks like I was wrong about those criminal justice statistics. I told you, never trust anything having to do with numbers that I say. But this one is kind of unfortunate. I was saying there were about 2 million Americans who were in the criminal justice system at this point. Looks like that was a huge understatement from a statistic I’ve just read. It’s more like 7 million. That means that 2 million are actually behind bars and the other 5 million are out on parole and getting ready to come back in sort of thing.

Difference Between Vision and Frame

Cycling through a little loose ends to up. I have two waiting. One is that Alana’s question was quite fair last time. What’s the difference between a vision and a frame? I was thinking about that, and I think a vision is the reason for a whole set of frames. Because in a particular situation like a conflict, we will tend to frame a conflict as a potential learning experience – however difficult it may be – where you, the nonviolent actor have the opportunity and therefore the responsibility of awakening the other person to a better state of awareness.

We would not be able to have that frame if we didn’t have a vision of interconnectedness or perhaps, in the extreme, actual unity. If we had the prevailing vision where people are separate – radically separate and therefore basically what you see is what you get and we come in this material packages, we would frame a conflict quite differently. And so that’s the relationship between those two terms.

There’s an unusual opportunity that’s about to end. And that is in four days there’s something called, “Peacemaker Training Initiatives,” which is being coordinated by a venerable institution that we will discuss a lot next semester, the Fellowship of Reconciliation. And they’re have a camp, January 3 through 10. January 3 through 10 on the East Coast. And you can call to find out about that at the following number. It’s a training for youth who want to learn nonviolence. And if you go to the FOR Web site and look for the Peacemaker Training Initiative, you can also find it. But if you are interested and you felt like being back in New England during that period of time. Do hurry because they only had four spaces left And I don’t have any control over this one. So

being nice to me, though it's inherently a good thing to do, would not help get you into that camp.

Okay, now we were talking. This is the last thing before we get to our – another practice run. We were talking about various resources that, of course, it's too late for you if you use them in your paper because in about an hour you're going to be piling all those up on my desk. But for future reference in addition to the Gandhiserve Web site that I told you about, that is probably the best way to get to the Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi Online.

All of Gandhi's works have been collected into pamphlets like this one on given subjects. And did I mention this one to you before? Okay. Someone was watching the webcast of these talks, heard me say that I didn't think that Gandhi had pulled together in any one place the five laws of fasting, that you know so intimately well and be ready to reproduce instantaneously on the 11th or the 14th ending. But all – any idea that you can think of that Gandhi ever spoke about from toothpaste to women to war have been pulled together into a pamphlet. And sure, enough there is one called, "Fasting in Satyagraha. It's use and abuse."

And all of these have been published by the Navajivan Publishing House. That may be handy. Navajivan means, "New life," or, "New disposition." In Ahmedabad India. So, if you wanted to get it in hard copy. And there are two places in the U.S. which tend to have very large collections of Gandhi material. And one is a group called – it's in Maine. It's called, "Green Leaf." Green Leaf Books. And the person who runs it is Arthur Wear, W-E-A-R. You can always reach him by phone except not during blueberry season because he has a blueberry farm. Even though, of course, he makes millions of dollars selling Gandhi books.

As I've always said, "The big money is in peace research." But just for a hobby. He's a gentleman blueberry farmer. And that's a very nice thing to do in the State of Maine. So, when it's not blueberry season you can always get him and he will – in fact, if you send him X amount of money, he will send you what he thinks are the top pics of Gandhi literature that he has for that amount of money. Incidentally, just for a little comic relief, I had written an article for an Indian journal, and I had no idea they were going to send me an honorarium.

So, Tuesday I open my mail and there's an honorarium check. And so of course, I immediately ripped open the envelop, snatched out the check very patiently. My eye falls on the number, "1000." I said, "Whoa. You know, \$1000 for writing a two-and-a-half-page article on a subject I knew nothing about." And then I saw, "RS. 1000." A thousand rupees. In other words, \$22.50. So, impatience is its own negative reward. The other place that sells Gandhi books is in Columbia, Missouri and it's the South Asia Books is the name of that outfit. And one of the directors of South Asia Books is a Gandhi scholar. It's Gerald Barrier.

Okay. So, as I say, this is way too late for you to use on your paper, but I'm sure that for most you, Gandhi will be an enduring interest. Okay, so yeah. I think that's it.

So, let's take a look at our statement. This is – it's not necessarily the case that the statement that you get to look at for Roman Numeral II on the final will be from somebody who actually knows something about nonviolence. It could be outrageously wrong, or he could be making all the classical mistakes and your point will be to spot them and pull out the assumptions that that person is basing his or her mistake on.

Four Basic Steps for a Nonviolent Campaign

But this is something written by Martin Luther King. "In any nonviolence campaign there are four basic steps. 1. Collection of the facts," he goes on to ascertain if injustice is alive. "Negotiation, self-purification. And 4. Direction action. We have gone through all of these steps in Birmingham. So even if you didn't see this and I hadn't mentioned it, you might guess that this was written by MLK. And it was probably in what document? Letter from Birmingham Jail because it's just exactly the right tone and the rhetoric and he mentions Birmingham.

So, you probably won't be asked to identify the statement that you're analyzing. The important part will be the analysis. But identification doesn't hurt.

Okay, so how do you feel about these four steps? Any comments that you want to make on them? Let's just imagine you're sitting there. You are somewhat more nervous than you actually are right now. And you want to make some intelligent noises about the statement, where would you start?

I might be giving you some clues on the exam, but right now I'm not. Risa?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:13:22]

Michael: Yeah. The term campaign, I guess, brings up the idea that this is a struggle. It's going to have strategic moves in it as well as a principled commitment. It also brings up another important idea in nonviolence which we'll talk about again extensively next semester and that is the Firmeza Permanente idea that it's rarely the case that you can get something accomplished decisively in a single outburst. And in fact, a lot of peace movement activity, resistant activity has confined itself to a single outburst. And we'll be using the term, "Effervescence of the crowd," as I mentioned on Tuesday.

So, let's see. Let's think of a good example of a terrific, very successful nonviolent campaign or not campaign – nonviolent episode that happened in response to an escalation of an injustice and then went away. Can we think of some good examples of this? It's going to be very helpful on the final when you have a general statement to make to come up with a specific case. It would be very, very helpful.

I hope you function a little bit better than this. I'll give you a hint for this one. There was a specific one that I'm thinking of. It's the one that we should always have somewhere in

our parietal lobe, wherever we store factual memories. When we go back home over vacation and we're at a family gathering or high school friends have collected. And let's say we're in a bowling alley or something. Which is not very likely, I know. Somebody says, "What did you take last semester?"

And you say, "Well, I took this terrific nonviolence course. And your parents get incensed because you're wasting their money. Or your friends want to tell you that you're wasting your time. And the first thing that's going to come out of them is, "It never would have worked against the Nazis." And then you say, "Oh yeah?" Oh, no you don't approach it that way. But what would you say immediately?"

Student: Rosenstraße.

Michael: Rosenstraße Prison Demonstration. The perfect example which absolutely no planning and absolutely no follow up. The whole thing lasted three days. It "worked" perfectly. It's hard to say whether it did any work. What kind of permanent change? It must have made some. I think it's hard to imagine the Gestapo not being affected by what had been done and what they had to do in response. But it certainly didn't bring down the regime. It didn't lead to, you know, any permanent structural change as far as we can see. On the other hand, we're going to be looking at the Otpor Rebellion which is a student led uprising in Serbia that converged in Belgrade in January of 2000. And in one day of demonstrations, it unseated Milosevic, President Milosevic, who had not been unseated by 11 weeks of NATO bombing. So that gives you a very neat way of measuring the relative force of violence and nonviolence.

But that was very different because it was a careful year of planning that preceded that. Step-wise, the way MLK is indicating here. And they had a plan for continuing it. They could have done a lot more, but a lot of the people who were involved in the uprising were elected to power. So, it's not like it had a terrific outcome, but much better than any one day outburst of emotion would have been able to create.

Okay, so look at how much we've had to say about one word. You know, you're going to have to think about what are the most important things to say. What about the steps, Alana?

Self-Purification and the Nonviolent Campaign

Student: I have a question. I was wondering if you could clarify the relation between the Rosenstraße demonstration and what you're saying about the campaign. You're talking about how the campaign is a longer strategy.

Michael: Yeah. Campaigns implies that you're in it for the long haul. You have a specific goal, but it's going to take a while to get there.

Student: So wouldn't you use an example that wasn't like a single moment?

Michael: Well, I use it by way of contrast. I wanted to show what happens if you don't have a sustained campaign versus what happens if you do. Yeah. Joanna?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:18:30]

Michael: This is very interesting. It's quite – I had the same response. That self purification should come first. If you're really a Gandhian, what else should we say about it? At what point? This is a trick question. At what point is self-purification appropriate to do? Don't get fooled. What's the right answer? All the time. Yeah. There's no particular point where I'll just be impure today and I'll pick it up my next Namas – I'll fix that. Yeah, Rami?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:19:12]

Michael: Well, that's what we're saying, that it makes sense to do it ahead of time and all time actually. John, we saved you a seat. There is some sense in his introducing it here because he may feel that – and I don't think it's quite correct. That you can do negotiation without some self-purification. That's probably not true because you'll do – you'll negotiate very badly. You might exhibit – you might exhibit triumphalism. You remember, it was one of the items from our list that some people were a little bit unclear about. But I think you would be a much better negotiator if you go in, in a frame of mind of dispassion and so forth. And you don't feel that you are completely responsible for the outcome. Right?

But if you're going to put it in at one point and say, "Here's where it's particularly required."

Self-Purification and Direct Action

Obviously, before you go into direct action you must get yourself into the right frame of mind or the direct action is much more explosive, much more dramatic. Could do a lot more harm if you do it badly.

You know, I sometimes forget which stories I have told you and which stories I haven't because I have this limited repertoire of stories. So stop me if I've told you this one, but I live in a meditation center, as you know. And a friend of ours was – he was saying in the early days of our work together that he was going to go down to San Francisco State because there was some racial difficulties there. They were like, you know, rioting going on.

He was told that it may not be a good idea to go down and get embroiled in something like that where there's so much passion. He said, "Well, I'm just going to go and watch." Have I told you this story? Oh, good. Good, good, good.

So he went down to just watch patiently from the sidelines. And when he saw the police beating up on the demonstrators, you know, kicking pick Black people, something

happened. Next thing we know the phone is ringing. It wasn't this kind of phone, sorry. This kind. "Hello?"

"Hi, this is Tim."

"What's up, Tim?"

"Can somebody come down to the city and get me?"

"Where are you?"

"I think I'm in the 63rd Precinct."

"What happened?"

"I don't know. When I came to, I was sitting on the policeman and punching him."

So, obviously, a lot of very accurate self-purification has to be undertaken if we're going to be in direct action and we don't want it to backfire. It'll blow up on us. So, if you were going to slot it in at any one point, that's the point where I would slot it in. But I think Joanna is quite correct, this is something that should be ongoing. And that is, perhaps, some of the differences between Gandhi and King, that he was in contact with his people, had really decades to build up to events that just kind of blew up on King before he had a chance to prepare for them.

Okay, what else do we want to say about this steps? Yes? Devia?

Collection of Facts

Student: I think for the first two, like the collection of facts that [unintelligible 00:22:41].

Michael: Very good. So, Devia, you said, first of all, that – let's see if I got this right. That the collection of facts is an obvious thing to do in any movement which is concerned with truth. Facts are a lot smaller than the truth, but they are a part of the truth, and we are not going to take the attitude that a former president of this country took when he said, "I don't care what the facts are. I will never apologize for the American people." Well, we do care what the facts are. We have a broader vision of what constitutes a fact, you know, a human attitude is a very important reality also.

Negotiation

But then he said, "Negotiation is a good thing to start with because the aim in a nonviolent framework is reconciliation, not winning." You're not going to stop until you get the injustice cleared up. But you are going to do that in a way that leads to harmonic – more harmony with the opponent. This is integrative power.

And you remember Toynbee, his famous saying? Who remembers that? It could be very handy. Arnold Toynbee. He made it – John?

Student: He made it impossible for us continue to rule India, but possible for us to leave without rancor and humiliation.

Michael: Very good. Yes. For 64 extra points, who he is, made it impossible for us to go on ruling India, but he made it possible for us to leave without rancor and without humiliation. Right. Now what if you're entering into a situation where you're very doubtful that negotiation is going to have any effect. These people look like they're very hard to reach. Why shouldn't you just go directly into direct action with a bit of self-purification, of course? Why would you, in fact, want to go through these four steps?

We might not have quite talked about this. But it might have emerged anyway. Carry, did you?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:25:32]

Michael: You want to try to work it out. And I think we can go a little bit further. And I'm going to bring up an example here. The startling way that Gandhi trusted Smuts, even after he had already betrayed him once. He let him betray him a second time. The principle here is – Devia, did you want to try a stab at this?

Student: I was going to say something different.

Michael: Okay. Hold that then. The principle here – Phillip?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:26:09]

Michael: Yes, but what the question that I'm raising is why bother handing someone an olive branch when they're just going to treat it like a goat? Rip. If they've given you to believe and understand that their ballistic. They're irreconcilable, would you still do this? Amy?

Student: Well, Gandhi stressed that like nonviolence implies complete trust and [unintelligible 00:26:37].

Michael: Complete trust in the positive aspects of human nature, that's good. Joanna?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:26:44]

Michael: Yeah. Human dignity is another important component of this. Yeah?

Student: Does it have to do with like – do you have to go through the stages? Do you have to go through the stage progressively in order for it to be effective?

Michael: You do have to go through the stages in order for them to be effective. But I'm partly asking you why. Alex?

Student: I think that in negotiations you recognize that the other person is [unintelligible 00:27:11].

Michael: Yes. This is what I'm ultimately getting at. All these steps were very good, but the basic point is that this is not a WYSIWYG universe. And even if a person who has just get come into your apartment and saying, "I'm a Gestapo captain and you're going to be arrested." Nonetheless, there still is a human being lurking inside that person. And so, the nonviolent actor, especially principled nonviolent actor will play to that hidden person in the opponent. And there's a Danish proverb, I understand, which goes – and I don't know how to say this in Danish, but it goes, "In every man there is a king. Speak to him, he will come out."

So, you are constantly assuming better of your opponent than that opponent is exhibiting. And Alex was giving us the reason. Because your assumption will influence what that person will become to you. It's very good, widespread examples of this in the Prague Spring, the famous case that illustrates a civilian based defense, 1968, 69, in Prague where the Warsaw Pact soldiers came in – 500,000 soldiers – Czechoslovakia is small country. The Czechs all acted – I mean they might have screwed up from time to time, but they tried to the greatest extent that they were capable of, to act towards those invaders as though they were comrades.

And instead of by, you know, shrinking away in fear when they saw the uniforms, step up to them and say, "Why are you doing this? We're both revolutionaries together." It had – I don't know that we have a lot of hard evidence on this, but it had an effect of moving those soldiers out of their posture of hostility. So that, in fact, the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet High Command had to rotate them out of the country and bring in other soldiers who were lied to about what was going on there. And went in there with a much more aggressive attitude.

So, we've gotten a lot out of this little paragraph here. I had another thought – yeah, Camilla?

Student: Can I ask you something about the [unintelligible 00:29:43]. It seems – I mean [unintelligible 00:29:47] it seems to me that obtaining negotiation at a place so early – like at first I thought it would make much more sense [unintelligible 00:29:53]. But now I think that it's important to establish that bond, you know, that connecting thread between two parties that are involved before the direct action. [unintelligible 00:30:02] because I think it kind of influences the way the opponent handles the direct action.

Michael: Yeah. Oh yeah. If you go right into direct action as your first step, it's going to be painful and destructive to the maximum degree. So even if – that's a very good point. Even if you think the opponent is not going to respond to a negotiation, the fact that you have acted in good faith towards him or her could mean that you'll get through that direct action part much less scathed. Yeah. That's a good point. We're saying that the purification should start even before the negotiation because I think the negotiation will go a lot sweeter. Alana?

Four Steps - Review

Student: We've gone through all the steps sort of [unintelligible 00:30:51].

Michael: It is meant to be a note of finality Remember the context of the letter.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:31:02]

Michael: Well, it's not finality in the sense that now there's nothing more we can do. He was involved in direct action and the white ministers were telling him, "You shouldn't have done that. That was not called for. Just do negotiations." He said, "No. These are the steps of the nonviolent campaign. We're not going to stop before you get the injustice out of the way." If negotiation doesn't work, you proceed to direct action. So, he was justifying why they weren't in direct action.

And in fact, there's another sentence where he says, "There is no question that injustice was being perpetrated permanently." So, he had done his due diligence. Let me emphasize that about this negotiation first, it has to do with human dignity. You are dignifying the opponent by the assumption that he or she is rational. And so, what other important term of ours might be brought in here? If you assume that person is rational, what are you doing for them? Remember they will listen to nothing but force. What do we sometimes call that?

It's a very important concept. I'm not sure it's immediately obvious how it comes in here, but it's very important. Yes?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:32:34]

Michael: I haven't even thought of that. I knew that, yes, of course. It's persuasion. You're using persuasion. This is persuasion of a rational kind. This is persuasion of the heart, this is persuasion of the mind.

But the term that I was thinking of was re-humanization. If you just plunge into, you know, rolled up sleeves fight with somebody, you're, in effect, not giving them credit for being able to act like a human being. When you humanize them, once again, as Camilla was point out, this will help them humanize you when it does come to the direct action.

All right, well, there's one other thing, which is actually the first thing that occurred to me, but it would, given who I am.

Escalation Curve

Suppose you are looking at this thing and you see these four steps. And especially when you see negotiations are direct action as two of those steps. Wouldn't you tend to think of a famous graph, a famous model that occurs in a famous book. You all know what I'm referring to? Amy?

Student: The Law of Escalation?

Michael: The Law of Escalation or would actually call it – there’s the “Escalation Curve.” And it’s interesting that there are three stages in that curve, and they don’t line up exactly with this model. And I don’t mention self purification on Page 108 of [Search for a Nonviolent Future](#) which was published by Naropa Publishers. But it’s – I think that just goes to show in a very typical way, how the various models and the vocabulary and all this in this whole field is not yet on the same exact page. We’re in the same vision, but sometimes the framing and the rhetoric and the analysis is in different terms because this is a new field. People haven’t caught on yet how lucrative it really is.

So how would you compare the Four Steps of Martin Luther King with the Three Stages of that author? Catherine, was it you who had the –

Student: Oh, I was just – I just wanted – [unintelligible 00:35:09].

Michael: So, what are the three stages of the escalation curve which has to be attributed to its author if you’re doing this as an ID. If I must say so myself, I think this is a useful model. It’s good to have it your mind. Alex?

Student: Correct me if I’m wrong.

Michael: That’s my job description, yes.

Student: The first stage is when you still appeal to the opponent with reason and logic. And then the second stage is when you might have to use direct action, like in the form of Satyagraha. And the third stage is when you’re so dehumanized that you have to make the ultimate sacrifice?

Michael: That’s right. My first phase is his second step. And my second is his fourth. We have to go from appeals to the head to appeals to heart. So, you have to go from negotiation type practices to Satyagraha. And then I divided Satyagraha into two stages and said that sometimes you can get things done by ordinary Satyagraha, which is already pretty extraordinary. But in the end, if even that hasn’t worked, you have to be willing to risk your life or lay down your life. And the hope, of course, is that all you’ll have to do is risk it. You don’t actually have to lose it. But there are cases where both are really necessary.

However, if someone is arguing with you over Christmas break, “Hey, I didn’t want to get killed.” Point out that sometimes people get killed using violence. You can be polite and understated about it. So that in reality, you actually probably lose your life much less frequently in nonviolence than violence. But you have to realize that if there’s something that’s worth dying for, that you have this ultimate weapon, if you will, of laying down your life. In effect, when you’re doing a fast unto death, that is a slow version of this.

So, I’m not particularly bothered by the fact that my scheme and Martin Luther King Junior’s scheme are not exactly the same. It’s not like he’s right and I’m wrong.

Certainly not vice versa, but that's just not – we're groping for different models to understand all this. John.

Student: [Unintelligible 00:37:54]

Non-Attachment to Results

Michael: Oh yeah. Well, you know, he makes this famous speech just before he was assassinated, and he was beginning to suspect – I mean more than suspect that he was going to be assassinated. He said, "I hope nobody has to die in this campaign. But if somebody does, I hope it's going to be me." It's a very, very emotional thing. And he said – and everybody was riveted by that. Yeah. I think it's also the same speech where he says, "I've been to the mountaintop, and I've seen the promised land. I may not get there with you." Okay. Hold on just one second, Zoe.

What does that illustrate? What famous model or set of terms does that illustrate, aside from Kings fantastic rhetorical gifts. "I've been to the mountaintop, and I've seen the promised land. I may not get there with you."

Student: Phalam. Fruits of action.

Michael: Phalam. Oh, that's much better than what I was going to say. Yes, that's what I was going to say. It's a terrific illustration of the Gita Theory of Action, especially the concept that the personal benefit of an act is not what you should be concerned with. So, he was giving a terrific illustration of non-attachment to the fruits. I may not get there with you.

Again, we could draw a military parallel because a lot of people lay down their lives in military combat and they never get to benefit from the conquest. But what I was going to say and it's not less exciting than what Rami discovered. This is a good example of success versus work. Because he's saying, "I know that this is eventually going to work, even if we don't see it working right here and now in my lifetime." But I like yours a lot better. You get A+. I get an A.

Okay. Well, I didn't think we'd get quite that much out of this paragraph. And, of course, you're going to be have to be a little bit more succinct. Emily?

Student: I was just wondering because I think all of these points are really amazing and, you know, we've discussed all these terms a lot. But in terms of like focus for responding to this passage, rather than just having [unintelligible 00:40:37]. Should we have that, and can we do that right now? Maybe I missed that. But like the focus for how we're responding to this, but like as a process?

Michael: You know, the focus for how you're going to actually respond to a passage like this on the exam will be up to you. You can easily – if it were me doing it, I would say this is a very plausible scheme. It's interesting that it doesn't line up quite exactly with other schemes. That tells something about where nonviolence is as a science

today. And then I would go into the four steps and bring in the key terms. Yeah. But bringing in the key terms and especially if you can bring in the key term and illustrate it. Like as we were doing with the campaign thing. Contrast with Rosenstraße Demonstration which was not a campaign with the Montgomery Bus Boycott that was.

So, to be able to correctly analyze the underlying principle, name it, especially if we have given it a name at one point. And illustrate it with a historical example and you will be home free. You'll be on your way to one of those six figure jobs that you get for getting into peace research. Zoe and then Joy.

Student: Well, actually the speech that you're talking about, I've been to the [unintelligible 00:41:59] incredibly prophetic. That was the night before he was assassinated.

Michael: Yes. Yeah, both of those comments were the night before he was assassinated. So, I think both he and Gandhi were pretty darn sure that their number was up. And if they were into this for saving their life, they would have dropped it and gone away. Gandhi would have said, "Yeah, maybe it is a good idea for me to go to the U.S." And King would have said, "You know, it's a good idea for me to go to India now." Violate swadeshi and everything else we can think of.

But no, this was – and interestingly enough, it was the type of deliberate martyrdom that I've emphasized in connection with the fast unto death. Namely, that it's not the same thing as suicide. They're not people who want to die. They are not killing themselves. But they're putting their life at your disposal in order to shock you into some kind of awareness – which didn't work. It worked but didn't quite "work." Joy?

Student: I was just wondering if you'd go over what she just asked you.

Michael: Which she? Emily?

Student: Yeah, Emily, sorry. About the exam. Like the question scoreable context.

Applying the Four Steps as a Study

Michael: Well, I could say that again. Let's say when negotiation has failed, he's saying you should go to direct action. This is – you can say something about the logic of that as we were saying, why you would do that. And then you would say, "As a matter of fact, this isn't exactly what he did in Montgomery. They went to the boycott first and it was only when they had softened the White Citizens Council up that they got them to the negotiating table.

But normally, you do not do what Lyndon Johnson famously did in Vietnam which was bomb people to the negotiating table. Because then you have a very poor sort of a negotiation. You start by negotiating. And then you might take many, many examples of this in Gandhi's story. Before he launched Satyagraha, he always told the Viceroy I'm going to have to do Satyagraha if you won't talk to me about this.

So, they did this prior to the Salt Satyagraha, prior to the Quit India Campaign. So that's what I mean. There may be a term that you can name that we're using that suit – that would respond to something the writer said. And you'll illustrate that with the historical example. Yeah?

Final Review

Student: So, in our response to like a question like this, do we have to criticize it or can we agree with it or both?

Michael: You know, I don't care really – it's totally true. For purposes of grading the exam, I don't care whether you agree or disagree. I just care that you can back up your case. In other words, if you say, "This statement is ridiculous. Period." And you go on to the essay, you will not get your 30 points or whatever it is. But I think the statement is ridiculous because it violates the following three important principles of nonviolence and here are the counter instances from history. That's fine. You can be dead wrong, as long as you can build a strong argument, you'll be fine.

The point is to – the real point of this particular question is we're going to be exposed to discourse about nonviolence endlessly 99 times out of 100, people who are talking about nonviolence do not know what they're talking about. They will make a set of classic errors. And if we can identify them and illustrate what they should have said or why what they said is not true, then that, you know, we're going to – first of all, we're going to spare ourselves for bringing propaganda.

One of you is writing a paper, was upset to read – who was it? IT was Hannah Arendt who is a very well-known political scientist. And who wrote "The Road to Wigan Pier?" Orwell, George Orwell. Orwell and Arendt both said that Gandhi – in fact, this may show up on your final, now that I've mentioned it. They both said – of course, you didn't mention, I know. They both said that if Gandhi had tried nonviolence in Germany he would have been killed instantly. It would have been a complete failure. It only worked because the British were so polite.

Now you're going to hear things like that many times. And, you know, your choice is either to scream and rant or just say, "No, you know, as a matter of fact, that isn't true because," and even Arendt and Orwell are heavy duty thinkers. These are not your man on the street. But still, despite everything she was able to understand about violence, she never really was exposed to any information about nonviolence. So even a person who was that brilliant that she is one of the best political scientists of all time. Didn't understand what nonviolence is, what the principles are, how you use it.

Okay. So now I'm at your disposal. [Unintelligible 00:48:01] things that you've come up with in the course of your intense midnight study sessions? Unfamiliar terms, fuzzy concepts? You're wondering do I have a 9mm in the top left drawer of the desk? As far as I know, not. Sid?

Student: What is the name of that principle of the [unintelligible 00:48:32].

Michael: I don't know that it actually has a principle name. I call it, "The madman with the sword illustration." Because that's what – that's how Gandhi addresses his – a madman is coming to the village with a sword. The one who dispatches that lunatic will have done the village – will have done society a favor. Yeah?

Student: Can you go over the three stages of religion?

Michael: The three stages of religion. Yeah. We did a little bit about that on Tuesday. So, who would like to try running us through those? I want you to do two things. Tell us what the three stages are, and then, of course, tell us why we care here in PACS 164A.

So again, we don't confuse this with the revelation, assimilation, cooptation. Those three devolutionary stages. These are evolutionary stages that go through human consciousness on a very broad scale. Alana?

Student: [Unintelligible 00:49:48] Religion that seeks the sacred in nature. And then next would see the next – well, and then building on that would see in the community, and finally the individual.

Michael: Yeah. Very briefly those are the three stages. The question that we're asking about a religion is, "Where do they locate power? Where is the sacred? What do they have to propitiate in order to have a more loved life?" And the earliest stage were these religions, are the animist religions and they still exist in the world. In fact, I once got into a lot of trouble with a Japanese student by saying that this was an early stage that we should outgrow. Because they still practice it in the context of other stages.

But in any case, it would seem – and it's very hard to get any hard evidence with Stage Number 1, that human beings first sensed the sacred nature of life in the surrounding world. Nature which they felt, very, very close to and a part of. Then they start seeing it in the community and this is the classical religions of the West, the classical period in the West, the Greek and Roman. So that's where the gods are the gods of the community.

That really doesn't do us a whole lot of good in the point of view of nonviolence. But okay, now why is Stage 3, which locates the sacred in the person such a big breakthrough from purposes of developing nonviolence in the world. What is it doing in this class? Why did I spend so much time talking about it? It couldn't just be from its inherent interest because everything I've said is inherently interesting. Yes, Amy?

Student: It kind of illustrates like negative heart unity. Every person is sacred so you can't, you know, you don't want to be violent to anyone [unintelligible 00:51:59]. And also [unintelligible 00:52:02] person power?

Michael: Right. I would say that is the main theme. That it is a sort of historical evolutionary basis for person power and that person power is the core of principled nonviolence, though people power is also kind of neat. And it illustrates heart unity

because if every individual is sacred, then you cannot really hurt another individual without violating a sacred unity. John?

Student: Is that the same as that of God?

Michael: It is exactly. It's why I like the Quakers so much because they base their faith on the principle that, "There is that of God in every man." Eventually, they would also include women, but the point is that this is why they're not so keen on formal established worship, is why George Fox goes into a church and he says, "This is not the church. This is a steeple house. The church is the people. And then he would go to the ministers – this is one of the reasons why he was constantly being beat up, run out of town, thrown in jail, and stuff like that.

He would say to the minister, are you in the frame of mind that the disciples were in that primitive Christianity? And of course, they would say, "No, no. I have a degree from Cambridge, but I'm not anymore," however they would put it. Not any more aware of the light than anybody else. So, he would say, "So you step down and let me talk." And that endeared him to everyone. But for our purposes I don't think that it's possible to have real nonviolence without being aware that the individual is sacred. And if you remember on Tuesday I said you can approach this – or from this you can both a negative and a positive development. Remember that?

Why is this important negatively? It's more or less what you said, Amy. Yeah, Alana?

Student: You mean how can it be construed negatively?

Michael: No, not how it can be construed negatively, but this is a truth which has norms which are both prohibitive and constructive they come from.

Student: But you can't hurt another person. They have God in them.

Michael: Right. If you hurt another person, you are, to that extent, desacralizing that of God. So, in itself, this is just negative. It's just telling you what you cannot do. But I'm okay with that for starters. Remember, I'm always saying you can back into nonviolence if you refuse to deny yourself the capability of being violent. But positively, it's even more important that there is that of God in every person. Why is that positively important for us? Think of our own situation now in the U.S.? How well are our large institutions working? You know, we don't even have a reliable voting system anymore. The economy and military, everything is kaput practically.

And if we were to look to the big institutions – or take the media for example. This Optor Rebellion which took a year of careful planning, was described in one journal as a mob descended on Belgrade. They were just completely clueless. You can't plan nonviolence because it doesn't exist, right?

Anyway, let's not get too carried away. All of our big institutions are failing us. So, there is a response that says, "Well, we need to mobilize millions of people." But there's another response that says, "We haven't even begun tap into our resources." Because if

we do a lot of this stuff, [Points to “self-purification”] King’s Stage 3, there are untold resources within the human individual which haven’t even begun to use.

So, person-based nonviolent revolution is the name of our game. Sid?

Student: Will that relate to Gandhi’s idea of Swaraj as being not only like self home rule, but like self rule and self control? Each individual has to work on it.

Michael: It strongly relates to that concept that in fact, for him, Swaraj is, as a political concept, as a political achievement, is the result of individual self-rule, self control. Anarchism of the good kind. Yeah. He was accused of using – taking the word “Swaraj” from the religious context and using it in a political context. He said, “I did it purposely. That’s exactly what I think the truth of the matter is.” Good. So that’s a good connection.

I just realized that I forgot to do something which is really not untypical. And in fact, if I don’t tell you about it, I’ll forget to mention it later. So let me tell you about it now. You know, this is extremely boring. And that is I forgot to bring the course evaluations. I know how you feel about the course. That would be terrific, yeah, if you can do that. Great. Thanks a lot. Okay, so that solves that problem.

Now how do we – where do we go from here? What else has struck you as intriguing, unclear, not sure how you’d respond to – we had a very good discussion last time so I would like to just continue it.

Student: I was wondering about legitimization and [unintelligible 00:58:44].

DACE and Legitimization

Michael: Yeah. Suppose you had this as an ID. Legitimization. And, of course, you would immediately recall the DACE system. This patented system. Money back guarantee. So, the first thing you want to do is define it. And who would like to quickly define legitimization or legitimacy? You might want to think of it in contrast to something that legitimization, de-legitimization is not. But I wouldn’t start my answer that way. But you might start rethinking by saying, “Legitimization is not the same in itself as institutionalization. You can de-legitimate something and it will still carry on as a vestigial sort of institution.

But if you get rid of the institution without delegitimizing the thing, war, racism, whatever we’re talking about, it’s going to come back. So, what is the delegitimization – actually, it’s not really very mysterious. It’s not a very technical term actually. There’s a very good chance that this is going to show up on the exam actually. Rami, you were about to say something, I think. You thought better of it? Maybe you’d think even better of it.

Student: I think legitimization is like bring about a realization of why certain practice is proper and why, like for instance, you know, seeing humanity in others and treating them according is legitimate, to understand that is, in effect, delegitimizing dehumanization.

Michael: Yes. Delegitimizing dehumanization. Yeah. Yes, where it came up actually, if I remember correctly, was in my sort of grand summation of what I think I King achieved. And what I said was he succeeded in delegitimizing racism. There were others that helped. In a funny way, Hitler helped. He showed how hideously ugly racism actually is. But then King came in and showed in a much more positive way how illegitimate it is to say that another human being is not a human being because they belong to a different race.

Very effectively delegitimized racism. You cannot pass a racist law in the South nowadays. However, I went on to say, because of the shortness of his career and for whatever other reasons, he did not delegitimize or delegitimate violence. Unfortunately, racism is an offspring of violence. So that with it still being perceived as legitimate, racism was bound to come back. So, to delegitimize something is to make people understand that it's not true. It's not legitimate. Joanna?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:02:26]

Michael: I don't think you can attribute this to someone. Thank you very much. Because it's a common – it's a term in common usage. Yeah. I think if anyone, I probably got the term from Kenneth Boulding. And if anyone invented it, I would say he did. But I wouldn't say that he owns in the sense that he owns, "The Three Faces of Power." Okay? And then contextualize it and explain why it's important. Yeah, Julia?

Student: [Unintelligible 01:03:10]

Michael: Okay. I think it's actually best to start with the negative term, delegitimization. The context is you are confronting some kind of injustice. The people clinging to that injustice, well, partly because it benefits them. Like the fact that poor white people were discriminated against almost as viciously as Black people were in the South because it was economically advantageous to the people doing it. But people can't just go on doing things like that unless they feel that it's legitimate. So, they have actual – they actually have the idea that racism is part of the natural of things and this is how society is organized.

And if you were to abolish racism, particularly in the most horrible and violent way, by interracial marriage, then what you would do is you would bring about a crisis of non-differentiation. In other words, you have a body of people who feels that racism is legitimate. And legitimate meaning is founded in reality. It's just. It's valid. It's something they have to value and cling to. And one of the most powerful move that you can make, which is going to make direct action if you happen to go into it, a lot easier and a lot less painful, then maybe you won't even be necessary to delegitimize racism in the minds of those people.

So, one of the fastest ways to do that is to show them that the dehumanized group is capable of nonviolence. Which it turns out, although people will not tell you this, we have in your minds the notion that nonviolence is a pre-eminently human characteristic.

Animals can sometimes respond in a nonviolent way. Like that Alpha dog that I was telling you about at the beginning of this hour and a half. But fawns cannot decide to be nonviolent in order to produce that kind of reaction in dogs.

They either are hardwired for that or they're not. I suppose what I just said was interesting, but irrelevant. The definition of delegitimization is – so don't try to do that on the exam.

The definition of delegitimization is awakening people to the reality that something they are clinging to is not legitimate. And the reason that – and then when you evaluate and say – this is a very important part of nonviolence practice. It's part of persuasion versus coercion. It's part of – its strategic. It's principled. It's everything.

So absolutely everything else we've discussed all semester is perfect clear then I take it? What are some other questions you have? Sid and then Angela.

Criminal Justice Reform and the Nonviolent Worldview

Student: I was just wondering if you could talk a little bit more about the criminal justice system and like [unintelligible 01:06:59].

Michael: Right. We'll probably talk about criminal justice reform more next semester because this is an ongoing thing. But it illustrates very well how if you have the wrong vision, you come up with the wrong framework. So, if your vision is that there are good guys and bad guys – in other words, you think the world is a Grade C cowboy movie, which apparently some people who hold high office in this country – no names please – actually believe. Or rather, they don't actually believe it, they know that they'll get a lot of votes for pretending to believe it. If you have that kind of vision, then when somebody commits a crime, you're going to use a moral framework and say they are – they've done something immoral, and they have to be punished.

So, then you build jail after jail after jail and put millions of people in there and you never notice that it isn't working. But if your vision is that everyone – we're all interconnected. People make mistakes. And as Barack Obama said in a historical speech yesterday, somewhere I think, in Southern California, "I am not in favor of putting people in prison for the rest of their life because they made a mistake."

You're looking upon destructive, abhorrent, unacceptable behavior. To be sure, it has all of those characteristics. But it's a result – it's a mistake and the mistake has to be corrected. And you're going to correct that mistake through education. And you build institutions to do that, then you're practicing restorative justice. And I gave you that one really arresting – wrong word to use in this context – really striking example of how this is done in some African communities where everybody sits around and has to say

something good about the person that's created the – has the done the mistake. Because what you're doing is not – you don't want them to identify with their mistake.

Just as I was saying about what fraternization did in Prague Spring. If someone comes in with a uniform and says, you know, you have to do this and you obey, you are validating that uniform. But if you step up to them and say, "Wait a minute, you know, we're both Slavic, we're both revolutionaries. We're good communists." Then you're bring out a different concept of who they are and helping them to move through the concept of who they are.

So that's the basic principle. Now another part of this is that retributive justice very much goes along with Stage 2 religions because it's a state that's doing the retribution. Not the individual. When the individual does his or her own retribution then you get Iraq that's going on right now. You know, the Hatfields versus the McCoys and that's the whole scapegoating thing was invented to put a crude kind of end to. But yeah, it's if you have a Stage 3 outlook on life and you're going to tend to believe that the crime – the persons involved are the victimizer and the victim, not the society.

So, if you're going to build institutions, they're not going to be prisons that keep the victimizer away from the victim indefinitely. On the contrary, you're going to try to bring them together. So, I cited this one practice V-O-R-P – VORP, which stands for Victim Offender Reconciliation Program which is what they do. They mediated, context, you set these people down at the same table and try to work out first of all, healing the breach in the relationship. And second of all, what are we going to do by way of restitution.

So, there are many other aspects of it which we haven't had time to discuss, but it's very clear that retributive justice is the justice system of the violent society. And when you try to change it to restorative justice system, we are hinting that we could have a nonviolent society. That would be a really important piece for us in this country right now to try to tackle. Okay. Andrea?

Unanimous Violence and Scapegoating

Student: [Unintelligible 01:11:35]

Michael: Unanimous violence? Okay, good. That's a nice handy workable technical term. Who wants to define it, attribute it, contextualize, and evaluate it? What's unanimous violence? Remember how this crept in? John?

Student: It's like this notion of a third party. Kind of like you continue victimizing them and kind of [unintelligible 01:12:10].

Michael: That's pretty good. Obviously, you're talking about scapegoating and that's where the term does come up. And a feature of scapegoating is you create a kind of crude unanimity by excluding a marginal and expendable part of the population. So, the

population is full of tensions. What can we agree on? Well, we can agree that we all hate this goat. So, load all sins on the goat and drive it out of the community and we are re-bonded together. So, what would be the attribution?

Student: I don't know. [Unintelligible 01:12:46] was that example of historically, of this intense, usually men dehumanizing women [unintelligible 01:12:56].

Michael: That's kind of an example. It's not totally unanimous. But yeah, we can all agree that we should dominate women and that gives us a kind of bond. Stupid as it may seem.

Just in interests of time, because I'd like you to bring your papers or pass them up and I'd like to pass out these evaluations. I can do it right for once.

Let me do the attribution which, of course, is to René Girard. He was the person who came up with this whole theory of scapegoating. And the evaluation. René Girard? [Writes, "René Girard"] It should actually be [French accent] *René Girard* but you can say, "René Girard." And the work that I'd work recommend is, "Job, the Victim of his People." And the evaluation of it is that this is scapegoating as – therefore unanimous violence – is an extremely common form of violence in society. Also, you can say even in individuals. Therefore, to get rid of it is a very big step for the direction of the nonviolent world. Yes?

Student: So unanimous violence is scapegoating?

Michael: It's a part of scapegoating. Unanimous violence refers to the fact that everybody in the in-group has a duty to expel a victim. And that's why if you remember in the Jewish Code there was a law that said that if everybody is against a person, that person must be set free. Because the likelihood is that it's a scapegoating process going on and not a just process going on. Okay, well, people, it's been great working with you. I hope this is the beginning and not the end of your nonviolent exploration. And I'll see some of you next semester in one way or another. Now if you would pass your papers forward and fill out those beige things for us.

